"A positive culture of support"
Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide
Report to the Ministry of Education
Sally Boyd and Rachel Felgate
NZCER
“A positive culture of support”:

Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide

Sally Boyd and Rachel Felgate
Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the many people who made the writing of this report possible. Our particular thanks go to the staff and students at PB4L School-Wide schools who completed surveys and responded to our requests for school data and documents. Our thanks also go to the School-Wide Practitioners and other Ministry of Education stakeholders who contributed their views and experiences to inform the scoping phase of the evaluation and provided the material used in this report. We would also like to thank our New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) colleagues who reviewed and formatted this report.
Table of contents

School-Wide in New Zealand: Main evaluation findings ................................................................. 1

1. Setting the scene .......................................................................................................................... 11
   Introduction to the School-Wide evaluation ................................................................................. 11
   Introduction to PB4L School-Wide ............................................................................................ 11
   Background to the evaluation ..................................................................................................... 13
      Using stakeholder knowledge to develop a theory of change .................................................... 13
      Questions that guide the School-Wide evaluation .................................................................... 15
      Evaluation phases and timelines .............................................................................................. 15
      Evaluation methodology ........................................................................................................... 16
      Data-collection strategies ......................................................................................................... 16
      Response rates ......................................................................................................................... 19
      Ethics and informed consent .................................................................................................... 20
      Survey data analysis and interpretation .................................................................................... 20
      Limitations of the evaluation design and data-collection strategies ......................................... 23
      The focus of this report ............................................................................................................ 23

2. Exploring evidence for short-term shifts .................................................................................. 25
   Summary of chapter findings ...................................................................................................... 25
   Evidence for short-term shifts ...................................................................................................... 27
      Differences in the extent of shifts reported by groups of respondents ....................................... 27
      Differences between schools in the extent of shifts ................................................................. 28
      Are changes happening in school culture? .............................................................................. 28
      Are changes happening for students? ...................................................................................... 30
      Are changes happening to school practices and systems? ....................................................... 44
      Are changes happening for teachers and in classrooms? ......................................................... 48
      Changes in the involvement of parents and whānau in School-Wide ......................................... 52
      Does School-Wide lead to change for all types of schools? ..................................................... 53

3. School-Wide implementation and support ................................................................................. 55
   Summary of chapter findings ...................................................................................................... 55
   Implementing School-Wide .......................................................................................................... 57
      Has there been a change between phases 1 and 3? ................................................................ 57
      Is there support for School-Wide? ........................................................................................... 57
      Are the key features of School-Wide in place? ........................................................................ 60
      How embedded is School-Wide? ............................................................................................. 61
      School teams ............................................................................................................................. 64
      In-school support for staff ......................................................................................................... 67
      Reporting and addressing behaviour incidents ......................................................................... 69
      Data management, reporting and use ....................................................................................... 70
      School staff views on aspects of School-Wide that need more support .................................. 72
      How aligned is School-Wide to New Zealand practice? .......................................................... 73
      School coaches’ views on the School-Wide support model ...................................................... 76
Support from cluster groups ................................................................. 77
The impact of support on rate of School-Wide implementation................................. 77
Support relationships and stability over time ................................................................ 78
Stability of school teams and clusters ......................................................................... 79
Aspects of School-Wide that may need further support ...................................................... 79
Focusing on priority learners ......................................................................................... 79
Shifting from punitive to learning-focused behaviour consequences ...................... 81
A widening gap between primary and secondary practice .............................................. 84
Providing support to schools .......................................................................................... 87
Access to support .......................................................................................................... 87
Consolidating the Tier 1 training and support model ....................................................... 87
Working in a joined-up way ............................................................................................ 90
Balancing regional delivery with national consistency .................................................. 91
A workforce model that balances the needs of Tiers 1 and 2 schools .......................... 92

4. Short and longer term sustainability ........................................................................... 95

Summary of chapter findings .......................................................................................... 95
Factors that enable School-Wide .................................................................................... 96
What can differences between Tiers 1 and 2 schools tell us about School-Wide enablers? 96
Enablers and barriers to implementation ...................................................................... 98
School enablers .............................................................................................................. 98
School barriers ............................................................................................................. 100
School-Wide support and system enablers ................................................................. 100
System barriers ............................................................................................................ 101
Keeping it fresh: Longer term sustainability and support models ............................. 101

5. Summing up the School-Wide journey ...................................................................... 107

Additional support for schools ..................................................................................... 110
Workforce and support models that maintain the momentum ....................................... 111
Final comments ............................................................................................................ 112
References ..................................................................................................................... 114

Tables

Table 1 Data-collection methods used to explore the evaluation questions ......................... 18
Table 2 Data-collection response rates ........................................................................... 19
Table 3 Positive changes to SSEE rates reported in phase 1 and phase 3 ........................... 33
Table 4 Mean total ODR rates by length of time in School-Wide ........................................ 34
Table 5 Wellbeing@School items (Year 5/6 students at 2013 School-Wide schools) ........... 41
Table 6 Wellbeing@School items (Year 5/6 students at 2012 School-Wide schools) .......... 42
Table 7 Wellbeing@School items (Year 9/10 students at 2013 School-Wide schools) ....... 43
Table 8 Who was represented on School-Wide teams in phase 3? (Coach n = 175) ............... 65
Table 9 Coach views on the alignment between external PLD and School-Wide goals ........ 75
Figures

Figure 1  Core features of the School-Wide Tier 1 framework* ................................................................. 12
Figure 2  School-Wide theory of change..................................................................................................... 14
Figure 3  School-Wide evaluation questions ............................................................................................ 15
Figure 4  Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes to school culture............................ 29
Figure 5  Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes to student knowledge and competencies ................................................................. 30
Figure 6  Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes to key behaviour outcomes ............ 32
Figure 7  Expulsion rates for School-Wide and comparison schools ........................................................ 36
Figure 8  Exclusion rates for School-Wide and comparison schools ....................................................... 36
Figure 9  Suspension rates for School-Wide and comparison schools .................................................... 37
Figure 10 Stand-down rates for School-Wide and comparison schools .................................................. 38
Figure 11 Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes in reporting and addressing behaviour incidents .................................................................................................................. 45
Figure 12 Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes to managing and using data.............. 46
Figure 13 Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes in collaboration................................. 47
Figure 14 Curriculum leader views on School-Wide’s contribution to confidence in managing behaviour .................................................................................................................. 49
Figure 15 Curriculum leaders’ views on School-Wide’s contribution to approaches to behaviour expectations .................................................................................................................. 50
Figure 16 Curriculum leader views on School-Wide’s contribution to behaviour management strategies .. 51
Figure 17 Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to working with parents and whānau................. 52
Figure 18 Coach views on school and community support for School-Wide............................................ 58
Figure 19 Curriculum leader views on school support for School-Wide .................................................. 58
Figure 20 Coach views on the School-Wide philosophy......................................................................... 59
Figure 21 Coach views on the extent key features of School-Wide are in place ..................................... 60
Figure 22 Coach views on the extent to which School-Wide is embedded ............................................. 62
Figure 23 Coach views on the School-Wide team .................................................................................... 64
Figure 24 Coach views on the links made by the School-Wide team ....................................................... 66
Figure 25 Curriculum leader views on School-Wide team support ........................................................ 67
Figure 26 Coach views on the in-school support provided to staff ......................................................... 68
Figure 27 Curriculum leader views on their access to in-school support .............................................. 68
Figure 28 Curriculum leader views on systems for reporting and addressing behaviour incidents ........ 69
Figure 29 Coach views on managing data .............................................................................................. 70
Figure 30 Coach views on reporting and using data .............................................................................. 71
Figure 31 Coach views on School-Wide’s alignment with school practice .............................................. 73
Figure 32 Coach views on the 2014 School-Wide support model ............................................................. 76
Figure 33 A school change journey shown as an s-shaped growth curve* ............................................ 102
Figure 34 Theory-of-change map for 2010/11 School-Wide schools (end of 2014) ................................. 108
Figure 35 Theory-of-change map for 2012/13 School-Wide schools (end of 2014) ................................. 109
Appendices

Appendix 1: School characteristics by School-Wide cohort year .............................................................. 116
Appendix 2: Data collection and analysis .......................................................................................... 117
Appendix 3: Wellbeing@School demographics ............................................................................... 119
Appendix 4: Wellbeing@School aspect map .................................................................................. 120
Appendix 5: Wellbeing@School aspect boxplots and item reports ................................................. 121
Appendix 6: Office Discipline Referral data .................................................................................... 150
School-Wide in New Zealand: Main evaluation findings

This report summarises the findings from the final phase of an evaluation of Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) School-Wide. It describes the extent of implementation of School-Wide in schools, identifies short-term shifts and considers the longer term sustainability of the initiative.

Overall, the findings suggest that School-Wide is being implemented as intended in many schools. Across a range of schools, School-Wide is resulting in many of the expected short-term shifts in practice and outcomes. A focus on School-Wide is being maintained in the short term at many schools. A few schools, particularly large secondary, may require adjustments to the support and resourcing model to fully implement the core features of School-Wide. Some schools are developing strategies to “keep School-Wide fresh” in the longer term. Other schools require more active support to address challenges to maintaining School-Wide over time.

What is School-Wide?

School-Wide is one component of PB4L. School-Wide is the New Zealand version of a proven international initiative called Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). School-Wide offers primary, intermediate and secondary schools a way of building a consistent and positive school-wide climate to support learning based around shared values and behaviour expectations. School-Wide is a framework of key features that schools implement in ways that suit their context. It aims to engage the whole school community in adapting school structures, practices and philosophies related to behaviour, and in developing systems that everyone can use in a consistent way. Each school forms a team to implement School-Wide in a way that is collaborative, data-driven and problem solving. School staff are offered a package of School-Wide training and support which includes training days, cluster meetings with local schools and access to regionally-based School-Wide Practitioners who work with schools as they implement School-Wide.

School-Wide has three tiers. During Tier 1 schools put in place a core set of behaviour support systems and practices designed to be used consistently by all to encourage positive behaviour. Once the core features of Tier 1 are in place schools can move to Tier 2 (developing targeted interventions for small groups of students who need additional support) and Tier 3 (developing specialised interventions for students who need individualised support). School-Wide began in New Zealand in 2010. Each year around 100 schools join the initiative.

Design and focus of the evaluation

The New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) evaluation was a mixed-method study with a focus on process and outcomes. The evaluation focused on Tier 1 of School-Wide and ran from 2013 to 2015. The evaluation questions this report addresses are:

- What short-term shifts is School-Wide supporting towards School-Wide outcomes for students and schools?
- Are core School-Wide practices being implemented as intended?
- What factors enable or hinder the shifts in schools?
- What does effective support for School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context?

The evaluation had three phases:

- In phase 1 we collected preliminary data about the implementation of School-Wide, and explored evidence for short-term shifts in schools that had been part of School-Wide for longer (i.e., joined School-Wide in 2010 and 2011). Phase 1 took place in Terms 3–4 of 2013. The preliminary findings from this phase are summarised in Boyd, Dingle, and Herdina (2014).
Phase 2 included seven case studies of School-Wide schools that had experienced significant changes in practice. The main aim of the case studies was to explore what effective practice in School-Wide schools looked like in a New Zealand context. The school visits occurred in Term 3 of 2014. The case studies can be found in Boyd, Hotere-Barnes, Tongati’o, and MacDonald (2015).

Phase 3 involved a second round of data collection similar to that undertaken in phase 1. Focusing on the schools that had been part of the initiative since 2010/11, one main aim was to provide insights into the longer term implementation successes and challenges. The second aim was to collect further evidence of short-term shifts that were associated with School-Wide at 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools.

This report mostly summarises the information collected during phase 3. Information from phases 1 and 2 is also referred to. Data from the following existing and new sources are included in this report.

Schools and Ministry of Education personnel

- Surveys from school coaches and English and mathematics curriculum leaders in School-Wide schools.
- School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) data from School-Wide schools (SET documents the extent to which seven essential features of School-Wide are in place in a school and consistently understood and used).
- Surveys from School-Wide Practitioners, and interviews with seven Ministry of Education School-Wide national and regional practice leaders and managers.

Student data

- National data on stand-down, suspension, expulsion and exclusion rates (SSEE) from School-Wide and non-School-Wide schools.
- Office Discipline Referral (ODR) data from School-Wide schools.
- Wellbeing@School surveys from a sample of students at schools that joined School-Wide in 2012 and 2013.

Key findings about shifts in practice and outcomes

Schools are following the expected pattern of shifts in practice and short-term outcomes

At the beginning of the evaluation, we developed a “theory of change” for how School-Wide processes and practices could lead to the expected outcomes, and the factors that could have a bearing on these changes. This theory of change underpins our evaluation work. To explore if schools are following the expected pattern of implementation and change, we used a range of data sources to map changes to practices and outcomes onto the theory-of-change diagram. The maps for 2010/11 and 2012/13 School-Wide schools are shown below.

The blue shading on the diagrams below indicates that 60% or more of school coaches or curriculum leaders agreed that a practice was in place, or reported a shift in practices or outcomes at the end of 2013 (phase 1). We also used data from national and regional Ministry of Education staff to inform some sections. Green shading adds to this pattern by showing the new practices in place and short-term outcomes reported by the end of 2014 (phase 3). As expected, respondents at schools that joined School-Wide in 2010 or 2011 reported more practices in place and a number of short-term changes, so the blue shading is much more evident. For 2010/11 schools this shading is similar in phases 1 and 3 which suggests these schools are maintaining their focus on School-Wide over time. By phase 3 more short-term outcomes are evident for these schools.

Yellow shading indicates less than 60% agreement or reports of shifts. In phase 1, respondents from the 2012/13 schools had been part of School-Wide for less time. As expected they reported fewer core practices in place or shifts, so the yellow shading is more evident. By the end of 2014, the amount of green shading on the 2012/13 schools shows they were following the same implementation pattern as the 2010/11 schools. The practices that shift first, and the outcomes that are first noted, are very similar to those initially reported by the 2010/11 schools. The fact that the pattern of change is very similar for 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools suggests that School-Wide is following an expected pattern of implementation which then leads to changes to outcomes.

These maps are included next to give the reader a visual impression of the pattern of change for schools.
Theory-of-change map for 2010/11 School-Wide schools (end of 2014)

Are these processes in place? Have these short-term changes happened by the end of 2013 or 2014?

NOT YET Yellow italics = less than 60% agreed

YES Blue = 60% or more agreed in 2013 Green = 60% or more agreed in 2014

CORE SCHOOL-WIDE ACTIVITIES and PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY

Student
- Students have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (have agency) (Coach)

School and staff
- School staff have an active role in developed shared values and expectations (Curric)
- Values and expectations are modelled and taught (Curric)
- The principal and senior leadership team actively support School-Wide (Coach)
- School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy in) (Curric)
- School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities (Coach)
- School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities, develops and implements action plans and reports data (Coach)
- Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and expectations and addressing behaviour incidents are developed (Coach)
- School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data (Coach)
- School develops effective system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data to stakeholders (to staff, less for students & whānau) (Coach)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners and students with special education needs (Coach)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the NZ education system (e.g., NZC and leadership models that value relationships and Manaakitanga, pono, ako and awhinatanga)

Parent, whānau and community
- School works effectively with community (including Māori and Pasifika communities) to develop shared values and expectations (Coach)

National and regional
- Effective school coaching and PLD networks set up in regions (Coach)
- School-Wide Practitioners (regional specialists) are recruited, trained and have the capabilities needed to work with school teams
- National structure provides guidance and feedback from data to regions and responding demands

SHORT-TERM CHANGES EXPECTED (1–2 years)

Student outcomes and shifts in processes
- Some decreases in challenging behaviour incidents and SSEE (Coach & Curric)
- Some increase in positive behaviours (e.g., attendance, engagement, social wellbeing) (Coach & Curric)
- Students offered active leadership role in promoting and celebrating school values (Coach)
- Students have access to effective learning experiences and staff modelling related to shared school values (Coach)

School outcomes and shifts in processes

Teachers and classrooms
- Shift from a punishment to a learning view of behaviour management (Curric)
- Increased confidence to manage behaviour outside and inside classroom (Curric—near 60% for modelling and teaching)
- Increased capability to actively model and incorporate values and behaviour expectations (to ways that relate to priority groups: Māori students, Pasifika students, students with special education needs) (Curric—near 60% for modelling and teaching)
- More time teaching (less time managing behaviour) (Coach)

Leadership, culture and systems
- School culture is more welcoming, inclusive and safe (Coach & Curric)
- School leaders maintain involvement with School-Wide and model learning and systems orientation towards behaviour (Coach)
- Increased use of consistent school approaches (School system for approaches to recognition of values and behaviours and addressing incidents is used by most staff and is relevant for target groups (Māori learners, Pasifika learners, students with special education needs) (Curric & Coach)
- School PLD processes support all staff to understand shared values and work to align their values and approaches (Curric)
- Effective team-based problem-solving processes in place (Coach)
- School uses SMS/data system proactively to report at different levels (school structures, classroom, all students, at-risk groups) (Coach)
- Staff are able to use data for meaningful decision making (e.g., to identify target groups or areas of practice) (Curric & Coach)
- School has reviewed and refined School-Wide processes to support School-Wide within their culture and community context and has worked to align approaches to learning and other initiatives and programmes with School-Wide (Coach)

Parent, whānau and community outcomes and shifts in processes
- School has established effective processes for seeking input from parents and whānau and reporting developments (Coach)
- School has started to make connections with groups in wider community to support School-Wide (e.g., Sports Clubs)

National and regional outcomes and shifts in processes
- Regional School-Wide Practitioner teams have a mix of needed expertise and a team-based approach that enables the team to effectively support schools (Māori and Pasifika expertise less available in some regions)
- School cluster processes support schools to share expertise (Coach)
- Processes developed for defining roles and sharing expertise between School-Wide Practitioner and other MoE professionals (networks exist but not formalised. Staff support development in 2013)
- Data collection and feedback loops are used to improve support to schools (use of regional data and national systems data) (informal loops exist)
- School-Wide Practitioner teams make connections with other agencies and sector groups
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Theory-of-change map for 2012/13 School-Wide schools (end of 2014)

Are these processes in place? | Have these short-term changes happened?
---|---
**NOT YET** | **YES**

Yellow Italic = less than 60% agreed | Blue = 60% or more agreed in 2013 | Green = 60% or more agreed in 2014

CORE SCHOOL-WIDE ACTIVITIES and PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY

**Student**
- Students have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (have agency) (Coach)

**School and staff**
- School staff have an active role in developed shared values and expectations (Curric)
- Values and expectations are modelled and taught (Curric)
- The principal and senior leadership team actively support School-Wide (Coach)
- School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy in) (Curric)
- School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities (Coach)
- School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities, develops and implements action plans and reports data (Coach)
- Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and expectations and addressing behaviour incidents are developed (Coach)
- School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and addressing students with special education needs (Coach)
- School develops effective system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data to stakeholders (Coach)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners, and students with special education needs (Coach)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the NZ education system (e.g., NZC and leadership models that value relationships and Manaakitanga, pono, ako and awhinatanga)

**Parent, whānau and community**
- School works effectively with community (including Māori and Pasifika communities) to develop shared values and expectations (Coach)

**National and regional**
- Effective school coaching and PLD networks set up in regions (Coach)
- School-Wide Practitioners (regional specialists) are recruited, trained and have the capabilities needed to work with school teams
- National structure provides guidance and feedback from data to regions
- Networks exist but have too many competing demands

SHORT-TERM CHANGES EXPECTED (1–2 years)

**Student outcomes and shifts in processes**
- Some decreases in challenging behaviour incidents (Coach not Curric)
- Some increase in positive behaviours (e.g., attendance, engagement, social wellbeing) (mostly Coach)
- Students offered active leadership role in promoting and celebrating school values (Coach)
- Students have access to effective learning experiences and staff modelling related to shared school values (Coach)

**School outcomes and shifts in processes**

**Teachers and classrooms**
- Shift from a punishment to a learning view of behaviour management (Curric)
- Increased confidence to manage behaviour outside and inside classroom (Curric—near 60% for outside classroom)
- Increased capability to actively model and incorporate values and behaviour expectations (in ways that relate to priority groups: Māori students, Pasifika students, students with special education needs) (Curric)
- More time teaching (less time managing behaviour) (Curric)

**Leadership, culture and systems**
- School culture is more welcoming, inclusive and safe (Coach & Curric)
- School leaders maintain involvement with School-Wide and model learning and systems orientation towards behaviour (Coach)
- Increased use of consistent school approaches (School system for approaches to recognition of values and behaviours and addressing incidents is used by most staff and is relevant for target groups (Māori learners, Pasifika learners, students with special education needs) (Coach not Curric)
- School PLD processes support all staff to understand shared values and work to align their behaviours and practices (Curric)
- Effective team-based problem-solving processes in place (Coach)
- School uses SMS/data system proactively to report at different levels (school structures, classroom, all students, at risk groups) (Coach)
- Staff are able to use data for meaningful decision making (e.g., to identify target groups or areas of practice) (Coach & Curric)
- School has filled School-Wide within their culture and community context and has worked to align approaches to learning and other initiatives and programmes with School-Wide (Coach)

**Parent, whānau and community outcomes and shifts in processes**
- School has established effective processes for seeking input from parents and whānau and reporting developments (Coach)
- School has started to make connections with groups in wider community to support School-Wide (e.g., Sports Clubs)

**National and regional outcomes and shifts in processes**
- Regional School-Wide Practitioner teams have a mix of needed expertise and a team-based approach that enables the team to effectively support schools (Māori and Pasifika expertise less available in some regions)
- School cluster processes support schools to share expertise (Coach)
- Processes developed for defining roles and sharing expertise between School-Wide Practitioner and other MoE professionals (networks exist but are not formalised, sector support drawn on in 2014)
- Data collection and feedback loops are used to improve support to schools (use of regional data and national systems data) (informal loops exist)
- School-Wide Practitioner teams make connections with other agencies and sector groups
School-Wide is supporting positive changes to school culture

The consistent picture from different sets of data is that School-Wide is an initiative that is supported by school staff, and this sense of support is being sustained over time.

The majority of coaches and curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools thought School-Wide focused on areas important to their school. The main messages from the school surveys were that School-Wide is improving school cultures and supporting increased consistency in approaches to behaviour. The majority of 2010/11 school coaches and curriculum leaders reported that School-Wide had contributed to:

- a more respectful and inclusive school culture (86% of coaches and 81% of curriculum leaders)
- school safety (85% of coaches and 70% of curriculum leaders)
- school systems and processes which supported consistency; for example, most reported that School-Wide had improved the effectiveness of school approaches to addressing behaviour incidents (79% of coaches and 63% of curriculum leaders).

The majority of coaches also reported that School-Wide had assisted in improving school systems for collecting and reporting behaviour data.

By phase 3, respondents at 2012/13 schools were starting to report similar changes to school culture; for example, 78% of coaches and 68% of curriculum leaders reported a positive change in the extent to which their school culture was respectful and inclusive.

A decrease in major behaviour incidents was one of the main changes reported for students

One of the largest positive changes reported by 2010/11 school respondents was a decrease in major behaviour incidents (86% of primary and 81% of secondary/intermediate coaches). By phase 3, 60% of coaches from 2012/13 schools were also reporting the same (the equivalent figures in phase 1 were 27% with 33% reporting it was too soon to tell).

By phase 3, 71–74% of 2010/11 secondary/intermediate coaches and 50–61% of primary coaches were also reporting that School-Wide was having an impact on the SSEE rates at their school. This was a slight increase from phase 1.

Around four-fifths of 2010/11 coaches and three-quarters or more of curriculum leaders also reported that School-Wide was supporting shifts in student outcomes, such as positive changes in student awareness of behaviour expectations and consequences and valuing of the way staff acknowledge positive behaviour.

By phase 3, changes were more evident in the classroom and 2010/11 curriculum leaders were reporting more positive changes associated with School-Wide; for example:

- 73% reported a decrease in disruptions in class (in phase 1, 58% reported this)
- 71% reported increased on-task behaviour and engagement (in phase 1, 61% reported this)
- 55% reported increases in the number of students arriving on time for class (in phase 1, 43% reported this).

In phase 1, many coaches and curriculum leaders at 2012/13 schools reported it was too soon to tell if changes were happening in the classroom. By phase 3, those at 2012/13 schools were starting to report similar changes.

Changes in student outcomes were more evident in reports from school staff than in student data. However, student data showed that stronger trends were emerging over time. The SSEE and ODR we collected mostly showed a
general downward trend, particularly in the more serious actions such as expulsions. This trend was stronger for the 2011 and 2012 schools that received a more consolidated training and support model. For a number of reasons these patterns need to be interpreted with caution taking into consideration the variable quality and coverage of these data.

**Student survey data showed similar patterns of changes**

In phase 1 we collected Wellbeing@School student survey data from schools that joined School-Wide in 2012/13, to provide a baseline for further monitoring. We returned to these schools a year later. The data from the Years 5/6 and 9/10 students for whom we had a larger sample of schools showed the expected pattern of small shifts in the practices and outcomes most aligned with School-Wide. One year is too short a time period to expect to see significant changes. In the first year of School-Wide the students’ survey responses suggested they were experiencing an increased focus on values, modelling of respectful relationships at school, and the development of more consistent ways of addressing behaviour incidents. A change in one of the more obvious forms of aggressive behaviour was also starting to happen (e.g., the number who reported weekly experiences of other students hitting, pushing or hurting them in a mean way decreased from 24% to 17%).

In the second year of School-Wide the focus on values and relationships is maintained. For example, at phase 3, 85% of the 2012 and 81% of the 2013 students agreed or strongly agreed that “everyone thinks our school values are important”. A decrease in a wider range of aggressive behaviours was more evident in the second year of School-Wide for Year 5/6 students.

Year 9/10 students from 2013 School-Wide schools showed the same pattern of an increased focus on values, relationships and consistent approaches to addressing behaviour incidents in their first year of School-Wide. They showed no change in the level of aggressive behaviours reported. These patterns suggest that change is occurring but, as they were measured over a one-year time frame, they are indicative only. A clearer pattern of change is more likely to be evident after 3 to 5 years. Longer time frames are particularly important for secondary settings as these schools take longer to implement School-Wide.

**Changes for teachers were becoming more evident over time**

The 2010/11 curriculum leaders who responded to the survey were in leadership roles in their schools. Therefore we would expect that many would be confident managing student behaviour. Most reported this was the case. Even so, in phases 1 and 3 similar numbers (around 60%) associated School-Wide with an increase in their confidence in managing behaviour in class and out of class. In phase 3, more reported this as a major positive change. They were also starting to report more positive change in students’ classroom behaviours.

The majority of 2010/11 curriculum leaders agreed that School-Wide had supported them to see that new behaviours could be taught and thought that School-Wide had made a difference to their approaches to behaviour. Only relatively small groups noted that School-Wide had made no difference to their approaches (13% in phase 3 and 15% in phase 1). This relatively low figure suggests that a focus on School-Wide is being maintained over time in many schools. The data from 2012/13 curriculum leaders were similar.

**Fewer changes were evident in how schools work with parents and whānau**

Making connections with parents and whānau is an area of practice where coaches reported fewer changes. However, their responses indicate that School-Wide is encouraging some schools to work more collaboratively. Low decile schools appear to have more collaborative processes in place than higher decile schools. This suggests that examples of practice exist that could be shared more widely.
Key finding about the implementation of School-Wide

Most schools were implementing the core features of School-Wide

As expected, the schools that joined School-Wide earlier (the 2010/11 schools) had most key School-Wide features in place. By phase 3, respondents from 2012/13 schools were also starting to report they had these features in place. The features that were still being implemented were mostly those that were more complex and needed other systems to be developed first. One example is making use of school data to change systems or settings. Effective data recording and reporting processes need to be in place before this practice can occur.

Schools that joined School-Wide in 2010/11 were accessing a range of other PB4L initiatives such as Incredible Years-Teacher and the Intensive Wraparound Service. The majority of schools reported these initiatives were well aligned with their School-Wide goals.

The current support mode was viewed as effective by most schools

Current support models and levels appeared to be effective for most 2010/11 schools, as well as newer schools that joined School-Wide in 2012/13. The majority of school coaches agreed they had access to:

- effective professional learning about School-Wide, and useful tools and resources they could adapt
- effective support and communications from School-Wide Practitioners and support for problem solving
- useful ideas from cluster sessions and connections with other schools.

Coaches from secondary and intermediate schools were the least likely to report that the School-Wide support and training model was effective. Other data show that large secondary schools have difficulty implementing some of the key features of School-Wide. Together this suggests that these schools may require adjustments to the support and resourcing model to build School-Wide practices in ways that are maintained over time.

Coaches’ reports of effective School-Wide professional learning and support from School-Wide Practitioners was related to faster initial implementation as shown by SET data. In phase 1, working with the same practitioner over time was associated with reports of better outcomes. In phase 3, working with the same practitioner was associated with 2010/11 schools’ ability to progress some of the more complex aspects of School-Wide. However, many schools had changes of practitioner.

Key findings about the factors that enable or hinder short- and longer term change

The School-Wide journey is more complex for large schools

The data from all sources suggest that the School-Wide implementation journey is more complex for large secondary and intermediate schools, and that School-Wide is less embedded in these schools. The gap between primary and secondary/intermediate schools widened between phases 1 and 3. This gap was not related to a belief that School-Wide does not work in secondary or intermediate settings. It was mostly related to the difficulties of working collaboratively and achieving consistency of practice in a large school. A number of secondary and intermediate schools had effectively implemented School-Wide and were reporting shifts in practice and student outcomes. Some had joined Tier 2. Therefore models of good practice in secondary settings exist that could be shared more widely.

SET data show that School-Wide is slower to implement in decile 1–2 schools than in higher decile schools. However, in phase 1 coaches in decile 1–2 schools reported more consultative approaches with staff, greater shifts in student outcomes and that School-Wide was embedded in their school. These differences were less evident in phase 3. The low and higher decile schools looked more like each other. This suggests that, although they took slightly different pathways, these schools were still on the same journey.
There are key enablers that support schools to implement and maintain School-Wide

A range of data sources indicates that the extent to which schools work collaboratively with their staff is a key enabler that can support later consistency of practice. Collaborative practices were particularly evident at the schools that had joined Tier 2. Other school enablers included:

- deliberate leadership and the active involvement of the principal
- a strong and connected School-Wide team that includes people with needed skills and broad representation
- the prioritisation of learning about School-Wide for all staff and learning alongside other schools
- the prioritisation of learning for all students through having planned processes for teaching behaviour expectations and teaching resources that support this
- processes to share and make active use of data
- external support to build practice and address challenges
- systems to embed and maintain School-Wide and refresh and build School-Wide over time.

Some areas to build school practice are evident

We identified a number of areas in which existing knowledge in the system could be drawn on to strengthen practice for schools. These include building a stronger focus on:

- support and resource models specifically tailored to secondary and large intermediate schools
- processes for working collaboratively in a large school
- models that show schools’ effective ways of working collaboratively with students and parents and whānau
- including the perspectives and needs of priority learners and their communities within School-Wide
- the development of learning-focused behaviour consequences that provide an alternative to SSEE
- system-wide and local ways to support schools with data use.

To best support schools, the workforce needs a clear and consistent model

School-Wide appeared to be helping regional Ministry of Education staff to build localised problem-solving teams that assist schools to work through challenges with implementing School-Wide. Regional staff were also working in a joined-up way with other educational professionals to support schools. Working in regional teams assisted ministry staff to offer support that was tailored to the schools in their area. During 2014, regional staff worked to offer more support to secondary schools and develop innovations relevant to their region and communities. However, some School-Wide Practitioners appeared to be pulled in many directions. Increasingly they were providing training and support to a larger group of schools with a wider range of needs. Interview data suggested that each region had different priorities in terms of supporting Tiers 1 and 2 schools. Ongoing concerns were expressed about “drift” between regions and a need for stronger networks to assess fidelity of training and support processes, share good practice and build new practices to ensure School-Wide was evolving. Solutions included building a stronger workforce model for School-Wide that outlined how different sets of expertise would be acknowledged and utilised.

Sustaining and building School-Wide over time requires a continuous improvement model

The majority of schools and Ministry staff reported School-Wide is supporting consistency of practice and positive changes to school practices, systems and outcomes. School-Wide appears to be assisting schools to develop a problem-solving culture, in their own school and with others in their School-Wide cluster group.
Most coaches from 2010/11 schools thought School-Wide was embedded in the way their schools worked. However, longer term sustainability was a concern for both schools and Ministry of Education staff. Implementing School-Wide is not a linear process that results in a fixed endpoint. To sustain School-Wide in the longer term, schools are continuing to build practice. Over half of 2010/11 schools had put in place a range of strategies to “keep School-Wide fresh” in the longer term. Joining Tier 2 is one way schools start a new growth cycle with School-Wide.

A few schools (about 10–15%) had reached a plateau or were starting to revert to previous practice. Staff turnover was a key factor that resulted in changes in direction. School-Wide Practitioners were developing a range of processes to support these schools to maintain the initiative over time. These findings suggest that both schools and the School-Wide workforce need a model that formalises existing problem-solving processes to enable all to build practice and expertise, and address challenges. Two core features were suggested for this model. One is that it maintains current communities of practice for schools and the School-Wide workforce that provide access to:

- new ideas to “keep School-Wide fresh”
- opportunities to network and problem solve with peers
- support or resources to make “adaptive breakthroughs” that address challenges.

The second feature is that coherence in the system is promoted through joined-up support and further integration of:

- Tiers 1 and 2 practice
- School-Wide with other aspects of PB4L such as the new Restorative Practices initiative
- School-Wide with other aspects of support for schools (e.g., senior advisor support)
- local and national data systems.

The findings suggest that most of these school and system challenges could be addressed by building on the successes, knowledge, expertise and processes already developed through School-Wide. For example, more processes could be developed to ensure that the Tier 2 schools that have successfully implemented School-Wide can act as mentors or demonstration schools that can provide examples of practice for Tier 1 schools.

Some challenges—such as the need for adjustments to the secondary support model and the need for stronger networks between Ministry of Education regions—may need to be addressed by adjustments to current approaches. Addressing these challenges, and further embedding processes that enable schools and School-Wide Practitioners to work in problem-solving communities that value continuous improvement, is likely to support the successes of School-Wide to be maintained and built on in the longer term.

Limitations of the data

A relatively low number of schools responded to the initial request for ODR data, and the ODR and SSEE data were of variable consistency and quality. This raises some questions about their usefulness in measuring the impact of School-Wide. As a consequence we have placed more emphasis on self-reporting from school respondents to draw conclusions about the extent of implementation of School-Wide and the initiative’s influence on short-term outcomes. To ensure the findings are robust, we used a combination of strategies to look for patterns in the data. These included data triangulation (looking at data from different sources to see if they tell a similar story) and mapping changes for 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools to see if they are following an expected pattern and sequence.
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1. Setting the scene

Introduction to the School-Wide evaluation

This report presents the findings from the third and final phase of the evaluation of School-Wide. This evaluation is designed to provide information and understandings that can be used by the Ministry of Education and the education sector to decide if any aspects of School-Wide need strengthening or changing, in order to achieve its medium- and long-term outcomes.

The main audiences for this report are Ministry of Education policy and practice personnel, and school leaders and School-Wide team members who are involved in implementing and maintaining School-Wide in their school.

Introduction to PB4L School-Wide

School-Wide is one component of the Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) initiative. PB4L is a key Ministry of Education strategy to improve the education sector’s capability to focus on student wellbeing and positive behaviour, through evidence-based initiatives with sound foundations in social and cognitive learning theory.

School-Wide was initially developed in the United States where it is known as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. In partnership with the school sector, School-Wide was selected for implementation in New Zealand following the Taumata Whanonga behaviour summit in 2009. School-Wide started in New Zealand in 2010. It is mostly funded by the Ministry of Education. The Prime Minister’s Youth Mental Health project provides some funding for secondary schools.

School-Wide offers primary, intermediate and secondary schools a way of building a consistent and positive school-wide climate to support learning. This climate is based around shared values and behaviour expectations. School-Wide is a framework of core features rather than a set “programme”, which means schools implement it in ways that suit their context. Each school forms a team that develops and implements the core features by working in a collaborative and problem-solving way. The School-Wide implementation process aims to engage the whole school community in adapting school philosophies, practices, structures and systems that relate to behaviour.

School-Wide has three tiers that school teams build sequentially. This evaluation only examines Tier 1. During Tier 1 a school puts in place a core set of systems and practices designed to encourage positive behaviour. These are called “universals” as they are aimed at all staff and students. Summaries of prior research shows that Tier 1 universal practices are effective in creating a climate of positive acknowledgement and ensuring about 70–80% of students avoid major discipline referrals (Sugai & Simonsen, 2012). The seven core features of the School-Wide Tier 1 framework and related practices are shown in Figure 1 below.
The principal provides support and promotes participation and ownership. The principal works to get at least 80% buy-in from staff before joining School-Wide. A representative team that includes a school coach and team leader, and parent and community members, is formed to lead consultation, decision making and implementation.

2. A common purpose and approach to discipline is developed in collaboration with the school community.

3. A set of three to five whole-school positive behaviour expectations (also called values), and a matrix that defines what these behaviours look like in different settings, are collaboratively developed and agreed on with staff, students, parents and whānau.

4. Behaviour expectations are actively taught and staff and students promote these behaviours to their peers.

5. Positive behaviour is reinforced by systems such as positive teacher attention, praise and rewards.

6. Consistent consequences are developed to discourage unwanted behaviour. Behaviour incidents are classified as minor (addressed by all staff) and major (addressed by senior staff). Behaviour incidents are addressed consistently and fairly and documented through an Office Discipline Referral (ODR) process.

7. Schools develop data-based decision-making systems to enable staff to identify and address problem behaviour and contexts. Data are shared with the school community and used to evaluate the effectiveness of School-Wide.

* Adapted from Ministry of Education (2012).

The Ministry of Education provides a small annual participation grant per school for training and support for the first 2 years of School-Wide Tier 1, and arranges national training days. Schools are expected to allocate some release time to enable staff to attend training. Schools are located in regional clusters that are supported by School-Wide Practitioners. The School-Wide Practitioners visit schools to offer support, administer the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) and facilitate local cluster meetings. The training and support model has been further developed each year. Overall support for School-Wide is managed by regional Ministry of Education offices.

Schools are expected to take between 3 and 5 years to implement the three tiers of School-Wide. Once the core features of Tier 1 are in place (as judged by consistent high scores on SET), schools can move to Tier 2 (developing targeted interventions for small groups of students who need additional support) and Tier 3 (developing specialised interventions for individuals who need individualised support).

By the end of 2014, about 500 schools had joined Tier 1 of School-Wide. This evaluation is focused on the 397 schools that joined Tier 1 of School-Wide from 2010 to 2013 and continued to be actively involved in 2013 and 2014. It is important to note that each cohort of School-Wide schools is slightly different. In 2010, schools expressed interest or were invited to join School-Wide. Overall, low decile and secondary schools are key priorities. See Appendix 1 for the characteristics of the schools in the 2010–13 School-Wide cohorts.

---

1 SET is the School-Wide Evaluation Tool. This tool explores the extent to which seven key dimensions of the PB4L-School-Wide framework are in place at a school. Schools use SET data to chart their progress and decide on next steps.
Background to the evaluation

Using stakeholder knowledge to develop a theory of change

This evaluation is a component of a larger evaluation that covers three key PB4L initiatives: School-Wide; Incredible Years-Teacher; and the Intensive Wraparound Service. The first stage of the overall evaluation involved a scoping period. During this period we developed a good grasp of School-Wide (and the other two initiatives). We read key documents and reports and interviewed key Ministry of Education staff, practitioners and sector stakeholders about the implementation and expected outcomes of the initiatives. We held two stakeholder hui to develop a set of strengths-based evaluation principles, and refine the evaluation approach and a theory of change for each initiative.

The theory of change developed for School-Wide is shown in Figure 2. This theory defines core School-Wide practices and the expected short-term changes and medium- to longer term outcomes, based on the literature and stakeholder knowledge. It was used to guide the selection of data sources and the development of evaluation instruments.

Theories of change are similar to programme logic models. However, logic models tend to be descriptive. They show, usually in a sequential flowchart, aspects of a programme including implementation activities and processes, outputs and short, medium or longer term outcomes. In contrast, theory-of-change models are more explanatory and predictive. They are more focused on specifying underlying assumed, hypothesised or tested causal linkages (Patton, 2002).

A theory of change is particularly appropriate for initiatives such as School-Wide that have a clearly defined set of core practices and principles that have been shown to result in similar outcomes across different types of schools and countries. Exploring the extent to which School-Wide follows the expected theory of change, as shown by international studies, is one way of inferring causality in a New Zealand context.
### PB4L principles and ways of working
- Evidence-based and researched strengths-based programmes or systematic approaches whose "delivery" is consistent with its "messages" (content)
- Emphasis on active learning and teaching and school agency (confidence in taking responsibility for shaping the environment promoting positive behaviour rather than seeing behaviour management as largely reactive and limited to consequences)
- Emphasis on data and evidence-based inquiry cycles
- Emphasis on importance of relationships and sharing of knowledge, and co-construction
- National teams leading and supporting local delivery through formative quality assurance, information and data sharing and knowledge-building partnership, rather than line management

---

### MEDIUM TO LONGER TERM OUTCOMES (3–5 years)

#### Student outcomes
- Improved behaviour and learning (fewer challenging incidents and SESE, increased engagement, attendance and achievement, smoother transitions to and from school)
- Increased wellbeing and ability to self-manage
- Increased skills and capability in promoting social wellbeing of peers and community

#### School outcomes
- Teachers and classrooms
  - Teachers skilled at proactively managing behaviour and modelling and teaching effective behaviour strategies
  - More inclusive classroom culture and stronger relationships
  - Increased focus on learning (less time managing behaviour)
  - Increased job satisfaction (higher staff attendance and retention)

---
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---

### Sector alignments:
- Key Government policy and targets and focus on priority learners, Ka Hikitia, Pasifika Education plan, Success for all, NZ Curriculum pedagogies, other Youth Mental Health initiatives
- Other MoE initiatives (e.g., Suspension reduction, Restorative practices, Te Kotahitanga)
- National support for school SMS
- Regional delivery model supports both local practice and national consistency
- Changes in reporting requirements for schools/ MoE (Reporting and interpreting: Reporting on priority learners)

---

### Extent of alignment between School-Wide and existing school cultures and practices:
- already defined values, behaviour expectations and consistent approaches
- alignment between School-Wide and other school PLD priorities
- staff’s existing views on behaviour (punishment or learning focused)
- classroom resources available that promote shared values and behaviour expectations
- existing capability of Student Management System (SMS)
- existing consultative relationship with students
- existing consultative relationship and processes with parents, whānau and wider community
- school’s existing collaborative in-house coaching PLD structure and processes
- readiness to share practice and work in clusters

---

### CORE School-Wide ACTIVITIES and PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY

#### Student
- Students have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (have agency)

#### School and staff
- School staff have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (SET A)
- Values and expectations are modelled and taught (SET B)
- The principal and senior leadership team actively contribute to School-Wide
- School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy-in; not too many other PLD priorities)
- School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities
- School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities from SET, develops and implements action plans and reports data (SET F)
- Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and expectations and addressing behaviour incidents are developed (SET C/D)
- School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data (SET E)
- School develops effective system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data to stakeholders (SET E)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners, and students with special education needs
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the NZ education system (e.g., NZCW leadership models that value relationships and Manaakitanga, pono, ako and awhinatanga)

#### Parent, whānau and community
- School works effectively with community (including Māori and Pasifika communities) to develop shared values and expectations

#### National and regional
- Effective school coaching and PLD networks set up in regions
- School-Wide Practitioners (regional specialists) are recruited, trained and have the capabilities needed to work with school teams
- National structure provides guidance and feedback to data from regions

### SHORT-TERM CHANGES EXPECTED (1–2 years)

#### Student outcomes and shifts in processes
- Some decreases in challenging behaviour incidents and SESE
- Some increase in positive behaviours (e.g., attendance, engagement, social well-being)
- Students offered active leadership role in promoting and celebrating school values
- Students have access to effective learning experiences and staff modelling related to shared school values

#### School outcomes and shifts in processes
- Teachers and classrooms
  - Shift from a punishment to a learning view of behaviour management
  - Increased confidence to manage behaviour
  - Increased capability to actively model and incorporate values and behaviour expectations (in ways that relate to priority groups: Māori students, Pasifika students, students with special education needs)
  - More time teaching (less time managing behaviour/ODR)
- Leadership, culture and systems
  - School leaders maintain involvement with School-Wide and model learning and systems orientation towards behaviour
  - Increased use of consistent school approaches (School system for approaches to recognition of values and behaviours and addressing incidents is used by most staff and is relevant for target groups (Māori learners, Pasifika learners, students with special education needs))
  - School PLD processes support all staff to understand shared values and work to align their behaviours and practices
  - Effective team-based problem-solving processes in place
  - School uses SMS/data system proactively to report at different levels (school structures, classroom, all students, at-risk groups)
  - Staff are able to use data for meaningful decision making (e.g., to identify target groups or areas of priority)
  - School has filed School-Wide within their culture and community context and has worked to align approaches to learning and other initiatives and programmes with School-Wide

#### Parent, whānau and community outcomes and shifts in processes
- School has established effective processes for seeking input from parents and whānau and reporting developments
- School has started to make connections with groups in wider community to support School-Wide (e.g., Sports Clubs)

### NATIONAL AND REGIONAL OUTCOMES AND CHANGES IN PROCESSES

#### Regional
- School-Wide Practitioners teams have a mix of needed expertise and a team-based approach that enables the team to effectively support schools
- School-Wide cluster processes support schools to share expertise
- Processes developed for defining roles and sharing expertise between School-Wide Practitioner and other MoE professionals
- Data collection and feedback loops are used to improve support to schools (use of regional data and national systems data)
- School-Wide Practitioner teams make connections with other agencies and sector groups

---

### Figure 2 School-Wide theory of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector alignments</th>
<th>Extent of alignment between School-Wide and existing school cultures and practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>already defined values, behaviour expectations and consistent approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alignment between School-Wide and other school PLD priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff’s existing views on behaviour (punishment or learning focused)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom resources available that promote shared values and behaviour expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>existing capability of Student Management System (SMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>existing consultative relationship with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>existing consultative relationship and processes with parents, whānau and wider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school’s existing collaborative in-house coaching PLD structure and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readiness to share practice and work in clusters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORE School-Wide ACTIVITIES and PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (have agency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School staff have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (SET A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and expectations are modelled and taught (SET B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal and senior leadership team actively contribute to School-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy-in; not too many other PLD priorities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities from SET, develops and implements action plans and reports data (SET F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and expectations and addressing behaviour incidents are developed (SET C/D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data (SET E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School develops effective system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data to stakeholders (SET E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners, and students with special education needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the NZ education system (e.g., NZCW leadership models that value relationships and Manaakitanga, pono, ako and awhinatanga)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parent, whānau and community outcomes and shifts in processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent, whānau and community outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School works effectively with community (including Māori and Pasifika communities) to develop shared values and expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National and regional |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National and regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective school coaching and PLD networks set up in regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Wide Practitioners (regional specialists) are recruited, trained and have the capabilities needed to work with school teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National structure provides guidance and feedback to data from regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEDIUM TO LONGER TERM OUTCOMES (3–5 years)

#### Student outcomes
- Improved behaviour and learning (fewer challenging incidents and SESE, increased engagement, attendance and achievement) 
- Smoother transitions to and from school
- Increased wellbeing and ability to self-manage
- Increased skills and capability in promoting social wellbeing of peers and community

#### School outcomes
- Teachers and classrooms
  - Teachers skilled at proactively managing behaviour and modelling and teaching effective behaviour strategies
  - More inclusive classroom culture and stronger relationships
  - Increased focus on learning (less time managing behaviour)
  - Increased job satisfaction (higher staff attendance and retention)

#### Leadership, culture and systems
- School culture is more welcoming, inclusive and consultative
- All staff actively promote consistent approach to shared values
- Effective staff relationships and team-based problem-solving culture is embedded and maintained in longer term
- Staff have ongoing access to effective PLD and opportunities to build expertise and practice
- Data systems are used for early targeting of individuals and student groups (Tiers 2 & 3)
- Range of effective approaches and support available for target individuals and student groups (Tiers 2 & 3)
- School-Wide fully integrated in business as usual at school (aligned with learning approaches, systems and other initiatives and aspects of practice)
- Lower demand for external professional support

#### Parent, whānau and community outcomes
- Parents/whānau more involved in school decision making and have increased learning orientation towards behaviour
- Wider community supports School-Wide

#### National and regional outcomes
- Nationally consistent PLD systems for School-Wide schools
- Increased capacity of School-Wide Practitioners and other external professionals to work in collaborative teams with schools
to address the needs of priority learner groups
- Effective network of sharing between schools is maintained and builds knowledge and practice (coaching network)
- Increased inter-agency alignment
- Shift in education services (less need for reactive services)
Questions that guide the School-Wide evaluation

The School-Wide evaluation is an outcome and process evaluation. The outcome evaluation aims to provide information about the short-term changes expected (over 1 to 2 years) of the initiative, as shown in the fourth column in Figure 2. These changes should allow the achievement of the medium- to longer term outcomes (column 5 in Figure 2). Outcomes are broadly defined as gains or shifts along the desired path experienced by schools.

The process evaluation aims to provide information about the implementation process and quality, and factors that may enable or hinder positive shifts towards the expected short-term changes and outcomes of School-Wide. The School-Wide evaluation questions are set out in Figure 3 below. This report mostly focuses on questions 1, 2, 3 and 5.

Figure 3  School-Wide evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes-focused question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: What short-term shifts is School-Wide supporting towards School-Wide outcomes for students and schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For students (e.g., decrease in challenging behaviour and increases in positive behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For teachers and classrooms (e.g., increased teacher confidence in managing behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For school leadership, culture and systems (e.g., increased consistency of practice in promoting positive behaviour expectations and addressing incidents; ability to use data for decision making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For parents and whānau (e.g., increased involvement in school decision making related to School-Wide)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process-focused questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Are core School-Wide practices being implemented as intended?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: What factors enable or hinder the shifts in schools (identified from question 1)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: What does effective practice in School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context (in particular, as experienced by Māori and Pasifika students and students with special education needs)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: What does effective support for School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation phases and timelines

The School-Wide evaluation was designed in three main phases:

- **Phase 1** had two main aims. One was to provide an insight into how the implementation of School-Wide was progressing for different cohorts of schools. The other was to collect evidence of short-term shifts, and barriers and enablers to change, for schools that joined School-Wide in 2010 and 2011. Phase 1 took place in Terms 3–4 of 2013. The preliminary findings from this phase are summarised in Boyd et al. (2014).

- **Phase 2** included a set of seven case studies of School-Wide schools that had experienced significant changes in practice. The main aim of the case studies was to explore evaluation question 4: What does effective practice in School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context? The case studies also documented some of the ways School-Wide is influencing change in practices and outcomes at schools. The school visits occurred in Term 3 of 2014. The case studies can be found in Boyd et al. (2015).

- **Phase 3** involved a second round of data collection similar to that undertaken in phase 1. Focusing on the schools that had been part of the initiative for 3–4 years, one main aim was to provide insights into the longer term implementation successes and challenges. The second aim was to collect further evidence of short-term shifts that were associated with School-Wide.
This report mostly includes the information collected during phase 3. Information from phases 1 and 2 are also referred to.

**Evaluation methodology**

The School-Wide evaluation is designed as a mixed-method study that utilises both quantitative and qualitative data, and connects existing school data with new evaluation data. The design of the School-Wide evaluation draws on the utilisation-focused approach developed by Michael Patton (2008, 2012). This approach is based on the idea that every step of evaluation decision making should be guided by a deliberate attempt to maximise the use of findings by intended users, as users are more likely to make effective use of findings if they have a sense of ownership over the process. This utilisation-focused approach has a close match with the PB4L principles of partnership, collaboration and transparency, and the processes NZCER set up to work with stakeholders in the scoping phase.

To support knowledge building we developed feedback processes that enabled us to discuss emerging findings and insights with the Ministry of Education and School-Wide personnel, and to share findings with school staff. This ensures that evaluation findings are communicated in ways that are likely to support their use.

**Data-collection strategies**

We collected a mix of different types of data to assist us to answer the evaluation questions. This included existing data that are already available about students and schools, as well as new data.

**Existing data**

The existing data included:

- stand-down, suspension, exclusion, expulsion (SSEE) data from School-Wide and non-School-Wide schools. Data from 2009 to 2013 were used in this report.
- past and current SET data. SET is an international tool designed to measure the extent and fidelity of School-Wide implementation. It is completed annually by all School-Wide schools. The SET data referred to in this report were collected from 2010 to 2013.
- Ministry of Education roll return data, which includes information on school type, size, decile and proportion of Māori and Pasifika enrolment.

**New student data**

To provide information about student outcomes, new data were collected via:

- **The Wellbeing@School student survey**. The Wellbeing@School student survey provides data on student perceptions of some core School-Wide practices and the extent to which students experience behaviours such as physical aggression and bullying at school. All schools that joined School-Wide in 2012 and 2013 were invited to use the student survey with students from two adjacent year levels: Years 5 and 6 students from contributing schools; Years 7 and 8 students from full primary and intermediate; and Years 9 and 10 students from secondary. These year levels were selected as they are key years in terms of student behaviour, wellbeing and learning. The surveys were repeated in phases 1 and 3 of the evaluation.

---

2 SET is available from http://www.pbis.org/evaluation/evaluation_tools.aspx
3 International literature shows that student wellbeing and learning can be affected during times when students are transitioning between schools. In their first year at a new school, a range of studies show that students are more likely to experience aggression from peers (Boyd, 2012). Studies also suggest that student engagement in school and learning decreases during the middle years of schooling (Gibbs & Poskitt, 2010).
• **Office Discipline Referral (ODR) data.** Schools were asked to fill in a form to show their total ODR count and a physical aggression (or nearest behaviour) count for 4 weeks in June. We requested the data from 2009 to 2014 from schools that joined School-Wide in 2010 to 2013. However, we expected that a number of the 2012 and 2013 schools might not yet have systems in place to collect this information.

**New data from school staff and Ministry of Education personnel**

Selected staff from schools that joined School-Wide in 2010 to 2013 were invited to take part in the following data-collection activities. These activities were repeated in phases 1 and 3 of the evaluation in order that we could look for patterns of change over time.

• **An online survey of school coaches.** The coach was selected as the main contact person in schools as they were likely to have a big-picture overview of all aspects of School-Wide, given their role in the school School-Wide team and in liaising between school leaders, School-Wide Practitioners and staff at their own and other schools at cluster meetings.

• **An online survey of mathematics and English curriculum leaders.** These school staff were selected as they were likely to have an overview of school systems and could provide an independent view about how they and other teachers from two key learning areas were experiencing School-Wide.

In phases 1 and 3 of the evaluation we invited Ministry of Education staff to take part in:

• an online survey for School-Wide Practitioners

• individual interviews for national and regional School-Wide managers and practice leaders.

The school staff and School-Wide Practitioner surveys were designed to explore the evaluation questions. We used the theory of change to define the areas of focus. To develop questions we drew on a number of sources including practitioner knowledge of School-Wide, the areas of focus in existing School-Wide evaluation tools[^4] and the themes noted in international research.

We also used the information collected from seven case studies of schools showing effective practice in School-Wide to inform this report. These case studies are reported in Boyd et al. (2015).

Table 1 shows how the data-collection methods map to the evaluation questions. For the questions covered in this report, more than one source of information is used to inform the findings.

## Table 1  Data-collection methods used to explore the evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Data-collection method</th>
<th>Students (Wellbeing @School)</th>
<th>School (coach &amp; curriculum leaders)</th>
<th>Regional School-Wide Practitioners</th>
<th>SET</th>
<th>SSEE</th>
<th>ODR</th>
<th>National/ regional managers &amp; practice leaders</th>
<th>Seven schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) What short-term shifts is School-Wide supporting towards School-Wide outcomes for students and schools?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Are core School-Wide practices being implemented as intended?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What factors enable or hinder the shifts in schools?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) What does effective practice in School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What does effective support for School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response rates

Table 2 provides an overview of the data collected during phase 1 and phase 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data-collection method</th>
<th>Data collected phase 1 (End 2013)</th>
<th>Data collected phase 3 (End 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Wellbeing@School student survey**    | 10,883 students from 71 School-Wide schools  
(2012 and 2013 schools only) | 12,176 students from 74 School-Wide schools  
• 29 schools from the 2012 School-Wide cohort and  
42 from the 2013 cohort  
• 1,531 students did the Primary survey  
• 9,352 students did the Intermediate/Secondary survey |
| **School coach survey**                | 191 surveys from individual schools  
(Sent to all 2010–2013 schools) | 177 surveys from individual coaches and 174 from individual schools  
• 89 surveys from 2010/11 School-Wide cohorts  
• 102 from 2012/13 School-Wide cohorts  
(This included 102 from primary, and 89 from intermediate/secondary/composite schools) |
| **School curriculum leader survey**   | 181 surveys (94 English and 87 mathematics from  
up to two English or mathematics leaders per school.  
Sent to all 2010–2013 schools) | 174 surveys (86 English and 88 mathematics from  
128 schools in total)  
• 74 surveys from 2010/11 cohorts  
• 107 surveys from 2012/13 cohorts  
(This included 74 surveys from primary/contributing, and 107 surveys from intermediate/secondary/composite curriculum leaders) |
| **School-Wide Practitioner survey**   | 13 surveys                        | 17 surveys                        |
| **National and regional interviews**  | 7 interviews                      | 7 interviews                      |
| **ODR data (from all 2010–2013 schools)** | 87 schools in total returned some 2009–2013 data  
• 50 from 2010/11 School-Wide cohorts  
• 37 from 2012/13 School-Wide cohorts | 171 schools in total returned 2014 data  
• 88 from 2010/11 School-Wide cohorts  
• 83 from 2012/13 School-Wide cohorts |
| **SSEE data (from the Ministry of Education national database)** | We used data for the analysis of SSEE rates from:  
• 179 School-Wide schools from the 2010/11 cohorts  
• 67 schools from the 2012/13 cohorts  
• 213 non-School-Wide comparison schools | |
| **SET data (from 2010-2013 schools)** | A total of 395 schools submitted 2010–2013 SET data to the Ministry of Education. 242 schools granted permission to use their SET data in our analysis. This included:  
• 116 schools from the 2010/11 cohorts  
• 126 schools from the 2012/13 cohorts | |

Collecting data from and about schools posed some challenges. In phase 1 we did not have access to direct contact details for the school coaches who were our main point of contact at schools, or curriculum leaders. Therefore we sent
generic emails and letters to schools. As much as possible we tried to make use of existing data on student outcomes such as SSEE data. We also collected some new data. Much of the data relating to student outcomes were incomplete and required substantial cleaning. Some of the lower response rates reflect the difficulties of contacting people and collecting data in school settings where staff have many competing priorities. These challenges also highlight some of the tensions in sourcing implementation and outcome data.

Ethics and informed consent
Prior to collecting data for the School-Wide evaluation, an ethics application for the study was approved by the NZCER Ethics Committee. NZCER ethical requirements stipulate that participation is voluntary and that participants are fully informed about the study. A number of different systems were put in place to protect the rights of participants. These included sending all adult participants information letters about each data-collection aspect they were involved in, and posting information on a webpage. Information about using the Wellbeing@School survey in a way that protects students’ confidentiality was provided with the administration instructions.

Survey data analysis and interpretation
The data from different cohorts of School-Wide schools are used in different ways. By the time of the phase 3 data collection round, schools that joined School-Wide in 2010 or 2011 had been part of the initiative for 3 to 4 years. Research about change in schools suggests that we should be able to see some short-term outcomes after this length of time. Therefore their data are the main focus of this report. We used these data to explore the extent to which the features of School-Wide were evident in schools, and the extent to which schools were noting short-term shifts.

In phase 1, the schools that joined School-Wide in 2012 and 2013 were in their first training year or in their first full year of implementing School-Wide. By phase 3 they were in the first or second year of implementing School-Wide. Therefore, data were collected from these schools in order to provide information on schools’ initial experiences of implementing School-Wide with the current model of practice. Data from these schools are also used to explore expected patterns of change over time as compared to 2010/11 schools.

We used a number of different approaches to assess the extent of School-Wide contribution to the changes noted in this report including:

- using the theory of change as a basis to document differences between the 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools to ascertain if the expected pattern of change over time was occurring (see the theory-of-change maps in the final chapter)
- comparing the patterns of change between phases 1 and 3 to see if both groups of schools were following the same sequence of change (see the theory-of-change maps in the final chapter)
- data triangulation (that is, looking at what the qualitative and quantitative data from different stakeholders and sources told us about key aspects of School-Wide practice and outcomes)
- comparing trends from comparison schools to patterns observed in the data in this report.

In combination, these different approaches enabled us to build a robust picture of the contribution of School-Wide to changes in school practice.

Analysis of survey data
There were two main types of questions included in the surveys: fixed-choice questions in the form of Likert-type scales (e.g., agreement or impact scales) or yes or no responses; and open-ended responses which were coded into categories.
The data from the fixed-choice questions were captured using SAS software. For ease of viewing, much of the data are presented in graphs. In figures and text the numbers who responded are indicated as a proportion of the total number of respondents replying to each survey. In some cases (mostly because of non-response or rounding), percentages do not always total to 100.

Some survey questions in the school staff surveys had relatively high levels of non-response and levels of non-response varied between questions. In both phase 1 and phase 3 non-response rates were higher for the questions at the end of the survey. Non-response rates were higher in phase 1. Non-response data are included in graphs and tables.

For the coach and curriculum leader surveys we compared the 2010/11 schools to the 2012/13 schools. We also compared responses from secondary and intermediate schools with primary and contributing schools between the 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools. We grouped intermediate and secondary schools together as they had some features in common, such as large rolls. Their data also showed a similar pattern. We also looked for differences between schools of different deciles and size. In analysing by decile, we compared decile 1–2 to decile 3–9 schools as there are very few higher decile schools in School-Wide.

As primary schools tend to be smaller than secondary, we categorised primary schools as small if they had a student roll of 200 or less, and large if their roll was more than 200. A small secondary or intermediate school had a roll of 400 or less, and a large school, more than 400.

We also looked at differences between the 2010/11 schools depending on whether they had joined Tier 2. Of the 86 coaches who responded to the coach survey, 39 were at schools that had joined Tier 2. We would assume that schools that have joined Tier 2 have successfully implemented School-Wide. Therefore we wanted to test the assumption that this should lead to more embedded practices and increased reports of outcomes from these schools.

For curriculum leader we compared responses between the 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools and English and mathematics leaders. For the 2010/11 leaders we also looked at differences between Tiers 1 and 2 schools, and for primary and intermediate/secondary respondents.

In phases 1 and 3, primary school respondents tended to respond in a more positive way to many questions. Therefore differences between primary and secondary/intermediate schools need to be interpreted with this in mind as this may exaggerate differences between the two sectors.

In phases 1 and 3, the lower overall school response rate to the curriculum leader surveys, combined with the fact that significantly more of the English leaders were also members of their School-Wide team, means that we need to be cautious in interpreting these data. Being a central member of the school team may influence teachers’ views as they are likely to have more knowledge of School-Wide implementation and outcomes at their school.

Mostly curriculum leaders replied to survey questions in similar ways to coaches. They showed similar overall levels of agreement or change but tended to select “agree” or report changes as minor. Coaches tended to strongly agree with statements and report changes as major. Given that the overall pattern was similar, rather than reporting curriculum leader data separately we have used their responses to supplement the data collected from school coaches. Where curriculum leader data patterns were of note or different from coaches, we have commented on this in the text. When we are exploring changes for teachers we focus on the data from curriculum leaders.

To enable similarities and differences between groups of school respondents to be identified, frequency tables were produced for all data. Chi-square statistics from contingency tables were used to test for statistically significant differences between groups. For ease of reading, statistical differences are indicated in the text with terms such as
significantly more/fewer, significantly more likely, or significantly less likely, or significantly less agreement. We only reported statistically significant differences where the p-value was equal to or less than 0.05. This indicates that there is a 95 percent probability that the differences observed were not a chance association.

In some cases relationships were not statistically significant but a pattern seemed evident. These relationships are indicated in the text with the phrase tended to.

Analysis of Wellbeing@School student data

We collected Wellbeing@School student survey data from 71 schools in phase 1 and 74 schools in phase 3. Demographic information about schools and students is reported in Appendix 3.

Wellbeing@School explores students’ perceptions of five aspects of school life (for more information, see the aspect map in Appendix 4). The primary aim of using the Wellbeing@School student survey was to provide a baseline dataset from 2012/13 School-Wide schools to start to track possible changes at the school level in student perceptions of school practice, and student behaviour, over the course of the evaluation. These data can also provide a foundation to track longer term change (3–5 years) in School-Wide schools. There is also a gain for individual schools, as they receive reports of their data which should be useful in their School-Wide work.

In phase 1 we used the reference data from the national Wellbeing@School trial which occurred in September and October of 2011 to compare with data from School-Wide schools to see how similar School-Wide schools were to the national picture. We also analysed the Wellbeing@School student data by School-Wide cohort (that is, 2012 and 2013).

The prior national trial analysis shows different patterns between Years 5/6, Years 7/8 and Years 9/10 students. Analysis of the phases 1 and 3 data from School-Wide schools showed similar patterns. Therefore we have reported the student data in sets of two year levels in the aspect and item reports in Appendix 5.

This analysis also showed that Year 9s were the most similar to the national reference group and Year 8s the least similar (this probably reflects the fact that there is more variability in the Year 8 data as these students could be in the last year of primary or intermediate school, or a junior in a Years 7–13 school.) Given the variability in the Year 8 dataset, and the low numbers of intermediate schools, we have focused on the Year 5/6 and Year 9/10 data to illustrate patterns.

The questions in the Wellbeing@School student survey are all in the form of Likert-type scales (e.g., agreement or frequency scales). For the purpose of comparison, students’ raw scores are changed into a measurement scale. These data are presented in boxplots in Appendix 5. Information about how to interpret boxplots is also included. Students’ raw scores have also been converted into percentages. These are shown in item reports in Appendix 5.

Analysis of School-Wide Practitioner survey and interview data

Because of the small number of School-Wide Practitioners and interviewees, a qualitative approach was used to analyse the School-Wide Practitioner survey and the interview data. A frequency table of the survey data was produced and this was analysed alongside open-ended responses which were coded into themes. The notes taken during telephone and face-to-face interviews were considered in relation to themes relating to the evaluation questions.

More details about who responded to the School-Wide Practitioner and school staff surveys are included in Appendix 2.

Analysis of school data and documents

We collected SSEE, SET and ODR from School-Wide schools. We used three approaches to explore these data:
• **Within School-Wide school analysis**—SSEE and ODR data were compared to the School-Wide schools’ patterns prior to joining School-Wide and since joining School-Wide to look for shifts over time. SET data from the first 2 years of School-Wide implementation were analysed to explore factors relating to the rate of implementation.

• **Between School-Wide school analysis**—Patterns for 2010/11 School-Wide schools were documented. These patterns were compared with 2012/13 schools.

• **National analysis**—SSEE data from cohorts of School-Wide schools were compared to national trends.

Further details about the analysis of SET, SSEE and ODR data are contained in Appendix 2.

**Limitations of the evaluation design and data-collection strategies**

A relatively low number of schools responded to our request for retrospective ODR data, and the data we received varied between schools. We also noted variability in the national SSEE dataset. Owing to the variable quality of the “hard” data we have access to, we have placed more emphasis on self-reporting of change from school respondents to draw conclusions about the extent of implementation of School-Wide and short-term outcomes. To ensure these statements are robust, as noted earlier, we used a combination of data triangulation and cohort mapping strategies to look for patterns in the data.

In phase 1 there was a relatively high non-response rate to some of the questions in the school coach and curriculum leader surveys, particularly questions at the end of the surveys. One impact of high non-response rates is that the percentages noted in the text are likely to be under-reported. For example, a question for which the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed might be reported as 75% agreement. Of the remainder, 15% could be missing data. Given the overall positive trend it is likely that many of the non-respondents might have also agreed with this question. Non-response rates were about 5% lower in phase 3 than phase 1. One impact of this is that differences between phase 1 and phase 3 need to be interpreted with caution. For example, 75% agreement in phase 1 might be equivalent to 80% agreement in phase 3. Because of the amount of missing data we selected a 60% cut-off point for the summary map against the theory of change rather than the 80% standard which is often used for School-Wide. Non-response data have been included in figures and tables.

**The focus of this report**

This report summarises the final findings from the School-Wide evaluation. The main focus of this report is exploring the extent to which short-term shifts in student, teacher and school outcomes are evident in schools that have been part of the initiative since 2010 and 2011 and whether School-Wide is being implemented as intended in these schools. Some big-picture patterns and differences between groups of schools are described.

This report includes information on evaluation questions 1, 2, 3 and 5, and is structured around these questions:

• Chapter 2 explores the evidence for short-term shifts relating to School-Wide.

• Chapter 3 outlines findings about the implementation of School-Wide and the School-Wide model of support for schools.

• Chapter 4 discusses enablers and barriers to longer term sustainability of School-Wide.

• Chapter 5 provides a reflection on the School-Wide journey to date and summarises the main evaluation findings and possible next steps.
2. Exploring evidence for short-term shifts

Summary of chapter findings

Focus of this chapter
This chapter explores question 1: What short-term shifts is School-Wide supporting towards School-Wide outcomes for students, teachers, schools, parents and whānau? The main focus of this chapter is data from the **2010/11 School-Wide schools**. These schools have been part of School-Wide for longer and therefore are more likely to be reporting outcomes. Data from **2012/13 School-Wide schools** are used to confirm the patterns noted.

Shifts in short-term outcomes and practices were more evident by phase 3
By the end of 2014 (phase 3), coaches and curriculum leaders thought School-Wide was supporting a wide range of positive changes to student, teacher and school outcomes. For schools that joined in 2010/11, some of the patterns of change reported in phase 1 had become stronger by phase 3.

The more recent group of schools were following the same pattern of change as the earlier group
By phase 3, schools that joined School-Wide in 2012/13 were starting to report the same patterns of change as their colleagues in 2010/11 schools. The fact that both groups of schools are following the same pattern indicates School-Wide is supporting change.

Positive changes in school culture were reported
The majority of 2010/11 coaches reported that School-Wide has contributed to positive changes in the three aspects of school culture we asked about. Coaches’ overall views were similar in both phase 1 and phase 3. By phase 3, more 2010/11 curriculum leaders were also reporting similar changes, as were coaches from 2012/13 schools. Coaches reported that School-Wide had contributed to:
- a respectful and inclusive school culture (2010/11: 86%; 2012/13: 78%)
- school safety (2010/11: 85%; 2012/13: 68%)
- staff morale (2010/11: 73%; 2012/13: 58%).

A decrease in major behaviour incidents was reported across all types of schools
By phase 3, more school staff from all types of schools were reporting that School-Wide was contributing to a decrease in major behaviour incidents. This decrease was reported by:
- 84% of coaches from 2010/11 School-Wide schools
- 86% of primary and 81% of secondary coaches from 2010/11 School-Wide schools (the equivalent figures in phase 1 were 73% of primary and 76% of secondary/intermediate)
- 60% of coaches from 2012/13 schools (the equivalent figure in phase 1 was 27% with 33% reporting it was too soon to tell).

By phase 3, staff were reporting improved relationships and changes to classroom behaviours
By phase 3, more coaches from both 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools were reporting School-Wide was assisting in improving relationships and students’ classroom behaviours. They reported:
- increases in students’ awareness of behaviour expectations and consequences (2010/11: 87%; 2012/13: 86%)
- students’ valuing of the way staff acknowledge positive behaviour (2010/11: 87%; 2012/13: 79%)
- improvements in relationships between students and teachers (2010/11: 84%; 2012/13: 70%)
- improvements in relationships between students and their peers (2010/11: 83%; 2012/13: 67%)
- positive changes in students’ ability to self-manage behaviour (2010/11: 82%; 2012/13: 66%)
- increases in on-task behaviour and engagement in class (2010/11: 84%; 2012/13: 69%)
- decreases in disruptions in class (2010/11: 81%; 2012/13: 67%).
A number of these changes were also reported by curriculum leaders. By the end of 2014, compared with phase 1, more 2010/11 curriculum leaders were reporting minor or major changes in classroom engagement and fewer disruptions in class associated with School-Wide. This suggests that over time School-Wide’s influence was becoming more evident in the classroom. Similar themes were also evident in the Wellbeing@School student survey data from Year 5/6 and Year 9/10 students.

The relationship between School-Wide and stand-down, suspension, expulsion and exclusion (SSEE) rates varies between schools

Coaches from 2010/11 schools reported that School-Wide was supporting a decrease in the different SSEE rates at their school (71–73% of secondary/intermediate, and 50–61% of primary coaches). By phase 3, slightly more coaches from both 2010/11 and 2012/13 School-Wide schools were reporting a change in these rates compared with those who did so in phase 1.

Although secondary/intermediate school coaches reported less agreement that some core features of School-Wide were evident at their school, they reported more changes to some SSEE rates than primary school coaches. This is likely to be related to the fact that secondary/intermediate schools have a greater number of major behaviour incidents (as shown by their higher SSEE rates) and therefore have more opportunity for change in these rates.

We compared school reports of decreases in major behaviour incidents and SSEE rates with the national SSEE and the Office Discipline Referral (ODR) data we collected from schools. A possible downward trend was shown in most of the SSEE rates except stand-downs. This may suggest that School-Wide schools are changing their practice and are attempting to offer consequences, such as stand-downs, that keep students at school. The different School-Wide cohorts had different patterns. The 2011 and 2012 schools showed stronger downward trends. Variations in the SSEE patterns between groups of schools suggests that more exploration is warranted of how SSEE decisions are made in schools to ensure that these decisions are aligned with School-Wide practice.

The ODR data showed an increase as schools joined School-Wide and sorted out their recording systems, then fluctuations over time. For a number of reasons these patterns need to be interpreted with caution. One reason is that the ODR and SSEE data are reported in different ways between schools, and the data we have are incomplete and therefore difficult to compare over time.

A range of positive changes in school practices were reported

Most coaches from 2010/11 schools, and many coaches from 2012/13 schools, reported that School-Wide has contributed to positive improvements in school systems and practices such as:

- effectiveness of approaches to addressing behaviour incidents (2010/11: 79%; 2012/13: 66%)
- regular reporting of student behaviour data to staff (2010/11: 77%; 2012/13: 57%)
- use of behaviour data to decide on areas for school action plans (2010/11: 78%; 2012/13: 56%).

Secondary/intermediate school respondents reported less change to these aspects of practice than their primary school colleagues particularly in relation to use of data to make changes. This appears to be an aspect of School-Wide that these schools were finding harder to put into place.

Changes for teachers were becoming more evident over time

The 2010/11 curriculum leaders who responded to the survey were in leadership roles in their schools. Therefore we would expect that many would be confident managing student behaviour. Most reported this was the case. In phases 1 and 3, similar numbers (around 60%) associated School-Wide with an increase in their confidence in managing behaviour in and out of class. By phase 3, more reported this as a major rather than a minor positive change in confidence.

The majority of 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported School-Wide had supported them to see that new behaviours could be taught and thought that School-Wide had made a difference to their approaches to behaviour. Only relatively small groups noted that School-Wide had made no difference to these approaches (13% in phase 3 and 15% in phase 1). This relatively low figure suggests that a focus on School-Wide is being maintained over time in many schools. The majority of 2012/13 curriculum leaders reported the same.
Curriculum leaders at some schools reported less change to some core School-Wide practices such as “I frequently use immediate and specific praise”. Curriculum leaders at schools that had joined Tier 2 reported more change to these practices, suggesting that these schools have processes that support changes to teaching practice that could be shared with other schools.

**Fewer changes were evident in how schools work with parents and whānau**
Making connections with parents and whānau in relation to approaches to behaviour is an aspect where fewer coaches reported changes to school practice. However, their responses indicate that School-Wide is encouraging some schools (such as decile 1–2) to work more collaboratively with parents and whānau, suggesting that these schools are developing models that could be shared.

**There were differences between groups in the extent of change reported**
Overall, coaches and curriculum leaders from primary schools, and respondents from Tier 2 schools, reported greater shifts in many outcomes. Coaches from secondary/intermediate schools tended to describe shifts as a minor change. In phase 1, low decile schools reported more outcomes from School-Wide. In phase 3, similar outcomes were reported by low and higher decile schools.

**Evidence for short-term shifts**
This chapter uses different sets of data to explore the extent to which School-Wide is supporting shifts towards School-Wide outcomes for students, teachers, schools, parents and whānau. These data include:

- information from school coach and curriculum leader surveys
- Office Discipline Referral (ODR) rates collected from schools
- stand-down, suspension, exclusion, and expulsion (SSEE) data
- national SET data from schools.

We asked school coaches and curriculum leaders about the extent to which School-Wide had supported change to a number of behaviours and practices, and whether this was a major or minor change. We have interpreted reports of either a major or minor positive change as an indication of a shift in student, teacher or school outcomes.

For changes to student and school outcomes we have mostly presented the coach data. For changes to teacher outcomes we have focused on the curriculum leader data. Most data are presented in figures with two strip graphs. The first strip graph shows the extent to which 86 school coaches from the 2010/11 schools reported that School-Wide had supported change to each practice. The second strip graph shows the response from 91 school coaches from the 2012/13 schools. Other graphs compare data from the 64 curriculum leaders from the 2010/11 schools to the 110 curriculum leaders from the 2012/13 schools.

The 2010/11 and 2012/13 data are shown together to give the reader a sense of the outcomes that are evident in schools that have been part of School-Wide for different lengths of time. Owing to rounding, the percentages reported in the text may be slightly different from those recorded on the graphs.

**Differences in the extent of shifts reported by groups of respondents**
Coaches from the two groups of schools responded in different ways to the surveys. Reflecting the length of time their school had been part of School-Wide, coaches from 2010/11 schools were more likely to report that shifts were a major positive change. Reflecting their shorter implementation period, coaches from 2012/13 schools reported less strong patterns of change. However, by the end of 2014 (phase 3), coaches from 2012/13 schools were reporting more change.
The fact that 2012/13 schools were following the same pattern as 2010/11 schools is one indicator that School-Wide is contributing to the expected outcomes.

The pattern for curriculum leaders was similar to that of coaches except that curriculum leaders had more qualified views on some questions. They showed similar overall patterns but tended to describe shifts as minor rather than major. For 2010/11 schools, the differences between coaches and curriculum leaders observed in phase 1 were less evident in phase 3. In phase 3, curriculum leaders reported more key outcomes, and more described shifts as major. There was a group of curriculum leaders who reported that School-Wide had no or a negative impact in relation to a number of practices. However, for some outcomes or practices, this group was smaller than in phase 1.

Differences between the views of coaches and curriculum leaders are likely to reflect the different position of these staff members. School coaches have more invested in School-Wide and therefore are more likely to notice and report change. Many curriculum leaders have less of a vested interest in School-Wide. However, over time they were starting to see evidence of change.

Differences between schools in the extent of shifts

We looked at the characteristics of the 2010/11 schools to see if these were impacting on the amount or intensity of reported shifts. All types of schools reported shifts in outcomes and practice. However, the intensity of the shift sometimes varied between groups. Some types of schools were more likely to describe shifts as a major change. School size made a significant difference to some outcomes. Small primary schools reported greater shifts in outcomes and practices than large primary schools. Similarly, small secondary/intermediate schools reported greater shifts in some outcomes and practices than larger secondary/intermediates. Overall, the least amount of change was reported by respondents at large secondary/intermediate schools. Schools that had joined Tier 2 also described many shifts as major, and those that were implementing Tier 1 tended to describe shifts as minor. Some of these differences were statistically significant. There were fewer differences between schools of different deciles. Some of the main statistically significant differences are included in the text.

Just over half (53%) of schools responded to both the phase 1 and phase 3 coach surveys. On the whole, the response patterns were very similar between phases 1 and 3, which suggests that the schools that completed surveys were having similar experiences of School-Wide.

Are changes happening in school culture?

Some of the main changes reported by coaches and curriculum leaders were that School-Wide was contributing to their positive perceptions of school culture. The majority of 2010/11 coaches reported School-Wide had contributed to a major or minor positive change in all three key areas we asked about: the extent to which school culture was respectful and inclusive (86%); school safety (85%); and staff morale (73%). The overall views of 2010/11 coaches on the extent of these shifts stayed similar between phases 1 and 3. In phase 3, many coaches from 2012/13 schools were noticing similar shifts (see Figure 4).
The type and size of schools influenced the intensity of some of these changes. Significantly fewer coaches from large secondary/intermediate schools reported a major shift in the extent to which their school culture was respectful and inclusive. For 2010/11 schools, a major shift was reported by:

- 70% of coaches from small primary schools (roll of up to 200)
- 57% of coaches from large primary schools (roll of 200 or more)
- 55% of coaches from small secondary/intermediate schools (roll of up to 400)
- 39% of coaches from large secondary/intermediate schools (roll of 400 or more).

In phase 3, a larger number (81%) of 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported major or minor positive shifts in the extent to which their school culture was respectful compared with phase 1 (62%). By phase 3 their views had become more similar to school coaches. Significantly more curriculum leaders from primary schools (69%) reported this as a major positive change compared to secondary/intermediate (29%). It is important to note that significantly more primary than secondary/intermediate curriculum leaders were on the School-Wide team. This is likely to be one factor contributing to these differences in views.

By phase 3, more curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools also reported that School-Wide had contributed to positive shifts in school safety (70%), and staff morale (52%).

Curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools were starting to show the same pattern as their 2010/11 peers, with 68% reporting a shift in school culture, 57% in school safety and 44% in staff morale.

Overall, coaches and curriculum leaders reported less change in relation to staff morale. This aspect of school life is noted in the School-Wide theory of change as a possible longer term outcome of School-Wide. These data support this.
Are changes happening for students?

Coaches and curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools reported that School-Wide was supporting positive change to a wide range of student outcomes. By phase 3, respondents from 2012/13 schools were also starting to see similar patterns. The main outcomes are summarised below.

**Changes to student knowledge and competencies**

The majority of coaches reported that School-Wide had supported a major or minor positive change in some of the initiative’s core features such as students’ awareness of behaviour expectations and consequences (2010/11: 87%; 2012/13: 86%) and their valuing of the way staff acknowledge positive behaviour (2010/11: 87%; 2012/13: 79%) (see Figure 5). Overall reports of shifts stayed similar between phases 1 and 3.

The majority of coaches from 2010/11 schools, and many coaches from 2012/13 schools, also considered School-Wide had supported major or minor positive changes in student and teacher relationships and student competencies (see Figure 5). Key shifts included:

- improvements in relationships between students and teachers (2010/11: 84%; 2012/13: 70%)
- positive changes in students’ ability to self-manage behaviour (2010/11: 82%; 2012/13: 66%).

![Figure 5 Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes to student knowledge and competencies](image)
Overall changes to students’ competencies and learning behaviours tended to be described as minor rather than major. In general, significantly more primary coaches than secondary/intermediate coaches described these shifts as major. This is one area where the Tier 2 schools showed a stronger and statistically significant pattern of change compared with schools that were still implementing Tier 1. Coaches from Tier 2 schools reported more positive shifts and, in particular, in the questions relating to relationships (i.e., students and teachers have good relationships; most students relate well to their peers). These data suggest that School-Wide is having an impact on the nature of relationships at school.

Curriculum leaders showed a similar pattern to coaches in terms of the aspects of student knowledge and competencies in which they considered School-Wide had supported change. For example, around three-quarters of both 2010/11 and 2012/13 curriculum leaders thought School-Wide had supported a positive change in students’ awareness of behaviour expectations and on the value students placed on positive behaviour acknowledgements. As to be expected from schools that had been part of School-Wide for longer, significantly more 2010/11 than 2012/13 curriculum leaders described a number of the changes as major. In general, significantly more 2010/11 primary than secondary/intermediate curriculum leaders also described these changes as major.

Changes to key student behaviour outcomes

Students’ classroom behaviours

By phase 3, schools’ focus on School-Wide seemed to be more evident in classroom behaviour. Coaches from both cohorts reported that School-Wide was supporting major or minor positive changes to the amount of on-task behaviour and engagement in class (2010/11: 84%; 2012/13: 69%) and decreases in disruptions in class (2010/11: 81%; 2012/13: 67%) (see Figure 5 above).

This change in classroom behaviour was also reported by curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools. In phase 1, 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported fewer changes than coaches to student behaviour. By phase 3 these differences were less evident and curriculum leaders were reporting that School-Wide was supporting a range of major or minor positive changes to classroom behaviours. For example:

- 73% reported decreases in disruptions in class (in phase 1, 58% reported this)
- 71% reported increased on-task behaviour and engagement (in phase 1, 61% reported this)
- 55% reported increases in the number of students who arrive on time for class (in phase 1, 43% reported this).

In general, significantly more 2010/11 primary than secondary/intermediate curriculum leaders described these as major changes. Reflecting their shorter time implementing School-Wide, curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools reported less change.

Changes in major behaviour incidents

Coaches reported School-Wide had supported shifts in all the outcomes relating to behaviour incidents and student attendance in the survey (see Figure 6). The largest positive change was a decrease in major behaviour incidents, such as physical assaults. Overall, at 2010/11 schools, a decrease in major behaviour incidents was reported by 84% of coaches and by 73% of curriculum leaders. In general, coaches from all types of schools reported a major or minor decrease in major behaviour incidents. This included:

- 86% of primary and 81% of secondary/intermediate coaches
- 75% of coaches from low decile schools and 88% from higher decile schools
- 87% of small primary, 86% of large primary, 82% of small secondary/intermediate and 80% of large secondary/intermediate coaches.
The intensity of the change varied between schools. For example, more coaches from small primary schools (61%), and schools that had joined Tier 2 (54%), described this decrease in behaviour incidents as a major shift.

Figure 6  **Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes to key behaviour outcomes**

As expected, significantly more 2010/11 coaches reported a decrease in major behaviour incidents compared with coaches from 2012/13 schools. However, by phase 3, coaches and curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools were also starting to see the expected decrease in major incidents. This outcome was reported by 60% of coaches and 58% of curriculum leaders from these schools. The equivalent figure for phase 1 was 27% of coaches with 33% reporting it was too soon to tell.

Reducing the number of major behaviour incidents is a core focus of School-Wide and these data suggest that the initiative has created change in this key outcome. The data also show that this change is becoming more evident over time.

**Changes in stand-down, suspension, exclusion and expulsion rates**

Compared with other behaviour outcomes, smaller numbers of coaches reported School-Wide was supporting major or minor changes to stand-down, suspension, exclusion, and expulsion (SSEE) and attendance rates. However over time, changes to SSEE rates were becoming more noticeable. In phase 1, around one-fifth or more of 2010/11 coaches reported there had been no change, or that it was too soon to tell if these rates were changing. Around half of 2012/13 coaches reported the same. By phase 3, more coaches from 2012/13 schools were also reporting changes in each SSEE (see Table 3). Change was most noticeable in the 2010/11 schools that had been part of School-Wide for a longer time period. This, combined with the way that both cohorts of schools were showing similar patterns over time, suggests that School-Wide is supporting a change in SSEE rates. This change is occurring at a slower pace than some other changes.

---

5 This difference was highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
Changes to SSEE rates were one of the few areas for which 2010/11 secondary/intermediate coaches reported more change than primary coaches. For example, significantly more secondary/intermediate school coaches (71%) reported a major or minor decrease in exclusions or expulsions compared with primary (50%). In part this difference reflects the fact that secondary schools are more likely than primary to exclude or expel students. It also shows that secondary schools are experiencing positive outcomes relating to School-Wide.

School data on key behaviour outcomes: Office Discipline Referrals

We asked schools to send us an annual snapshot of Office Discipline Referral (ODR) data as we wanted to see if this showed the expected pattern of decreases over time. School coaches filled in a form to show their total ODR count and a physical aggression (or nearest behaviour) count for 4 weeks in June, for each year from 2009 to 2014. To provide data comparable across schools we divided these data counts by roll size to give an average rate per school. We then looked for change in mean rates over time by the length of time schools had been in School-Wide (i.e., 2010 schools had been in School-Wide for 5 years at the time the phase 3 data were collected).

A number of schools noted that their rates were very variable as they were sorting out how to record data, had changed their data management system or had changed how they reported major and minor incidents over time. Some of the issues raised by schools are shown below.

Are there any comments you would like to make about this data?

We have reviewed school wide the way we are completing the referrals as there were some discrepancies with teachers filling out referrals for minor teacher managed incidents which was distorting the data with high numbers of referrals for some students in some classes. Always refining how we do things at fortnightly meetings. We have had difficulties individualising the data—we started using SWIS but it was too American and are trying to use Etap [database] but find it still hard to make it suit our school and our needs. (School respondent, 2014)

At present we have been working with the KAMAR system but this is proving to be difficult when collating data—we attempted to collate data in the month of August using KAMAR but found this system too unreliable and difficult. We have since decided to go with the SWIS program which should fix this issue. We will be training in this system early next term. This is on our action plan to do next. Our data is unreliable at the moment. (School respondent, 2014)

Only a few schools reported data for the full number of years requested (2009–2014). This resulted in a small number of schools in the baseline year. Most schools provided data for some but not all years, and so each programme year includes a different mix of schools. Therefore these data should be read with caution as they do not provide a consistent comparison.
Table 4 shows the mean total ODR rate per school from the baseline year to fifth year in School-Wide. It is important to note that the baseline year only included a small number of schools, and that the categories used for incidents were likely to be different. For 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools these data show a pattern of increases in the first year of School-Wide. This is likely to reflect the fact that schools were developing their data and reporting systems and deciding which behaviours to refer and record. Following this increase, for 2010/11 schools the data seem to stay relatively stable over the next few years. The 2012/13 data show a greater increase in the first year of School-Wide then a decrease. These data do not have a clear match with school respondent or Year 5/6 student reports of decreases in major behaviour incidents. There are a number of reasons for this—one is that these rates reflect the reported, not the actual, incidents. We also know that many schools have changed these categorisations over time. These changes were commented on by schools that were part of the case study component of the evaluation (Boyd et al., 2015).

Table 4  Mean total ODR rates by length of time in School-Wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme year</th>
<th>2010/11 schools</th>
<th>2012/13 schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variability in the data returned by schools, combined with the low response rate, supports other information presented in this report which suggests that these data need to be interpreted with care. The complexities of managing data, and developing reports that reflect their needs, was commented on by staff interviewed as part of the case study aspect of this evaluation (Boyd et al., 2015). These data illustrate the difficulties of collecting meaningful student outcome data when the systems to collect these data are being developed or improved on over time as part of an initiative. Additional ODR data are contained in Appendix 6.

National data on key behaviour outcomes

Stand-down, suspension, exclusion, and expulsion (SSEE) rates also provide a measure of behaviour incidents in schools. We looked at SSEE data to see if School-Wide schools were showing any changes over time. We included all School-Wide schools for which we had at least three time points of data—that is, the 2010–12 schools—as we wanted to see if each cohort was following a similar pattern. We looked at the rates for each of the four aspects of SSEE (stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions and expulsions). It is important to note that the SSEE dataset we had access to was incomplete. To provide anonymity for students, some data are removed:

To protect student privacy, where there are less than 5 students in the denominator for a stand-down, suspension, exclusion or expulsion at a school or where there are less than 1–4 cases in a category, these have been masked with an ‘x’. (Ministry of Education data notes)
Effectively this results in the data being removed from schools that have fewer than five SSEE incidents. Therefore the data in this report reflect only the schools that have had no incidents or those that have five or more. For this reason, and the challenges of creating a meaningful comparison group (discussed below), these data should be viewed as indicative only. A full set of SSEE data is likely to show different trends and therefore be interpreted differently.

We compared the data from 2010–12 School-Wide schools to a comparison group of non-School-Wide schools. To select this group we used data on school decile, type (primary, intermediate, composite, secondary) and region. Owing to the relatively small number of secondary schools in New Zealand it is difficult to select a comparison group with a strong match to all school characteristics. In addition, between phases 1 and 3 the comparison group got smaller and more select as some comparison schools joined School-Wide. These schools were therefore excluded from the comparison group.

The fact that the School-Wide and comparison schools are not the same is shown by their different starting points. Figures 7–10 below show that, at their baseline year, the School-Wide schools mostly had higher SSEE rates than comparison schools. One reason for this is that the schools that joined School-Wide tend to be those that had the most need for the initiative and therefore they started from a different place than non-School-Wide schools. This suggests these School-Wide schools have different approaches to managing behaviour incidents and therefore are likely to have different patterns of change. For these reasons we need to be very cautious when comparing School-Wide and non-School-Wide schools. The most valid comparison is to look at the pattern of change for each cohort of School-Wide schools over time.

For each cohort of schools we included a baseline rate (the year before they joined School-Wide). For example, for 2010 schools the 2009 data is a baseline year. For 2012 schools the 2011 data is the baseline year. It is important to note that, for each rate, we are looking at very small differences (e.g., 0.1–0.6 per 100 students). A shift in a rate could represent incidents related to only one or two students.

**Expulsions**

Figure 7 shows expulsion rates for School-Wide and comparison schools. Expulsions are the most serious consequence as they result in students being removed from school. These data show that the year before 2010 and 2011 School-Wide schools joined the initiative they had higher expulsion rates than other schools. Since 2011 the School-Wide schools have maintained low exclusion rates. The comparison schools show slight variations over time. These data may suggest that School-Wide may be influencing school decisions to expel students in schools that made use of expulsions prior to the initiative.

---

6 The overall SSEE data from all schools are showing a downward trend over time. For this reason and to ensure comparability we have presented these data by calendar year.
Exclusions

Figure 8 shows exclusion rates for School-Wide and comparison schools. These data illustrate that SSEE rates are more volatile for School-Wide schools than the comparison group. Each group of School-Wide schools shows a different pattern. The 2010 schools appear to be showing an upward trend in exclusions. The 2011 and 2012 schools show an opposite downward trend. Their patterns are becoming more similar to the comparison group over time. Possible reasons for the difference between 2010 and 2011/2012 schools are discussed in the section below that summarises these data.
Suspensions

The suspension rates for School-Wide and comparison schools are shown in Figure 9. Since 2011, all groups of schools appear to be showing a general decrease in suspensions. The 2011 and 2012 schools are becoming more similar to the comparison schools over time. The 2010 School-Wide schools show more variation; however, after 2011 they start to show the same downward trend.

Figure 9  Suspension rates for School-Wide and comparison schools

Stand-downs

Stand-downs are the least serious consequence of the four SSEE actions. Figure 10 shows the stand-down rates for School-Wide and comparison schools. A small initial increase in stand-down rates is noted for 2010 School-Wide schools. The 2011 and 2012 School-Wide schools show a different pattern which could be the start of a decrease in stand-downs or a normal fluctuation. The comparison schools show a small decrease in stand-downs over time which then flattens out.
Summary of SSEE data

Overall, School-Wide schools have more movement in their SSEE rates than comparison schools, which suggests School-Wide schools have more variability in behaviour incidents between years. For the School-Wide schools, the SSEE data in Figures 7–10 appear to show a small decrease in expulsions (the most serious consequence out of the four SSEE actions). They also show a downward trend in suspensions and the possible start of a similar downward trend in exclusions.

Ideally, when analysing outcome data from an initiative we would not use the data from the first cohort, as they tend to experience a training and support model that is still in development. These data suggest that this is the case for the 2010 schools. The 2010 School-Wide schools show different patterns from the 2011 and 2012 schools. The 2011 and 2012 schools conform more to the expected pattern. In the year before they joined School-Wide, the 2011 and 2012 schools mostly had higher rates of SSEE than the comparison schools. Over time their SSEE rates are decreasing and they are becoming more similar to the comparison group.

All cohorts of School-Wide schools have higher stand-down rates than the comparison schools. For 2010 schools these rates do not appear to be decreasing over time. The 2011 and 2012 schools show the start of a possible decrease. However, this could be a normal fluctuation in the data.

These data tentatively suggest that School-Wide schools are working to offer students less serious consequences such as stand-downs that result in them staying at school. Over time, they also appear to be making less use of more serious consequences such as expulsion and suspension.

Given the constraints of the dataset noted earlier, these data are indicative only. They illustrate the difficulty of accessing comparable outcome data, the volatility of SSEE as a measure and the difficulties of finding a meaningful comparison group. Analysis of the full SSEE dataset over a longer time period would be necessary to ascertain if these shifts represent a sustained pattern.
Is there an association between implementing School-Wide and SSEE rates?

To explore the connection between School-Wide implementation and SSEE rates, we looked at SET data to see if they showed a relationship to SSEE data. SET measures the extent of School-Wide implementation but not outcomes. However, you would expect that, over time, as School-Wide becomes more embedded in a school, high scores on SET would be associated with improved outcomes for students, such as lower rates of each of the four aspects of SSEE.

We looked for correlations between the seven SET components and the average SET score and each component of SSEE. We looked at these data by the length of time schools had been part of School-Wide (i.e., year one was 2010 for schools that joined in 2010, and 2011 for 2011 schools). The maximum number of schools we were able to compare was 128.

The data from the first year that schools joined School-Wide showed a few small but statistically significant correlations between higher SET scores and higher suspension rates in both phase 1 and phase 3.\(^7\) Like the ODR data reported above, this may suggest that in the first year of School-Wide, as schools sorted out their behaviour consequences systems, some may have relied more on suspension as a consequence for unwanted behaviour. In phase 3, the second- and third-year data showed a positive connection between the SET component “expectations taught” and lower exclusion rates.\(^8\) This reinforces the importance of teaching behaviour expectations. We need to be cautious about interpreting these data as both the SET and SSEE datasets are incomplete.

As shown above, the relationship between School-Wide and SSEE rates is not straightforward. This finding has been noted internationally. An Australian study found a decrease in the length of suspensions but no overall decrease in suspension rates in the schools that were part of the Australian version of School-Wide (Mooney, Dobia, Barker, Power, & Watson, 2008).

Lowering SSEE rates, and particularly expulsion rates, is an important outcome for School-Wide as SSEE experiences are linked to early school leaving and poorer long-term education and health outcomes for youth (Fergusson, Swain-Campbell, & Horwood, 2002). Further monitoring of the full SSEE dataset over time is likely to give a more complete picture, and particularly for the schools that are now joining Tier 2. Tier 2 supports are designed for the students who are most likely to experience SSEE.

The School-Wide case studies show that some schools have developed learning-focused behaviour consequences that have enabled them to lower their SSEE rates (Boyd et al., 2015). The SSEE data reported above suggest that schools may need more models to show how decision making about SSEE can be integrated within School-Wide processes in ways that build student and staff capabilities. These models are discussed further in Chapter 3.

Using Wellbeing@School data to explore student outcomes

Wellbeing@School student survey data were collected from the 2012/13 School-Wide schools. The primary aim of using this student survey was to provide a baseline dataset to start to track possible changes at the school level in student perceptions of school practice, and student behaviour, over the course of the evaluation. This dataset can also provide a foundation to track longer term change (3–5 years) in School-Wide schools.

Key data are presented here. A summary of demographic details from the students and schools that responded, summary boxplots and full item reports from the Primary and Intermediate/Secondary survey are included in the appendices.

Wellbeing@School explores students’ perceptions of five aspects of school life (for more information, see the aspect map in Appendix 4). These aspects are:

\(^7\) In phase 3 the correlations were of the magnitude of 0.24 to 0.26 with \(p\)-values ranging from 0.01 to 0.006.
\(^8\) The correlations were of the magnitude of -0.19 to -0.58 with \(p\)-values ranging from 0.04 to 0.003.
• **School-wide climate and practices:** the extent to which a safe and caring climate is modelled through school-wide culture and practices

• **Classroom teaching and learning:** the extent to which a safe and caring climate is modelled through teacher behaviours and expectations, and within the classroom learning programme

• **Community partnerships:** the extent to which a safe and caring climate is modelled through connections with parents and whānau

• **Student prosocial culture and strategies:** the extent to which students and their peers engage in prosocial behaviours and use prosocial strategies

• **Aggressive student culture:** the extent to which aggressive and bullying behaviours occur at school.

**What were the patterns in the Wellbeing@School student data in phase 1?**

At the time of the phase 1 baseline data collection, 2012 schools had only been part of School-Wide for a year, and 2013 schools were in their first training year. Therefore we would not expect to see statistically significant differences between 2012 and 2013 School-Wide schools. The data from schools showed, as expected, there were no clear differences between these schools.

We compared the School-Wide schools to the students in the Wellbeing@School national reference group. Compared with a national sample of students from the same year levels, students at School-Wide schools tended to report:

- slightly lower scores on the school-wide climate and practices aspect
- slightly lower scores on the student prosocial culture and strategies aspect
- slightly higher levels of aggressive behaviours (note that the aggressive scale is reversed: a higher scale score indicates more frequent reports of aggressive behaviour).

**What were the patterns in the Wellbeing@School student data in phase 3?**

We returned to the schools at the end of 2014 (phase 3) to collect a second set of Wellbeing@School data. In general, one year is too short a time period to expect clear patterns of change in student outcomes (Russell, 2003; Stoll & Fink, 1996; Timperley, 2003). Russell (2003) states that approximately 3–5 years are necessary in a primary context, and 5 years or more in secondary settings may be needed before changes are evident in student data. In the time frame of one year we might expect to see some small short-term shifts in practices that are closely tied to School-Wide. For the above reasons, any shifts should be viewed as indicative only. Longer term monitoring would be needed to ascertain if the shifts represented a definitive pattern.

We compared the phase 1 and phase 3 data from 2012 and 2013 schools. Students from different year levels completed the survey. Because each year group responds differently to questions, we grouped students in bands of two adjacent year levels: Year 5/6 students from contributing schools; Year 7/8 students from intermediate schools; and Year 9/10 students from secondary and composite schools. There were different numbers of schools in each year band. Where we had a large number of schools of the same type, the data from these year levels showed the most change that appeared to be related to School-Wide. One likely reason is that between school differences are less evident with a larger sample of schools. Therefore we have reported these data in more detail. The school types for which we had the most data were: Year 5/6 data from schools that joined School-Wide in 2012 and 2013, and the Year 9/10 data from schools that joined in 2013.

As expected, there was no clear difference between phases 1 and 3 in the overall aspect reports (see Appendix 5). The Year 5/6 and Year 9/10 students from 2013 schools showed a small positive shift in the school-wide climate and practices aspect. This aspect is most closely tied to School-Wide practice. The Year 9/10 students also showed small shifts in the classroom teaching and learning and student prosocial culture and strategies aspects.
We looked at the individual items in the Wellbeing@School survey to see what they could tell us about particular practices that might be shifting over time or changes to outcomes. To review the phase 1 data we worked with the School-Wide national practice group to develop a set of items that most closely responded to School-Wide practice and expected outcomes. We looked for change in these items. We also looked for patterns in clusters of related items. We took a difference between phases 1 and 3 of 5% or more as suggestive of a change, and a difference of 10% or more as indicative of a more definitive shift.

The data from 2013 schools are presented first. At the time the phase 1 data were collected, these schools had just joined School-Wide. By phase 3 they had been part of School-Wide for about one year. The Year 5/6 students responded very positively to many questions, therefore there was little room for movement. The Year 5/6 data from 2013 schools showed a pattern of small positive shifts between phase 1 and phase 3. No negative shifts reached the 5% threshold.

The majority of the positive differences were in the school-wide climate and practices aspect. The largest positive differences are shown in Table 5. By phase 3, we would expect that these schools had developed a set of values and behaviour expectations that were being promoted and modelled to students in a more consistent way. Items relating to these sorts of activities, and items that convey a sense of strengthening teacher–student relationships and an increase in culturally responsive practices, showed the most difference. The largest difference of 7% was related to a core School-Wide practice: “Everyone thinks our school values are important”.

The second largest difference was a 7% decrease in the number of students who reported being the target of physical aggression on a weekly basis (from 24% to 17%). These differences appear to confirm the patterns reported by respondents at 2012/13 School-Wide schools.

Table 5  Wellbeing@School items (Year 5/6 students at 2013 School-Wide schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-wide climate and practice items</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree</th>
<th>Difference between phases 1 and 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1 (n = 519) %</td>
<td>Phase 3 (n = 505) %</td>
<td>% points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone thinks our school values are important*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school wants us to get on with students from different cultures and backgrounds</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are interested in my culture or family background</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items from other Wellbeing@School aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always behave how they want us to behave</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat teachers with respect</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items from the aggressive student culture aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These items are included because they are key School-Wide practices.
The students at 2012 schools had been part of School-Wide for a year longer than the 2013 students. They showed a different pattern of responses. There were no clear differences in the school-wide climate and practices items. Apart from a few minor fluctuations, these items stayed at a level similar to the phase 3 data from the 2013 students. However, students from 2012 schools reported decreases in a wider range of aggressive behaviours than their peers at 2013 schools (see Table 6). Physical aggression in the form of hitting, pushing or hurting is the main behaviour that appears to have decreased. This behaviour is probably the most visible to staff. Over time it seems that a wider range of behaviours are changing including those that might be less visible to staff such as those explored in questions such as “Do other students tell lies about you in a mean way?” This suggests that peer relationships might be changing.

Table 6  Wellbeing@School items (Year 5/6 students at 2012 School-Wide schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-wide climate and practice items</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree Phase 1 (n = 514) %</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree Phase 3 (n = 585) %</th>
<th>Difference between phases 1 and 3 % points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are interested in my culture or family background</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone thinks our school values are important*</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items from other Wellbeing@School aspects</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree Phase 1 (n = 514) %</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree Phase 3 (n = 585) %</th>
<th>Difference between phases 1 and 3 % points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school I am taught to think about other students’ feelings</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have a problem with another child, I feel I can ask teachers for help</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items from the aggressive student culture aspect</th>
<th>Happens 1 or 2 times a week/Almost every day Phase 1 %</th>
<th>Happens 1 or 2 times a week/Almost every day Phase 3 %</th>
<th>Difference between phases 1 and 3 % points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students tell lies about you in a mean way?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These items are included because they are key School-Wide practices

Looking at the Year 5/6 data together, there is a tentative pattern emerging. In the first year of School-Wide (phase 3 for 2013 schools) students experience an increased focus on values, the modelling of respectful relationships and the development of more consistent ways of addressing behaviour incidents. A change in one of the more obvious forms of aggressive behaviour starts to happen. In the second year of School-Wide the focus on values and relationships is maintained. For example, by phase 3, 85% of 2012, and 81% of 2013, students agreed or strongly agreed that “everyone thinks our school values are important”. A decrease in a wider range of aggressive behaviours is more evident in the second year of School-Wide for the 2012 students.

Do the Year 9/10 students from 2013 schools show a similar pattern? Year 9/10 students showed less overall agreement than younger students to these questions in phase 1, therefore they have more room for movement. The items in the school-wide climate and practices aspect showed some of the larger shifts (see Table 7). A number of differences were also evident in two other aspects: student prosocial culture and strategies; and teaching and learning. Students appeared to be experiencing a more consultative and inclusive environment at school. There was no change in the aggressive behaviour items, although more students reported feeling safe at school.
Table 7  Wellbeing@School items (Year 9/10 students at 2013 School-Wide schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-wide climate and practice items</th>
<th>Strongly agree / Agree Phase 1 (n = 5,723) %</th>
<th>Strongly agree / Agree Phase 3 (n = 7,101) %</th>
<th>Difference between phases 1 and 3 % points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The buildings and grounds are looked after at school</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at school</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone thinks our school values are important*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have a say in what happens at school</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students get on with other students from different cultures</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students care about each other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items from other Wellbeing@School aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat each other with respect</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make learning interesting</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students look after others who are new at school</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school I am taught it is OK to be different from other students</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school I am taught what to do if someone is hassling or bullying me</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can say how I am feeling when I need to</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat teachers with respect</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always behave how they would like us to behave</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students always stand up for others if someone is hassling them</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have a problem with another student, I feel I can ask teachers for help</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school I am taught to manage my feelings (like if I get angry)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are good at listening to each other’s views and ideas</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents, family, and whānau always feel welcome at school</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Key School-Wide practices
Looked at in combination, there are three indicators that suggest that School-Wide is contributing to the shifts reported above. One indicator is that the aspect that has consistently shifted is the one most tied to School-Wide practice. The second indicator is that the pattern of change is relatively similar for 2012 and 2013 schools, and across contributing and secondary schools. This suggests they are sharing a common experience. Thirdly, these shifts are consistent with reports from respondents at 2012 and 2013 schools.

One of the main aims of School-Wide is to reduce the number of major behaviour incidents, and in particular physical aggression. These data show decreases in Year 5/6 students’ reports of aggressive behaviour. Year 5/6 and Year 9/10 student data also suggest that more positive relationships are developing between students and staff, and between students. As we are only looking at data over one year, the patterns are indicative only. Further monitoring would be needed to see if this picture is maintained over time, and if students report further decreases in aggressive behaviours, including those that are more covert behaviours such as bullying.

Are changes happening to school practices and systems?

Changes in how behaviour is acknowledged and incidents are addressed

Some of the largest changes to school systems reported by coaches and curriculum leaders were improvements in consistency in regard to systems for addressing behaviour incidents (see coaches’ views in Figure 11). These are the aspects of School-Wide that schools focus on first. For example:

- 80% of 2010/11 coaches and 67% of 2012/13 coaches reported major or minor positive changes to the extent to which all staff were clear about the types of incidents that are self-managed or referred to someone else
- 79% of 2010/11 coaches and 66% of 2012/13 coaches reported major or minor positive changes in the extent to which their school had effective and consistent approaches for addressing behaviour incidents.

Coaches from all types of schools reported that School-Wide had contributed to consistency in how behaviour incidents were addressed. However, reflecting their longer time in School-Wide, 2010/11 coaches were significantly more likely to describe these changes as a major shift. Coaches from small schools and primary schools were also more likely to do the same. Not surprisingly, it seems to be easier for smaller schools to encourage consistent use of systems.

Please describe the three main improvements your school has made to systems or practices as a result of PB4L-School-Wide.

Regular pastoral team and form level meetings to consider PB4L data. (Coach survey, 2014)
Collecting and using data and breaking assumptions with accurate analysis. (Coach survey, 2014)
Meeting as a whole school staff to discuss behaviour data. (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)
Clear flowchart that shows how to deal with different levels of behaviour. (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)
Curriculum leaders had more qualified views. For example, 63% of 2010/11, and 47% of 2012/13 curriculum leaders reported School-Wide had contributed to change in the extent to which their school had effective and consistent approaches for addressing behaviour incidents. More change was reported by primary school curriculum leaders than secondary/intermediate.

Curriculum leaders and coaches from Tier 2 schools had the most unified views. They were significantly more likely than their peers at Tier 1 schools to: strongly agree that they had effective and consistent approaches for addressing behaviour; and report that School-Wide had contributed to more shifts in this aspect of school practice. This suggests that these schools could provide examples of practice for other schools.

**Changes in managing and using data**

Most 2010/11 coaches considered School-Wide had supported them to improve their systems for managing, reporting and using data. Around three-quarters reported major or minor changes to each of the aspects in Figure 12. There was little change in these data between phases 1 and 3 which suggests that schools are maintaining these practices over time.

As to be expected, coaches from 2012/13 schools showed more change between phases 1 and 3. This suggests they are starting to put in place key School-Wide data management structures.
School coaches reported fewer major changes to practices that might be more complex, such as using data to support staff to inquire into their practice or to set goals in action plans. This pattern was particularly evident for secondary/intermediate schools. These schools also appeared to have fewer systems in place for managing, reporting and using data, and they reported less change in this area. Some of the biggest differences were relating to the use of data. Two examples of statistically significant differences between 2010/11 primary and secondary/intermediate schools are shown below:

- 36% of primary and 12% of secondary/intermediate coaches strongly agreed their school had processes in place for staff to discuss student behaviour data in ways that assisted staff to inquire into and improve their practice. 77% of primary and 62% of secondary/intermediate coaches reported School-Wide had contributed to a shift in this practice.

- 59% of primary and 21% of secondary/intermediate coaches strongly agreed that their school used student behaviour data to develop areas for improvement in school action plans. 80% of primary and 62% of secondary/intermediate coaches reported School-Wide had contributed to a shift in this practice.

We asked curriculum leaders some of these questions. Around 50–60% of those from 2010/11 schools reported School-Wide had supported major or minor positive changes to school data reporting and usage practices. Differences between primary and secondary/Intermediate schools were very evident in the curriculum leader data. Primary curriculum leaders reported more major changes. There was a statistically significant difference for every question.

Around one-fifth of curriculum leaders reported there had been no change for all the questions about data management and use. This proportion stayed similar between phases 1 and 3. The majority of those who reported no change were located in secondary or intermediate schools.

Looked at together, these data suggest that School-Wide is supporting schools to make changes to how they report and use data. However, the data also suggest that these practices are not fully embedded at some schools. These schools may have reached a plateau in terms of making improvements and may need extra support to keep developing their data systems and the way they use data. This was especially the case for secondary/intermediate schools.
This plateau was less evident for Tier 2 schools. They appeared to be more active in sharing data and involving staff in making changes. Significantly more coaches and curriculum leaders strongly agreed that their school reported behaviour data to staff, and more reported this as a major change. The difference between Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools was particularly noticeable in the curriculum leader data. Significantly more Tier 2 curriculum leaders reported shifts in school processes for teachers to discuss data to inquire into their practice, and more shifts in their own use of these data. For example, only 8% of the curriculum leaders at Tier 2 schools reported no change to their approaches to using student behaviour data to improve their practice. The figure for curriculum leaders at Tier 1 schools was 41%.

**Changes in the extent of collaboration**

Figure 13 shows that coaches from 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools reported that School-Wide had supported positive changes to processes for collaborating with staff, students and local schools.

**Figure 13**  **Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to changes in collaboration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of change</th>
<th>2010/2011 cohort</th>
<th>2012/2013 cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Minor positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly seek staff input to improve our approaches to behaviour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are actively involved in promoting school values and behaviour expectations to their peers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are key partners who assist in developing school values and behaviour expectations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We work with other schools to assist us to build approaches to behaviour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school has a lot of leadership opportunities available to students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly seek input from staff who are responsible for special education needs provision to improve our approach to behaviour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly use behaviour data to report to parents and students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly report summaries of behaviour data to students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low decile schools reported significantly more positive changes than higher decile schools in the way they collaborated with students, and other schools. Primary schools reported significantly more changes to the way they sought input from staff responsible for special needs provision. Secondary/intermediate schools’ coaches were the least likely to report that their school worked collaboratively or had made changes to the aspect of practice in connections with School-Wide.

Coaches’ views that their school had developed a more collaborative way of working were supported by curriculum leaders, who reported School-Wide had supported positive changes to the way staff’s input was sought to improve approaches to behaviour (61% of 2010/11 and 55% of 2012/13 schools). A change was particularly evident in 2010/11 primary schools. Most (81%) primary curriculum leaders reported a major or minor positive shift in this practice compared with 47% of secondary/intermediate curriculum leaders. This change in practice had not happened at all schools. Around one-fifth of curriculum leaders reported no change or a negative change.
Are changes happening for teachers and in classrooms?

To explore whether School-Wide was supporting changes to teacher beliefs, practice or confidence we asked curriculum leaders a number of questions about their practice. Overall, the majority of the 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported that School-Wide had made a difference to their approaches to behaviour and agreed that School-Wide had supported them to see that new behaviours could be taught. Only a small group noted that School-Wide had made no difference to their approaches to behaviour (phase 1: 15%; phase 3: 13%). One or two also reported it was too early to tell. These relatively low figures suggest that School-Wide is making a difference to the practice of respondents at 2010/11 schools and that they are maintaining changes over time.

By phase 3, curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools were starting to show the same pattern. Only 13% noted that School-Wide had made no difference to their practice, and a small number (6%) reported it was too soon to tell.

*Teacher confidence in managing behaviour*

The curriculum leaders who responded to the survey were in leadership roles in their schools. Therefore we would expect that many would be confident managing student behaviour. Most reported this was the case. However, a number of the 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported that School-Wide had supported a major or minor positive change in their confidence in managing behaviour inside (56%) or outside (62%) the classroom (see Figure 14). The overall figures stayed similar in phases 1 and 3. However, some further positive shifts were evident. For example, in phase 3, more (31%) curriculum leaders reported a major change in their confidence to manage student behaviour outside the classroom. The equivalent figure in phase 1 was 16%.

Significantly more curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools reported positive changes in confidence compared with 2012/13 respondents, which suggests that School-Wide had contributed to change for 2010/11 respondents. Curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools were also starting to show the expected pattern of shifts, with 46% reporting a major or minor change in their confidence in managing student behaviour outside the classroom.
Figure 14  **Curriculum leader views on School-Wide’s contribution to confidence in managing behaviour**

Strategies for promoting behaviour expectations

The active teaching of behaviour expectations is a core aspect of School-Wide. The majority of 2010/11 curriculum leaders (73%) reported that School-Wide had supported a major or minor positive change in the extent to which their school had a shared approach to teaching behaviour expectations. This change was more evident at Tier 2 schools with significantly more of these curriculum leaders describing this as a major change (Tier 2: 60%; Tier 1: 26%).

The majority of 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported that School-Wide had supported a major or minor change for half or more on many other core School-Wide practices shown in Figure 15. These included:

- displaying school behaviour expectations in their classroom (73% reported a major or minor change)
- knowing school behaviour expectations (62% reported a major or minor change)
- actively reminding students about behaviour expectations whether they are in their classes or not (61% reported a major or minor change)
- actively teaching behaviour expectations in classrooms (56% reported a major or minor change).

Curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools were starting to see similar changes in some of the core School-Wide practices. For example, 65% reported a major or minor positive change in the extent to which their school had a shared approach to teaching behaviour expectations.
As shown in Figure 15 above, most 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported that School-Wide had contributed to changes in the way they approached behaviour expectations. However, the number who reported no change to each practice was also relatively high (up to 31%). For some practices this is likely to be because they are already well embedded, as all who responded agreed they engaged in this practice. One example is: “I actively remind students about behaviour expectations whether they are in my class or not”. All 2010/11 curriculum leaders who responded agreed they engaged in this practice.

**Strategies for managing behaviour**

The curriculum leader survey also included a focus on the different strategies teachers use to manage behaviour. These are shown below in Figure 16. The 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported making more use of these strategies than 2012/13 curriculum leaders. Around half of the 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported School-Wide had supported a major or minor change on some of the core School-Wide practices including:

- I make sure I acknowledge students’ positive behaviours more than I discuss behaviour concerns (67% reported a major or minor change)
- I involve students in deciding what behaviours like respect look like (64% reported a major or minor change)
- I frequently use immediate and specific praise (63% reported a major or minor change).

In general, more of the primary than secondary/intermediate curriculum leaders described these shifts as a major change.
In both phase 1 and phase 3, curriculum leaders tended to report most shifts as minor, and the number who reported no change to each practice was also relatively high. For example, in phase 3 this number ranged up to 41%. Like the approaches to behaviour expectations discussed above, for some practices this is likely to be because they are already well embedded. However, we might expect more movement on some of the core School-Wide practices such as “I frequently use immediate and specific praise”. Although 63% reported positive change to this practice, for 39% this was a minor change, and 27% reported no change. Around 59% of curriculum leaders strongly agreed they engaged in this practice. This practice was more embedded in Tier 2 schools. Significantly more Tier 2 curriculum leaders (80%) strongly agreed they frequently used immediate and specific praise compared with 46% of their peers at Tier 1 schools. Again this suggests that schools that have joined Tier 2 could provide examples of practice for other schools. The School-Wide case study report (Boyd et al., 2015) also provides examples of how support can be provided to teachers to assist them to change their practice.

English and mathematics curriculum leaders reported similar patterns of change. The 2012/13 curriculum leaders were also starting to show a similar pattern of change to their 2010/11 peers. Looked at together, these data suggest that School-Wide is contributing to changes in teacher practice.

The phases 1 and 3 data also suggest that some practices appeared to be less embedded across many schools and also were less likely to change. Most of these practices were about making space for the different groups of priority learners to share their perspectives when discussing behaviour. This suggests that schools might benefit from clearer models for the types of teacher behaviours that are expected in the classroom.
Changes in the involvement of parents and whānau in School-Wide

In phases 1 and 3, 2010/11 coaches and curriculum leaders reported School-Wide had supported fewer shifts in relation to working with parents and whānau compared with other areas of practice. These practices included involving parents and whānau as key partners in developing or reviewing school values (see Figure 17). Respondents also reported fewer shifts in some of the practices described earlier such as reporting to parents and whānau. Coaches also reported lower levels of agreement that parents and whānau supported School-Wide compared with how they perceived support by students and staff (see Figure 18 in the next chapter).

Figure 17  Coach views on School-Wide’s contribution to working with parents and whānau

However, School-Wide had supported some schools to make changes to the way they worked with parents and whānau and their community. Low decile schools reported significantly more positive changes than higher decile schools in the way they collaborated with parents and whānau. Primary schools reported significantly more changes to the way they sought input from Māori and Pasifika communities. Secondary/intermediate school coaches were the least likely to report that their school had made changes to these aspects of practice. For example, 2010/11 coaches reported that:

• School-Wide had supported a major or minor change in the extent to which their school regularly sought Māori community input to improve approaches to behaviour (53% of primary and 31% of secondary/intermediate)

• School-Wide had supported a major or minor change in the extent to which their school regularly sought Pasifika community input to improve approaches to behaviour (39% of primary and 12% of secondary/intermediate).

Coaches and curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools also reported fewer shifts in practices that involved parents and whānau and communities. However, Figure 17 shows some changes were also starting to happen for these schools.

These data suggest that actively involving parents and whānau, and Māori and Pasifika communities, in approaches to behaviour is an area for which schools could benefit from more support. Some schools are developing approaches that could be shared more widely with others. Examples of some of these approaches can be found in the case study report (Boyd et al., 2015).
Does School-Wide lead to change for all types of schools?

We looked at the data from the 2010/11 schools that had joined Tier 2 to assist us to answer two questions about the relationship between the implementation of School-Wide and patterns of change. Of the 86 schools that responded to the coach survey, 39 had joined Tier 2. To join Tier 2, schools need to have successive high scores on SET. These scores indicate they have successfully implemented core School-Wide features and are maintaining their focus over time. We wanted to test the assumption that successful implementation of School-Wide features leads to change. If School-Wide is functioning as intended we would expect that schools that have joined Tier 2 would report more shifts and would be more likely to show a stronger pattern of change than those still implementing Tier 1. A number of examples are presented in this chapter to show that coaches from Tier 2 schools reported a stronger pattern of change to student, teacher and school outcomes and practices. There was a clear trend for coaches at Tier 2 schools to report greater positive changes across most of the student knowledge, competency and behaviour outcomes associated with School-Wide. Tier 2 coaches were significantly more likely to report decreases in behaviour incidents. For example:

- 49% of Tier 2 and 26% of Tier 1 coaches reported a major decrease in disruptions in class
- 46% of Tier 2 and 30% of Tier 1 coaches reported a major decrease in suspensions and stand-downs.

The largest differences in outcomes between Tier 2 and Tier 1 schools were to do with relationships. For example, coaches were significantly more likely to report that School-Wide had contributed to major positive changes in the extent to which:

- the school culture is respectful and inclusive (72% of Tier 2 and 38% of Tier 1 schools)
- students and teachers have good relationships (49% of Tier 2 and 21% of Tier 1 schools)
- most students relate well to their peers (46% of Tier 2 and 21% of Tier 1 schools).

Tier 2 coaches were also significantly more likely to report a major change in staff’s confidence in managing behaviour incidents (56% of Tier 2 and 21% of Tier 1 schools). Curriculum leaders at Tier 2 schools reported similar changes. They were significantly more likely to report that School-Wide had contributed to major positive changes in the extent to which:

- the school culture is respectful and inclusive (76% of Tier 2 and 26% of Tier 1 schools)
- the school is a safe place for students and staff (52% of Tier 2 and 21% of Tier 1 schools)
- most students relate well to their peers (44% of Tier 2 and 18% of Tier 1 schools)
- most students are on task and engaged in learning (52% of Tier 2 and 13% of Tier 1 schools)
- the school had effective and consistent approaches for addressing behaviour incidents (56% of Tier 2 and 25% of Tier 1 schools).

Looked at together, these data suggest that School-Wide is leading to the expected changes and, in particular, to the nature of relationships at schools. One factor that may also be contributing to these shifts is the fact that over half of the Tier 2 schools had done some form of restorative practices professional learning. The case study findings suggest that using restorative approaches alongside School-Wide is one way of building positive relationships (Boyd et al., 2015).

The second question we explored was whether School-Wide can be effective for all types of schools. The data in this chapter show the intensity of changes reported could vary between schools. Primary schools reported more positive change than secondary/intermediate schools. Overall, small primary schools reported the most change, and large secondary/intermediates, the least. Some of the reasons for this could be that the School-Wide framework could have less fit with, or be more difficult to implement in, secondary/intermediate schools.
If School-Wide can be effective for secondary/intermediate schools we would expect to see these schools reflected in the Tier 2 data. Of the 86 schools that responded to the coach survey, 39 had joined Tier 2. These 39 schools were evenly split between primary (20 schools) and secondary/intermediate (19 schools). The fact that almost half of the Tier 2 group are secondary/intermediate schools suggests that School-Wide can be effectively implemented in these schools. Of the 19 secondary/intermediate schools, five were large intermediates and eight were large secondary. This suggests that School-Wide can support change in large schools.

Although some types of schools face more challenges implementing School-Wide, it appears that School-Wide can be implemented in ways that led to the desired outcomes in these schools. An analysis of the types of practices schools that had joined Tier 2 put in place to ensure successful implementation is included in Chapter 4.

---

9 Interviews with regional policy and practice leaders suggested that the criteria for moving to Tier 2 varied between regions. Therefore, some secondary schools may have joined Tier 2 without all the features of School-Wide being in place as shown by SET data.
3. School-Wide implementation and support

Summary of chapter findings

Focus of this chapter
The chapter explores question 2: Are core School-Wide practices being implemented as intended?, and question 5: What does effective support for School-Wide schools look like in a New Zealand context?

Many 2010/11 schools had the core School-Wide features in place
At the time the phase 1 data were collected, there were many differences between the 2010/11 schools that had been part of School-Wide for longer and the 2012/13 schools that had recently joined the initiative. By phase 3 these differences were less evident and the 2012/13 schools had become more like the earlier schools.

Most of the coaches from schools that had been in School-Wide since 2010/11 reported that many of its key features were in place. Schools appeared to be sustaining these features between phases 1 and 3. Data from curriculum leaders show a similar picture. The features that most schools had in place were:

- an actively involved principal
- a problem-solving School-Wide school team
- collaborative processes for working with staff
- behaviour expectations that are well-known by students
- a system for teaching behaviour expectations
- effectively used acknowledgement processes and behaviour consequences systems
- clarity around minor and major behaviour incidents and consistent approaches to addressing incidents
- an easy and consistently used system for reporting behaviour incident data.

The 2012/13 schools had also put in place many of these core features and were still implementing some of the more complex aspects of School-Wide that were more embedded in the 2010/11 schools. These aspects included:

- processes for using school data to improve school systems and practices
- a process for inducting new staff or relievers into School-Wide practices
- processes for considering School-Wide in relation to priority learners and exploring outcomes for these groups.

School-Wide was well-supported by many school staff and starting to become embedded in schools
Most school coaches and curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools were maintaining high levels of support for School-Wide. They thought School-Wide focused on areas important to their school. Most also thought that School-Wide was embedded at their school and worked well for different groups of students.

Most coaches and curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools also showed support for the initiative. By phase 3, most also agreed that School-Wide was embedded in their schools.

Significantly fewer coaches and curriculum leaders from secondary/intermediate schools strongly agreed that School-Wide was embedded at their school (43% of secondary/intermediate and 70% of primary). Another key difference was that over half (55%) of secondary/intermediate coaches reported their school had a group of staff who did not support School-Wide. Only 7% of primary coaches thought the same. A small number of schools (around 10–15%) reported they were starting to lose momentum with School-Wide.

The School-Wide support model is assisting schools to make changes
The models and levels of support offered to schools in both 2013 and 2014 appeared to be well regarded by the majority of coaches at both cohorts of schools. School-Wide policy and practice staff also considered the Tier 1 training and support model to be well-developed. The majority of school coaches agreed they had access to:

- effective professional development about School-Wide, and access to useful tools and resources to adapt
- effective communications from School-Wide Practitioners and support to problem solve if needed
- useful ideas from cluster sessions and connections that assisted in developing approaches.
Secondary and intermediate schools were the most likely to consider they needed additional forms of support. Coaches’ reports of effective School-Wide professional learning and support from School-Wide Practitioners was related to faster initial implementation as shown by SET data. In phase 1, working with the same practitioner over time was associated with reports of better outcomes. In phase 3, working with the same practitioner over time was associated with 2010/11 schools’ ability to progress some of the more complex aspects of School-Wide. However, many schools had changes of practitioner.

Schools that joined School-Wide in 2010/11 were accessing a range of other PB4L initiatives such as Incredible Years-Teacher and the Intensive Wraparound Service. The majority of schools reported these initiatives were well-aligned with their School-Wide goals.

Large secondary and intermediate schools had a different journey with School-Wide

Secondary and intermediate schools reported shifts in practice and student outcomes. However, School-Wide was less embedded in these schools. Their School-Wide journey was more complex as they had a wider gap between existing practices and School-Wide. They were also less likely to: have an actively involved principal; work collaboratively with their community; have practices that supported consistency; and have data systems that enabled them to use data to make changes to school systems or practices. By phase 3 the gap between primary and secondary and intermediate practice was wider, particularly for large schools.

This gap was not related to beliefs that School-Wide did not work in secondary or intermediate settings. It was more about the time it takes and the challenges inherent in working collaboratively and achieving consistency of practice in a large school. This suggests that secondary and intermediate schools may require further alterations to the School-Wide model that takes into account the complexities of shifting the cultures of large schools. A number of secondary and intermediate schools have effectively implemented School-Wide. Some had joined Tier 2. This suggests that models of good practice in secondary settings exist and could be shared more widely to address known concerns.

The phase 1 data indicated that School-Wide was faster to implement in higher decile schools than in lower decile schools. Decile 1–2 schools worked more collaboratively and took longer to implement School-Wide. In phase 1, coaches in low decile schools reported School-Wide was more embedded with greater shifts in student outcomes. In phase 3, low and higher decile schools were looking more like each other. This suggests that schools of different deciles have different ways of working. However, over time they appear to reach a similar point in terms of outcomes.

A few areas to build practice were identified for teachers and schools

Three main areas to build practice were identified:

- how School-Wide incorporates a focus on priority learners
- the development of learning-focused consequences that are an alternative to SSEE
- the fit between School-Wide and secondary school practice including ways to:
  - work collaboratively in large schools with all staff
  - make more use of data
  - develop shared systems for teaching behaviour expectations
  - assist teachers to change their practice in line with core School-Wide practices (see Chapter 2).

To best support schools, the workforce model could be further developed

The regional delivery model was assisting managers and School-Wide Practitioners to tailor support to the schools in their area. During 2014, regional staff had offered specific support to secondary schools and developed innovations relevant to the schools and communities in their area. They had re-developed modules in areas of need and were working to provide more integrated support to schools by seconding sector partners to work with schools, and through forming stronger links with senior advisors and Resource Teachers: Learning and Behaviour (RTLBs).

Some School-Wide Practitioners appeared to be pulled in many directions. Increasingly they were providing training and support to a larger group of schools with a wider range of needs. Each region had different priorities in terms of supporting Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools. Ministry of Education policy and practice staff identified a need for a clearer workforce model which outlined how School-Wide Practitioners’ different sets of expertise would be acknowledged and utilised. Ongoing concerns were expressed about the “drift” between regions. Solutions included building stronger networks to review fidelity of training and support, share good practice and build new approaches to ensure School-Wide keeps evolving.
Implementing School-Wide

This chapter combines different sources of data to explore the extent to which schools have implemented the key features of School-Wide, and how the School-Wide support model might enable this implementation. These data include: information from the school and School-Wide Practitioner surveys; SET data; and information from interviews with national and regional Ministry of Education staff who are involved in leading and delivering School-Wide.

To show which features of School-Wide are in place, we have placed most weight on data from schools that have been part of School-Wide for longer (the 2010/11 schools). Paralleling the data presented in Chapter 2 about short-term shifts, coaches tended to show a pattern of stronger agreement that the core features of School-Wide were in place compared with curriculum leaders.

We looked at the characteristics of schools to see if they were associated with different patterns of implementation. Paralleling the data on short-term outcomes, respondents from all types of schools “strongly agreed” or “agreed” their school was implementing many of the key features of School-Wide. There were relatively few who selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” options. However, the level of agreement varied between groups. School size and type made a significant difference. Some of the main statistically significant differences are included in the text.

Has there been a change between phases 1 and 3?

In this section we have mostly reported the data from phase 3. We have included some key data from phase 1 to illustrate patterns of change over time. Schools that joined School-Wide in 2010/11 appeared to be maintaining the key features of School-Wide between phases 1 and 3. By phase 3, coaches and curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools were starting to look more like the 2010/11 schools, with more agreeing that practices were in place. This suggests that School-Wide is being implemented in similar ways across different cohorts of schools.

Is there support for School-Wide?

Support by school leaders, staff and students is important to the success of an initiative. This support is related to sustained School-Wide implementation (McIntosh et al., 2010; McIntosh et al., 2013). Almost all the 2010/11 coaches agreed School-Wide was supported by staff, students, parents and whānau. The 2010/11 coaches reported similar views about support for School-Wide in phases 1 and 3, which suggests that a focus on School-Wide is being maintained over time.

In phase 1, 2010/11 coaches were significantly more likely to strongly agree that School-Wide was supported by staff than coaches from 2012/13. This was still the case in phase 3. In phase 1, around one-fifth of 2012/13 coaches reported that it was too early to tell if students or parents and whānau supported School-Wide. In phase 3 they were starting to agree that students supported School-Wide. This indicates that support for School-Wide is growing over time (see Figure 18).
Most curriculum leaders also thought School-Wide was supported at their school, with over four-fifths agreeing or strongly agreeing that they and the colleagues in their department supported School-Wide (see Figure 19). Like coaches, the 2010/11 curriculum leaders reported similar views on the level of support for School-Wide in phases 1 and 3.

In phase 1 there were a number of significant differences between the views of 2010/11 and 2012/13 curriculum leaders. In phase 3 these differences were not evident. This indicates that, over time, support for School-Wide is growing at 2012/13 schools. This is the pattern you would expect if the initiative was being successfully implemented.

A few curriculum leaders at 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools did not support School-Wide. These numbers were relatively small in both phase 1 and phase 3 (around 10%). These data suggest that School-Wide has relatively high levels of support from respondents.

The majority of respondents from both primary and secondary/intermediate schools thought that School-Wide was supported at their school. However, significantly more primary school respondents strongly agreed with many of these statements. For example, 73% of 2010/11 coaches at primary schools and 17% of 2010/11 coaches at
secondary/intermediate strongly agreed that staff support School-Wide approaches. This difference was highly statistically significant, and larger than in phase 1. Respondents from large schools were the least likely to strongly agree with this statement. Like coaches, curriculum leaders from secondary/intermediate schools were the least likely to strongly agree that they or others supported School-Wide. This lends support to the case that, although School-Wide can be effective in secondary/intermediate schools, it is more difficult to promote consistency in these settings.

The philosophy of School-Wide

We also asked coaches and curriculum leaders a range of questions about the core features of School-Wide and aspects of the philosophy about behaviour that underpins the initiative, as well as possible tensions that might be unique to a New Zealand setting (see Figure 20).

Respondents from 2010/11 schools had adopted the School-Wide philosophy that positive behaviour can be taught and learned. They maintained their views over time. All of the 2010/11 coaches who responded thought that School-Wide supported staff to see the value of acknowledging positive behaviour and that new behaviours can be taught. Most 2010/11 coaches also agreed or strongly agreed with the other questions about School-Wide philosophy such as this school makes clear connections between approaches to behaviour developed through School-Wide and learning (76%); and School-Wide encourages useful dialogue about behaviour between staff and students (83%).

Figure 20 Coach views on the School-Wide philosophy

Overall, 2010/11 curriculum leaders showed a similar pattern to coaches in how they responded to these questions. They showed slightly lower levels of strong agreement to a few statements. For example 33% strongly agreed that School-Wide encourages useful dialogue about behaviour between staff compared with 42% of coaches. The overall similarity between curriculum leaders and coaches shows that these different groups of staff had relatively consistent and positive views about the philosophy of School-Wide that are being maintained over time.

In phase 1, there were significant differences between the responses from 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools to statements about School-Wide philosophy. By phase 3, these differences were no longer evident. The 2012/13 coaches and curriculum leaders were reporting a stronger pattern of adoption of School-Wide philosophies. For example, in phase 1, 16% of 2012/13 coaches strongly agreed that School-Wide supports staff to see that new behaviours can be taught and

---

10 Highly significant indicates \( p < 0.0001 \).
13% reported it was too soon to tell. By phase 3, more (31%) strongly agreed with an equivalent question and only 5% reported it was too soon to tell.

The 2012/13 curriculum leaders showed a similar pattern. For example, in phase 1, 12% strongly agreed that School-Wide supports staff to see that new behaviours can be taught and 21% reported it was too soon to tell. By phase 3, more (30%) strongly agreed with an equivalent question. This pattern of stronger adoption of School-Wide philosophies is what we would expect if 2012/13 schools were effectively building a focus on School-Wide.

Reflecting the pattern of difference shown elsewhere in this report between 2010/11 primary and secondary staff, significantly more primary school respondents strongly agreed with a number of the statements about School-Wide philosophy.

Are the key features of School-Wide in place?

Figure 21 provides an overview of the extent to which coaches considered the key features of the School-Wide framework were in place at their school. The majority of 2010/11 coaches agreed that these features were in place. Their overall views were similar in phase 1.

Figure 21  Coach views on the extent key features of School-Wide are in place
Coaches from 2012/13 were starting to show the same pattern, with two-thirds or more agreeing that most of the practices were in place. There were only three significant differences between 2010/11 and 2012/13 coaches. Two of these related to the questions about the use of data. This is an aspect of School-Wide that is likely to take longer to implement as it requires other systems to be put in place.

The 2012/13 coaches also reported their schools had made progress with one feature of School-Wide that SET data show is slower to implement: the teaching of behaviour expectations. By phase 3, 74% of 2012/13 coaches agreed this was in place at their school compared with 48% in phase 1. The fact that 2012/13 schools are becoming more similar over time to 2010/11 schools indicates they are following the expected implementation pattern.

The majority of 2010/11 coaches from both primary and secondary/intermediate schools reported the key features were in place. However, reflecting the pattern of difference shown elsewhere, significantly more coaches from primary schools agreed with some statements. A few differences stood out. These differences were more pronounced for large secondary/intermediate schools:

- Half (50%) of the primary coaches strongly agreed their school regularly sought staff input to improve approaches to behaviour compared with 17% of secondary/intermediate coaches.
- All the primary coaches who responded reported their school had a planned process for teaching behaviour expectations in classes. Over a quarter (26%) of secondary/intermediate coaches reported their school did not have a planned process.
- All the primary coaches who responded reported staff effectively used acknowledgement and behaviour consequence systems to encourage positive behaviour. Almost a quarter (24%) of secondary/intermediate coaches disagreed with this statement.\(^\text{11}\)
- More primary school coaches (68%) strongly agreed they frequently reviewed data compared with secondary/intermediate (44%). Primary coaches reported making more use of these data for a range of purposes.

**How embedded is School-Wide?**

_**Do coaches from 2010/11 schools think School-Wide is embedded?**_  
The responses of 2010/11 coaches suggest that School-Wide is part of the fabric at these schools. The majority of coaches thought School-Wide was embedded in the way their school worked (78%), and was improving their school culture (83%). All who responded also thought that School-Wide approaches work well for most students, and nearly all thought School-Wide worked well for each of the three main groups of priority learners. Coaches responded in similar ways to these statements in phases 1 and 3.

There were some differences between schools in how long it took to embed School-Wide. SET data showed that decile 1–2 schools took longer to implement School-Wide than higher decile schools. However, in phase 1, coaches in low decile schools reported the initiative was more embedded and greater shifts in a wider range of student outcomes. More also reported using collaborative approaches with staff. A similar difference in the use of collaborative approaches with staff was evident in the phase 3 data. However, other differences were less evident. The proportion of coaches from schools of low and higher decile who strongly agreed that School-Wide was embedded in their school is shown below:

- **Phase 1:** 45% of decile 1–2 and 35% of decile 3–8 schools
- **Phase 3:** 55% of decile 1–2 and 58% of decile 3–8 schools.

\(^{11}\) This difference was highly significant \(p < 0.0001\).
This difference between phases 1 and 3 may suggest that schools of different deciles have different initial ways of working. However, over time they appear to reach a similar point.

Figure 22  **Coach views on the extent to which School-Wide is embedded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of agreement</th>
<th>2010/2011 cohort</th>
<th>Extent of agreement</th>
<th>2012/2013 cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB4L-SW approaches work well for most students</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB4L-SW is effective in improving the culture of this school</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB4L-SW approaches work well for Māori students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have realistic timelines for making changes relating to PB4L-SW</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB4L-SW has become embedded in the way this school works</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB4L-SW approaches work well for students with special education needs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approaches developed through PB4L-SW enable staff to spend less time managing behaviour and more time focusing on teaching and learning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB4L-SW approaches work well for Pasifika students</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school regularly celebrates the progress we are making with PB4L-SW</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a group of staff who do not support PB4L-SW</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are starting to lose interest in PB4L-SW and are returning to previous practices</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are unable to fully commit to PB4L-SW because of too many other initiatives</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly fewer 2010/11 coaches from secondary/intermediate schools (43%) than primary (70%) strongly agreed that School-Wide was embedded at their school. Another key difference was that 55% of secondary/intermediate coaches reported their school had a group of staff who did not support School-Wide. Only 7% of primary coaches thought the same.

The responses of 2010/11 coaches suggest some schools were finding it harder to maintain momentum with School-Wide. A few (14%) 2010/11 coaches reported that staff were starting to lose interest in School-Wide and were returning to previous practices. These staff tended to be located in secondary/intermediate schools (19% of secondary/intermediate and 9% of primary).

These data suggest that some schools were finding it harder to develop consistent approaches and some did not have the mechanisms needed to sustain School-Wide in the longer term. Interviews with regional Ministry of Education staff reported a similar pattern that was mostly related to staff or leadership changes at schools.

---

This difference was highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
Do coaches from 2012/13 schools think School-Wide is embedded?

By phase 3, more of the coaches from 2012/13 schools were also reporting that School-Wide was embedded at their school. They had become more similar to their peers at 2010/11 schools. In phase 1, around one-fifth or more of the 2012/13 coaches selected the “too soon to tell” options for the questions in Figure 22 above. By phase 3, fewer did the same and they responded to the questions in similar ways to 2010/11 coaches. For example, all 2012/13 coaches who responded to the question agreed that School-Wide approaches work well for most students. There was only one main difference between the two groups which was highly significant.13 As to be expected, 2012/13 coaches were less likely to strongly agree that School-Wide was embedded at their school (25% of 2012/13 coaches and 57% of 2010/11 coaches).

Do curriculum leaders think School-Wide is embedded?

The 2010/11 curriculum leaders responded to these questions in a similar way to coaches. All but three who responded agreed that School-Wide approaches work well for most students. The majority also thought School-Wide was improving their school culture (74%) and was embedded in the way their school worked (72%). English and mathematics curriculum leaders reported similar views to each other. Like coaches, significantly fewer secondary/intermediate curriculum leaders (26%) strongly agreed that School-Wide was embedded in their school compared with primary (69%). More tended to report that staff were starting to lose interest in School-Wide and were returning to previous practices (18% of secondary/intermediate and 4% of primary). Overall this suggests that different staff members at 2010/11 schools have relatively consistent views about how embedded School-Wide is in school practice.

All but one of the 2012/13 curriculum leaders who responded also agreed that School-Wide approaches work well for most students. As to be expected for schools that are newer to School-Wide, 2012/13 curriculum leaders showed less agreement with some questions, and tended to make more use of the “too soon to tell” option, compared with 2010/11 curriculum leaders. Fewer 2012/13 curriculum leaders strongly agreed that School-Wide was embedded in their school and was effective in improving the culture of their school, or was effective for Māori and Pasifika students.

In the next sections we look more closely at some of the key features of School-Wide.

13 \( p < 0.0001 \).
School teams

Comments on school team work from the school surveys

*Our school was calm, with good working practices, however, PB4L has improved on what was already good. It has given a forum for staff relationships and team work.* (Coach survey, 2014)

*The staff work even more closely as a team, and everyone feels valued by being a part of the PB4L meetings, discussions and planning.* (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)

An effective School-Wide school team is related to sustained implementation (McIntosh et al., 2010, 2013). In phases 1 and 3, only a small number of schools did not have a School-Wide team (three of each of the 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools).

By 2014, the School-Wide teams of the 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools looked similar in terms of overall practices and composition. In phases 1 and 3, teams varied in how often they met. In phase 3, over half of the 2010/11 and 2012/13 teams met frequently (every 1–4 weeks). Of the rest, 25% met every 5–8 weeks, and 13% met once a term or once or twice a year.

As shown in Figure 23 below, most coaches from both groups of School-Wide schools were positive about their team’s working and skill mix. Almost all coaches strongly agreed or agreed that their team worked well together to find a way through challenges (92% of 2010/11 and 87% of 2012/13). This suggests that the School-Wide practice of team problem solving is well-embedded in many schools.

Secondary/intermediate coaches were significantly less likely to strongly agree that the way the team leader and coach roles were structured worked well for their school. Almost half (45%) of the 2010/11 primary coaches were the principal or another senior leader. This contrasted with 12% of the secondary/intermediate coaches. It is likely that more senior staff are more able to create change in their school. More (41%) of the 2010/11 primary coaches thought they had enough time allocated to their role compared with secondary/intermediate (21%).

Table 8 shows that most teams included key leaders. Fewer teams included people who represented a wider range of staff or people who could represent student or community interests.
The involvement of the principal is a key success factor for School-Wide and most 2010/11 and 2012/13 teams included the principal. On the whole, the 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools had teams with similar compositions. There were a few differences. More 2012/13 coaches reported they had students, staff with expertise in managing data, teachers from different year levels and people who could represent the interests of Pasifika students.

The composition of teams stayed relatively similar between phases 1 and 3 except that in phase 3 coaches reported less involvement from some of the people who could represent students and their community including:

- board of trustee members (44% in phase 1 and 24% in phase 3)
- parents and whānau (37% in phase 1 and 20% in phase 3)
- people who could represent Māori students (43% in phase 1 and 23% in phase 3).

For two reasons the lower level of community representation on School-Wide teams reported in phase 3 is a concern. Having someone on the School-Wide team who represents the interests of Māori students was identified as a success factor in the phase 1 analysis. This analysis also identified that involving the wider community is an aspect of School-Wide that could be strengthened. It appears that schools may have community representation in the first years of School-Wide as they define their values and behaviour expectations. This representation then decreases over time. This pattern was evident at some case study schools. This suggests school approaches to community input are focused on consultation more than active collaboration.

We compared the composition of the teams at primary and secondary/intermediate schools from the 2010/11 schools. Reflecting the different roles in secondary/intermediate schools, their teams were significantly more likely to include staff with pastoral responsibility and school counsellors. Secondary/intermediate teams, and particularly those from large schools, were significantly less likely to include the principal (98% of primary and 62% of secondary/intermediate).14 This is a concern, as having an actively involved principal is a key School-Wide success factor. Secondary/intermediate teams were also less likely to include: a SENCO or staff who managed learning

---

14 This difference was highly significant (p < 0.0001).
support; board of trustee members; and parents and whānau. This suggests that secondary/ intermediate teams have less representation of key people than primary teams.

**Alignment of school teams**

Consistency is supported by aligning different aspects of practice. One way this can be achieved is through connections between different school teams. We asked coaches a number of questions about the extent to which the School-Wide team was connected with other teams or groups at their school (see Figure 24). Overall, the coaches at 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools reported the School-Wide team was connected with other school teams. Coaches at secondary schools were significantly less likely than coaches at primary schools to strongly agree that the School-Wide team was aligned with other teams at their school.

**Figure 24  Coach views on the links made by the School-Wide team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of agreement</th>
<th>2010/2011 cohort</th>
<th>2012/2013 cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This school has a team approach to identifying students with extra learning support needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PB4L-SW team makes connections with staff who make decisions about learning support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PB4L-SW team makes connections with other teams at this school that make sure approaches are aligned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PB4L-SW team makes connections with people who make decisions about stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions or expulsions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student involvement in School-Wide teams and decisions**

A few schools had student representatives on the School-Wide team (12% of 2010/11 and 23% of 2012/13). More had processes at team meetings to hear the input of student representatives (42% of 2010/11 and 45% of 2012/13). In phase 3, the number of schools with these processes was slightly higher than in phase 1 (27% and 34% respectively). This may suggest that involving students is becoming a more common practice in School-Wide schools. In general, coaches and curriculum leaders showed lower levels of agreement about most of the survey statements that related to input in decision making by students compared with other aspects of practice.

**Curriculum leader views on School-Wide teams**

Curriculum leaders from both cohorts were generally positive about their school’s School-Wide team and their involvement in School-Wide decisions (see Figure 25). In phase 1, a number of curriculum leaders from 2012/13 schools reported it was too soon to tell if team processes were in place. In phase 3, 2012/13 curriculum leaders were responding in a similar way to their peers at 2010/11 schools. This suggests that many of the teams at 2012/13 schools had developed processes that involved staff. A number of respondents to the curriculum leader survey were on the School-Wide team at their school (41% of 2010/11 and 32% of 2012/13). Therefore they are more likely to be knowledgeable, and positive, about the working of the team.
In-school support for staff

In phase 1, most 2010/11 school coaches reported that their school had developed a variety of resources and supports for staff to assist them to implement core School-Wide practices (see Figure 26). Fewer 2012/13 coaches reported the same. By phase 3, this difference was no longer evident and the majority of coaches reported they had a range of supports in place for staff. Most schools held regular professional learning sessions for staff about School-Wide (80% of 2010/11 and 81% of 2012/13 schools). In addition, commonly reported supports included:

- resources that support staff to acknowledge and promote positive behaviour (94% of 2010/11 and 89% of 2012/13 schools)
- resources that support staff to manage behaviour incidents (91% of 2010/11 and 81% of 2012/13 schools)
- training on processes for reporting behaviour incidents (88% of 2010/11 and 78% of 2012/13 schools).

In phases 1 and 3 the least common practice was a process for inducting new staff and relievers into School-Wide practices (69% of 2010/11 and 55% of 2012/13 schools). Overall, 2010/11 primary coaches reported a stronger pattern of agreement that they had these resources and supports in place than secondary/intermediate coaches.
By phase 3, there were also fewer differences between 2010/11 and 2012/13 curriculum leaders than were evident in phase 1. Curriculum leaders gave generally positive responses about their access to teaching resources and professional learning and development (PLD), suggesting their school was providing them with the support they needed to integrate core School-Wide approaches into their practice (see Figure 27). Around 16% of 2010/11 and 22% of 2012/13 curriculum leaders did not have access to resources that gave them ideas about how to effectively respond to behaviour incidents. This could be one area for which more resources are required.
Reporting and addressing behaviour incidents

School-Wide prioritises consistency of approach. To enable that, schools need to have developed effective systems for staff to record and address behaviour incidents. Most 2010/11 (83%) and 2012/13 (76%) coaches considered their school had effective and consistent approaches for addressing behaviour incidents. Slightly fewer coaches reported that all staff were clear about which types of behaviour were self-managed (minor) or referred to someone else (major) (79% of 2010/11 and 64% of 2012/13 coaches). More 2012/13 coaches disagreed with this question which suggests that some 2012/13 schools were still working on developing consistent approaches.

The majority of curriculum leaders mostly held similar views to coaches (see Figure 28). Both cohorts of curriculum leaders responded in similar ways, suggesting that 2012/13 schools had developed effective systems. Around three-quarters thought school systems for recording behaviour incidents were easy to use (73% of 2010/11 and 72% of 2012/13 curriculum leaders). Most were clear about which types of behaviour were minor or major (80% of 2010/11 and 77% of 2012/13 curriculum leaders).

Some curriculum leaders did not think the systems at their school were effective and consistent (19% of 2010/11 and 18% of 2012/13 curriculum leaders) or that they helped them to encourage positive behaviour (11% of 2010/11 and 13% of 2012/13 curriculum leaders). These staff were more likely to be located at secondary/intermediate schools. This indicates that developing effective systems that are consistently used is a challenge for some schools, including those that have been part of School-Wide for a longer length of time.

Figure 28  Curriculum leader views on systems for reporting and addressing behaviour incidents
Data management, reporting and use

The phase 1 report suggested that developing effective systems for data management and use was an aspect of the School-Wide framework that some schools found more challenging. We included a number of questions about this aspect of practice in the phase 3 surveys.

Managing data

By phase 3, coaches from both cohorts reported their school had systems in place to manage data (see Figure 29). These included:

- a database that gave the reports needed (78% of 2010/11 and 70% of 2012/13)
- a process for building staff expertise in managing data (71% of 2010/11 and 60% of 2012/13)
- access to technical support for the database used to record data (78% of 2010/11 and 87% of 2012/13).

Having access to people to support them to develop data capacity was a concern for some schools. At 2010/11 schools, 13% of coaches reported they did not have access to technical support for their database. At 2012/13 schools, 21% of coaches reported they did not have a process for building staff expertise in managing data.

![Coach views on managing data](image)

Reporting and using data

The information presented above suggests that, by phase 3, 2012/13 schools had developed systems for recording behaviour incidents and managing data. Two areas of difference between 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools were in how they reported and used data. As to be expected, processes for reporting data were more well embedded in 2010/11 schools (see Figure 30). For example, 91% of coaches reported that student behaviour data were reviewed by some staff or the school team at least every 5–8 weeks and 77% regularly reported summaries of these data to staff. Significantly fewer of 2012/13 coaches reported the same, suggesting they were still developing these processes (70% reviewed student data at least every 5–8 weeks, and 57% regularly reported data summaries to staff).

Processes for using data were also more well embedded in 2010/11 schools. Coaches from these schools were more likely to report they used student behaviour data to make improvements to school settings or systems (78%) or to develop areas for improvement in school action plans (76%). Significantly more also reported their school used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for Māori (74%) and Pasifika students (62%). Significantly fewer coaches from 2012/13 reported using data and feedback for these purposes.
As noted in the phase 1 preliminary report, processes that made use of feedback and data from priority learners were less strongly embedded than other practices. Schools were also less likely to regularly report behaviour data to students and parents and whānau.

Figure 30 Coach views on reporting and using data

One key difference that stood out was the different practices of primary and secondary/intermediate schools in terms of how they used data. Coaches from 2010/11 primary schools were more likely than secondary/intermediate coaches to report that they shared data and made active use of data for a range of purposes. This difference was particularly evident in the questions about priority learners. For example:

- 89% of primary and 57% of secondary/intermediate coaches reported they used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for Māori students
- 68% of primary and 55% of secondary/intermediate coaches reported they used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for Pasifika students
- 77% of primary and 54% of secondary/intermediate coaches reported they used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for students with special education needs.

Overall, there were significant differences between 2010/11 primary and secondary/intermediate coaches on nearly all the questions to do with data use (but not necessarily to do with data management). Curriculum leaders from 2010/11 schools showed a similar pattern. This suggests that primary schools are finding it easier to use data to inform actions.

Curriculum leaders had different views from school coaches on some of the data questions, and they showed more disagreement with statements about their ability to use data in comparison with other survey statements. For example,
20% of 2010/11, and 29% of 2012/13, curriculum leaders disagreed or strongly disagreed that behaviour data are reported to staff in a way that is useful. However, significantly more 2010/11 curriculum leaders than 2012/13 reported positive shifts in some areas relating to staff use of data. This suggests that, as schools progress with implementing School-Wide, these practices are being strengthened. One example was school processes for teachers to discuss student behaviour data so they could inquire into their practice. More 2010/11 curriculum leaders (69%) reported these processes were in place than 2012/13 curriculum leaders (57%). This suggests that these practices take longer to develop.

School staff views on aspects of School-Wide that need more support

---

Are there any aspects of PB4L-School-Wide that don’t work so well at your school and need more support?

Staff ‘turnover’ on the PB4L team, mainly through staff Leaving and others not being prepared to commit the necessary time, is a major problem. We need to find more time on top of numerous other commitments to enable the momentum to be continued. (Coach survey, 2014)

More focus on gathering student and community voice. (Coach survey, 2014)

Still developing robust systems for data entry, analysis and reporting. [We need to] keep up to date with completion of data tools. (Coach survey, 2014)

I am hoping that clear consequences and processes will be made explicit and followed through next year. Currently there are no processes and no consistency in consequences. Staff are left to fend for themselves in classes, with no referral or support system. What do we do once proximity, rule reminder etc, have all been used? (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)

---

Although most coaches and curriculum leaders supported School-Wide, some reported aspects of School-Wide that did not work so well for their school and needed more support (in response to an open-ended question). There was a wide range of issues each reported by a few respondents. Most of the concerns raised in phase 1 were still evident, and staff from both cohorts had similar concerns. The six most common were:

- inconsistency of practice or some staff not moving to a positive approach (7% of coaches and 11% of curriculum leaders)
- staff or school changes slowing momentum (3% of coaches and 6% of curriculum leaders)
- the need for more support to use data management systems (5% of coaches and 4% of curriculum leaders)
- the need for more or improved external support and PLD (6% of coaches)
- the need for more resources to support community input (5% of coaches)
- the need for clearer behaviour consequence processes (4% of curriculum leaders).
How aligned is School-Wide to New Zealand practice?

Coherence is one of the principles of the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007). The extent to which School-Wide aligns with other aspects of educational practice is particularly pertinent as School-Wide was initially developed overseas and therefore may not be perceived as “fitting” the New Zealand education system. Alignment is important at a school and system level. We examined the extent to which School-Wide is perceived as aligning with school practice and current educational models and professional learning approaches in New Zealand. A lack of alignment could be one factor that influences the implementation and success of the initiative.

How well does School-Wide align with school or community ways of working?

Over three-quarters of coaches at both cohorts of schools considered School-Wide fitted well with the leadership approaches used in New Zealand schools and could be adapted to suit the values and ways of working of their parent and whānau community (see Figure 31). Very few coaches disagreed with either of these statements. The 2010/11 primary and secondary/intermediate school coaches held similar views. This suggests that coaches perceive School-Wide to be well-aligned with current educational practices as well as community ways of working.

Over 70% of coaches also agreed with the statements about School-Wide fitting well with their school’s existing approaches to behaviour and that their school made clear connections between approaches to behaviour developed through School-Wide and approaches to learning. The 2010/11 primary coaches showed more overall agreement with these statements than secondary/intermediate coaches. This suggests that School-Wide has a stronger degree of alignment to current primary school practice. This may be one factor that influences the uptake of School-Wide in secondary/intermediate schools.

Figure 31  Coach views on School-Wide’s alignment with school practice

15 This difference between primary and secondary/intermediate coaches was highly significant (p < 0.0001).
How well does School-Wide align with other professional learning initiatives in schools?

We asked school coaches a question about the other professional learning and development (PLD) initiatives they had recently undertaken or were currently involved in, and the extent to which these supported their goals for School-Wide. We focused on three types of initiatives: other PB4L initiatives (e.g., Incredible Years-Teacher); initiatives that focused on building cultural capacity (e.g., Te Kotahitanga); and those that aimed to build achievement (e.g., literacy PLD).

As shown in Table 9, the most common form of other PLD undertaken by School-Wide schools was Restorative Practices PLD (50% of 2010/11 and 44% of 2012/13 schools). School coaches considered that all types of PLD aligned well with their School-Wide goals. The 2010/11 schools, and particularly those that had joined Tier 2, were significantly more likely to have made use of a range of other PB4L initiatives including Incredible Years-Teacher, Check and Connect16 and work with a student’s Intensive Wraparound Service team.

This pattern was also noticeable in the school case studies (Boyd et al., 2015). A number of the primary schools found that Incredible Years-Teacher PLD provided strategies that strengthened teachers’ approaches to promoting positive behaviour. Some primary and secondary schools found Restorative Practices PLD had provided positive strategies for addressing behaviour incidents that also built student and staff capabilities. This suggests that a range of other initiatives can either provide a foundation for School-Wide or act to strengthen aspects of School-Wide practice.

We also asked coaches and curriculum leaders if they considered they were unable to commit to School-Wide because of too many other initiatives. Only a small number of coaches (7% of 2010/11 and 13% of 2012/13) and curriculum leaders (14% of 2010/11 and 13% or 2012/13) thought this was the case. Overall, these data suggest that School-Wide is well-aligned with other forms of school PLD.

16 A relatively high number of schools reported they were part of Check and Connect. Respondents may have confused this initiative with Check In and Check Out which is a Tier 2 School-Wide initiative.
### Table 9  Coach views on the alignment between external PLD and School-Wide goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of PLD</th>
<th>2010/11 schools ((n = 86))</th>
<th>2012/13 schools ((n = 91))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School done/doing this PLD %</td>
<td>PLD supports School-Wide goals (% of schools attending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB4L PLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incredible Years-Teacher</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Intensive Wraparound Service team</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check and Connect</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My FRIENDS Youth</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB4L related PLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Practices/hui whakatika*</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building cultural capacity PLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kotahitanga</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He Kakano</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on Success</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika Success</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement and retention PLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy PLD/work with facilitators</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy PLD/work with facilitators</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with SAF facilitators (Student Achievement Function)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with ART facilitators (Attendance, Retention &amp; Transition)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with social sector trial group</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Restorative Practices is a new addition to PB4L. Most schools would have attended prior Restorative Practice PLD offered by other providers.
School coaches’ views on the School-Wide support model

School-Wide offers a support model to schools that includes regional training days, booster sessions on areas of need, visits to schools by School-Wide Practitioners, access to School-Wide conferences and access to local cluster meetings where schools meet to support each other. The Ministry of Education provides a small participation grant per school per year for training and support for the first 2 years of School-Wide.

The mix of different external supports that constituted the School-Wide support and training model appeared to be meeting the needs of many schools. Most coaches from both cohorts (82%) agreed that the way support and resources were organised in 2014 was effective for their school (see Figure 32). A similar number (78%) thought the same in 2013.

In phases 1 and 3, coaches from 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools responded in very similar ways to these questions, suggesting that the support model was effective for schools that had been in School-Wide for a number of years and were not getting any additional funding. The model also appeared to be effective for the 2012/13 school that had more recently joined the initiative. In phase 3, over 80% of coaches from both cohorts strongly agreed or agreed to nearly all questions. This shows a high level of support for the model and suggests that the majority of schools had effective working relationships with schools in their cluster and School-Wide Practitioners.

Figure 32 Coach views on the 2014 School-Wide support model

There was a small group of coaches (12%) who did not think the model was effective. More of these coaches were located at secondary/intermediate schools. In general, coaches from secondary/intermediate schools showed less agreement on all the questions about the support model. This difference was more pronounced by phase 3 with some of these differences being statistically significant. Coaches at secondary/intermediate schools reported less access to useful School-Wide tools, materials and resources that could be adapted for their school, and less agreement that their School-Wide regional practitioner assisted them to problem solve and find solutions to challenges if needed.
In terms of internal support provided by their school, only about one-third (32%) of all coaches thought they had enough time allocated to their role. This figure was similar in phase 1 (34%).

Their School-Wide role was part of the usual workload of slightly less than half of coaches (42% of 2010/11 and 51% of 2012/13). For a few (8%) a new role had been created or an existing role reorganised. Around two-fifths had extra acknowledgement for their role. This was more common for 2010/11 coaches. Significantly more had extra release or FTE time allocated (19% of 2010/11 and 7% of 2012/13) and more had an extra management unit (34% of 2010/11 and 22% of 2012/13). These differences suggest that the coach role has become more formalised and embedded in a number of 2010/11 schools.

Support from cluster groups

The School-Wide support model sets up clusters in districts to encourage schools to work together to problem solve and build practice. All but five of the 2010/11 coaches who responded to a question about cluster groups reported they had attended some meetings, and 63% had attended all of their cluster’s meetings in 2014. Similarly, only one 2012/13 coach reported they had not attended any cluster meetings and most (75%) attended all meetings. These figures stayed relatively similar between phases 1 and 3 suggesting that coaches are maintaining attendance at cluster meetings.

All but one coach reported benefits from these meetings. The 2010/11 and 2012/13 coaches reported similar benefits. The most common (selected by 60% or more across both cohorts) included:

- ideas about how to promote and acknowledge positive behaviour (82%)
- having a safe place to have conversations about data and school practice (72%)
- information about the evidence base of School-Wide (67%)
- ideas about how to manage behaviour incidents (64%)
- ideas about ways of changing school systems or settings to encourage positive behaviour (64%)
- ideas about how to set up effective school systems for reporting behaviour data (61%).

The least commonly mentioned benefits related to practices that might involve students, parents and whānau as more active partners. Other findings in this report suggest these practices are less common practice in schools. The least commonly mentioned benefits included:

- ideas about how to seek student input or provide leadership opportunities for students (42%)
- strategies for working effectively with parents and whānau to share understandings about behaviour (40%)
- ideas about how to incorporate Māori, Pasifika or community values and ways of working into School-Wide (26%)
- ideas about how School-Wide practices can support students with special education needs (20%).

This suggests that a focus on these areas in cluster meetings might assist schools to build a stronger focus on working collaboratively with their students, parent and whānau community.

The impact of support on rate of School-Wide implementation

In phases 1 and 3 we used SET data from schools to see if there were any differences between schools that had a fast or slow rate of implementing School-Wide. SET is completed annually by schools. This tool gives an indication of the extent to which schools have implemented the key features of School-Wide. A feature is considered to be implemented if there is 80% agreement on a number of items about this feature. Schools also get an overall score which summarises their overall level of implementation.
In phase 3 we split the 2010 to 2012 schools into fast, medium, or low or no change groups\textsuperscript{17} depending on their rate of change in average SET scores between the first 2 years they were part of School-Wide.\textsuperscript{18} We looked to see if there were any differences between schools by their rate of implementation to see if those that were faster to implement School-Wide were different from other schools.

In phase 1, one key difference between schools was that significantly more coaches from fast-implementing schools strongly agreed they got effective support and communications from their School-Wide Practitioner (50% of fast and 21% of medium/low). They also tended to be more likely to strongly agree that they were able to have one-on-one sessions with their School-Wide Practitioner if needed (33% of fast and 18% of medium/low).

In phase 3, significantly more coaches from fast-implementing schools strongly agreed that they got all the PLD needed to assist them in their role (31% of fast and 13% of medium/low), and that the professional development provided through School-Wide was effective for their school team (44% of fast and 17% of medium/low). More coaches from fast-implementing schools tended to strongly agree with all the other questions about the School-Wide support model. For example, 44% of fast, and 31% of medium/low, schools strongly agreed that their School-Wide Practitioner assisted them to problem solve if needed.

Support relationships and stability over time

The analysis summarised above suggested that perceptions of effective PLD and assistance from School-Wide Practitioners assists schools to implement School-Wide. Therefore we took a closer look at the other questions in the coach survey about the connections between schools and School-Wide Practitioners who support and train schools. We looked at the data from all 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools.

For 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools, perceptions of effective support from School-Wide Practitioners were related to stronger levels of agreement that School-Wide was effective for all students and in improving school culture. For 2010/11 schools, a perception of effective support was also related to higher levels of agreement that staff, students, and parent and whānau supported School-Wide and that the underpinning philosophies of School-Wide had been adopted by staff and the school. For example, coaches who strongly agreed they got effective support from their School-Wide Practitioner were also more likely to strongly agree that School-Wide was effective in improving the culture of their school (79% strongly agreed to both statements).

The phase 1 data showed that many schools had changes in the School-Wide Practitioner with whom they worked. By phase 3, only 25% of coaches reported their practitioner had stayed the same over their time in School-Wide (20% for 2010/11 schools; 31% for 2012/13 schools). Of the rest, 23% had one change, 28% had two or three changes and 7% had four or more changes in School-Wide Practitioner. The other schools did not respond to this question.

In phase 1, the coaches from 2010/11 schools were more likely to strongly agree that many of the features of School-Wide were in place if their School-Wide Practitioner had stayed the same. They also reported more positive outcomes. A different pattern was evident in the phase 3 data. There were fewer significant differences in relation to outcomes. For example, 65% of 2010/11 coaches from schools with the same practitioner reported a major positive change to the number of behaviour incidents compared with 51% of the schools that had one or more changes of practitioner. However, this difference was not statistically significant.

\textsuperscript{17} Fast rate = 40% or more improvement in the average SET score; medium rate = 25% to 39% improvement; and low, no or negative rate = up to 25% change.

\textsuperscript{18} In phase 1 we did a similar analysis with the 2010 and 2011 schools.
One main pattern stood out for the 2010/11 schools that had worked with the same practitioner over time. These schools reported significantly more agreement or positive change in relation to the aspects of School-Wide that the evaluation findings suggest are more complex, such as: working collaboratively with the SENCO and the staff who provide learning support; seeking Māori community input into school approaches to behaviour; reporting to parents; using data to make changes; and attempting to use all behaviour consequences before SSEE actions. There were no clear patterns for 2012/13 schools.

These data suggest that effective relationships with School-Wide Practitioners is one key aspect of the support model that assists schools to adopt School-Wide philosophies and make initial progress with implementing School-Wide. Over time, these relationships assist schools to address the more complex aspects of School-Wide.

Stability of school teams and clusters
School coaches tended to report more stability in their school teams. In total, 42% of school teams had the same coach, team leader and principal over their time in School-Wide. Over half (55%) of survey respondents were still in the same cluster. As to be expected, 2010/11 schools reported more change in school teams and clusters than 2012/13 schools. For 2010/11 schools, having the same team over time appeared to assist schools to make significantly more progress with some of the more complex aspects of School-Wide including: developing resources to support staff to acknowledge positive behaviour and manage behaviour incidents; forming connections with SENCO and the staff who manage learning support; consulting with the school’s Pasifika community; and developing processes for analysing and using data by staff and the team. This suggests that teams that stay the same over time are in a better position to build and maintain a web of relationships and connections that support School-Wide. The schools with stable teams reported more positive changes to school culture than those with teams that had changed. The schools with stable teams reported similar decreases in major behaviour incidents as other schools. Interestingly, they also report fewer shifts in SSEE rates. This may be because coaches at schools with stable teams are more aware of longer term trends at their school.

Aspects of School-Wide that may need further support
In this section of the report we look at three aspects of practice that were identified in the phase 1, 2 and 3 analysis as warranting additional consideration. These are:

- how School-Wide incorporates a focus on priority learners
- the relationship between School-Wide, types of behaviour consequences and SSEE
- the fit between School-Wide and secondary school practice.

The data from the school and School-Wide Practitioner surveys, and interviews with Ministry personnel, suggested that, in line with the School-Wide focus on problem solving, Ministry of Education personnel were actively working to build practice at a national, regional and local school level in relation to a focus on priority learners and the fit between School-Wide and secondary school practice. There appeared to be less focus on sharing examples of behaviour consequences that also built student and staff capabilities to manage major incidents and thus avoided consequences such as SSEE.

Focusing on priority learners
The School-Wide theory of change identifies alignment with Ministry of Education goals as one factor that is likely to influence School-Wide implementation. One important Ministry of Education goal is improving outcomes for priority learners. Therefore the School-Wide evaluation questions and data-gathering tools include a focus on approaches and outcomes for three groups of priority learners: Māori students; Pasifika students; and students with special education needs. We asked questions about how schools and School-Wide Practitioners included a focus on the perspectives of
priority learners and their communities, given that working collaboratively with the whole school community is also a core aspect of School-Wide practice.

In general, most school coaches and curriculum leaders considered that School-Wide worked well for all three groups of priority learners. However, compared with other questions, school staff showed less agreement that specific practices were in place that could assist them to explore the experiences of priority learners (see the summary below). They also reported School-Wide had supported fewer shifts in these practices. This pattern was similar in phases 1 and 3.

Overall, 2010/11 coaches reported more inclusion of priority learner and community perspectives than 2012/13 coaches. A few of these differences were statistically significant. This suggests that School-Wide is supporting change in this area, but these practices are slower to change than other aspects of practice.

Schools seemed to have more processes for ensuring Māori students and community perspectives were included in School-Wide, and exploring outcomes for Māori learners, than they did for Pasifika learners. Examples of the ways schools included the perspectives and worldviews of Māori learners and communities are provided in the case study report (Boyd et al., 2015). Schools also appeared to be developing connections between teams to support learners with special education needs.

In relation to Māori learners, whānau and communities:

• Most coaches agreed or strongly agreed that PB4L-School-Wide approaches work well for Māori students (83% of 2010/11 and 80% of 2012/13).

• A few coaches reported having staff, parents or community members who could represent the interests of Māori students on the School-Wide team (21% of 2010/11 and 24% of 2012/13). This was a decrease from phase 1, where 45% and 41% respectively reported the same.

• Over half of the coaches reported that their school used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for Māori students (73% of 2010/11 and 48% of 2012/13).

• Less than half of the coaches reported that their school regularly sought Māori community input to improve approaches to behaviour (55% of 2010/11 and 34% of 2012/13).

• The majority of curriculum leaders reported they made space for Māori learners to share their cultural perspectives and attitudes when discussing behaviour (81% of 2010/11 and 71% of 2012/13).

In relation to Pasifika learners and communities:

• The majority of coaches agreed or strongly agreed that PB4L-School-Wide approaches work well for Pasifika students (76% of 2010/11 and 74% of 2012/13).

• A few coaches reported having staff, parents or community members who could represent the interests of Pasifika students on the School-Wide team (5% of 2010/11 and 18% of 2012/13).

• Less than half of coaches reported that their school regularly sought Pasifika community input to improve approaches to behaviour (36% of 2010/11 and 24% of 2012/13).

• About half of coaches reported that their school used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for Pasifika students (62% of 2010/11 and 43% of 2012/13).

• The majority of curriculum leaders reported they made space for Pasifika learners to share their cultural perspectives and attitudes when discussing behaviour (78% of 2010/11 and 70% of 2012/13).
“A positive culture of support”
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In relation to students with special education needs:

- The majority of coaches agreed or strongly agreed that PB4L-School-Wide approaches work well for students with special education needs (78% of 2010/11 and 78% 2012/13).

- About half of coaches reported having a SENCO or staff who provided learning support on the School-Wide team (48% of 2010/11 and 46% of 2012/13), and about one-third, teacher aides (30% of 2010/11 and 39% of 2012/13).

- Most coaches reported the School-Wide team made connections with the staff who make decisions about learning support (84% of 2010/11 and 72% of 2012/13).

- Just under two-thirds of coaches reported their school regularly sought input from staff who are responsible for special education needs provision to improve approaches to behaviour (64% of both 2010/11 and 2012/13).

- About half of coaches agreed their school used data and feedback to review how School-Wide was working for students with special education needs (62% of 2010/11 and 47% of 2012/13).

- The majority of curriculum leaders reported they made space for learners with special education needs to share their perspectives when discussing behaviour (84% of 2010/11 and 75% of 2012/13).

**Ministry of Education staff views about focusing on priority learners**

School-Wide Practitioners reported differences in the extent to which schools had processes in place to work collaboratively with priority learners and their communities. Some schools had well-developed processes, others had fewer mechanisms for seeking community input.

Ministry of Education staff were working at a national and regional level to build approaches that took into account Māori and Pasifika learner and community perspectives. These approaches are discussed later in this chapter.

Some Ministry of Education staff noted that they were supporting schools to consider ways of being more inclusive through sharing good practice examples from schools. However, it was unclear whether examples of practice were needed or available to show how the perspectives of students with special education needs could be incorporated within School-Wide.

Overall, the information from schools and Ministry of Education staff suggests that, while both groups are building ways to include and support priority learners within School-Wide, regions and schools could benefit from further exploration, and sharing of, good practice.

**Shifting from punitive to learning-focused behaviour consequences**

The data presented in Chapter 2 show that expulsion rates appear to be dropping at School-Wide schools. It is not yet clear whether stand-down rates are following this trend. One tension highlighted in these data is that some schools appear to be relying on stand-downs as a short-term solution to address major behaviour incidents. One reason for this could be that the School-Wide team and the people who make decisions about SSEE (the board of trustees) are not connected. Most 2010/11 coaches (78%) reported the School-Wide team made connections with the people who make decisions about SSEE. However, only 24% note that they had a board of trustee member on their school team. This level of representation had decreased between phase 1 and phase 3. The secondary/intermediate schools, that make the most use of SSEE, were the least likely to have board of trustee representation on the team.

Most coaches reported their school tried to keep students at school by making sure all other consequences for behaviour were tried before using SSEE (85% of 2010/11 and 81% of 2012/13). Many (67%) 2010/11 coaches reported School-Wide had supported a major or minor positive shift in this practice. Around 60–68% of 2010/11 coaches also reported
major or minor positive shifts in SSEE rates at their school. In general, these shifts are lower than those reported for other student behaviour outcomes.

SSEE are essentially a punitive consequence. Other examples of punitive consequences are detentions or withdrawal of privileges. Frequent use of punitive consequences seems to contradict the idea of “positive behaviour for learning” as SSEE and detentions often take time away from learning. SSEE are associated with early school leaving and poorer longer term outcomes for students (Fergusson et al., 2002). Māori and Pasifika students, and especially boys, are over-represented in SSEE statistics. The fact that suspensions and expulsions do not support learning was commented on by students at some of the case study schools we visited (Boyd et al., 2015). Students were clear that they and their peers should be able to make mistakes in regard to their behaviour, and learn from these experiences, rather than be excluded from school.

Some of the case study schools had developed learning-focused consequences (Boyd et al., 2015). A learning-focused consequence prioritises problem solving and ways of addressing incidents and restoring relationships that build the capability of students and staff. Therefore one aim of a learning-focused consequence is to lessen the likelihood of repeat concerns. The staff at schools that had more learning-focused consequences had asked themselves hard questions such as “How do detentions support learning?”, “Is zero tolerance to drugs and automatic exclusion of students necessary, or are there other solutions?”, or “We say we are placing the child at the heart. If we really mean this, can we find a solution for a child who is a danger to other students and has little support at home?” These schools had repositioned “problem behaviour” as a collective responsibility. They worked with staff, students and families to consider the different contributions to a situation and to co-construct solutions. One example of a secondary school that had been through a paradigm shift and turned their prior “three-strikes and you’re out” consequence system into a learning opportunity for all is described below.

“Catch-up” and “fix-up”—Behaviour consequences that promote learning*

A secondary school has two behaviour consequence systems. For behaviours such as lateness, truanting or missed work, students are required to go to “catch-up” time from 2.30–3.00 pm. Other students can go home at 2.30 pm. “Catch-up” is run by teachers who are rostered on to support students to catch up work they have missed. “Catch-up” also functions as an after-school homework club because other students can elect to go for extra support. One benefit of this dual focus is that it enables teachers to do what they do best—support students with their learning. Another benefit is the students who elect to go to “catch-up” can act as role models for their peers.

The second system is “fix-up”—a tiered restorative approach that supports students and teachers to “fix up” relationships. Low-level behaviours are managed in class by teachers through prevention (offering an engaging curriculum) or processes such as restorative thinking questions. Students can also be asked to develop an in-class restorative thinking plan in which they reflect on the school expectations. Medium-level behaviours are managed by time out in a Restorative Thinking Room where students develop a restorative thinking plan with the support of a skilled facilitator. This plan is then discussed with the teacher or the other students involved. Planned actions are revisited at a later date. These processes place the onus on both students and teachers reflecting and learning from an incident. Both sides hear each other’s perspectives, work to repair the harm that is caused and develop strategies to “fix-up” the situation and avoid repeat issues.

More serious incidents are managed by a restorative mini-conference, or a community conference which involves all the people affected, including parents and whānau. This school is attempting to “suspend” suspensions, and so a key aim of the restorative process is to keep students at school. To support this system, all staff have attended restorative practices and behaviour management training. Teachers are provided with resources that outline strategies they can use in the classroom to interact in a respectful and restorative manner.

The two groups of students we spoke to strongly supported the school’s systems and perceived them as fair and focused around learning. They thought teachers went the extra mile in supporting their learning.

“There aren’t immediate suspensions or expulsions—it helps people learn more. Students in conflict can come together and look at what they can do to fix it. After restoratives, students come out being friends.”  
(Years 12/13 student leaders)

“Both the school and our attitudes have changed towards ‘catch-up’... ‘Catch-up’ is a learning opportunity, not a punishment. People who want to learn can go and learn more. It builds your bond with the teacher. It’s about being a more productive learner... It’s a time where I can go and do work, ‘cause I may have been distracted. You can stay till 4:30 pm with the teachers... It’s a good opportunity especially when you’re behind with credits for NCEA—it’s good for students who are working at a slower rate...”  
(Years 12/13 student leaders)

The experience of the case study schools suggests that both schools with learning-focused behaviour consequences as well as those with more traditional systems can be successful in lowering SSEE rates. However, learning-focused consequences appear to have a better fit with the idea of “positive behaviour for learning”.

To more closely align consequence systems with the wider intent of PB4L, these findings suggest that schools need more support and examples of practice (such as the one above) to develop learning-focused consequences. In particular, more secondary school examples are needed given that these schools rely more on punitive consequences. The new PB4L Restorative Practices initiative could potentially assist in providing this support. Most of the School-Wide case study schools with learning-focused consequences had taken part in some form of whole-school restorative practices PLD. This PLD was offered by a variety of different providers. The coach survey data shows that 41 of the 43 schools that had done some form of restorative practices PLD considered this supported School-Wide goals. Many of these schools had joined Tier 2 (25 of the 41). This suggests that there is a synergy between restorative practices and School-Wide. Tier 2, with its focus on providing extra support for students for whom Tier 1 does not “work”, might also result in further changes to school consequence systems and SSEE rates.

Ministry of Education staff views about behaviour consequences

Interviews with the school staff at the case study schools and Ministry of Education staff indicate that the reasons for stand-downs can be complex. Some schools use stand-downs as a mechanism for accessing additional support for students; others feel pressure from their school community to “punish” students who are involved in major incidents, or protect victims. Ministry of Education staff considered the over-use of SSEE as behaviour consequences was mostly an issue for secondary schools. Because of the size of secondary schools, the School-Wide team could be disconnected from SSEE decisions and therefore SSEE could sit outside the school’s behaviour consequences system.

There were differences in opinion as to whether a drop in SSEE rates is a feasible outcome of Tier 1 of School-Wide. Some suggested that more change might be expected at Tier 2 with its emphasis on supporting the more challenging students, not the “usual 80%”. However, Ministry of Education staff were also seeing some successes in terms of School-Wide supporting changes to SSEE rates. In one region, five large secondary schools had a 50% drop in SSEE. Others had supported school change by working with a senior advisor and a Ministry of Education team to support a school with high SSEE rates. Some solutions suggested by Ministry of Education staff included:

- ensuring SSEE were clearly part of school consequence systems and not outside
- sharing more models of what learning-focused consequences could look like, such as the processes that could be developed through restorative practices PLD
- increasing the focus on including school senior management teams in School-Wide training
• increasing the messaging to the school and parent community about the needed paradigm shift away from punishment towards learning approaches to behaviour.

A widening gap between primary and secondary practice
Most of the data sources utilised for this evaluation indicate that secondary and large intermediate schools experience more challenges implementing School-Wide compared with primary or contributing schools. For example, significantly fewer secondary/intermediate coaches strongly agreed that School-Wide was embedded in the way their school worked. As the length of time schools have been part of School-Wide grows, the gap between primary and secondary practice appears to be getting larger.

This gap is not about a difference in philosophy, as both primary and secondary respondents report supporting School-Wide. The data in Chapter 2 on short-term shifts showed that secondary schools can successfully implement School-Wide in ways that lead to the desired outcomes. The growing number of secondary schools that have successfully implemented Tier 1 and have joined Tier 2 is evidence of this.

The gap is more about working collaboratively to make changes to school culture. The phase 3 data show more highly significant differences between secondary and primary practice and outcomes than was evident in the phase 1 data. The secondary and intermediate coaches from 2010/11 schools reported fewer changes to practice and few shifts in school culture, student competencies and relationship-based outcomes than did 2010/11 primary and contributing school coaches.

The main factor that is contributing to these differences is school size and the impact that this has on the team’s ability to work collaboratively and promote consistency of practice. Both small primary and small secondary schools can develop consistent practices in a shorter time frame and so can move forward faster. The findings in this report suggest that developing a consistent focus takes longer in the larger and more complex settings of secondary schools.

Specific challenges in a secondary setting
We looked at the different data sources to see what they could tell us about the aspects of School-Wide implementation that might be more complex for secondary and intermediate schools to implement and therefore might benefit from further support. In phases 1 and 3 we compared the data from 2010/11 secondary/intermediate school coaches and curriculum leaders with data from primary schools. We also looked at these data by school size. We split the schools into four groups: small primary; large primary; small secondary/intermediate; and large secondary/intermediate. We also looked at data from surveys and interviews with School-Wide Practitioners and other national and regional Ministry of Education staff involved in School-Wide.

The pattern of differences between primary and secondary/intermediate schools was similar between phase 1 and phase 3. The main differences are reported in the text in sections on outcomes and implementation and are summarised below. Overall, significantly fewer secondary/intermediate school coaches agreed that some of the core features of School-Wide were in place compared to their primary colleagues. They were also less likely to report shifts in practice in relation to some of these features. A similar pattern was evident in responses from curriculum leaders.

There were six main areas of difference between secondary/intermediate and primary schools. Most of these differences were statistically significant. A number were more pronounced for large secondary/intermediate schools. Secondary/intermediate school coaches were less likely to:
• **strongly agree**\(^{20}\) that **School-Wide fitted well with their school’s existing approaches** (31% of secondary/intermediate and 61% of primary)

• **report their school had an actively involved principal who was on the school team** (62% of secondary/intermediate and 98% of primary\(^*^{21}\))

• **work collaboratively leading the whole school community in a School-Wide journey.** Secondary/intermediate coaches reported less agreement that their school had processes in place for working collaboratively with all the key members of the school community (staff, students, parents and whānau) and other schools. For example, significantly fewer secondary/intermediate coaches strongly agreed that their school regularly sought staff input to improve approaches to behaviour (17% of secondary/intermediate and 50% of primary)

• **strongly agree that the School-Wide team make connections with other teams** (14% of secondary/intermediate and 43% of primary)

• **provide teachers with resources that supported them to promote positive behaviour and agree or strongly agree that they had a planned process for teaching behaviour expectations in class** (64% of secondary/intermediate and 98% of primary). This is one aspect of School-Wide that SET data show is harder for schools in general to implement (Ministry of Education, 2013)

• **develop consistent practices for reinforcing positive behaviour and addressing incidents.** Significantly fewer secondary/intermediate coaches strongly agreed with statements about consistency of approaches across the school such as: all staff are clear about which types of behaviour incidents are self-managed (minor) and which are referred to someone else (major) (24% of secondary/intermediate and 61% of primary); and all staff effectively use the acknowledgement/rewards and behaviour consequences systems to encourage positive behaviour (60% of secondary/intermediate and 89% of primary*).

• **develop effective data-reporting processes.** Significantly more Secondary/intermediate schools reported using a student data management system such as KAMAR or MUSAC to manage School-Wide data. Primary schools made more use of Excel or other databases. There were differences in views about data capability and use. Secondary/intermediate coaches were significantly less agreement that they had a process for building staff expertise in managing data (62% of secondary/intermediate and 80% of primary). They reported less sharing of data and significantly fewer agreed that data were used to make improvements to school settings or systems (67% of secondary/intermediate and 89% of primary*).

Overall, these data suggest that shifts in practice in secondary schools are likely to involve longer time frames and more support to develop processes that engage the whole school community, support the teaching of behaviour expectations and consistency of practice and enable schools to make effective use of data.

There were some suggestions that the School-Wide structure and support processes were less effective for secondary/intermediate coaches. These differences seemed more pronounced in phase 3. Secondary/intermediate coaches were significantly more likely to disagree that the way the School-Wide team leader and coach roles were structured worked well for their school (12% of secondary/intermediate and no primary). Significantly fewer reported they got useful ideas from cluster meetings about how the School-Wide team could effectively use the different expertise of team members (21% of secondary/intermediate and 43% of primary). Fewer also strongly agreed that they

---

\(^{20}\) See chapter 3 for examples of the full questions and response scales.

\(^{21}\) *These differences were highly significant (p < 0.0001).
had access to useful School-Wide tools, materials and resources they could adapt for their school (17% of secondary/intermediate and 41% of primary) and that their School-Wide Practitioner assisted them to problem solve and find solutions to challenges (17% of secondary/intermediate and 45% of primary).

The information presented above indicates that School-Wide is more complex to implement in secondary and intermediate school settings, and particularly in large schools. The data presented in Chapter 2 show that School-Wide can “work” in secondary and intermediate schools, and produce outcomes. However, these schools have more challenges to work through. These findings are consistent with international literature about the USA equivalent of School-Wide (Flannery, Sugai, & Anderson, 2009).

Ministry of Education staff views on School-Wide in secondary/intermediate schools

Reflecting the findings from schools summarised above, School-Wide Practitioners and other regional Ministry staff were finding that secondary schools could take much longer to implement School-Wide. On the whole the complexities in the secondary sector and for some large intermediate schools identified by School-Wide Practitioners and other regional Ministry staff were similar to those identified by schools. They commented on:

- the size of the school and therefore number of staff who coaches needed to work with
- the principal devolving leadership of School-Wide to less senior staff or changes in leadership that resulted in School-Wide falling off the agenda
- competing priorities with some schools being involved in many initiatives
- the range of roles school coaches or team leaders had, such as other key school management or pastoral roles
- the management structures in some secondary schools that did not enable connections between the different leadership teams
- an existing school behaviour management approach that did not align well with School-Wide and therefore resulted in difficulties getting all staff on board with new approaches
- difficulties with managing and using data within existing data-management systems
- a high turnover of school staff in general, and in the school School-Wide team.

Some of the solutions found by regional School-Wide teams to support secondary schools are discussed in the next section.
Providing support to schools

This section of the report draws on information from the School-Wide Practitioner survey and interviews with national and regional Ministry of Education staff involved with School-Wide.

Access to support

The analysis presented earlier that showed an association between the successful implementation and building of School-Wide and stability of School-Wide Practitioner supports the School-Wide literature which suggests that regular access by school staff to external expertise is related to sustained School-Wide implementation (McIntosh et al., 2010; McIntosh et al., 2013). Therefore an effective support workforce with the requisite knowledge is a core component of School-Wide. Support to School-Wide schools is currently provided by School-Wide Practitioners employed by regional Ministry of Education offices. The School-Wide Practitioners work in regional teams. Their role varies depending on their level of experience but usually includes running Tier 1 school training days, facilitating school cluster sessions and visiting schools to provide one-on-one mentoring and problem-solving support, and to assist in administering tools such as SET. For some, their role has expanded in 2014 to include running Tier 2 training, providing Tier 2 support and supporting schools that are losing momentum with School-Wide to re-engage.

Consolidating the Tier 1 training and support model

The feedback from schools summarised in this report suggests that the Tier 1 training and support model was meeting the needs of most schools. National and regional Ministry of Education staff also considered the Tier 1 training model had been developed to the point at which it provided the necessary foundation for most schools. Some of the concerns expressed in phase 1 about the training model being too static and “powerpoint” focused were less evident in phase 3. Ministry of Education staff now considered the training model was:

- more efficient and rigorous in that it transmitted a clearer view of core School-Wide features
- more engaging and interactive, and orientated towards schools building practice together rather than being driven by an “expert”
- being delivered in a more confident manner owing to the growing expertise of School-Wide Practitioners.

Over time the training has been adapted to suit school needs and modules had been revised to address areas that needed strengthening. One example was the whānau, family and communities module. Over 2014, this module has been redeveloped by drawing on national practice, School-Wide Practitioner, and Māori and Pasifika expertise. The module now includes more focus on Māori and Pasifika views of wellbeing and approaches to engaging communities. The redeveloped module is now a core part of the first year of universal training for school teams and principals. Previously this module was a workshop that team members attended after core training.

For some regions, developing the Tier 2 training process had crystallised staff’s views about aspects of Tier 1 that needed more scaffolding. Some regions planned to further adapt Tier 1 training to ensure schools, and particularly secondary, were offered more support in areas they found more challenging. These included classroom behaviour management techniques and using data to make changes at a school-wide and classroom level.

Building practice to fit New Zealand communities

Ministry of Education interviewees and respondents to the School-Wide Practitioner survey showed lower levels of agreement to questions about culturally responsive practices than to other questions about their practice. For example, less than half of survey respondents reported they had examples to share with schools of ways to implement School-Wide that took into account Pasifika worldviews. Less than half also reported they had access to Pasifika advisors if needed.
Recognising the need to build a stronger focus on this aspect of practice for themselves and for schools, Ministry of Education staff were working at a national and regional level to build approaches that took into account Māori and Pasifika learner and community perspectives.

The 2014 redevelopment of the whānau, family and communities training module is one example of how the School-Wide workforce worked together to problem solve and build practice in areas of need, as well as practice that fits New Zealand communities. There was a general consensus that this module, should assist schools to develop stronger processes for working collaboratively with Māori and Pasifika communities.

School-Wide Practitioners and other regional Ministry of Education staff felt the region provision of School-Wide support was enabling them develop examples of practice to suit local Māori or other communities. One region had a relationship with a local provider from an iwi who was assisting in strengthening iwi and school partnerships in the area. Another had seconded a principal from a Māori-medium school to work with the regional team to adapt School-Wide approaches and resources so they could be used by a group of kura. This team had developed School-Wide resources in te reo Māori. Staff from other regions were hoping to have access to these resources.

Other regions noted they needed to build a stronger focus on Māori and Pasifika ways of working but did not have the personnel to support this work. Some aimed to join up with other regions to support them to develop their practice. One region was planning that all School-Wide Practitioners would attend training to assist them to work effectively with Māori-medium schools and communities.

Providing problem-solving support to Tier 1 schools

The demographic questions in the School-Wide Practitioner survey gave some indication that those who responded were likely to have a range of competencies and knowledge sets they could draw on to support Tier 1 schools. In terms of their professional practice, all the practitioners who responded to the surveys in phases 1 and 3 agreed they felt confident in their role. Most felt they received the training they needed for their various roles in working with schools. However, some felt they needed more access to PLD to continue to build their capability to support schools.

Regional managers considered that the experienced School-Wide Practitioners were now highly effective in building relationships with schools and working to support Tier 1 schools to problem solve. In addition, one of the benefits of having a larger group of School-Wide schools was that there were more schools to learn from each other.

Some School-Wide Practitioners expressed a concern that the emphasis of School-Wide training differed between regions. They considered newer staff required more induction to ensure they had a solid foundation in School-Wide before training schools.

Providing extra support to secondary schools

One ongoing focus for national and regional staff was developing ways to provide extra support to secondary schools. In 2014, all regions intensified the amount of tailored support offered to secondary schools. All offered extra group support in the form of sector forums or booster sessions tailored to needs. Some regions were working proactively and were using SET and other data to identify target schools and offer support related to identified areas of difficulty. Others were more reactive and offered support if it was requested.

One of the benefits of the regional support model was that regions could organise support to suit the schools, and individual clusters, in their area. Most regions had consulted with secondary schools about their needs and developed approaches to suit. Approaches designed to provide extra support to secondary schools included:
• locating secondary schools in the same cluster groups, or holding additional secondary sector meetings to ensure school staff had time to meet together to share ideas and problem solve. Some regions changed the timing of these sessions to better suit schools or made sure meetings were planned well in advance
• seconding experienced secondary school staff to run school cluster meetings. Use of secondments also gave more School-Wide Practitioner time to engage in problem solving with schools
• offering tailored group training, such as forums or booster sessions about concerns specific to most secondary schools (e.g., working with KAMAR student management systems)
• developing a menu of booster training sessions that schools could opt into depending on their needs. In some regions, some boosters were compulsory before schools joined Tier 2
• setting goals about visiting all School-Wide secondary schools once a term and allocating time for School-Wide Practitioners to engage in coaching of the school team. This was particularly important for the staff at geographically isolated schools who found it hard to get to cluster meetings
• working in teams of two School-Wide Practitioners with different expertise to visit schools to problem solve
• offering School-Wide Practitioners support to re-engage staff with School-Wide such as assisting school coaches to run whole-school PLD sessions about School-Wide or specific debates at their school
• working with senior advisors and other Ministry staff to ensure the support they provided to struggling schools was co-ordinated.

In general, School-Wide Practitioners and other regional Ministry of Education staff considered that more acknowledgement was needed of the complexities of the secondary environment and the time it might take for the whole-school cultural shift that School-Wide requires. This view is consistent with international literature which notes that the School-Wide model is primarily used in elementary (primary) and middle schools, and is more complex to implement in secondary school contexts (Flannery et al., 2009).

In 2014, regions and School-Wide Practitioners had tried, within the bounds of the existing School-Wide model, to offer extra support for secondary schools. In some cases, School-Wide Practitioners reported they worked very intensively with school teams for a period of time. This is one indication that some secondary schools might require a different structure of staff roles.

The findings of this report suggest that School-Wide can be successful in secondary schools. The findings also suggest the challenges of achieving consistency of practice are larger for secondary schools. This begs the question: Is this difference inevitable, or does the School-Wide resourcing and support model need further adaptation to acknowledge the complexity of large schools? Some Ministry of Education staff considered extra resources might be needed. This could take the form of a longer period of resourcing, or more release time for school coaches or team leaders in large secondary schools. A few schools had already taken this step. For example, one had put in place four coach positions at their school. The findings of this report suggest that secondary schools require ongoing support or more examples of practice that show ways forward.

**Forming partnerships to meet local needs**

One benefit of a regional delivery model is the ability to second or contract staff with specific expertise relevant to local needs. In 2014, all regions had seconded staff or employed staff on short-term contracts to assist them to support Tier 1 schools. As well as addressing local needs, regions had a range of reasons for broadening their base of staff. They were responding to a national message about the need to build stronger sector partnerships. They were also attempting to
address a perceived need for more staff to support a growing number of schools. Each region developed different relationships and partnerships that addressed needs in their setting. These included contracting or seconding:

- school staff with expertise in School-Wide to support the running of school cluster meetings
- skilled school staff to run particular booster sessions
- people who could assist in building stronger partnerships with iwi and Māori-medium schools
- skilled school staff who could support a cluster with a behaviour management module
- Special Education advisors or RTLBs to support School-Wide Practitioners.

Most viewed seconding or contracting as an effective but short-term solution. Some regions had longer term plans to continue secondments. Others had not formalised their plans. Some queried whether seconding staff was a sustainable approach as it might not always be possible to find sector personnel with expertise that was a good fit with school needs. Others commented that short-term approaches did not support the development of sustained relationships with schools. Sustained relationships are noted elsewhere in this report as an aspect of effective support.

**Working in a joined-up way**

Most School-Wide Practitioners who responded to the survey reported they felt part of a School-Wide community of practice in their region which worked together to discuss challenges and problem solve. At the time of the phase 1 interviews, Ministry of Education staff suggested there was a need to further explore how School-Wide fitted with the work of other Ministry of Education staff to ensure schools received a coherent package of support. By the end of 2014, School-Wide Practitioners and regional managers reported stronger connections with other educational practitioners such as senior advisors and RTLBs.

These connections relied on existing relationships rather than formal systems. The extent of connections with senior advisors varied between regions. Some regions were moving to an approach where all PLD and extra support for vulnerable schools was filtered through the senior advisor who held a big-picture overview of the school’s needs and plans for support. They were working closely with a team led by senior advisors to plan support for some vulnerable schools. Other regions had more informal connections with senior advisors.

Staff from each region reported different levels of contact with other education professionals. All regions had invited RTLBs, SAF (Student Achievement Function) or Special Education staff to take part in School-Wide training so they could gain an understanding of what School-Wide aimed to achieve. They received a variable response to this offer. Some regions had strong connections with some RTLBs who supported regional School-Wide teams. Others reported fewer connections.

Some regional staff, and school leaders at case study schools, noted that a philosophical issue that could inhibit joined-up work is that School-Wide is about working at a systems level to support school systems to shift. Some professionals who work with schools target individual students. They considered this difference in philosophies could be a barrier to joined-up work.

One structural factor that was inhibiting the integration of support was that each group of professionals had different management structures and regional clusters of schools. For example, School-Wide and RTLB clusters were different. As a practical example, an RTLB might attend a coach network group to provide support to a group of School-Wide schools. Some of these schools might be in their RTLB cluster and others might not. Ministry of Education staff reported that some RTLB managers were comfortable with their staff supporting schools that were not in their cluster. Other managers were less supportive.
Ministry of Education staff saw a number of benefits that could stem from a joined-up way of working. They were unclear about whether formal processes were needed to build stronger partnerships or if the current connections, which relied on existing relationships, were adequate. However, it was clear that the extent of connections varied between regions.

**Balancing regional delivery with national consistency**

The ability to tailor support to local needs and employ staff in areas of need are some of the benefits of a regional delivery model. A number of Ministry of Education staff considered a regional approach also created some challenges. Some of these appeared to be growing stronger over time. For example, of those who responded to the School-Wide Practitioner survey, half or more disagreed there were systems in place to ensure School-Wide Practitioners worked in a similar way across regions or that there were effective national systems in place for sharing good practice between regions. Other ongoing concerns raised by Ministry of Education staff included:

- the perception of “drift” between regions
- lack of time to do induction and training of new School-Wide Practitioners in regions
- unclear communications from national level
- difficulties in collecting regional data that could be used nationally
- different management structures between regions, and varying knowledge about School-Wide practice.

A national practice group and lead School-Wide Practitioner roles had been formalised in late 2013 to help address some challenges. For a number of reasons this group found it hard to progress their work programme. One key reason was that the School-Wide Practitioners on the team had many other responsibilities in their regions including supporting Tier 1 schools and developing Tier 2 training.

Most interviewees considered some form of national presence was needed for School-Wide as well as stronger systems that supported continuous improvement by enabling regions to work together to assess the “fidelity” of their practice, and identify and share good practice between regions. However, there was less agreement about what form this might take.

---

**Are there any changes that could be made to the School-Wide Practitioner role to assist you to more effectively support schools?**

There needs to be a clear ‘Lead Practitioner’ role where that person’s main role is to support and develop the other practitioners’ knowledge, confidence and skills. There also needs to be a completely separate Practice Advisor role to allow practitioners to concentrate on material and information development rather than having to balance demands across too many areas of general service delivery. (School-Wide Practitioner survey, 2014)
A workforce model that balances the needs of Tiers 1 and 2 schools

A common theme in the phase 1 and phase 3 interviews with Ministry of Education staff was that Tier 1 of School-Wide had been implemented quickly and new cohorts of schools added before practices had been embedded. In 2014, many considered they were now going through a similar process of “building the plane while flying it” in terms of developing a model of delivery for Tier 2. Many considered there was not enough resourcing to spend the time needed to pilot and develop new approaches.

In 2013, the staff from some regions noted they had struggled to support schools owing to staff turnover or staff funding caps. This sense was stronger in 2014 with some staff clearly feeling overloaded and pulled in too many directions as they juggled providing support to new Tier 1 schools, the existing Tier 1 schools that were struggling and schools that were moving to Tier 2. All but two of the School-Wide Practitioners who responded to a question about the number of schools they supported reported they were working with more than the recommended 20 schools. One-third considered their region did not have effective systems for balancing Tiers 1 and 2 school needs. Interview data suggested that priorities varied between regions. Some felt they were offering effective support to new Tier 1 schools but were concerned that they were finding it hard to support some existing schools that might be struggling. Other regions had prioritised supporting secondary and struggling schools and were concerned that the new Tier 1 schools might be missing out.

A number of interviewees considered School-Wide had reached a critical tipping point. They noted that School-Wide needed a solid foundation otherwise it was in danger of becoming “just another short-term Ministry initiative”. There was general agreement between most interviewees that the fast scale-up process was too focused on targets and did not have enough focus on consolidation. They suggested New Zealand needed to learn from overseas. For example, a USA state which had a similar rapid trajectory had stopped taking on new schools for a year to consolidate their model and revisit existing schools. This had been a successful process. 22

One source of pressure for many was that the workforce model was still unclear. Regional staff were unsure if RTLBs would be supporting School-Wide. Each region had different approaches in terms of which staff were supporting Tier 2 schools. Usually the most experienced School-Wide Practitioners were taking the current Tier 2 training for schools. Some regions were training all School-Wide Practitioners to take on this role in the near future. In other regions, experienced staff were allocated this role and there was a structured plan to build capability over time. Some experienced staff were concerned that newer staff did not have expertise to run Tier 2. However, due to FTE pressures and the growing number of schools in School-Wide, some regions needed to quickly train less experienced staff.

---

22 As described by Rob Horner at the 2014 School-Wide conference.
A workforce model that enables sharing and retains skilled staff

Interviewees and respondents to the School-Wide Practitioner survey suggested there were a number of factors that needed addressing in the current workforce model to ensure that it enabled regions to recruit and retain School-Wide Practitioners, build capability and share good practice. These factors included:

- job descriptions, contracts or remuneration that recognised expertise, and provided job security
- a national induction and/or formalised accreditation process for School-Wide Practitioners
- a planned structure for Tiers 1–3 that outlined how the workforce would be structured, the different skill sets required for Tiers 1–3 and which allowed for specialist positions and opportunities for career progression
- more recognition or resources for School-Wide Practitioners who worked with schools in isolated regions which required substantial travel time
- easy online access to the most up-to-date New Zealand School-Wide training and support resources (some respondents noted the current system was hard to access)
- more networks that enabled School-Wide Practitioners to build and share practice between regions
- more structures to support the ongoing development of School-Wide Practitioners in their role such as a formalised PLD structure, ongoing supervision or more opportunities to develop critical friend relationships with international experts.

Most School-Wide Practitioners and Ministry of Education staff were strongly supportive of School-Wide and considered that the initiative was achieving good outcomes. They also thought these outcomes could be made more consistent across schools with a clearer workforce model that addressed ongoing tensions, provided support that addresses the growing diversity of needs of Tiers 1 and 2 schools, built capability through a community of practice and addressed questions of regional drift.
4. Short and longer term sustainability

**Summary of chapter findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of this chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This chapter addresses question 3: What factors enable or hinder the shifts in schools? It also considers the future of School-Wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Different sets of data point to a similar set of factors that enable School-Wide**

Schools that reported more consistency of School-Wide practice and short-term shifts:

- had deliberate leadership including the active involvement of the principal in School-Wide
- used collaborative processes to encourage staff ownership and student input
- had a School-Wide team that included people with the needed skills, broad representation and links with other school teams
- prioritised learning for all staff and learning alongside other schools
- prioritised learning for all students through having planned processes for teaching behaviour expectations and teaching resources that supported this
- had processes to share and make active use of data
- had access to external support to build practice and address challenges
- had systems to embed and maintain School-Wide (e.g., to train new staff or celebrate progress)
- had a focus on refreshing and building School-Wide over time.

For schools, barriers to successful school implementation were mostly the converse of the factors above. For Ministry of Education staff, systems-level barriers included the rapid growth of School-Wide and a lack of clarity about the workforce model.

**To sustain School-Wide over time schools and the workforce require a continuous improvement model**

Implementing School-Wide is not a linear process that results in a fixed endpoint. To sustain School-Wide in the longer term schools are continuing to build practice. Over half of 2010/11 schools had put in place a range of strategies to “keep School-Wide fresh” in the longer term. Joining Tier 2 is one way schools start a new growth cycle with School-Wide.

Survey data show that a few schools (about 10–15%) had reached a plateau or were starting to revert to previous practice. Staff turnover was a key factor that resulted in changes in direction. Ministry of Education staff were developing a range of processes to support these schools to maintain School-Wide.

The findings suggest that schools and the School-Wide workforce need a model that formalises existing problem-solving processes that build practice and expertise. One key aspect of the model is that it maintains communities of practice for schools and the workforce. These provide access to:

- new ideas to “keep School-Wide fresh”
- opportunities to network and problem solve with peers
- support or resources to make “adaptive breakthroughs” that address challenges.

The second aspect is promoting coherence in the system through joined-up support. School-Wide could be strengthened through further integration of:

- School-Wide Tier 1 and Tier 2 practice
- School-Wide with other aspects of PB4L such as Restorative Practices
- School-Wide with other aspects of support for schools (e.g., senior advisor support)
- local and national data systems.
Factors that enable School-Wide

The focus of this chapter is the third evaluation question: What factors enable or hinder the shifts in schools? It also considers the future of School-Wide. We used a number of different sources of data to inform this chapter.

- We looked to see if the schools that had joined Tier 2 of School-Wide were different from those that had not. We focused on the data from the 2010/11 cohort of School-Wide schools. Joining Tier 2 is one indicator that schools have successfully implemented School-Wide and are active in building a longer term focus.

- We looked at the factors that the case study schools had in common that supported them to implement School-Wide and maintain it in the longer term.

- We compared high-shift schools to low- or medium-shift schools. High-shift schools were those reporting more shifts in outcomes and the extent to which School-Wide was embedded in their school. This analysis is described in more detail in the phase 1 report.

- We have also included data from interviews and surveys with Ministry of Education staff about systems-level enablers and barriers and longer term sustainability of School-Wide.

What can differences between Tiers 1 and 2 schools tell us about School-Wide enablers?

Schools need to have successfully implemented Tier 1 before they join Tier 2. The data presented in Chapter 2 show that coaches and curriculum leaders at 2010/11 Tier 2 schools were significantly more likely than staff at Tier 1 schools to report that School-Wide had contributed to major positive changes in a wide range of outcomes to do with school culture and relationships, staff confidence in managing behaviour and student behaviour.

We compared the Tier 2 and Tier 1 schools in the 2010/11 cohort to see what this data could tell us about key enablers that might support the successful implementation of Tier 1. We looked at the data from 39 coaches whose schools had joined Tier 2 of School-Wide compared with 47 schools that had not. Tier 2 coaches were significantly more likely to report more consistency of practice, stronger school systems and that School-Wide was more embedded in their school (69% of Tier 2 and 47% of Tier 1). Some of these differences were highly significant which suggests that Tier 2 schools have particular ways of working that are resulting in change. Four main differences between Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools stood out. Schools that had joined Tier 2:

- had stronger and more collaborative School-Wide teams. Tier 2 coaches were twice as likely to strongly agree that their School-Wide team included people who have the different skills and knowledge needed (67% of Tier 2 and 34% of Tier 1). Compared with Tier 1 schools, Tier 2 school teams had more people with specific expertise such as: senior leaders; staff with expertise in managing data; and specialists who worked with the school such as RTLBs or psychologists. The teams were also more collaborative. Teams at Tier 2 schools were more likely to include teachers from different year levels and administration, support staff or caretakers. These features are expected for schools moving to Tier 2.

- prioritised staff learning and consistency. Coaches at Tier 2 schools were more likely to strongly agree with statements that suggested their school had stronger learning processes in place for staff. Coaches from Tier 2 schools were:
  - twice as likely to strongly agree they held regular PLD sessions for staff relating to School-Wide (51% of Tier 2 and 21% of Tier 1)
Reflecting coach views, curriculum leaders from schools that had joined Tier 2 were also more likely to say they had access to PLD and training relating to School-Wide and that School-Wide had supported a major shift in the extent to which their school had a shared approach to teaching behaviour expectations.

• **placed a high value on collaborating with staff and students.** The value schools placed on working collaboratively could be seen in the composition of the School-Wide team, and the emphasis on PLD noted above. In addition, coaches from Tier 2 schools were:
  - twice as likely to strongly agree that their school regularly reported data summaries to staff (69% of Tier 2 and 32% of Tier 1)
  - twice as likely to strongly agree that their school had a lot of leadership opportunities for students (56% of Tier 2 and 26% of Tier 1).

• **had more buy-in to School-Wide.** For example, 82% of coaches at Tier 2 schools strongly agreed that School-Wide focused on areas that were very important for their school, compared with 57% of Tier 1 coaches. This buy-in is likely to be due, at least in part, to the other factors mentioned above.

Many of the largest differences between Tier 2 and Tier 1 schools reported above were about the development of collaborative relationships and the provision of opportunities for staff learning. This confirms the preliminary analyses from phase 1 which suggested that having a culture of valuing staff and student input and collaboration, and prioritising ongoing staff learning in relation to School-Wide, are key success factors.
Enablers and barriers to implementation

We used a number of different sources of information to explore the factors that might enable School-Wide implementation. The comparison of Tier 2 and Tier 1 schools above, the experiences of case study schools, the analysis of high- and medium-/low-shifts schools in the preliminary report, all indicate similar success factors for School-Wide implementation. These are outlined below.

School enablers

**Examples of enablers identified in school survey questions**

- Month and term reports on behaviour are very detailed and used for next step planning. (Coach survey, 2014)
- Teaching staff how to minimize incidents in their own classes. (Coach survey, 2014)
- The practice of all teachers explicitly teaching the same behaviour plan at the same time. (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)

**School processes and systems**

School-Wide was more embedded and more change was reported in schools where staff supported the philosophy of School-Wide, and considered the initiative was well-aligned with existing practice and flexible enough to fit with their school culture. Other enablers included:

- **deliberate leadership:**
  - through the active involvement of the principal in School-Wide, and particularly on the school team
  - through putting in place realistic timelines for change

- **the use of collaborative processes:**
  - as schools joined School-Wide to encourage staff buy-in and ownership
  - to work with all staff to build all aspects of School-Wide
  - to seek student input into School-Wide and by offering students leadership opportunities
  - to work with other schools to share ideas and build practice

- **a strong School-Wide team:**
  - that had people with the needed skills who were able to work through challenges
  - with broad representation from staff, support staff and people who could represent different groups of students such as Māori students and students with special education needs
  - that was well-organised and had administrative support
  - that made connections with other teams in the school

- **the prioritisation of learning for all staff:**
  - by offering staff a range of supports to work towards consistency of practice, frequent training on school systems and frequent professional learning opportunities
  - through processes that supported staff to use data to inquire into their practice
  - by making connections between approaches to behaviour and learning
  - by making use of other PB4L PLD initiatives to strengthen practice
• **the prioritisation of learning for all students:**
  - by having planned processes for integrating the teaching of behaviour expectations within classroom programmes and teaching resources that support this

• **making active use of data:**
  - through access to a data management system that gave the needed reports
  - through frequently reporting data summaries to all members of the school community (staff, students, and parents and whānau)
  - to make changes to school systems and practices and to set school goals

• **systems to embed and maintain School-Wide:**
  - through embedding School-Wide within all aspects of school practice
  - through training new staff and relievers
  - by regularly celebrated progress with School-Wide

• **a focus on refreshing and building School-Wide over time:**
  - through injecting new ideas, personnel and PLD such as through joining Tier 2 (see the section below).

**Support models**

Schools were better able to adopt School-Wide philosophies and continue to build practice in the more complex aspects of School-Wide if they:

• received effective support from School-Wide Practitioners

• had a School-Wide Practitioner who stayed the same over time and assisted the school to problem solve

• had access to effective training and cluster meetings where schools worked together to build approaches.
Examples of barriers identified in school survey questions

Developing consistency across the school. Staff still discipline [students] for minor offences which could have been solved within the classroom. We are working on this one teacher at a time. Rewards—for us is not about flooding the market, we are more discreet and realistic—we are building on systems in place and making them more authentic. (Coach survey, 2014)

We have a continual turnover of staff and it is difficult to ensure new staff get immediate training to ensure their buy into PB4L. (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)

School size and type were associated with the extent to which the core features of School-Wide were in place in schools. Primary schools found School-Wide easier to implement. School-Wide was less embedded in secondary or intermediate schools, and in particular, large schools. Other school barriers included:

- less emphasis on staff consultation, involvement and professional learning in relation to School-Wide
- less emphasis on working collaboratively (e.g., processes that include the perspectives of students, parents and whānau, and priority learners in the School-Wide journey or for reporting data to students, parents and whānau)
- less emphasis on developing planned approaches to teaching behaviour expectations and difficulties achieving consistency across the school
- challenges with reporting and using data (for example, some secondary schools had fewer processes for reporting and using data. Some had difficulty using existing student management systems to manage data. However, other schools reported using these systems effectively.)
- unclear connections between School-Wide philosophies and decisions about stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions and expulsions
- staff movement and turnover of the principal or members of the School-Wide team
- a focus on too many initiatives at once
- high workloads for school coaches and team members.

School-Wide support and system enablers

Data from Ministry of Education staff, and questions in the coach survey about School-Wide support and training approaches, have been used to explore the system enablers and barriers described below. Aspects of the system that appeared to be supporting schools to embed School-Wide included:

- an effective training, support and cluster model that is well regarded by schools
- the regional delivery model when it enabled Ministry of Education staff to tailor approaches to suit local school needs and to address known concerns
- a focus on using problem-solving approaches with school teams to support schools to implement School-Wide and to maintain a focus over time
- the formation of regional School-Wide teams with a mix of skills and the ability to access support and network with other Ministry of Education professionals.
System barriers
System-level factors that appeared to be acting against building a stronger support system for schools included:

- the need for a School-Wide workforce model that clearly recognised different sets of expertise and addressed how to balance the needs of Tiers 1 and 2 schools, schools new to School-Wide and schools that were experiencing difficulties maintaining School-Wide. Supporting a wide range of schools was resulting in School-Wide Practitioners juggling many priorities

- the need for a School-Wide workforce model that built capacity in the workforce (e.g., included formalised processes for School-Wide Practitioner induction, training, supervision and ongoing PLD)

- the need for more formalised connections between regions in relation to known areas to build practice (e.g., incorporating Māori and Pasifika worldviews within School-Wide)

- perceptions of drift or difference in practice between regions and concerns about fidelity of the School-Wide support model

- difficulties with access to regional and/or national data to review and build practice.

Keeping it fresh: Longer term sustainability and support models

If your school has been part of PB4L-School-Wide for three or more years, what are the main ways you keep the momentum going?

Sharing the data from year to year so that staff can ‘see’ the difference that has been made. Linking it to academic behaviour etc...moving away from calling it ‘PB4L’ and using such statements as ‘at our school...’, ‘what works best for our students...’. Reviewing, changing and enhancing what we already have in place each year... Changing the members of the PB4L team. Focusing on the ‘relationships’ rather than the ‘behaviours’. Getting the staff involved in making changes to what we have—enhancing aspects. (Coach survey, 2014)

Our momentum is maintained by regular meetings, having all staff on the Tier 1 team, monthly PD often taken by RTLB passionate about PB4L-School-Wide, the use of resources from the internet, continual review of our processes, the use of our data, attending conferences, cluster meetings etc. (Coach survey, 2014)

The first few years of being part of School-Wide creates a momentum or growth phase in schools. Keeping this momentum going is a concern for schools and the Ministry of Education. The New Zealand education system has a history of funding initiatives for a few years with the expectation that practices will become embedded and ongoing support is not needed. A new initiative comes along and funds and attention are diverted. This pattern is noted in literature about the longer term sustainability of educational initiatives. This literature concludes that school improvement successes can be fragile (Fullan, 2007; Goldenberg, 2004; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006).

This assumption of linear implementation is challenged by Fullan (2004). He suggests that, rather than being linear, change processes in schools often take the form of an ongoing cycle of growth phases and plateaux. The s-shaped growth curve is often used to represent this cycle. As shown in Figure 33, this curve has an introduction phase that is often followed by an implementation dip. After this is a growth and maturation phase (the first plateau), and then either a decline or a new growth phase (which then leads to another plateau).
Schools can reach an implementation “plateau” (point A) in terms of ideas or energy. At this point they could move to the next idea or initiative, or get “stuck” on a particular challenge. At point B, Fullan suggests we need to harness available resources to innovate and create an “adaptive breakthrough” to support a new growth phase. Otherwise we may see a return to old practices.

The responses of some coaches to the survey questions suggest they are at point B—the tipping point. A few coaches reported staff were starting to lose interest in School-Wide and were returning to previous practices (14% of 2010/11 coaches and 12% of 2012/13). A change in school principal, most of the staff on the School-Wide team or high teacher turnover were all experiences that could rapidly shift a school’s focus and send it into a “decline” phase.

School coaches noted that changes in staff could result in a decline in consistency. Some addressed this concern by developing induction processes for new staff. Overall schools used a range of approaches to create a new growth phase. Accessing new forms of PLD such as joining Tier 2 is one way schools moved to a new growth phase as this ensures access to new ideas, learning opportunities and ongoing external support. The case study report includes other examples of the ways schools addressed challenges and moved on to a new growth phase.

Coaches from 2010/11 schools described using a range of strategies to “keep School-Wide fresh” and maintain momentum with Tier 1. There were four main groups of strategies. Each category within these was mentioned by 5% or more of coaches in an open-ended question.

**Ongoing leadership**

- Regular team meetings
- Bringing in new staff or leaders to the team
- Making sure the principal or senior leaders are involved
- Allocating funding or management units for staff to lead School-Wide
Ongoing collaboration with staff and students

- Regular involvement of staff in building or refining practices
- Ongoing internal PLD for staff or induction for new staff
- Seeking student input or involving student leaders

Refreshing and revising approaches

- Making sure School-Wide had a positive visual presence (through a constant focus on rewards, celebrations or new signage)
- Regular use of data to suggest new priorities
- Ongoing refinement of practices and types of rewards
- Finding ways to embed school values and School-Wide language within new areas

Seeking external input

- Attending cluster meetings
- Joining Tier 2 of School-Wide
- Seeking external PLD or input from advisors

Although school staff were putting in place a range of strategies to maintain School-Wide in the longer term, their responses to questions about longer term sustainability suggest that some form of support is needed to ensure the longevity of School-Wide. At the end of 2014, 63% of 2010/11 coaches thought they had the structures and processes in place to keep developing Tier 1. This is a small increase from the 52% who reported the same in phase 1. Around half wanted continued contact with other School-Wide schools or School-Wide Practitioners.

How School-Wide Practitioners support schools to maintain momentum

Please describe the strategies you use to re-engage schools if they seem to be losing momentum with School-Wide.

- Initiate a visit to the coach or team leader, failing that, the principal.
- Offer to run a booster for the whole staff/new staff/team/coach.
- Arrange a cluster visit to a high performing School-Wide school.
- Offer to facilitate some PD for the whole school.
- Discuss what support they need to re-engage and provide resources/exemplars to help them not reinvent the wheel.

(School-Wide Practitioner survey, 2014)

Interviews and the School-Wide Practitioner survey suggest that Ministry of Education staff considered that the amount of ongoing support schools needed to maintain School-Wide had been underestimated. School-Wide Practitioners were finding that schools’ longer term needs varied. Some schools, and particularly primary schools, appeared to be self-sustaining and were continuing to build practice through gaining new ideas and energy from cluster meetings, conferences and other networks. Other schools required more support. These included large secondary schools and schools that had significant changes in leadership or in the School-Wide team. School-Wide Practitioners were using a variety of strategies to assist schools to maintain momentum finding. They were finding they could successfully re-engage a number of schools. Some concerns were expressed that providing this support could take time away from other schools such as those new to School-Wide. Many of the strategies used by School-Wide Practitioners to provide
extra support required active face-to-face engagement. This engagement could be quite intensive, as shown by the quote above from one School-Wide Practitioner. Common strategies used to re-engage schools included:

- attending School-Wide team meetings in schools to support the team to problem solve
- meeting with the principal or senior leadership team to discuss progress
- working with the school School-Wide team to review SET, Team Implementation Checklist or school data to review school goals and action plans to identify areas to work on
- running whole-school staff sessions or PLD to assist the School-Wide team to re-engage staff
- offering the School-Wide school team retraining or relevant module or booster options
- encouraging schools to seek support from other schools through cluster meetings or by pairing schools with others that had addressed similar challenges.

This list gives some indication of the ongoing support that might be needed to assist some schools to maintain a focus on School-Wide.

**Longer term support models**

Fullan’s curve is also valid for the Ministry of Education staff who provide support, training and PLD to School-Wide schools. A number of the policy and practice leaders considered that the support model for School-Wide was at point B—the tipping point. Resources were stretched as they balanced the needs of new schools joining School-Wide Tier 1 with those starting Tier 2. Some staff had a number of years’ experience in supporting change processes in schools. Taking on the role of supporting Tier 2 schools had acted to move some onto the next growth curve in terms of their learning. Others considered they needed new challenges and more access to PLD to assist them to get to a new growth phase so they could support schools to develop new focuses. They wanted a workforce model that built expertise over time and did not rely on short-term secondments. Most Ministry of Education staff strongly supported the regional delivery model of School-Wide; however, most also considered some form of national focus was needed.

In general, Ministry of Education staff considered that both schools and the School-Wide workforce needed a model that promoted longer term sustainability. However, there were differences in views about what such a model might look like.

Most would like to see a model that had two main features. In keeping with School-Wide’s focus on problem solving, one was that this model harnessed the resources of the system to create continuous improvement communities. The second aspect of the model was that it integrated practice at different levels. Both aspects are discussed below.

**Continuous improvement communities**

Ministry of Education staff comments suggest that sustaining School-Wide in the longer term requires a continuous improvement culture that creates conditions for “adaptive breakthroughs” (see Fullan’s model above). To do this, an approach was needed that had layers of communities that harnessed and shared: the expertise of those in schools; the knowledge of highly skilled School-Wide Practitioners and school sector staff; and wider national and international expertise.

One challenge was that the tiers of School-Wide were still in development; therefore, it was more difficult to have a concept of what a model might look like in the future. The suggestions provided by school and Ministry of Education staff about the features of a longer term and sustainable model included:
1. **New ideas to “keep it fresh”**

- For schools this could include current structures such as: joining Tier 2; PLD boosters and refresher sessions; School-Wide conferences; and ongoing cluster meetings and sector group forums. New approaches suggested included: formalised demonstration schools; the opportunity to attend PLD on new School-Wide modules (such as a New Zealand adaptation of the School-Wide bullying module); and boosters or PLD that addressed the new approaches or alignments that are inevitable as the education sector changed over time.

- For School-Wide Practitioners this could include the opportunity to research and adapt new School-Wide modules, and gain access to research findings relevant to New Zealand as well as international contexts. For example, to support this ongoing development of School-Wide, one region was liaising with a local university to discuss a positive behaviour Master’s programme that could eventually feed back into School-Wide practice.

2. **Opportunities to network and problem solve with peers**

- For schools this could be in the form of the existing school cluster meetings. One future possibility was aligning different school clusters (e.g., linking School-Wide and RTLB clusters).

- For School-Wide Practitioners this included current regional team networks, as well as opportunities to network across regions and internationally to share and build practice.

3. **Support or resources to make an “adaptive break-through” and address challenges**

- For schools this could include extra forms of support such as School-Wide Practitioner time to re-engage with School-Wide, review goals and data, and problem solve to address challenges.

- For School-Wide Practitioners this could include a stronger dedicated national focus or communities of practice that built practice for aspects of School-Wide that could be strengthened, or formalised critical friend relationships with local and international experts to support the development of different tiers of School-Wide.

As noted earlier, the New Zealand education system has a history of funding initiatives for a few years. Then a new initiative comes along and funds and attention are diverted. For initiatives to stay the distance, this suggests that they need structures that support ongoing development.

**Joined-up models of support**

The second aspect of a model that is sustainable in the longer term is that it promotes coherence for schools through integrating practice. School-Wide national and regional practice leaders and managers welcomed a current push to move past silos and integrate practice across the Ministry of Education. They considered a stronger foundation for School-Wide could be developed through continuing to build:

- **integration of School-Wide Tier 1 and Tier 2 practice**: As schools moved to Tier 2, this had crystallised views about some of the aspects of Tier 1 that schools found harder to implement. As a result, regional staff had reviewed Tier 1 training to make sure it was designed to support schools to put in place the core foundations needed for Tier 2. Refreshing Tier 1 was an ongoing focus.

- **integration of PB4L practice**: Regional School-Wide staff wanted to make stronger connections across PB4L by connecting with the providers of Incredible Years-Teacher and the new Restorative Practices initiative. They considered this could support them to better align their practice and maximise the gains from PB4L as a whole package of support.
- **integration of support**: Currently, School-Wide staff have connections of varying strength with other Ministry staff who support schools, and RTLBs. The structures used by these staff for providing support were not necessarily aligned. Aligning school cluster groups such as RTLB and School-Wide could be one way of integrating support.

- **integration of data management**: A need to build stronger data management systems that could meet both local school and national needs was indicated.
5. Summing up the School-Wide journey

Do you have any other comments to make about PB4L-School-Wide?

A great framework that works well for us. All schools would benefit from it without any concerns that it changes what is successful about their individual cultures. (Coach survey, 2014)

We are on the right path and just need to stay updated to continue in our positive direction. (Curriculum leader survey, 2014)

One main aim of this report is to document the short-term changes that School-Wide is supporting in schools. In this section, we give an overall picture of how the first group of 2010/11 schools, and the second group of 2012/13 schools, have made progress in their School-Wide journey. Mapping the extent to which an initiative is following an expected pattern of implementation and change is one way of evaluating whether an initiative is supporting improved outcomes. This mapping also provides a summary of the evaluation findings.

Figures 34 and 35 below use the School-Wide theory of change to compare the extent to which 2010/11 and 2012/13 School-Wide schools reported having key School-Wide activities and processes in place and were reporting changes to practices and outcomes.

Only the short-term changes identified in the theory of change are included in these figures. As expected, staff from schools that had been part of School-Wide for longer (the 2010/11 group) reported more practices in place and a number of short-term changes. By phase 3, the 2012/13 schools were starting to show the same pattern of change as the earlier group.

- **Blue shading** represents the practices in place and reported short-term outcomes evident by the end of 2013 (phase 1). Blue shading is used when 60% or more of school coaches (coach) or curriculum leaders (curric) agreed that a practice was in place or reported a shift in practices or outcomes. For survey data, a 60% cut-off was selected as this represents a majority view. National and regional changes are based on a summary of Ministry of Education staff views.

- **Green shading** adds to this pattern by showing the additional practices in place and short-term outcomes reported by 60% or more respondents by the end of 2014 (phase 3).

- **Yellow shading** indicates less than 60% agreement or reports of shifts either in phase 1 or phase 3.

---

25 Each statement has been colour-coded from responses to core questions, or clusters of questions, in the school coach or curriculum leader survey. Faded text represents aspects of practice not included in the surveys.

26 A 60% cut-off was also selected to compensate for the amount of missing data to later questions in the survey.
### Theory-of-change map for 2010/11 School-Wide schools (end of 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are these processes in place?</th>
<th>Have these short-term changes happened by the end of 2013 or 2014?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT YET</td>
<td><strong>Yellow italics</strong> = less than 60% agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Blue</strong> = 60% or more agreed in 2013  <strong>Green</strong> = 60% or more agreed in 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORE School-Wide ACTIVITIES and PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY**

**Student**
- Students have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (have agency) *(Coach)*
- School staff have an active role in developing shared values and expectations *(Curric)*
- The principal and senior leadership team actively support School-Wide *(Coach)*
- School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy in) *(Curric)*
- School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities *(Coach)*
- School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities, develops and implements action plans and reports data *(Coach)*
- Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and expectations and addressing behaviour incidents are developed *(Coach)*
- School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data *(Coach)*
- School develops effective system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data *(Coach)*
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners and students with special education needs *(Coach)*

**School and staff**
- School staff have an active role in developed shared values and expectations *(Curric)*
- Values and expectations are modelled and taught *(Curric)*
- The principal and senior leadership team actively support School-Wide *(Coach)*
- School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy in) *(Curric)*
- School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities *(Coach)*
- School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities, develops and implements action plans and reports data *(Coach)*
- Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and expectations and addressing behaviour incidents are developed *(Coach)*
- School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data *(Coach)*
- School develops effective system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data *(Coach)*
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners and students with special education needs *(Coach)*
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners and students with special education needs *(Coach)*

**Parent, whānau and community**
- School works effectively with community (including Māori and Pasifika communities) to develop shared values and expectations *(Coach)*

**National and regional**
- Effective school coaching and PLD networks set up in regions *(Coach)*
- School-Wide Practitioners (regional specialists) are recruited, trained and have the capabilities needed to work with school teams *(Coach)*
- National structure provides guidance and feedback from data to regions *(networks exist but have too many competing demands)*

**SHORT-TERM CHANGES EXPECTED (1–2 years)**

**Student outcomes and shifts in processes**
- Some decreases in challenging behaviour incidents & SSEE *(Coach & Curric)*
- Some increase in positive behaviours *(e.g., attendance, engagement, social wellbeing)* *(Coach & Curric)*
- Students offered active leadership role in promoting and celebrating school values *(Coach)*
- Students have access to effective learning experiences and staff modelling related to shared school values *(Coach)*

**School outcomes and shifts in processes**

**Teachers and classrooms**
- Shift from punishment to a learning view of behaviour management *(Curric)*
- Increased confidence to manage behaviour outside and inside classroom *(Curric—near 60% for inside classroom)*
- Increased capability to actively model and incorporate values & behaviour expectations *(in ways that relate to priority groups: Māori students, Pasifika students, students with special education needs)* *(Curric—near 60% for modelling and teaching)*
- More time teaching *(less time managing behaviour)* *(Curric)*

**Leadership, culture and systems**
- School culture is more welcoming, inclusive & safe *(Coach & Curric)*
- School leaders maintain involvement with School-Wide and model learning and systems orientation towards behaviour *(Coach)*
- Increased use of consistent school approaches *(School system for approaches to recognition of values & behaviours and addressing incidents is used by most staff and is relevant for target groups (Māori learners, Pasifika learners, students with special education needs))* *(Coach & Curric)*
- School PLD processes support all staff to understand shared values and work to align their behaviours and practices *(Curric)*
- Effective team-based problem-solving processes in place *(Coach)*
- School uses SMS/data system proactively to report at different levels *(school structures, classroom, all students, at risk groups)* *(Coach)*
- Staff are able to use data for meaningful decision making *(e.g., to identify target groups or areas of practice)* *(Coach & Curric)*
- School has established School-Wide within their cultural and community context and has worked to align approaches to learning and other initiatives and programmes with School-Wide *(Coach)*

**Parent, whānau and community outcomes and shifts in processes**
- School has established effective processes for seeking input from parents and whānau and reporting developments *(Coach)*
- School has started to make connections with groups in wider community to support School-Wide *(e.g., Sports Clubs)*

**National and regional outcomes and shifts in processes**
- Regional School-Wide Practitioner teams have a mix of needed expertise and a team-based approach that enables the team to effectively support schools *(Māori and Pasifika expertise less available in some regions)*
- School cluster processes support schools to share expertise *(Coach)*
- Processes developed for defining roles and sharing expertise between School-Wide Practitioner and other MoE professionals *(networks exist but are not formalised. Sector support drawn on in 2013)*
- Data collection and feedback loops are used to support schools *(use of regional data and national systems data)* *(informal loops exist)*
- School-Wide Practitioner teams make connections with other agencies and sector groups
**Figure 35  Theory-of-change map for 2012/13 School-Wide schools (end of 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are these processes in place?</th>
<th>Have these short-term changes happened?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT YET</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yellow italics</strong> = less than 60% agreed</td>
<td><strong>Blue</strong> = 60% or more agreed in 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORE School-Wide ACTIVITIES and PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY**

**Student**
- Students have an active role in developing shared values and expectations (have agency) (Coach)

**School and staff**
- School staff have an active role in developed shared values and expectations (Curric)
- Values and expectations are modelled and taught (Curric)
- The principal and senior leadership team actively support School-Wide (Coach)
- School staff are ready to implement a new initiative (80% buy in) (Curric)
- School selects School-Wide team leader and coach with needed authority and capabilities (Coach)
- School develops a School-Wide team that identifies priorities, develops and implements action plans and reports data (Coach)
- Consistent systems for recognition of shared values and addressing behaviour incidents are developed (Coach)
- School develops staff capacity to manage data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data (Coach)
- School develops effective data system for collecting and reporting School-Wide data to stakeholders (Coach)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the context of their school community and the needs of Māori and Pasifika learners and students with special education needs (Coach)
- Schools use School-Wide framework in ways that align with the NZ education system (e.g., NZC & leadership models that value relationships and Manaakitanga, pono, ako and awhinatanga)

**Parent, whānau and community**
- School works effectively with community (including Māori and Pasifika communities) to develop shared values and expectations (Coach)

**National and regional**
- Effective school coaching and PLD networks set up in regions (Coach)
- School-Wide Practitioners (regional specialists) are recruited, trained and have the capabilities needed to work with school teams
- National structure provides guidance and feedback from data to regions networks exist but have too many competing demands

**SHORT-TERM CHANGES EXPECTED (1–2 years)**

**Student outcomes and shifts in processes**
- Some decreases in challenging behaviour incidents and SSEE (Coach, not Curric)
- Some increase in positive behaviours (e.g., attendance, engagement, social wellbeing) (mostly Coach)
- Students offered active leadership role in promoting and celebrating school values (Coach)
- Students have access to effective learning experiences and staff modelling related to shared school values (Coach)

**School outcomes and shifts in processes**

**Teachers and classrooms**
- Shift from a punishment to a learning view of behaviour management (Curric)
- Increased confidence to manage behaviour outside and inside classroom (Curric—near 60% for outside classroom)
- Increased capability to actively model and incorporate values and behaviour expectations (in ways that relate to priority groups: Māori students, Pasifika students, students with special education needs) (Curric)
- More time teaching (less time managing behaviour) (Curric)

**Leadership, culture and systems**
- School culture is more welcoming, inclusive and safe (Coach & Curric)
- School leaders maintain involvement with School-Wide and model learning and systems orientation towards behaviour (Coach)
- Increased use of consistent school approaches (School system for approaches to recognition of values and behaviour and addressing incidents is used by most staff, and is relevant for target groups: Māori learners, Pasifika learners, students with special education needs) (Coach, not Curric)
- School PLD processes support all staff to understand shared values and work to align their behaviours and practices (Curric)
- Effective team-based problem-solving processes in place (Coach)
- School uses SMS/data system proactively to report at different levels (school structures, classroom, all students, at risk groups) (Coach)
- Staff are able to use data for meaningful decision making (e.g., to identify target groups or areas of practice) (Coach & Curric)
- School has fitted School-Wide within their culture and community context and has worked to align approaches to learning and other initiatives and programmes with School-Wide (Coach)

**Parent, whānau and community outcomes and shifts in processes**
- School has established effective processes for seeking input from parents and whānau and reporting developments (Coach)
- School has started to make connections with groups in wider community to support School-Wide (e.g., Sports Clubs)

**National and regional outcomes and shifts in processes**
- Regional School-Wide Practitioner teams have a mix of needed expertise and a team-based approach that enables the team to effectively support schools (Māori and Pasifika expertise less available in some regions)
- School cluster processes support schools to share expertise (Coach)
- Processes developed for defining roles and sharing expertise between School-Wide Practitioner and other MoE professionals (networks exist but are not formalised) (informal loops exist)
- Data collection and feedback loops are used to improve support to schools (use of regional data and national systems data) (informal loops exist)
- School-Wide Practitioner teams make connections with other agencies and sector groups
This map suggests that the implementation of School-Wide is mostly functioning as intended in schools and is resulting in many of the expected shifts in practice and outcomes. The pattern of blue and green shading on the 2010/11 map shows these schools are reporting many core practices are in place and a number of short-term shifts. In phase 1, these shifts were mostly reported by school coaches. By phase 3, curriculum leaders were also reporting shifts.

This pattern also suggests that 2010/11 schools are continuing to build capability in the practices that were not in place at the time of phase 1. The fact that the pattern of blue shading continues to be maintained over time suggests that many schools are sustaining their focus. This sense is confirmed by the survey data. However, a few schools were reporting they were finding it hard to maintain the momentum.

The 2012/13 schools have been part of School-Wide for a shorter period of time. As expected in 2013 (phase 1), this group of schools reported fewer core practices in place or shifts (i.e., a pattern of yellow shading was more evident). However, the pattern of green shading shows that, a year later, the 2012/13 schools were starting to look more like the earlier schools. The practices that shift first, and the outcomes that are first noted, are very similar to those reported by the 2010/11 schools in phase 1. The fact that the pattern of change is very similar for 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools suggests that School-Wide is following the expected pattern of implementation which then leads to changes to outcomes.

Guskey (2006) argues that teaching practices, and student learning, tends to change before teacher attitudes and beliefs. He notes that it is difficult to directly change teachers’ beliefs, and that these changes are more likely to occur in response to seeing changes in learning. The information presented above suggests that teachers start to shift their beliefs to a more positive mind-set at a similar time to which they start actively promoting and teaching school behaviour expectations. One reason School-Wide might not be following the pattern suggested by Guskey, with teacher beliefs being the last thing to change, is that the expected paradigm shift is clearly set out as a key message that captures staff’s attention:

In the past in education.....

• "If a student does not know how to read, we teach
• If a student does not know how to swim, we teach
• If a student does not know how to multiply, we teach
• If a student does not know how to behave, we punish.”

* Slide adapted from School-Wide training materials, and used by a case study school for whole-school PLD.

Additional support for schools

The findings in this report suggest School-Wide is supporting many positive shifts in practice and outcomes. The 2013 and 2014 support model appeared to be effective in providing most 2010/11 schools with the support they needed to build or maintain School-Wide, and the newer 2012/13 schools the support they needed to implement School-Wide. Ongoing relationships with School-Wide Practitioners were an important component of this support. Initially, for 2010/11 schools, strong relationships were related to reports of faster implementation and improved outcomes. In the longer term these relationships assisted schools to continue to build practice in some of the aspects of School-Wide that this evaluation shows are more complex to implement.

For the majority of schools, School-Wide is balancing what Fullan (2007) calls the “too tight/too loose” dichotomy. That is, processes for change cannot be too tight (e.g., mandated reforms that do not create ownership) nor too loose
(bottom-up change where educators are left to shape an initiative to their own design). The findings also suggest that working at a school and system level to strengthen the resources and support offered to schools, and to share existing models of good practice, is likely to result in more consistent outcomes for a wider range of schools.

One area that appeared to be “too loose” is the model of support offered to secondary and intermediate schools. International literature notes that the School-Wide model is mostly used in elementary (primary) and middle schools, and is more complex to implement in secondary school contexts (Flannery et al., 2009). The findings in this report show that School-Wide can support positive outcomes in the secondary sector. However, these evaluation findings also align with international literature in that more variation in implementation practices is evident in secondary and intermediate schools than primary schools. Between phases 1 and 3 the gap between primary and secondary/intermediate schools appeared to get wider, particularly for large schools. The differences reported by secondary/intermediate schools did not reflect a view that the philosophy of School-Wide did not work in their setting. The main differences related to the complexities of implementing School-Wide, and achieving consistency of practice, in larger schools with less involvement of the principal, and with more structures such as siloed departments that make it harder to work collaboratively.

Over 2014, Ministry of Education staff have worked hard to develop new approaches to support these schools with known areas of difficulty such as managing data. This support has been provided within the bounds of the current model. These report findings suggest that a rethink of the resourcing, support structures and time frames for large secondary and intermediate schools may be necessary. The findings suggest a number of aspects of support for schools that could be strengthened. These include sharing effective processes and models for:

- working collaboratively with all staff (especially at large secondary schools)
- working collaboratively with students, and parents and whānau
- managing, reporting and using student behaviour data
- considering the world views and needs of priority learners and their communities within School-Wide practice
- reviewing SSEE processes including: promoting “learning-focused” consequences for major behaviour incidents that build student and staff capabilities rather than rely on SSEE; and working to strengthen the alignment between School-Wide and SSEE decision making
- building a longer term sustainable School-Wide focus to ensure schools “keep it fresh”.

The data collected suggest that some schools have developed these processes; therefore, this knowledge already exists in the system to be harnessed and shared more widely.

**Workforce and support models that maintain the momentum**

In both 2013 and 2014, Ministry of Education staff were unclear about how the School-Wide workforce model would keep pace with the growing number of School-Wide schools, including those joining Tier 2. This is another aspect of practice that respondents perceived as needing a clearer balance between being “too loose” and “too tight”. Interviewees and survey respondents suggested there were a number of factors that needed addressing to ensure the workforce could keep pace with the needs of schools and that regions were able to recruit and retain School-Wide Practitioners and build capability. Factors included:

- job descriptions or remuneration that were clearly aligned with the expected job role
- more formalised induction, accreditation and/or supervision processes
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- a planned structure for Tiers 1–3 that outlines how the workforce will be structured, the different skill sets required for Tiers 1–3 and offers opportunities for career progression
- more recognition of the resources needed to work with geographically isolated schools
- easy online access to the most up-to-date School-Wide training and support resources
- clarity around workloads, and sector partnerships and secondments
- stronger processes that enable School-Wide Practitioners to build practice between regions
- more structures to support the ongoing development of School-Wide Practitioners in their role.

Internationally, many reforms follow the pattern of a short burst of activity followed by a return to previous practice as attention shifts to new focuses (Thomson, 2010). A number of Ministry of Education personnel considered School-Wide was now at this tipping point. Making changes in school settings is a complex endeavour and changes can easily be undone. For example, School-Wide Practitioners were finding that schools that have been through significant changes, such as new leadership, needed support to re-engage with School-Wide. Fullan’s (2004) iterative model of change (discussed in Chapter 4) suggests that, rather than changes being embedded for the long term, schools need some form of ongoing support to move past tipping points and keep building practice.

Fullan (2007) suggests a way forward in balancing the tensions inherent in change processes is to create a continuous improvement culture that values innovation while also having measures of accountability. This idea of a continuous improvement culture is already embedded in School-Wide with its focus on both school and School-Wide Practitioner problem solving and data-driven decision making. However, Ministry of Education staff considered clarity was needed about what the support and workforce models might look in the longer term to ensure they encouraged ongoing development by mixing practice and theory. Looking to the future they suggested an approach with two key features. One feature is a sustained community of practice for schools and the School-Wide workforce that provides each with access to:
- new ideas to “keep School-Wide fresh”
- opportunities to network and problem solve with peers
- support or resources to make “adaptive breakthroughs” that address challenges.

The second feature is that coherence is promoted through joined-up support processes that integrate the tiers of School-Wide with other PB4L initiatives, as well as other forms of Ministry of Education support. Coherence could also be promoted through a system that has effective data-collection and usage practices at the local school, regional and system level that support the system to self-improve. The ability to access and use data is a key prerequisite of a data-driven initiative such as School-Wide.

Final comments

Overall, the findings from this 2-year evaluation suggest that School-Wide is being implemented as intended in many schools, and across a range of schools, is resulting in many of the expected short-term shifts in practice and outcomes. A focus on School-Wide is being maintained in the short term at many schools.

School-Wide is well regarded by the majority of school staff and Ministry of Education staff who support schools. The main themes that stood out from school and Ministry of Education staff reports were that School-Wide was supporting improvements in school culture, student behaviour and the development of more positive and consistent approaches to behaviour. Staff at most of the schools that had been part of School-Wide since 2010/11, and many of the 2012/13
schools, considered that School-Wide was supporting a wide range of changes to their school. Key changes are shown in the above diagrams and include:

- a more respectful, inclusive and safe culture
- fewer major behaviour incidents
- an improved classroom environment and student engagement, with teachers spending less time managing behaviour
- the development of an effective School-Wide team that uses data to improve school practice
- the building of collaborative ways of working with staff and students to improve school practice.

The findings also suggest that there are a few school and system challenges, that, if addressed could strengthen outcomes. The School-Wide community is active in building knowledge and practice in relation to many challenges. Others could be addressed by building stronger systems for harnessing the successes, knowledge and expertise already developed through School-Wide.

Some challenges, such as the need for adjustments to the secondary support model, and the need for stronger networks between Ministry of Education regions, may need to be addressed by rethinking the existing models. Addressing these challenges, and further embedding problem-solving communities within the School-Wide support and workforce models, is likely to support the successes of School-Wide to be maintained and widened in the longer term.
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Appendix 1: School characteristics by School-Wide cohort year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-Wide cohort*</th>
<th>2010 (n = 79)</th>
<th>2011 (n = 112)</th>
<th>2012 (n = 88)</th>
<th>2013 (n = 118)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile band in 2013</td>
<td>1–2 32 41 46 41 30 34 38 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3–8 47 59 65 58 56 64 71 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9–10 0 0 1 1 2 2 9 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>25 32 34 30 19 22 32 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central South</td>
<td>20 25 20 18 19 22 26 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>15 19 34 30 33 38 29 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>19 24 24 21 17 19 31 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full primary</td>
<td>16 20 27 24 23 26 23 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>17 22 33 29 23 26 29 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>20 25 8 7 16 18 7 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>8 10 3 3 2 2 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>18 23 41 37 24 27 54 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table includes schools that were still active in 2014. Over time, a small number of schools have merged or have left the initiative.
Appendix 2: Data collection and analysis

Who responded to the school surveys?

The schools of the respondents who responded to the staff surveys were broadly representative of the full cohort of School-Wide schools. They included a mix of schools with high, medium and low progress rates on SET. There were some slight variations in terms the response rate by Ministry of Education region. We did not do an analysis by region as there were not enough schools by cohort to make this robust. In addition, school type varies by region (e.g., there are fewer low decile schools in the southern region). This would have impacted on the analysis.

The age, gender and ethnicity data showed that the people who responded to the school coach surveys in phases 1 and 3 were broadly representative of the teaching workforce. As to be expected, more were in leadership roles in their school. In phase 3, 7% were principals, 38% middle or senior leaders and 35% senior or classroom teachers. Around 20% did not respond to the demographic questions.

The age, gender and ethnicity questions in the curriculum leader survey also showed they were broadly representative of the teaching workforce. As expected, the majority were senior or middle school leaders. Less than 10% were senior or classroom teachers. In phases 1 and 3, more than one-third, and significantly more of the English leaders, were on the School-Wide team at their school.

Who responded to the School-Wide Practitioner surveys?

The demographic questions in the phases 1 and 3 School-Wide Practitioner surveys showed that School-Wide Practitioners from all four Ministry of Education regions responded. Of those who responded, the majority were females aged 40 or more. Prior to becoming a School-Wide Practitioner the majority had 5 or more years’ experience facilitating group training or cluster sessions and supporting school staff to address behaviour challenges; and as teacher or in a position of responsibility at a school.

Analysis of SET data

We used SET data in a number of ways. We used the complete SET data that we had for 167 schools from the 2010/11 and 2012 cohorts. We split the School-Wide schools into groups depending on their rate of change in the average SET score in the first years they were in School-Wide. We used the rate of change to divide schools into three groups that each contained large enough numbers to analyse. These were:

- fast rate = 40% or more improvement in the average SET score (50 schools)
- medium rate = 25% to 39% improvement in the average SET score (57 schools)
- low, no or negative rate = up to 25% change in average SET score (60 schools).

We used these data to explore if schools that had a faster rate of initial implementation were different from other schools, and the factors that might impact on implementation rates. We also looked for correlations between SET data and SSEE.

Analysis of stand-down, suspension, expulsion and exclusion data

Patterns over time for School-Wide and a comparison group

We obtained the national stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions, and expulsions (SSEE) dataset for 2009–13 for all schools from the Ministry of Education. We used these data to compare patterns of change over time in SSEE rates for
School-Wide schools, and to look for similarities or differences between cohorts of School-Wide schools and the pattern for non-School-Wide schools.

We selected a comparison group of non-School-Wide schools with characteristics similar to the 2010–13 School-Wide schools. To select this group we used data on school decile, type (primary, intermediate, composite, secondary) and region. It is difficult to select a comparison group with a strong match to all three characteristics given that there are not very many low decile secondary schools in New Zealand. In addition, there were some missing data in the dataset. For these reasons, the data from the comparison group should be viewed as indicative only.

SSEE data from the Ministry of Education are calculated as an age-standardised rate per 1,000 students. For comparison purposes with other data sources we converted this into a rate per 100 students. It is important to note that the SSEE dataset we used is designed to protect student confidentiality. The data from schools that had one to four incidents have been removed. Therefore, the data in this report reflect only the schools that have no incidents and those that have five or more.

We looked at patterns for schools that had been in School-Wide for longer (2010, 2011 and 2012 schools). The SSEE data are presented by calendar year to ensure that the data from School-Wide schools are comparable to the data from the comparison schools. The SSEE data show a general overall downward trend over 2009–13, therefore presenting these data by calendar year is a more accurate comparison.

We looked at patterns of change for schools that had been in School-Wide for a number of years. For example, for schools that joined School-Wide in 2010, the 2009 data are their baseline prior to joining School-Wide. Data from 2010–13 then show SSEE rates over time. For the comparison schools we have presented data from their baseline year onward.

**Analysis of school Office Discipline Referral data**

We asked school coaches to fill in a form to show their total Office Discipline Referral (ODR) count and a physical aggression (or nearest behaviour) count for 4 weeks in June. The data from 2009 to 2014 were requested if available. We received retrospective ODR data for 2009–13 from 87 schools, although the data were not complete for all schools. A relatively low response rate is to be expected as schools are developing ODR data collection systems as part of School-Wide. We received 2014 data from 171 schools. For data that were comparable across schools we divided the total ODR count and the physical aggression count by the school’s roll each year to calculate a per student rate per school. We then looked for change in mean rates over time.

We also looked at the ratio of physical aggression to total ODR incidences to see if the level of major incidences was changing over time in relation to the total ODR rate.

A number of schools noted that their ODR data were very variable as they were sorting out how to record data or had changed the way they categorised behaviours. Some schools recorded only major incidents; others recorded all minor and major incidents. Some had data for the full number of years requested. Others returned data from the one or two most recent years. This variability means we need to be very cautious in interpreting any data patterns. The higher response rate for the 2014 data suggests that, over time, schools are developing more capacity to collect and report these data.
Appendix 3: Wellbeing@School demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1 (End of 2013 data)</th>
<th>Phase 3 (End of 2014 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 School-Wide cohort</td>
<td>2012 School-Wide cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>7 full primary</td>
<td>8 full primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 contributing</td>
<td>6 contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>50% Male</td>
<td>47% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Female</td>
<td>52% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>60% NZ European</td>
<td>49% NZ European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Māori</td>
<td>35% Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15% Pasifika</td>
<td>23% Pasifika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% Asian</td>
<td>4% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% Other</td>
<td>20% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/</td>
<td>2012 School-Wide cohort</td>
<td>2012 School-Wide cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Composite</td>
<td>4 Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Secondary</td>
<td>22 Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>6,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>47% Male</td>
<td>48% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53% Female</td>
<td>52% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>62% NZ European</td>
<td>67% NZ European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Māori</td>
<td>23% Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% Pasifika</td>
<td>8% Pasifika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% Asian</td>
<td>11% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15% Other</td>
<td>14% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Wellbeing@School aspect map

#### Main aspect: School-wide climate and practices
This aspect explores students’ perceptions of whether a safe and caring climate is modelled through school-wide culture and practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-aspect</th>
<th>This sub-aspect explores the extent to which …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Caring and collaborative school</td>
<td>… students perceive the school to be a caring place that models values such as caring (aroha), respect and hospitality (manaakitanga), and collaboration with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Safe school</td>
<td>… students perceive the school to be a safe place with consistent approaches to behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Respect for culture</td>
<td>… students perceive the school acknowledges and affirms their different cultures and backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Main aspect: Classroom teaching and learning
This aspect explores students’ perceptions of whether a safe and caring climate is modelled through teacher behaviours and expectations, and within the classroom learning programme.

4. Caring teaching ... students perceive teachers have high expectations for all students, and model and promote respectful interactions and prosocial behaviours (e.g., caring, helping, showing empathy).

5. Caring learning ... students perceive the learning programme provides experiences that are likely to enhance their social and emotional competencies (e.g., how to engage in social problem solving).

#### Main aspect: Community partnerships
This aspect explores students’ perceptions of whether a safe and caring climate is modelled through connections with parents and whānau, and whether they consider the wider community to be caring.

6. Home–school partnerships ... students perceive that school practices model a sense of community with parents and whānau, and that they have access to social support outside school.

#### Main aspect: Prosocial student culture and strategies
This aspect explores students’ perceptions of the extent to which they and their peers engage in prosocial behaviours and use prosocial strategies.

7. Prosocial student culture ... students perceive themselves and their peers to be engaging in prosocial behaviours (e.g., caring, helping, showing empathy).

8. Students’ social strategies ... students know and use social problem-solving strategies (e.g., managing their emotions, seeking help).

#### Main aspect: Aggressive student culture
This aspect explores students’ perceptions of the extent to which aggressive and bullying behaviours occur at school.

9. Aggressive student culture ... students experience aggressive and bullying behaviours.
Appendix 5: Wellbeing@School aspect boxplots and item reports

Wellbeing@School data

This appendix presents the phase 1 and phase 3 Wellbeing@School student data from schools that joined School-Wide in 2012 and 2013. The primary aim of collecting these data was to provide a baseline dataset to track possible changes in student perceptions of school practice and behaviour over the course of the evaluation, and to provide a foundation to track longer term change (over 3–5 years) in School-Wide schools.

Prior Wellbeing@School analysis from the national trial shows different patterns between Years 5/6, Years 7/8 and Years 9/10 students. Therefore we grouped the data by these year levels.

Wellbeing@School explores student perceptions of five aspects or dimensions of school life (for more information, see the aspect map in Appendix 4). Summary boxplots that show the five main aspects of Wellbeing@School are presented below. There is one aspect that is more clearly aligned with School-Wide practice, namely: school-wide climate and practices. The aggressive student culture aspect is aligned with some of the expected outcomes of School-Wide. (Note that the aggressive scale is reversed. A higher scale score indicates more frequent reports of aggressive behaviour.)

Aspect boxplots that compare each set of year levels between phase 1 (2013) and phase 3 (2014) are presented below to illustrate these patterns. The information below is a quick guide to interpreting the boxplots.

Following this are the item reports from each set of year levels.

Note that for some year levels there are only a few schools in the dataset. This is the case for the Year 7/8 students at 2013 School-Wide schools, and the Year 9/10 students at 2012 schools. The small number of schools in these groups restricts our ability to do meaningful comparisons. Therefore any differences between phases 1 and 3 need to be interpreted with caution as a small number of schools means that the data are likely to be influenced by school effects.
A quick guide to boxplots for the Wellbeing@School survey

- In the Wellbeing@School survey, raw scores (student responses to questions) are converted to locations on a measurement scale.
- Once located on the scale, the distribution of scale scores for a group of students can be compared with the distribution of scores for another group. (For example, Years 9/10 student responses can be compared to the national trial data. The national reference data are shown as the shaded boxplot behind each coloured plot in the figures following.)
- The score are evenly divided into four groups called quartiles.

Boxplots include a:

- **Median** (the mid-point of the data shown by the line that divides the box into two parts): half the scores are greater than or equal to this value and half are less.
- **Upper quartile** (the box above the mid-point line): 75% of scores fall below the upper quartile.
- **Lower quartile** (the box below the mid-point line): 25% of scores fall below the lower quartile.
- **Whiskers** (the vertical lines above and below the box): The upper and lower whiskers represent the top 25% and lower 25% of scores.

Different boxplot shapes and positions give information about the data.

- **If the boxplot is comparatively short**: This suggests that, overall, students have a high level of agreement with each other.
- **If the boxplot is comparatively tall**: This suggests students hold quite different opinions about this aspect.
- **If one boxplot is much higher or lower than another**: This could suggest a difference between groups. For example, if a boxplot is more than one quartile higher or lower than another boxplot this is likely to indicate a statistically significant difference.
- **If the four sections of the boxplot are uneven in size**: This shows that many students have similar views at certain parts of the scale, but in other parts of the scale students are more variable in their views. A long whisker means that student views are varied in the upper or lower quartile. A short whisker means views are more similar.
Wellbeing@School aspects: Years 5&6, 2012 School-wide schools (Students: 2013 $n = 514$; 2014 $n = 585$)\textsuperscript{27}

Wellbeing@School aspects: Years 5&6, 2013 School-wide schools (Students: 2013 $n = 519$; 2014 $n = 505$)\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} Scale is reversed.
\textsuperscript{28} Scale is reversed.
Wellbeing@School aspects: Years 7&8, 2012 School-wide schools (Students: 2013 \( n = 1,287 \); 2014 \( n = 1,255 \))\(^{29}\)

Wellbeing@School aspects: Years 7&8, 2013 School-wide schools (Students: 2013 \( n = 865 \); 2014 \( n = 1,117 \))\(^{30}\)

\(^{29}\) Scale is reversed.

\(^{30}\) Scale is reversed. Note: There are only three schools in the 2013 data and four schools in the 2014 data. Differences between 2013 and 2014 data need to be interpreted with caution as they are likely to be influenced by school effects.
Wellbeing@School aspects: Years 9&10, 2012 School-wide schools (Students: 2013 \( n = 1,477 \); 2014 \( n = 865 \))\(^{31}\)

Wellbeing@School aspects: Years 9&10, 2013 School-wide schools (Students: 2013 \( n = 5,723 \); 2014 \( n = 7,101 \))\(^{32}\)

\(^{31}\) Scale is reversed. Note there are only six schools in the 2013 data and six schools in the 2014 data. Differences between 2013 and 2014 need to be interpreted with caution as they are likely to be influenced by school effects.

\(^{32}\) Scale is reversed.
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 1, 2012 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Second PB4L-SW Year (N=514)</th>
<th>Third PB4L-SW Year (N=585)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school works well to get on well with students from different cultures or backgrounds</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, we celebrate the good things students do.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at school.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students care about each other.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone thinks our school values are important (like respect for others).</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buildings and grounds are looked after at school.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students get on well with other children from different cultures.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are interested in my culture or family background.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I belong at school.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have a say in what happens at school.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentages represent the distribution of responses for each statement.
### Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 2, 2012 School-wide schools

#### Second PB4L-SW Year (N=514)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers think all students can do well.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught that it's OK to be different from other children.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what to say or do if other children are being mean or bullying me.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always believe how they would like us to be here.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings (like if I get angry).</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers often notice when students help each other.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat students fairly.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make learning interesting.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught to think about other children's feelings.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Third PB4L-SW Year (N=585)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers think all students can do well.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught that it's OK to be different from other children.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what to say or do if other children are being mean or bullying me.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always believe how they would like us to be here.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings (like if I get angry).</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers often notice when students help each other.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat students fairly.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make learning interesting.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught to think about other children's feelings.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 3, 2012 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Second PB4L–SW Year (N=514)</th>
<th>Third PB4L–SW Year (N=585)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents and teachers respect each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside school, I have a parent or adult who I can go to if I am upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents, family, and whānau always feel welcome at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and parents work together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the area where I live, people get on well with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always feel safe when I am going to or from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 4, 2012 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Second PB4L–SW Year (N=514)</th>
<th>Third PB4L–SW Year (N=585)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students look after other children who are new at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other children are mean to me, I know how to ignore them or walk away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students always stand up for other children if someone is mean to them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have a problem with another child, I feel I can ask teachers for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have a problem with another child, I feel I can ask other students for help (e.g. buddies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can stand up for myself in a calm way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can say how I am feeling when I need to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students include other children who are being left out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat teachers with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are good at listening to each other's views and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat each other with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 5, 2012 School-wide schools

“‘A positive culture of support’
Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide

Second PB4L-SW Year
(N=514)

Third PB4L-SW Year
(N=585)

- Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?
  - 27% Never
  - 19% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 15% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 15% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 13% Almost every day

- Do other students tell lies about you in a mean way?
  - 20% Never
  - 24% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 16% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 17% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 12% Almost every day

- Do other students leave you out in a mean way?
  - 40% Never
  - 19% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 16% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 17% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 6% Almost every day

- Are you bullied by other students?
  - 42% Never
  - 21% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 11% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 4% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 2% Almost every day

- Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?
  - 31% Never
  - 13% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 26% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 22% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 11% Almost every day

- Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?
  - 59% Never
  - 17% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 12% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 9% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 3% Almost every day

- Are other students mean to you because you look or talk or act different from them?
  - 59% Never
  - 15% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 9% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 5% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 8% Almost every day

- Do other students say mean things about your culture or family?
  - 54% Never
  - 15% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 10% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 8% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 3% Almost every day

- Do other students take or break your stuff in a mean way (e.g., money, pets)?
  - 61% Never
  - 15% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 10% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 6% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 8% Almost every day

- Do other students use cell phones (like texting) or the Internet (like Facebook) to be mean to you?
  - 81% Never
  - 4% 1 or 2 times a year
  - 3% 1 or 2 times a month
  - 1% 1 or 2 times a week
  - 3% Almost every day
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 1, 2013 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>First PB4L-SW Year (N=519)</th>
<th>Second PB4L-SW Year (N=505)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school</td>
<td>18 71</td>
<td>12 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds</td>
<td>38 33</td>
<td>37 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school helps us to get on with students from different cultures or backgrounds</td>
<td>35 50</td>
<td>36 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at school</td>
<td>35 46</td>
<td>35 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students can get on well with each other</td>
<td>44 46</td>
<td>41 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other</td>
<td>43 48</td>
<td>43 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buildings and grounds are looked after well at school</td>
<td>45 34</td>
<td>40 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied</td>
<td>44 34</td>
<td>48 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone thinks our school values are important (like respect for others)</td>
<td>40 34</td>
<td>49 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, we can talk to the good things we want to do</td>
<td>53 31</td>
<td>54 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I belong at school</td>
<td>30 33</td>
<td>30 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students get on well with other children from different cultures</td>
<td>48 22</td>
<td>49 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour</td>
<td>40 26</td>
<td>46 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are interested in my culture or family background</td>
<td>47 23</td>
<td>49 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have a say in what happens at school</td>
<td>56 23</td>
<td>57 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 2, 2013 School-wide schools

First PB4L-SW Year (N=519)

- Teachers think all students can do well: A
- At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK: D
- Teachers always treat each other with respect: D
- At school, I am taught what to say or do if other children are being mean or bullying me: D
- At school, I am taught that it is OK to be different from other children: D
- Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied: A
- Teachers always believe how they would like us to be here: A
- Teachers care about how I feel: A
- Teachers make learning interesting: A
- Teachers treat students fairly: A
- At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings (like if I get angry): A
- Teachers often notice when students help each other: A
- At school, I am taught to think about other children's feelings: A

Second PB4L-SW Year (N=505)

For each item, the percentage of responses is shown as follows:
- No response
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 3, 2013 School-wide schools

First PB4L–SW Year (N=519)  Second PB4L–SW Year (N=505)

- My parents and teachers respect each other:
  - First Year: 50% agree, 27% disagree, 23% strongly agree, 10% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 52% agree, 28% disagree, 42% strongly agree, 16% strongly disagree

- If other children are mean to me, I know how to ignore them or walk away:
  - First Year: 52% agree, 32% disagree, 38% strongly agree, 16% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 54% agree, 33% disagree, 35% strongly agree, 22% strongly disagree

- I can stand up for myself in a calm way:
  - First Year: 49% agree, 35% disagree, 43% strongly agree, 22% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 48% agree, 36% disagree, 43% strongly agree, 25% strongly disagree

- Students look after other children who are new at school:
  - First Year: 39% agree, 38% disagree, 55% strongly agree, 5% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 55% agree, 58% strongly agree

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 4, 2013 School-wide schools

First PB4L–SW Year (N=519)  Second PB4L–SW Year (N=505)

- If other children are mean to me, I know how to ignore them or walk away:
  - First Year: 32% agree, 35% disagree, 49% strongly agree, 16% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 33% agree, 36% disagree, 43% strongly agree, 22% strongly disagree

- If I have a problem with another child, I feel I can ask teachers for help:
  - First Year: 40% agree, 40% disagree, 43% strongly agree, 17% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 42% agree, 38% disagree, 40% strongly agree, 18% strongly disagree

- Students always stand up for other children if someone is mean to them:
  - First Year: 43% agree, 36% disagree, 45% strongly agree, 18% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 43% agree, 34% disagree, 45% strongly agree, 23% strongly disagree

- I can say how I am feeling when I need to:
  - First Year: 41% agree, 41% disagree, 31% strongly agree, 17% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 43% agree, 33% disagree, 45% strongly agree, 22% strongly disagree

- Students treat teachers with respect:
  - First Year: 39% agree, 39% disagree, 48% strongly agree, 16% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 51% agree, 31% disagree, 30% strongly agree, 18% strongly disagree

- Students treat each other with respect:
  - First Year: 48% agree, 48% disagree, 18% strongly agree, 6% strongly disagree
  - Second Year: 51% agree, 51% strongly agree

“A positive culture of support”
Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 5&6, Aspect 5, 2013 School-wide schools

“A positive culture of support”
Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 1, 2012 School-wide schools

Second PB4L-SW Year (N=1287)

- Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school.
- Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds.
- At school, we are encouraged to get on with students from different cultures or backgrounds.
- I feel safe at school.
- At school, we celebrate the good things students do.
- Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other.
- Teachers and students care about each other.
- At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being bullied.
- I feel I belong at school.
- Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour.
- At school, people accept me for who I am.
- Everyone thinks our school values are important (like respect for others).
- Teachers are interested in my culture or family background.
- The buildings and grounds are beautiful.
- Students have a say in what happens at school.
- Students get on well with other students from different cultures.

Third PB4L-SW Year (N=1255)

- Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school.
- Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds.
- At school, we are encouraged to get on with students from different cultures or backgrounds.
- I feel safe at school.
- At school, we celebrate the good things students do.
- Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other.
- Teachers and students care about each other.
- At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being bullied.
- I feel I belong at school.
- Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour.
- At school, people accept me for who I am.
- Everyone thinks our school values are important (like respect for others).
- Teachers are interested in my culture or family background.
- The buildings and grounds are beautiful.
- Students have a say in what happens at school.
- Students get on well with other students from different cultures.
### Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 2, 2012 School-wide schools

**Second PB4L–SW Year (N=1287)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>StrONGLY Disagree</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers think all students can do well.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught that it is OK to be different from other students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what to say or do if students are teasing or bullying me</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always behave the way they would like us to behave</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers often praise students for helping each other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings (like if I get angry).</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat students fairly.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught to think about other students, feelings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make learning interesting.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third PB4L–SW Year (N=1255)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>StrONGLY Disagree</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers think all students can do well.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught that it is OK to be different from other students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what to say or do if students are teasing or bullying me</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always behave the way they would like us to behave</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers often praise students for helping each other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings (like if I get angry).</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat students fairly.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught to think about other students, feelings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make learning interesting.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 3, 2012 School-wide schools

Second PB4L–SW Year (N=1287)  
- No response  
- Strongly disagree  
- Disagree  
- Agree  
- Strongly agree

Third PB4L–SW Year (N=1255)

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 4, 2012 School-wide schools

Second PB4L–SW Year (N=1287)  
- No response  
- Strongly disagree  
- Disagree  
- Agree  
- Strongly agree

Third PB4L–SW Year (N=1255)
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 5, 2012 School-wide schools

Second PB4L–SW Year (N=1287)

- Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?
- Do other students tell lies or spread rumours about you?
- Are you bullied by other students?
- Do other students leave you out or ignore you on purpose?
- Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?
- Do other students call you up to put you down, or are they rude to you because of your culture or family?
- Do other students say rude things about your culture or family?
- Do other students use cell phones like texting or the Internet (like Facebook) to be mean to you or spread rumours?
- Are other students rude to you because you learn in a different way from them?
- Do other students take or break your stuff in a mean way (e.g., money, rates)?
- Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?
- Do other students say sexual things you do not like, or touch you in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?

Third PB4L–SW Year (N=1255)

- Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?
- Do other students tell lies or spread rumours about you?
- Are you bullied by other students?
- Do other students leave you out or ignore you on purpose?
- Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?
- Do other students call you up to put you down, or are they rude to you because of your culture or family?
- Do other students say rude things about your culture or family?
- Do other students use cell phones like texting or the Internet (like Facebook) to be mean to you or spread rumours?
- Are other students rude to you because you learn in a different way from them?
- Do other students take or break your stuff in a mean way (e.g., money, rates)?
- Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?
- Do other students say sexual things you do not like, or touch you in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 1, 2013 School-wide schools
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 2, 2013 School-wide schools

First PB4L–SW Year
(N=865)

Second PB4L–SW Year
(N=1117)

- At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.
- Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.
- Teachers always treat each other with respect.
- Teachers think all students can do well.
- At school, I am taught that it’s OK to be different from other students.
- At school, I am taught what to say or do if students are having an argument.
- Teachers always behave how they would like us to behave.
- Teachers often praise students for helping each other.
- Teachers treat students fairly.
- Teachers care about how I feel.
- Teachers make learning interesting.
- At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings when I get angry.
- At school, I am taught to think about other students’ feelings.

%
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 3, 2013 School-wide schools

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 4, 2013 School-wide schools
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 7&8, Aspect 5, 2013 School-wide schools

First PB4L-SW Year
(N=865)

- Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?
  - Never or hardly ever: 27, 19, 18, 22, 14
  - Once or twice a year: 44, 21, 20, 10
  - Once or twice a month: 53, 19, 11, 9
  - Once a week: 49, 24, 16, 5
  - Almost every day: 48, 27, 12, 4

- Are you bullied by other students?
  - Never or hardly ever: 44, 21, 20, 10
  - Once or twice a year: 55, 17, 13, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 56, 17, 13, 5
  - Once a week: 40, 24, 16, 5
  - Almost every day: 40, 24, 16, 5

Second PB4L-SW Year
(N=1117)

- Do other students say rude things about your culture or family?
  - Never or hardly ever: 27, 19, 18, 22, 14
  - Once or twice a year: 44, 21, 20, 10
  - Once or twice a month: 53, 19, 11, 9
  - Once a week: 49, 24, 16, 5
  - Almost every day: 48, 27, 12, 4

- Do other students tell lies or spread rumours about you?
  - Never or hardly ever: 44, 21, 20, 10
  - Once or twice a year: 55, 17, 13, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 56, 17, 13, 5
  - Once a week: 40, 24, 16, 5
  - Almost every day: 40, 24, 16, 5

- Do other students call you guy to put you down, or are they rude to you because of your sexuality?
  - Never or hardly ever: 73, 50, 12, 5
  - Once or twice a year: 74, 50, 12, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 55, 17, 13, 5
  - Once a week: 55, 17, 13, 5
  - Almost every day: 55, 17, 13, 5

- Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?
  - Never or hardly ever: 43, 20, 15, 5
  - Once or twice a year: 41, 20, 15, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 41, 20, 15, 5
  - Once a week: 41, 20, 15, 5
  - Almost every day: 41, 20, 15, 5

- Do other students say sexual things you do not like, or touch you in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?
  - Never or hardly ever: 71, 50, 12, 5
  - Once or twice a year: 72, 50, 12, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 58, 17, 13, 5
  - Once a week: 51, 17, 13, 5
  - Almost every day: 51, 17, 13, 5

- Do other students use computers like texting or the internet (like Facebook) to be mean to you or spread rumours?
  - Never or hardly ever: 74, 50, 12, 5
  - Once or twice a year: 75, 50, 12, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 68, 17, 13, 5
  - Once a week: 66, 17, 13, 5
  - Almost every day: 66, 17, 13, 5

- Are other students rude to you because you look or are different from them?
  - Never or hardly ever: 63, 19, 13, 5
  - Once or twice a year: 62, 19, 13, 5
  - Once or twice a month: 62, 19, 13, 5
  - Once a week: 62, 19, 13, 5
  - Almost every day: 62, 19, 13, 5
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 1, 2012 School-wide schools

Second PB4L-SW Year (N=1477)

- Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school: 2% Agree, 39% Disagree, 54% Strongly disagree
- At school, we celebrate the good things students do: 54% Agree, 22% Disagree, 25% Strongly disagree
- At school, we are encouraged to get on with students from different cultures or backgrounds: 42% Agree, 17% Disagree, 25% Strongly disagree
- I feel safe at school: 15% Agree, 54% Disagree, 31% Strongly disagree
- At school, people accept me for who I am: 16% Agree, 65% Disagree, 19% Strongly disagree
- I feel I belong at school: 15% Agree, 54% Disagree, 21% Strongly disagree
- Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds: 64% Agree, 15% Disagree, 21% Strongly disagree
- At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied: 34% Agree, 50% Disagree, 16% Strongly disagree
- Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour: 31% Agree, 62% Disagree, 7% Strongly disagree
- Students get on well with other students from different cultures: 31% Agree, 62% Disagree, 7% Strongly disagree
- Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other: 35% Agree, 46% Disagree, 9% Strongly disagree
- The buildings and grounds are looked after at school: 34% Agree, 45% Disagree, 1% Strongly disagree
- Students have a say in what happens at school: 34% Agree, 45% Disagree, 1% Strongly disagree
- Everyone thinks our school values are important (like respect for others): 45% Agree, 39% Disagree, 6% Strongly disagree
- Teachers and students care about each other: 33% Agree, 51% Disagree, 6% Strongly disagree
- Teachers are interested in my culture or family background: 16% Agree, 36% Disagree, 48% Strongly disagree

Third PB4L-SW Year (N=865)

- Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school: 2% Agree, 39% Disagree, 55% Strongly disagree
- At school, we celebrate the good things students do: 54% Agree, 25% Disagree, 21% Strongly disagree
- At school, we are encouraged to get on with students from different cultures or backgrounds: 60% Agree, 15% Disagree, 23% Strongly disagree
- I feel safe at school: 18% Agree, 60% Disagree, 21% Strongly disagree
- At school, people accept me for who I am: 21% Agree, 59% Disagree, 17% Strongly disagree
- I feel I belong at school: 15% Agree, 66% Disagree, 19% Strongly disagree
- Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds: 64% Agree, 15% Disagree, 21% Strongly disagree
- At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied: 32% Agree, 48% Disagree, 12% Strongly disagree
- Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour: 31% Agree, 50% Disagree, 19% Strongly disagree
- Students get on well with other students from different cultures: 31% Agree, 62% Disagree, 7% Strongly disagree
- Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other: 33% Agree, 44% Disagree, 13% Strongly disagree
- The buildings and grounds are looked after at school: 29% Agree, 44% Disagree, 27% Strongly disagree
- Students have a say in what happens at school: 32% Agree, 43% Disagree, 12% Strongly disagree
- Everyone thinks our school values are important (like respect for others): 40% Agree, 36% Disagree, 6% Strongly disagree
- Teachers and students care about each other: 29% Agree, 53% Disagree, 18% Strongly disagree
- Teachers are interested in my culture or family background: 42% Agree, 26% Disagree, 32% Strongly disagree
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 2, 2012 School-wide schools

Second PB4L – SW Year (N=1477)

Third PB4L – SW Year (N=865)

1. At school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.  
   - Strongly disagree 25, Disagree 45, Agree 18

2. Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.  
   - Strongly disagree 19, Disagree 56, Agree 7

3. At school, I am taught that it’s OK to be different from other students.  
   - Strongly disagree 18, Disagree 62, Agree 37

4. Teachers always treat each other with respect.  
   - Strongly disagree 15, Disagree 61, Agree 19

5. Teachers think all students can do well.  
   - Strongly disagree 20, Disagree 46, Agree 14

6. At school, I am taught what to say or do if students are racing or bullying each other.  
   - Strongly disagree 27, Disagree 82, Agree 12

7. At school, I am taught how to manage my feelings (like if I get angry).  
   - Strongly disagree 31, Disagree 40, Agree 9

8. Teachers always behave how they would like us to behave.  
   - Strongly disagree 31, Disagree 45, Agree 9

9. Teachers often praise students for helping each other.  
   - Strongly disagree 29, Disagree 55, Agree 9

10. At school, I am taught to think about other students’ feelings.  
    - Strongly disagree 29, Disagree 55, Agree 9

11. Teachers care about how I feel.  
    - Strongly disagree 25, Disagree 45, Agree 14

12. Teachers treat students fairly.  
    - Strongly disagree 14, Disagree 35, Agree 46

13. Teachers make learning interesting.  
    - Strongly disagree 14, Disagree 35, Agree 46
A positive culture of support

Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 3, 2012 School-wide schools

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 4, 2012 School-wide schools

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 5, 2012 School-wide schools
Final report from the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide

### A positive culture of support

#### Second PB4L-SW Year
(N=1477)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a year</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a month</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students tell lies or spread rumours about you?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students say rude things about your culture or family?</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students leave you out or ignore you on purpose?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you bullied by other students?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students call you gay to put you down, or are they rude to you because of your sexuality?</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students use cell phones (like texting or the Internet (like Facebook)) to be mean to you or spread rumours?</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students say sexual things you do not like, or touch you in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are other students rude to you because you I am in a different way from them?</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students take or break your stuff in a mean way (e.g., money, pens)?</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Third PB4L-SW Year
(N=865)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a year</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a month</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students tell lies or spread rumours about you?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students say rude things about your culture or family?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students leave you out or ignore you on purpose?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you bullied by other students?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students call you gay to put you down, or are they rude to you because of your sexuality?</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students use cell phones (like texting or the Internet (like Facebook)) to be mean to you or spread rumours?</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students say sexual things you do not like, or touch you in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are other students rude to you because you I am in a different way from them?</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students take or break your stuff in a mean way (e.g., money, pens)?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 1, 2013 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First PB4L-SW Year (N=5723)</th>
<th>Second PB4L-SW Year (N=7101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours like hitting or bullying are not OK at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, we are encouraged to get on with students from different cultures or backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers get on well with students from different cultures and backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, we celebrate the good things students do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, people accept me for who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I belong at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students get on well with other students from different cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buildings and grounds are kept after all school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, everyone knows what to do if someone is being hurt or bullied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the school rules about behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers ask for our ideas about how students can get on better with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have a say in what happens at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students care about each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone thinks our school values are important (the respect for others).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are interested in my culture or family background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A positive culture of support
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Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 2, 2013 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>First PB4L-SW Year (N=5723)</th>
<th>Second PB4L-SW Year (N=7101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All school, I am taught what behaviours are OK and not OK.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always take action if someone is being hit or bullied.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always treat each other with respect.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught that it's OK to be different from other students</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers think all students can do well.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught what to say or do if students are teasing or bullying me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers always behave in the way they would like us to behave.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught how to manage my emotions (like if I get angry)</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, I am taught to think about other students’ feelings.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers often praise students for helping each other.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat students fairly.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers care about how I feel.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers make learning interesting.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“A positive culture of support”
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Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 3, 2013 School-wide schools

Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 4, 2013 School-wide schools
## Wellbeing@School item report: Years 9&10, Aspect 5, 2013 School-wide schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>First PB4L-SW Year (N=5723)</th>
<th>Second PB4L-SW Year (N=7101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do other students put you down, call you names, or tease you in a mean way?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students tell lies or spread rumours about you?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you bullied by other students?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students say sexual things you do not like, or touch you in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students say rude things about your culture or family?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students leave you out or ignore you on purpose?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students call you gay to put you down, or are they rude to you because of your sexuality?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students use cell phones like texting or Internet to be mean to you or spread rumours?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are other students rude to you because you seem to be a different way from them?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students take or break your stuff in a mean way (e.g., money, papers)?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students threaten you in a mean way or force you to do things?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other students hit, push, or hurt you in a mean way?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%
Appendix 6: Office Discipline Referral data

The table below shows the mean physical aggression Office Discipline Referral (ODR) rate by time in School-Wide. For both 2010/11 and 2012/13 schools these data show fluctuations over time. It is not clear whether these fluctuations represent real differences in behaviour incidents or are a result of schools developing more clarity about how they identify and record incidents of physical aggression. For this reason, and due to the variable response rate, these data need to be read with caution.

### Mean physical aggression ODR rates by length of time in School-Wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme year</th>
<th>2010/11 cohort</th>
<th>2012/13 cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows the ratio of physical aggression referrals compared to the overall ODR rate. We included this analysis to see if rates of physical aggression referrals decreased in relation to the overall rate. This tests whether schools are experiencing lower levels of physical aggression referrals in relation to other types of behaviour. This analysis shows no clear patterns, which suggests that referrals for physical aggression are increasing or decreasing in similar ways to other behaviours.

### Ratio of physical aggression ODR to total ODR by time in School-Wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme year</th>
<th>2010/11 cohort</th>
<th>2012/13 cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>