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Executive summary

Introduction

The Innovations Funding Pool was set up to fund education programmes to support students at risk of poor educational outcomes, and is managed by the Ministry of Education. Included among the programmes funded via this mechanism since January 2001 is the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme.

The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme. The specific objectives were:

- To determine whether the programme is “sustainable”, “adaptable”, and “transferable” between school communities.
- To determine the extent to which and how the programme has brought about positive (academic, social, and behavioural) change for students, particularly those at risk of poor educational achievement (i.e. the extent to which it has been “effective”).

Following phases of the evaluation that involved scoping and development, and evaluation design, the evaluation involved an interview with the National Coordinator for Cool Schools, interviews with key stakeholders at case study sites (in four schools), and a survey (census) of all participating schools.

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation is a national programme that has been established in primary and secondary schools in New Zealand for 12 years. The programme is initially delivered in schools by the Peace Foundation. The underlying aim of the programme is to change the paradigm of the way conflict is handled, thus creating a better learning environment in schools, and links with the Relationship strand of the Health and Physical Education curriculum document. The main goal of the programme is to give students the skills to mediate disputes and conflicts – to empower them to reach a resolution without physical or verbal violence. The programme also aims to reduce the stress on teachers by reducing the number of conflicts that they have to deal with – both inside and outside the classroom. All teachers in the school are trained in the programme, and staff, in turn, teach the mediation skills to their classes. Peer Mediators – older students whose role is to mediate disputes between students – patrol the playground at intervals and lunchtimes, trained and overseen by the Cool Schools Coordinator (a nominated teacher). A full description of the programme is given in the main body of the report.

The funding provided by the Ministry of Education through the Innovations Funding Pool for Cool Schools is costed to cover the initial teacher training session, a follow-up revisit, five training manuals, a training video, and a contribution towards the costs of a uniform for the Peer Mediators. This totals around $2,000 per school (on average). For the purposes of the evaluation, 24 schools formed the population base for the survey; however, over 30 schools had received training in Cool Schools Peer Mediation funded by the Ministry in 2002.
Previous research literature has attributed a decrease in the numbers of incidents or conflicts in the playground, improved self-esteem or self-confidence among Peer Mediators, a reduction in bullying, and a reduction in the time teachers spend sorting out issues to the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme (Barnes, 1994; O’Meara, 1996; Moses, 1998). The programme has been rated as effective (The Radford Group, 1996). New and/or part-time teachers, who had not attended the original Cool Schools training, were found to have not acquired knowledge of the programme’s philosophy and skills (O’Meara, 1996).

**Accessibility/reach**

- **The Cool Schools programme is reaching low decile schools.**
  The majority (71%) of the 24 schools participating in the programme in Terms 3 and 4 of 2002 and supported through the Innovations Funding Pool were low decile schools (deciles 1 to 3), and most of these schools (10 of the 17) were decile 1. Six of the remaining seven schools were middle decile (deciles 4 and 5 only).

- **Teacher participation in the programme is variable, partly due to staff turnover.**
  Over half of the schools responding to the survey (12 of the 21 schools) indicated that 80% to 100% of teachers in the school had received training in the Cool Schools programme. Conversely, a quarter (5 of the 21 schools) indicated that 35% or less of their current teachers had participated in the training.

  Evidence from the case studies indicates that staff turnover is the primary reason for the variability in teacher participation in the Cool Schools training.

- **All or most classes are being exposed to the programme.**
  Over half of the surveyed schools (10 of the 17 that were implementing the programme at the time of the survey) indicated that all (100%) of their classes learnt conflict resolution skills in the classroom. A further 3 schools indicated that most (69% to 95%) of their classes were taught these skills.

- **The number of students acting as Peer Mediators in the school varies.**
  The surveyed schools (the 17 that were implementing the programme at that time) had an average of 26 students active in the role of Peer Mediator. The number of Peer Mediators in the school ranged from 0 to 118.

**Effectiveness**

- **Schools appear to develop or revise their goals or targets for the Cool Schools programme as they implement it.**
  Over half (13 out of 21) of the schools responding to the survey had developed goals or targets before implementing the programme, and the majority (12 out of the 17 where
the programme was currently operating) had goals or targets at the time of the survey. Four of these schools developed their goals or targets after the programme was first introduced.

In the majority of cases, goals or targets developed before implementing the programme related to general social improvements in the school and improvements in students’ attitudes. Almost all the schools had goals or targets in these areas at the time of the survey, but the majority also had goals or targets for improvements in student behaviour. Only three schools had goals or targets in exactly the same areas before implementing the programme and at the time of the survey.

Details from the case study schools suggest that schools generally had quite broad goals, rather than specific targets, in each of these areas.

It appears that the surveyed schools developed or revised their goals for the Cool Schools programme as they implemented it, and there was some evidence for this in the case studies.

- **Monitoring and reporting to assess the effectiveness of the programme in the school is variable.**

Before implementing the programme in the school, few of the surveyed schools (5 out of 21) had agreed on a way of monitoring the programme.

Five schools (of the 17 surveyed schools implementing Cool Schools at the time of the survey) had not used the Ministry of Education’s monitoring forms, which were based on existing forms used by the Cool Schools providers. Of the remaining 12 schools, seven rated them as either “not very useful” (5) or “not useful at all” (2).

The Research Team’s assessment of the monitoring forms was that the forms were not always completed consistently or systematically and that there was some confusion over when certain forms should be completed.

- **Schools generally use qualitative methods to monitor the programme’s effectiveness.**

Most of the surveyed schools (13 out of 17 implementing the programme at the time of the survey) monitored the effectiveness of the programme. Almost all (12) of these schools did so through feedback from students. Feedback from teachers (10) and observing students (10) were also common ways of monitoring the programme. Few schools collated and analysed measurable data (5) or specifically monitored progress against goals/targets (1).

Informants in the case study schools commented that it was difficult to quantify any changes that had occurred in the school or to know for certain whether any changes that had occurred were a direct result of the programme. Informants also argued that qualitative monitoring is the best indicator of how well the programme is doing.
• **Schools are generally positive about the programme’s success for their school.**

The surveyed schools most commonly rated the success of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme for their school as “successful” (7) or “very successful” (3) (of the 17 implementing the programme at the time of the survey). A further five schools rated it as “partly successful”.

Notably, the three schools that rated the programme as “very successful” had implemented it in the school for at least three years.

The most successful areas identified by surveyed schools were the mediation of playground conflicts and/or a reduction in the number of conflicts, students gaining skills (such as communication skills, life skills, or self-control), and Peer Mediators, in particular, gaining skills or self-esteem from the role.

Informants in all four case study schools had observed some changes in the school that they attributed, at least in part, to the Cool Schools programme. Most commonly, these were reductions in the number of playground conflicts, the number of detentions, and the instance of bullying. The number of mediations needed also decreased over time. Also observed were increases in students’ leadership and problem-solving skills, changes in teachers’ behaviour, and possible flow-on effects to students’ academic work.

• **Programme training and content and the commitment and effectiveness of the Coordinator are seen as key contributors to the programme’s success.**

Surveyed schools (of the 17 schools currently implementing the programme) most commonly reported that the training provided or the content of the Cool Schools programme (5) contributed to the positive outcomes or successes they experienced.

Another key determinant of the programme’s success in the school was the commitment/dedication and effectiveness of the school’s Cool Schools Coordinator (4).

Comments from the case study informants reinforced these themes; however, the central factor for these schools was the fact that the whole school was involved in and supportive of the programme, including students and school management.

• **Variability in the commitment or expectations of teachers is seen as a barrier to the programme’s success in some schools.**

Surveyed schools most commonly believed that variability in the level of commitment to the programme by teachers (sometimes as a result of there being new staff), or in their expectations of the mediators, detract from achieving further positive outcomes or successes (4 of the 17 schools currently implementing the programme).

The same number of respondents (4) said that nothing detracted from positive outcomes or successes of the programme.
Case study informants reinforced this, linking lack of teacher commitment to the programme to teachers being new to the school. Also mentioned was that lack of parental support detracted from the programme’s effectiveness.

- **The programme appears to be effective when integrated into the school’s behaviour management plan.**

All three case study schools that were implementing the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme had, to some degree, incorporated the programme into their behaviour management plan. This means that mediation is used as one of the first “steps” for dealing with student problems or misbehaviour. The programme appeared to be most effective in reducing the amount of conflict among students in the case study school that had completely integrated the programme into their behaviour management plan and where mediation was simply part of the culture of the school.

**Transferability/adaptability**

- **The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is considered to have a good reputation, and this influences its uptake.**

The large majority of the surveyed schools (18 out of the 21 schools) reported that the initial appeal of the programme was that it had a good reputation. Respondents also commonly believed that the programme would help address a major issue at the school (15), that it would fit easily into the curriculum (14), and that it was conceptually well-based (13).

- **Some schools adapted Cool Schools before introducing it, and the amendments appear to be mostly minor.**

Some of the surveyed schools (6 out of 21) amended aspects of the Cool Schools programme before introducing it. The amendments made mostly related to the training and rostering of Peer Mediators.

One case study school, however, made significant adaptations to the implementation of the programme, without changing its substance. Specifically, the Cool Schools programme was not implemented as a standalone programme but was integrated into the school’s behaviour management policy, along with aspects of other programmes and approaches. Other adaptations included having Teacher Mediators in addition to Peer Mediators and having all Year 5 and 6 students in the Peer Mediator role.

- **The programme may not be transferable to very small schools.**

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme relies on having a certain number of senior students (a minimum of 10) in the school to act as Peer Mediators, so that they can be rostered on duty in the playground at lunchtime and interval. If the school does not have enough willing and suitable (e.g., mature) students to undertake the role, it may not be logistically possible to implement the programme. This may especially be the case for small contributing primary schools, as they do not have Year 7 and 8
students. However, adaptations involving classroom mediations are possible in small schools.

**Sustainability**

- **Schools’ expectations of the programme have generally been met, and intention to continue with the programme is high.**

Most of the surveyed schools (12 of the 17 implementing the programme at the time) reported that their initial expectations of Cool Schools had been met to either a “large” (10) or “very large” (2) extent. This finding is fairly consistent with the proportion of schools rating the programme as a “success” for their school (i.e., positive, but weighted more towards “successful” than “very successful”).

Respondents were more strongly positive in their intention to continue or re-establish the programme in the future. The vast majority of schools (19 out of the 21 who had run the programme in the past three years) said it was “very likely” (14) or “likely” (5) that they would continue with the programme or re-establish it.

The large majority of these 19 respondents said they would continue with the programme (or re-establish it) because of positive feedback from students (16) and staff (15) and because the programme had successfully met goals/targets (14). Other common reasons were because of positive feedback from other stakeholders (11) and because the programme is cost efficient (11).

- **Low levels of resourcing are required to establish and maintain the programme.**

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is made easy to establish and maintain because of its relatively low cost. This was particularly the case where the Ministry of Education had covered the initial training and so on through the Innovations Fund. Although schools put a range of different resources into the programme to implement it on an ongoing basis, the actual level of these resources is quite low.

- **Staff turnover and lack of buy-in from teachers may be a threat to sustainability.**

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is a whole-school programme. This means that its ongoing implementation relies on having teaching staff who are all trained in the programme and committed to it. Where there is a high staff turnover, ensuring all staff are fully trained in the programme may be difficult, as the case study schools indicated that they tend to wait for a training session to be run in their area rather than provide full in-house training in Cool Schools for new staff.

Not having staff buy-in means that the programme may not be delivered consistently in the classroom and that Peer Mediators may not be fully supported in their role. Case study informants generally indicated that staff lacking commitment to Cool Schools were those who were new to the school and/or not fully trained in the programme. Thus, ongoing training of staff is crucial to the sustainability of the programme in the school.
One case study school claimed to have reduced staff turnover through Cool Schools itself, as integrating the programme with the school’s behaviour management plan helped to provide teachers with manageable classrooms.

Discussion

In general, the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme appears to be adaptable to the needs and circumstances of a range of schools. However, the ability of the programme to operate in the school relies on having sufficient willing and suitable (e.g., mature) students to take on the role of Peer Mediator, although adaptations can be made.

Schools see the programme as having a good reputation, and the programme is generally considered to be successful. The areas in which it is most effective are in the mediation of playground conflicts and/or a reduction in the number of conflicts, students gaining valuable skills, and Peer Mediators, in particular, gaining skills and self-esteem from the role. These findings are consistent with previous literature on the programme (Barnes, 1994; O’Meara, 1996; Moses, 1998). However, systematic and rigorous monitoring of the programme and its effectiveness was not common among the participating schools.

Factors contributing to the perceived success of the programme are most commonly the programme training and content, the commitment and effectiveness of the Coordinator, and the school-wide focus and support. Although not specifically mentioned by schools as a factor contributing to its success, our observations from the case studies suggest that integration of the programme into the school’s behaviour management policy/plan appears to be an effective strategy for implementing the programme. It may be that schools do this as a matter of course.

Respondents were generally positive in their ratings of the success of the Cool Schools programme and the extent to which their expectations had been met. However, they were much stronger in their assertion that they would continue running or re-establish the programme, with the vast majority (19 out of 21) indicating that they were likely or very likely to do so. This finding may be due to schools initially having unrealistic expectations for the programme (or having unrealistic expectations about how soon results might be seen) but still seeing its value, or it may be due to the nature and severity of the problems in schools at the time they adopted the programme, rather than anything to do with the programme itself.

Because of the low cost of implementing the programme, resourcing does not appear to affect the sustainability of the programme. The key factor in sustainability seems to be more related to the ongoing commitment of school staff, which in turn is related to staff turnover. One way commitment within the school can be retained is through ongoing training for both staff and students, so that new arrivals at the school can be fully trained in the programme, and some schools evidently do this. Annual revisits by the programme provider, perhaps to clusters of schools in an area, would help to ensure that all staff in the schools are trained.

Because of the contestable nature of the funding through the Innovations Funding Pool, the Ministry of Education is required to review the funding of programmes through the Innovations Fund. The programme appears to represent good value for money - the initial outlay is relatively
small (compared to some other programmes funded by the Ministry of Education), and the programme may impact on the entire school for a number of years.

However, schools could be encouraged to systematically collect quantifiable data that would allow assessments to be made about the programme’s effectiveness. In particular, baseline data could be collected prior to introduction of the programme, and comparisons made with data collected after the programme had been in place for certain periods of time.
1. Purpose & background to the evaluation

1.1 The programmes evaluated

The Innovations Funding Pool was set up in 1998 to make contestable funding available, managed by the Ministry of Education, for alternative education programmes focused on supporting students at risk of poor educational outcomes. The purpose of the delivery of such funding is that outcomes for these students will be improved through, for example:

- “identifying excellent New Zealand practice that improves educational outcomes for students at risk, and that can be readily used by other schools at reasonable cost;
- “increasing school management and teachers’ understanding of the principles of effective programmes; …
- “providing information to feed into the Ministry of Education’s policy work on meeting the needs of students at risk in the school sector.” (Ministry of Education, 2002, p1)\(^1\)

- Included among the programmes funded via this mechanism since January 2001 are the Tū Tangata, Cool Schools Peer Mediation, and Kiwi Can programmes.

The Ministry’s contract with each of the programme providers stipulates that the funding given is for the provision of the programme in schools with a high proportion of “at-risk” students. The Ministry considers that students deemed to be “at risk” are predominantly those attending low decile schools.

The programme that is the focus of this report is the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme.

1.1.1 A brief description of Cool Schools

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation is a national programme that has been established in primary and secondary schools in New Zealand for 12 years. The programme is initially delivered in schools by the Peace Foundation. The central component of the programme is Peer Mediators – students who patrol the school playground at intervals and lunchtimes to mediate disputes between students. Peer Mediators are students at the most senior levels of the school, and they are trained in this role by the Cool Schools Coordinator (a nominated teacher), who also supervises them and manages the duty roster.

All teaching staff at the school are also trained in the Cool Schools programme (by the programme provider) so that they can teach mediation skills in their classes.

The underlying aim of the programme is to change the paradigm of the way conflict is handled, thus creating a better learning environment in schools, and links with the Relationship strand of

\(^1\) Ministry of Education (2002). Request for Proposal – Evaluations of three programmes funded through the Innovations Funding Pool.
the Health and Physical Education curriculum document. The main goal of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is to give students the skills to mediate disputes and conflicts – to empower them to reach a resolution without physical or verbal violence. The programme also aims to reduce the stress on teachers by reducing the number of conflicts that they have to deal with – both inside and outside the classroom.

The funding provided by the Ministry of Education through the Innovations Funding Pool for Cool Schools is costed to cover the initial teacher training session, a follow-up revisit, five training manuals, a training video, and a contribution towards the costs of a uniform for the Peer Mediators. This totals around $2,000 per school (on average).

A more detailed description of the programme is given in section 3.1 of this report.

1.2 Purpose & specific objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate the three programmes: Cool Schools Peer Mediation, Tū Tangata, and Kiwi Can. The specific objectives were:

- To determine whether the three programmes are “sustainable”, “adaptable”, and “transferable” between school communities.
- To determine the extent to which and how the programmes have brought about positive (academic, social, and behavioural) change for students, particularly those at risk of poor educational achievement (i.e. have been “effective”).

1.3 Research questions

The research questions to be answered by the evaluation of Cool Schools were:

1. Are the roles and responsibilities of those running the programme clearly defined and understood by school personnel? How is this made clear?

2. Are there realistic expectations by all about what the programme can deliver with the resources they have? Do all those involved understand what can be delivered and do they have the same understanding? What is the resource contribution schools make to the programme?

3. How adaptable or transferable is the programme between schools?

4. How well is the programme integrated into the school operations or policies? Do they consider other programmes in the school and how they interrelate/integrate/align? How do the programmes link in with the curriculum?

5. How does the programme as delivered match the programme objectives? How do they measure whether the programme objectives have been achieved? In terms of the information collected, what is useful and why? What does it tell them in terms of the success of the programme? How does it feed back into the operation of the programme?
Who is involved in the process of feeding back the information, and who is informed of the success or otherwise of the programme and possible implications?

6. How are unintended outcomes dealt with?

7. How do the programme providers maintain momentum of the programme once changes/improvements are evident? Is there the facility to evolve the programme and how is the evolution managed?

8. How high is staff/provider/volunteer turnover? How do they manage sustaining the programme?

9. Do programme providers negotiate objectives and delivery of the programme to meet the needs of their students? How and who is involved?

1.4 Definitions of terms used

To enable us to evaluate the three programmes in terms of their “accessibility”, “transferability”, “adaptability”, “effectiveness”, and “sustainability”, we first need to define these terms. Here are the definitions developed by the Evaluation Team in consultation with the Ministry for the purposes of this evaluation.

- **Accessibility** – the extent to which the programme is reaching the students and schools that are its intended targets, particularly in relation to groups targeted by the Ministry to receive the programme funded through the Innovations Funding Pool.

- **Transferability** – the extent to which the programme is transferable, either in its standard form or in a modified form, across different types of schools, such as schools of various sizes and schools with differing student populations.

- **Adaptability** – the extent to which the programme can be adapted or modified to meet the needs of individual schools and their student populations and whether any adaptations of the programme have been successful in meeting those needs.

- **Effectiveness** – the extent to which the programme has been successful in meeting the goals and objectives set by the schools involved in the programme and the extent to which any positive change has occurred in the school that might be attributed to the programme. Specifically – in terms of the Ministry of Education’s objectives in funding the programme – effectiveness is the extent to which the programme has produced positive outcomes for students in the social, behavioural, and academic areas.

- **Sustainability** – the extent to which the programme can be sustained and supported to continue, either in an individual school or as a whole, given the costs associated with it, the personnel required to deliver it, and the support provided at a national and regional level.
2. Evaluation methodology

2.1 Overview

In order to inform and satisfy the objectives of the evaluation, the decision was initially made to undertake the evaluation in three phases:

1. Phase 1: Scoping and development phase, including:
   - Review of documentation/literature.
   - Consultation with key stakeholders.
   - Development of Success Indicators.
   - Development of evaluation methodology.

2. Phase 2: Design phase, including:
   - Finalisation of Success Indicators.
   - Finalisation of evaluation plan.

3. Phase 3: Evaluation phase, including:
   - Consultation with programme providers.
   - Examination and analysis of monitoring forms provided by participating schools to the providers.
   - Site visits and interviews with key stakeholders at case study schools.

The methodology that was developed for the Evaluation was the same for all three programmes evaluated.

2.2 Changes to the evaluation

The Scoping and Development phase (Phase 1) and the Design phase (Phase 2) were completed by September 2002, including the identification of the key Success Indicators for the programmes and the development of an appropriate evaluation plan. It must, however, be noted that although the Success Indicators were identified, this process did not including setting of targets to determine whether the programmes were sustainable, adaptable, transferable, and effective in a measurable way.

The Evaluation phase (Phase 3) was to include consultations with programme providers, the examination of monitoring forms provided by participating schools to the providers, and site visits and interviews with key stakeholders at case study sites (i.e. a sample of schools).
However, as a result of our evaluation planning, it became clear that the monitoring forms would be of limited use for analysis purposes (see also Section 2.6.1). As a result, the decision was made to conduct a survey (census) of all funded schools participating in the three programmes to collect the information that would otherwise have been made available by the monitoring reports, as well as some additional contextual information. This required the Ministry to make available additional funding for this hitherto unplanned evaluation activity.

All other planned evaluation activities were undertaken.

Phase 3 of the Evaluation commenced late in 2002 and was completed in May 2003.

2.3 Provider interviews

2.3.1 Key informants

Interviews were conducted with one or two key informants in each of the three provider organisations. In each case, this included the person who coordinated the programme on a national basis and who was the Ministry of Education’s contact within the organisation.

The purpose of the interviews with the providers was to gain additional background information about the programme and the provider organisation and to determine what (if any) data were available that could be used by the Research Team in their evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme.

2.3.2 Instrument design

An interview guide was developed to assist the Research Team to conduct these interviews. A copy of the interview guide for the Cool Schools key informants is attached in Appendix A. The interview guide included questions relating to the following:

- background and description of the provider organisation;
- what databases or written record relating to the delivery or outcomes of the programme are kept by the provider;
- the main goals of the programme;
- the process of establishing the programme in schools;
- whether the programme is modified to meet the needs of individual schools and, if so, how;
- schools’ expectations about what can be achieved through the programme;
- how well they believe the programme is actually delivered against agreed goals and objectives;
- what monitoring takes place;
- how the provider organisation is structured to support delivery of the programme.
2.4 Survey of schools

2.4.1 Purpose of the survey
The main purpose of the survey was to provide sufficient information to confidently report on each of the following areas (or outputs) of the evaluation:

- **Adaptability:**
  - the extent to which the school has needed to modify (and has modified) the programme to make it appropriate to their school;

- **Access/Reach:**
  - who in the school is accessing/using the programme;

- **Effectiveness:**
  - how “effectiveness” is being evaluated by the school;
  - whether monitoring is being undertaken;

- **Sustainability:**
  - the extent to which the school believes it can continue to run the programme, given current resourcing, circumstances, etc.

2.4.2 Questionnaire development
The questionnaires for each of the three programmes were developed in consultation with the Ministry of Education, following the output areas identified above. The large part of each questionnaire was identical across the three programmes, with variations in the questions related to who was accessing the programme and how it was being implemented.

A copy of the questionnaire for Cool Schools is included in Appendix A.

2.4.3 Defining the population base for the survey (census)
As the expected number of schools funded by each programme in any given year was about 25, it was decided that all schools receiving the funded programmes over a specified period would be surveyed – that is, a census of those schools would be conducted. In consultation with the Ministry, the Research Team then set about defining the population of schools for the census.

As the monitoring forms standardised by the Ministry of Education were first required in Term 3 of 2002, and it was originally envisaged that the survey and the analysis of the monitoring forms could be linked, it was agreed that all schools receiving a funded programme in Terms 3 and 4 of 2002 would be the population. The Research Team requested a list of schools meeting this definition from each of the three programme providers. Because of the different ways in which the three programmes are implemented, slightly different definitions were developed for each programme.
In the case of the Cool Schools programme, the definition was revised to account for the fact that the Cool Schools training (the part that is funded) is generally delivered one or two terms prior to implementation of the programme. Thus, all the schools receiving either initial or revisit training in Terms 1 or 2 of 2002 were included in the population, and schools that had received the training later in the year and had not yet implemented the programme were excluded.

As a result of the final definitions agreed upon, the defined population for the Cool Schools survey comprised N=24 schools.

2.4.4 Conduct of the survey (census)

The Ministry of Education sent all 24 schools an introductory letter (written by the Research Team and the Ministry) outlining the survey and case study components of the evaluation. The letter introduced BRC as the researchers and advised that the Research Team would contact them shortly to be involved in the survey and, in some cases, the case studies.

Questionnaires, along with a covering letter and reply-paid envelope, were sent to all 24 schools at the beginning of April 2003 (the second-to-last week of Term 2). Schools were asked to return their questionnaires “as soon as possible”. The following week, schools that had not yet responded were sent a reminder letter, and a further reminder was made by telephone at the beginning of May (the end of the first week of Term 3).

2.4.5 Respondents

By the cut-off date (9 May 2003), n=22 schools had responded to the Cool Schools survey. This is an excellent response rate (92%).

2.5 Case studies

2.5.1 Objectives of the case studies

The main purpose of the case studies was to explore, in greater depth than what could be expected from the survey and other evaluation activities, issues to do with the adaptability, transferability, effectiveness, and sustainability of the programmes.

Of key importance was the ability to do this from the perspective of a diverse range of stakeholders, including (where appropriate) school principals, teachers, programme coordinators, programme deliverers, and students themselves.

2.5.2 Instrument design

The interview guides for the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme were developed in consultation with the Ministry of Education, following the output areas identified above. Although the interview guides covered the same general areas of questioning as the survey questionnaires, the issues were covered in more depth and each stakeholder was probed their own perspective or for different information.
Because the themes were similar across the three programmes and with most stakeholders, a master interview guide was developed as a general guide, and, to support the Evaluation Team, more detailed guides were developed with specific probes for each stakeholder.

Copies of the master interview guide and the detailed guides for the Cool Schools programme are included in Appendix A.

2.5.3 Sampling

The schools involved in the case studies were selected from the population of schools identified for the survey; however, some further restrictions were made on which schools were eligible. In particular, for the purposes of the case studies, only low-decile (decile 1 to 3) schools were included, as these were of primary interest to the Ministry. The schools in the survey ranged from decile 1 to decile 8, with 71% of the schools being low decile. The other restriction made was that schools that had received only retraining for Cool Schools over the specified period were excluded.

These restrictions limited the population for the Cool Schools case studies to N=8 schools.

From this population, the Evaluation Team selected four schools, to obtain, as far as possible, a mix of school type (e.g. full primary vs. contributing primary), school size, proportion of Māori students in the school population, and location (including, where applicable, urban/rural area). Consideration was also given to the practicalities of conducting the case studies, with the result that the geographical coverage of the case studies across the three programmes evaluated was limited to four areas.

Thus, four schools were involved in the case studies for Cool Schools.

The case study interviews for Cool Schools were conducted in April 2003, just before the school holidays. A total of 67 informants were interviewed across the 4 schools. These informants comprised the following:

- 5 Principals/Deputy Principals,
- 4 School Coordinators,
- 13 teachers,
- 22 Peer Mediators, and
- 23 students.

2.5.4 Description of case study schools

The four schools involved in the case studies for Cool Schools had the following characteristics:

- three were contributing primary schools and the other was a full primary;
- one was small and the other three were medium-sized;
- their populations ranged from 27% to 98% Māori;
- three were in a main urban area and the other was rural;
- the schools all had a decile 1 rating.
In this report, the schools are referenced by an arbitrary assignment of letters of the alphabet, to protect their confidentiality. The schools involved in the case studies for Cool Schools are thus named School D, School E, School F, and School G.

### 2.6 Secondary information

#### 2.6.1 Monitoring forms

The original intention was to analyse the monitoring forms that the schools involved in each programme provided to the programme providers, to assess the extent to which the programmes were meeting their goals and were effective in producing positive outcomes for students.

However, after embarking on the collation and analysis of these forms, it became clear that it would not be possible to use the forms in this way. The first reason for this was issues surrounding the completeness of the forms – that is, the Evaluation Team could not be confident that we had complete sets of forms for all the schools involved in each programme. There were also issues with completion of the monitoring forms in the manner intended – that is, there was evidence that forms for the beginning and end of term had been filled out on the same day and that forms intended to be completed by different people at the school had been completed by one person.

After discussing these issues with the Ministry of Education, it was agreed that no further analysis of the monitoring forms would be undertaken and that we would ensure that the proposed survey of schools covered the areas originally intended to be covered by the monitoring forms.

#### 2.6.2 Relevant literature

Previous research literature has attributed a decrease in the numbers of incidents or conflicts and an increase in the incidence of positive behaviour in the playground to the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme (Barnes, 1994; O’Meara, 1996). Also reported as effects or outcomes of the programme are improved self-esteem or self-confidence among Peer Mediators, a reduction in bullying, and a reduction in the time teachers spend sorting out issues (Barnes, 1994; O’Meara, 1996; Moses, 1998). A possible increase in verbal aggression as physical aggression declines is indicated (Barnes, 1994; O’Meara, 1996; Moses, 1998).

The Radford Group (1996) found that schools with Cool Schools were less likely than those without it to agree that problems with conflict or violence were “non-existent” in their school. This was attributed to Cool Schools schools being more aware of these behaviours or issues. In support of this conclusion, they found that 98% of respondents familiar with Cool Schools thought the programme effective (82% “somewhat effective” and 16% “very effective”, estimated from graph on p12 of their report).

O’Meara (1996) found that new and/or part-time teachers, who had not attended the original Cool Schools training, had not acquired knowledge of the programme’s philosophy and skills, and he concluded that training was needed for these teachers.
3. Findings

3.1 Detailed description of programme

The description of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme given below comes from information gathered through the key informant interview with the programme provider, Ministry of Education documents, published literature, and Cool Schools materials.

3.1.1 Background

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme was conceived by Yvonne Duncan in the mid 1980s in response to issues at the school where she was teaching at the time. She had started to use mediation techniques in her classroom, based on material developed by the Peace Foundation. After using these techniques in the classroom to resolve conflicts for some time, some of her students suggested to her that they use the same approach to resolve fights in the playground over marbles.

It was from this suggestion that Yvonne developed the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme. Yvonne approached the Peace Foundation to support Cool Schools as an umbrella organisation – as she had long-standing links with the organisation and the techniques used originally came from Peace Foundation material – and she subsequently took up a role within the Peace Foundation as the National Coordinator for Cool Schools.

The Peace Foundation was established in 1975 and is involved in other activities that promote peace and peaceful relationships. It is a not-for-profit organisation, which relies on membership subscriptions and on donations from the public and benefactors to support its work.

3.1.2 Programme goals

The main goal of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is to give students the skills to mediate disputes and conflicts – to empower them to reach a resolution without physical or verbal violence. The programme also aims to reduce the stress on teachers by reducing the number of conflicts that they have to deal with – both inside and outside the classroom.

3.1.3 “Target” audience for Ministry of Education funding

The Ministry of Education’s intended “target” for the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme funded through the Innovations Pool were schools that were new to the programme, that did not also receive Kiwi Can or Tū Tangata (funded through the Pool), and that had “at-risk” students. The Ministry’s view was that schools with “at-risk” students were primarily low decile schools, although this expectation was not written into the contract with the programme provider.

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme does not target individual “at-risk” students, so the Ministry had no expectations around targeting individual students.
3.1.4 Components of the programme

The central component of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is Peer Mediators – students trained in mediation and conflict-resolution techniques who patrol the school playground at intervals and lunchtimes to mediate disputes between students as they arise. Peer Mediators are students at the most senior levels of the school, and they are trained in this role by the Cool Schools Coordinator (a nominated teacher), who also supervises them and manages the duty roster.

The role of the Peer Mediator is to objectively mediate between the disputing parties, to encourage them to listen to each other’s viewpoint, and to encourage them to reach a satisfactory resolution; it is not their role to pass judgement or to mete out punishments for misbehaviour. Serious disputes (such as those involving physical violence) are beyond the scope of the Peer Mediator role and are referred to the duty teacher.

The other key component of the programme is the delivery of the Cool Schools programme in all classes in the school, so that all students learn the skills of mediation. Such skills include listening to others and using “I” statements to express one’s feelings. Classroom implementation of the programme is preceded by an intensive training session for all the teaching staff at the school with the programme provider. Staff are provided with a manual containing topics and activities for delivering the programme in their classes.

Thus, Cool Schools is a whole-school programme.

3.1.5 Implementation

The Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is delivered in both primary and secondary schools. In most cases, the Peace Foundation is approached by schools wishing to be involved in the programme, rather than the other way around. The first step after contact has been made is to arrange a whole-staff training session with a Cool Schools trainer. This initial training session is generally five hours in length, and is usually undertaken in one day.

The Cool Schools Coordinator is then appointed from the teaching staff at the school, and it is their role to recruit and train a group of senior students in the school into the role of Peer Mediator and to coordinate the implementation of the programme in classrooms across the school.

Once the in-class training has been delivered and Peer Mediators have been trained, pairs of trained Peer Mediators are then rostered onto duty in the playground at intervals and lunchtimes, where they are available to other students to help resolve their disputes. In a large school, there may be two or three pairs of mediators on duty at any one time.

When helping other students to resolve their disputes, the Peer Mediators complete a form outlining the nature of the conflict and the agreed outcome. They generally carry clipboards containing these forms and reference materials and walk around the school grounds, making themselves available to students. They are easily identifiable to other students by their “uniform”, which is usually a brightly coloured bib, T-shirt, or cap. The Peer Mediators only assist those students who want to have their conflict resolved.
Schools may receive a shorter “revisit” training some months after the initial training, which is included in the programme package.

The Ministry of Education’s Innovations funding for Cool Schools is costed to cover the initial training session, the follow-up revisit, five training manuals, a training video, and a contribution towards the costs of a uniform for the Peer Mediators. This totals around $2,000 per school (on average). For the purposes of the evaluation, 24 schools formed the population base for the survey (as schools generally implement the programme one to two terms after receiving the training); however, over 30 schools had received training in Cool Schools Peer Mediation funded by the Ministry in 2002.

3.2 Accessibility/Reach

3.2.1 Schools involved in the programme

One of the central issues explored by the evaluation was whether the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme – and hence the funding that supported it – was reaching the schools and students the Ministry intended to target through the funding provided.

As noted in section 3.1.3 above, the primary target group for the Cool Schools programme was schools with students “at risk”. In the Ministry’s view at least, such students are more likely to attend low decile schools.

From the list of (N=24) schools supplied by the provider that constituted the population for the survey, 17 (71%) were low decile (decile 1 to 3) schools, including 10 that were decile 1. Of the remaining schools, six were middle decile schools (deciles 4 and 5 only) and one was a high decile school, which we understand joined a cluster of schools for the training (it being a very small rural school).

Also of interest in terms of the reach of the Cool Schools programme is whether the schools accessing the programme over the specified period were new to the programme. As noted earlier (section 3.1.5) funding provided through the Pool is intended to cover initial teacher training. Thus, we assume that schools that are new to the programme would have had their first (or only) full training in the programme in the period that the Ministry of Education has provided funding for the programme – that is since January 2001.

Of the (22) schools that responded to the survey, seven schools indicated that they had undertaken the initial training for the programme prior to January 2001 – one as early as 1991. Our experience with the case study schools – two of which are among these seven – suggests either that these schools had a full retraining in the programme in 2002 or that one or more teachers from the school attended a training session at another school (and the school was then counted by the provider as having received training funded by the Ministry in 2002).

In addition, one responding school indicated that staff at the school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the past three years, but that they had undertaken the “revisit” training. (This school is not included in any of the remaining survey data.)
Thus, responses to the survey revealed that eight of the 22 schools that responded were not new to the programme.

### 3.2.2 Teachers involved in the programme

Respondents to the survey were asked (a) how many teachers currently at the school had received either the initial or “revisit” training in the Cool Schools programme and (b) how many classroom teachers there were currently at the school in total. From the responses to these two questions, we have calculated the percentage of teachers currently at each school who have had training in the programme, and this is shown in Table 1.

As shown, the percentages ranged from 1% to 100%, with four schools indicating that all of their teachers were currently trained in the programme and eight indicating that 80% to 91% were trained. Conversely, five schools indicated that 35% or less of their current teachers had received (official) training in the programme.

Our experience with the case studies schools indicates that staff turnover is the primary reason for fewer than 100% of the current teaching staff having received training in the programme.

#### Table 1: Percentage of teachers who had had Cool Schools training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teachers who have had training</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

* This is a large secondary school.

### 3.2.3 Students involved in the programme

Only one of the schools responding to the survey indicated that students at the school had not been given training to be Peer Mediators (see Table 2). Respondents were then asked how many students were currently active in the role of Peer Mediator in the school. Including only the
responses of those (17) schools currently implementing the Cool Schools programme, as Table 3 shows, the number of Peer Mediators currently active at the school ranged from 0 to 118, with two schools indicating that no students were currently active in the role of Peer Mediator. The mean number of Peer Mediators active in each school was 26.

The school with 118 active Peer Mediators was one of the case study schools. In that school, all children in Years 5 and 6 were trained Peer Mediators, and each of these classes had a set period when they were responsible for Peer Mediation duty.

Table 2: Whether students had Peer Mediation training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

Table 3: Number of active Peer Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17, because of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.

Two of the case study schools raised the issue of involving ESOL students in the Cool Schools programme. It was acknowledged that having English as a second language created issues for students wanting to be Peer Mediators, due to the written and oral communication needed to conduct mediations; however, the schools did their best to support these students so that they were not excluded.

One boy just recently came from Samoa … [with limited English], but he desperately wanted to be a mediator, and [the coordinator] has managed that by pairing him with a
very, very capable girl. It has enhanced his self-esteem a lot, ’cause he’s a mediator. (Principal, School F)

So you have to deal with the ESOL issues – just as you do in anything. These ESOL children have to be supported in every way, and if they want to be a mediator, they have to be supported. (Principal, School F)

We have about 56 students who attract ESOL Funding, .... However, the programme still works with them too – it doesn’t exclude anybody. (Principal, School E)

Survey respondents were asked (a) how many classes in the school currently learn about conflict resolution in the classroom as part of the Cool Schools programme and (b) how many classes there were in the school in total. From the responses to these two questions, we have calculated the percentage of classes at each school who currently learn about conflict resolution in the classroom, and this is shown in Table 4. Only the (17) schools that were currently implementing the programme are included in the data.

As the table shows, of the 17 respondents that were implementing the programme at the time of the survey, over half (10) indicated that all (100%) of their classes learnt about conflict resolution as part of the Cool Schools programme. In an additional three schools, most (69% to 95%) classes learnt about conflict resolution. In one school, however, only 9% of their classes were taught conflict resolution skills in the classroom and, in another, no classes (0%) were taught these skills.

Table 4: Percentage of classes learning conflict resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of classes</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17, because of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.

Our experience with the case studies has indicated that the reason not all classes are taught conflict resolution skills is due to staff training and confidence in the programme, which in turn is related to staff turnover.

No, not [all teachers are using the programme in their classrooms] currently, because some of them haven’t been trained. ... Ones that have been well trained ... do [use the programme]. (Coordinator, School F)
3.3 Transferability and adaptability

3.3.1 Transferability

3.3.1.1 Establishing the programme in the school

When asked what it was about the Cool Schools programme that initially appealed to their school, 18 of the 21 survey respondents indicated that at least part of its appeal was that “the programme had a good reputation” (see Table 5). Other things about the programme that appealed were that it “would help address a major issue at the school” (15), that it “would fit easily into the curriculum” (14), and that the programme “was conceptually well-based” (13). The fact that the “programme was provided free of charge to the school” was also a factor for 11 of the respondents.

Table 5: What initially appealed about Cool Schools

Q3. What was it about the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme that initially appealed to your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The programme had a good reputation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme would help address a major issue at the school</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme would fit easily into the curriculum</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme was conceptually well-based</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme was free of charge to the school</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme came equipped with all necessary resources</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme would involve all stakeholders</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme was being provided by a respected organisation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme was reasonably priced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=21) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

In all of the case study schools, there were serious issues at the school that needed to be addressed. In at least two of these schools, there had been instances of extreme behavioural problems among the students, and all had general concerns about the numbers of less serious incidents. In two schools, the decision to get Cool Schools was made many years earlier; by contrast, another school had brought in the programme only two terms earlier, as part of the response to a damning Education Review Office (ERO) report.

[I wasn’t here at the time, but] I think they had a lot of problems with children's behaviour. ...I think it was a reasonably bad school. I think there were a lot of issues between children at that time. (Coordinator, School D)

At the time we applied for the Cool Schools we had a higher degree of behaviour in the playground that we didn’t consider appropriate. Bullying type behaviour, interfering in others’ games, and those sorts of things – infringing the rights of others was the main sort of behaviour. (Principal, School G)
The Board was sacked because of the Board’s absolute inability to manage the performance of the [previous] Principal. … One of the aspects that needed to be addressed was [that the school] had been cited as having a very unsafe environment with respect to student behaviour. As well as the whole curriculum, student behaviour was at the top of the list to address. (Principal, School F)

Our children come in with very little preschool experience, very often a lack of skills with English speaking, expressing their wants, expressing their needs, ... so that when they get into a conflict situation, the automatic thing to do is to be physical, because they haven’t got the verbal skills. (Deputy Principal, School D)

The impetus to introduce the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme to the school generally came from one person.

[The programme was brought in by a classroom teacher who] felt passionately about kids having the skills to solve their problems. (Deputy Principal, School D)

We found that there were a proportion of children that did not respond appropriately [with the Assertive Discipline programme]. A constant theme to our environment is what is the next step to affect more children. That is when one of our teachers read about Cool Schools and we went out and found it – it didn’t come and find us. (Principal, School E)

It was my idea. [Other staff were] Not really [involved in the decision to get the programme], because at that stage most of the staff were undergoing competency procedures and so ... we were telling them [not consulting them]. (Principal, School F)

Only a total of nine respondents to the survey indicated that the programme provider gave support to a “large” or “very large” extent to help establish the programme in the school (Table 6). However, an additional eight respondents had received help to “some extent” from the programme provider.

### Table 6: Support from provider to establish Cool Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. To what extent did the programme provider (the Cool Schools trainer or the Peace Foundation) provide support to help establish (or set up) the programme in the school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a limited extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

Those interviewed for the case studies were generally positive about the support received from the programme provider to establish the programme in the school. Staff at School D in particular appreciated the teacher training session and having the manual to refer to whenever they needed it. The Coordinator at this school found that the meetings with other Cool Schools
coordinators in the area were the most helpful support he received from the programme provider (these meetings are organised by the Peace Foundation once a year).

School F was especially positive, as the National Coordinator for Cool Schools had gone out of her way to help get the programme in place as quickly as possible.

_“I rang [the National Coordinator] and she was just marvellous – she was fully booked, but when I explained the situation, she realised it was a crisis and made herself available. So she came straight away, more or less.”_ (Principal, School F)

_“I did that training session and then we had ongoing feedback from [the National Coordinator] with email and with [the Principal] calling her for any support and accessing resources. She did training sessions with the kids, which was really awesome.”_ (Coordinator, School F)

School G, which never implemented the Cool Schools programme, indicated that they had not received much support from the programme provider, but they did not initiate contact regarding the problems they were having and they did not attribute their inability to implement the programme to lack of support from the provider.

_“We received support on the day of the training. I don’t think we’ve had much other than that … not that I know of. But to be honest it wasn’t a huge [period of time] before we decided we wouldn’t run it, therefore if any support had been offered at that stage, it was really too late.”_ (Principal, School G)

_“But I don’t think the things that went wrong were really resolvable [by support from the provider] – basically we didn’t have the kids to run the programme, so that’s it.”_ (Principal, School G)

In order to establish the Cool Schools programme in the school, 15 of the 21 survey respondents had to “assign existing staff to the programme”, 12 had to “purchase additional equipment”, and 12 had to “purchase additional materials” (Table 7). Respondents also commonly reported making “existing equipment available” (9) and allocating “a shared space in the school to the Cool Schools programme” (9).
Table 7: Resources school provided to establish Cool Schools

Q7. Which of the following resources has the school had to provide in order to establish (or set up) the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme in the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assign existing staff to the programme</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase additional equipment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase additional materials</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make existing equipment available</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a shared space in the school (e.g., the school hall) to the Cool Schools programme</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing materials</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a classroom or other space in the school to exclusive use by the Cool Schools programme</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay a (one-off) establishment fee to the programme provider</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ additional temporary staffing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=21) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

Reports from the case study informants indicated that schools did not have to contribute any significant resources to establishing the programme in the school.

*We had to get caps and boards and things like that. We have to give time for staff meetings. [The Coordinator] has given an enormous amount of time. We had to build it into our planning. [The training and manuals were funded by the Ministry of Education.] Very little, minimal outlay.* (Principal, School F)

*Had to buy the books [i.e., manuals], the Cool Schools teaching programme. [Other than this] not any more than you would have to do for any other programme – you develop your resources. [The training was] Ministry funded.* (Deputy Principal, School D)

*We send [the Peace Foundation] a donation – it is not a huge amount – just a thank you donation. [We get the posters] but we have to pay for those and everything else. There are booklets that go with the programme and we buy those.* (Coordinator, School E)

Before implementing the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme in the school, 13 of the 21 survey respondents “develop[ed] goals or targets for the school to achieve through the programme” (Table 8). Fewer respondents reported that they “amend[ed] aspects of the programme so that it was better suited to [their] school, [their] students, or the school environment” (6), “consult[ed] with the school community about adopting the programme” (5), or “agree[d] on a way of monitoring the programme” (5). A small number of respondents (3) reported that they had done “none of these” things.
Table 8: Action taken before Cool Schools implemented

Q5. Before implementing the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme in the school, did you (or someone else in the school) do any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop goals or targets for the school to achieve through the programme</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend aspects of the programme so that it was better suited to your school, your students, or the school environment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with the wider community about adopting the programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on a way of monitoring the programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=21) because of multiple response.
Note 2: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

In order to gauge how transferable the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is across schools, one area the Evaluation Team asked about in the case study interviews was how smoothly the programme was implemented in the school. One of the issues raised was the initial reaction of other children to the Peer Mediators when they first go out into the playground.

*The first year the older children were being a bit of a nuisance around the peer mediators but that doesn’t happen anymore.* (Coordinator, School E)

*Last year we had problems with the students ... [not] really understanding what they were meant to do with the mediators. Because they went from daily fights and bickering to having these people trying to solve their problems.... Of course, there were kids who were really disrespectful and harsh on the mediators – ... just coming up and pushing them and things.* (Coordinator, School F)

*We tried to combat that by having mediators go around the classrooms [and explaining their role] .... but I saw some of them were starting to be affected, like thinking, “this is a lot of work, I’ve put myself on the line”.* (Coordinator, School F)

Other issues raised included the variable commitment among staff, and the programme’s reliance of children agreeing to mediate.

*What is not going well would be the differentiation between staff, some staff being totally onboard and others ... [complaining because] the mediators didn’t turn up for duty.... rather than [saying], they are kids, they’re learning, of course there will be days when they don’t turn up. ... It’s just that different attitude and again I have noticed there is less understanding and tolerance from people who haven’t done training.* (Principal, School F)

*The teachers were really supportive in that way, the best way they could.* (Coordinator, School F)
Cools Schools relies on children agreeing to mediate and that is not always the case – [for example if] … something severe has already happened or there is anger involved. ... That is one of the limitations of the Cool Schools for us and that is where we have had to find other things beyond that. (Principal, School E)

On the positive side, what was going well for School F, which had only recently introduced the programme, was the training and support for the Peer Mediators.

[What is going really well is] The training for the kids that they get from [the National Coordinator] and the back-up and follow-up they get from [the School Coordinator]…. It is doing a lot for those kids in their leadership skills and they are growing in the ability to mediate. It is early days for us but they are growing very well through that and they are starting to have a positive impact in the playground. (Principal, School F)

3.3.1.2 Similar or related programmes

In order to help build up a picture of what schools were doing that might contribute to the effectiveness of the programme in the school, survey respondents were asked whether they had, in the past three years, run other programmes with similar or related goals or themes to Cool Schools. Of the 21 survey respondents, 18 said that they had done so (Table 9).

Most frequently, the other programmes concerned were “the school’s own programme” (12) and “Keeping Ourselves Safe” (11) (Table 10). However, “Health Promoting Schools” (8), “Eliminating Violence Managing Anger” (7), and “Kia Kaha” (7) had also commonly been run by the responding schools. The seven schools that had run “other” programmes gave diverse responses. These programmes had predominantly been run “at the same time as Cool Schools is/was running” (14) (Table 11).

Table 9: Whether similar programmes implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4. In the past three years, has the school run any other programmes with similar or related goals or themes to Cool Schools?</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.
Table 10: Similar programmes implemented
Q4a. If so, what similar or related programme(s) has the school run?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school’s own programme</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Ourselves Safe</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promoting Schools / Healthy Schools / Mentally Healthy Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating Violence Managing Anger</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia Kaha</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Adventure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=18) because of multiple response.
Note 2: The total number of respondents is 18 because 3 schools had not run any other similar programmes.

Table 11: When similar programmes run
Q4b. Have these other programmes been run in conjunction with Cool Schools or at a different time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When run</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Cool Schools was introduced</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the same time as Cool Schools is/was running</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Cool Schools was discontinued</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable – Cool Schools has not been implemented at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=18) because of multiple response.
Note 2: The total number of respondents is 18 because 3 schools had not run any other similar programmes.

In all three case study schools that were implementing the Cool Schools programme, the programme was inseparably linked with the school’s behaviour management policy or plan. In each of the schools, the behaviour management plan involved a series of steps for dealing with misbehaviour, and Peer Mediation was one of those steps.

In School F, a new behaviour management policy and Cool Schools were introduced at the same time and completely integrated.

[The National Coordinator] helped us to start it and it was just part and parcel of the whole introducing the behaviour management policy, so that the students were at least in class and we could start addressing classroom programmes. So it was part of the whole thing. (Principal, School F)

Yes [the behavioural management policy is integrated with Cool Schools]. It’s just like a code of conduct thing. So if you fall out a bit, you can go to the mediators. (Principal, School F)

School E, on the other hand, started with the Assertive Discipline programme, which formed the basis of their behaviour management plan, then introduced Cool Schools to address a need that
was not being filled by that approach. However, the Assertive Discipline approach was not abandoned – Cool Schools was integrated into what was already there.

The first thing we did wasAssertive Discipline (Lee Canter).... Children control their own behaviour and, if you have appropriate systems of rewards for good behaviour and consequences for poor behaviour, then in theory as the rewards increase the consequences will decrease. Each classroom and the playground operated on agreed boundaries and rules and the consequences were known beforehand. That theory has continued throughout the school. (Principal, School E)

The classroom plan follows the structure of Assertive Discipline but the steps include Cool Schools steps. [And] ... we have retained is what we call the severe step, so anything that is severe jumps everything. (Principal, School E)

This school did not limit itself to these two programmes, however; they used parts of at least three other programmes or approaches that they felt would contribute to improving behaviour in the school.

The notion of self-responsibility really comes in from the Quality Schools Programme. All teachers have been through that training too. (Principal, School E)

Another thing we have done is the non-violent crisis intervention. One of the things that we also recognise in children’s behaviour is the confrontational aspect. If an adult confronts children, sometimes the reaction is to confront back. (Principal, School E)

The Lions let me use an Anger Management type programme without doing their main programme. It specifically targets anger and it is very good. It is called “Working it Out”. (Coordinator, School E)

School D’s behaviour management policy was linked, not only to Cool Schools, but to the school being a Health Promoting School. However, the Deputy Principal saw Cool Schools as being the umbrella for all the behaviour management rather than the other way around. This school had also introduced a shortened lunch break to cut down on incidents at lunchtimes.

We’re a Health Promoting School, and part of what we did last year and the year before was to develop a Behaviour Management Plan that was consistent across the school, and the Peer Mediators fit into that. Another thing we did was that we found there was a lot of fighting at lunchtimes, so we shortened our lunchtime and finish earlier.... So we’ve had a multi-pronged approach and the Peer Mediators are part of that. .... I do [see Cool Schools as fitting into the school’s overall programme], but I also see it as a focus ... and the Cool Schools is an umbrella for it. (Deputy Principal, School D)

I think that Cool Schools is being reinforced with our Behaviour Policy – ... it quite often refers to Peer Mediators and the steps for behaviour, if the child does something wrong, the steps of what the teacher needs to go through. (Teacher, School D)

3.3.1.3 Implementing the Cool Schools programme

Respondents to the survey were asked when the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme had been first implemented in the school. One school had undertaken the training but had never implemented the programme. Of the 20 schools in which the programme had been implemented, five indicated that the programme had been implemented in the same term as the
school had had the initial training and five indicated that the programme had been implemented in the following term (Table 12).

The Cool Schools programme was, at the time of the survey, operating in 17 of the 21 schools (Table 13).

Table 12: Number of terms between Cool Schools training and implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same term and year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

Table 13: Whether Cool Schools still operating in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training in the previous three years.

In close to all of the 17 schools that were operating the programme at the time of the survey, respondents reported that “classroom teachers teach conflict resolution skills to their classes” (16), “Peer Mediators are on duty in the playground” (15), and “Peer Mediators mediate between students with conflicts” (14). These schools also commonly reported that “students resolve their own conflicts using skills they have learnt” (11). In only a third (6) of the schools did “Peer Mediators reward students who are behaving well”. (See Table 14.)
Table 14: How Cool Schools operates in schools

Q10. In which ways is the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme currently operating in the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers teach conflict resolution skills to their classes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediators are on duty in the playground</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediators mediate between students with conflicts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students resolve their own conflicts using skills they have learnt</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediators run mediation sessions in the classroom</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., beside the Cool Schools poster)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediators reward students who are behaving well</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=17) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.

In all three case study schools that were implementing Cool Schools, there were three main ways in which the programme was being implemented in the school. These were: the Peer Mediators operating in the playground, a Cool Schools unit being delivered by classroom teachers as part of the curriculum, and elements that tied into the school’s behaviour management policy or plan.

We’ve got our school-wide topic, … the Peer Mediators out in the playground, [and] we’ve got our Behaviour Management Programme, which is consistent across the school. (Deputy Principal, School D)

The school-wide topic was generally covered at the start of the year and included all students.

We decided that it should become our focus topic for the whole school at the beginning of each year, and we did that last year and this year. We’ve done things like bullying – we’ve always done things like that – but we decided Cool Schools would be our topic. (Deputy Principal, School D)

It was just going through that greenish manual, the Cool Schools booklet, which we all use when we teach health units and things like that around Cool Schools. (Teacher, School D)

Depending on the way things are going outside the school we choose which topic we are going to study for that term. It is all integrated and when you have done your block bit at the beginning of the year, it is up to each classroom teacher which bits you deal with in your classroom, which bits are needed in your class. (Teachers, School E)

In our classrooms … we did the whole Cool Schools unit for five weeks … [at] the beginning of Term 4 [last year]. For that whole five weeks it was just implementing all of those skills so that juniors knew… what it was all about and learning the simple mediation process … In the senior programme, all of the senior classes learnt the mediation process, the in-depth one. (Cool Schools Coordinator, School F)
Waitangi [Day] is at that time of the year, so that is how we look at [the Treaties Unit]. We began the year [this year] with Social Studies and what a Treaty was, the big Treaty [Treaty of Waitangi] and our School Treaty – our School Code of Behaviour being our School Treaty – and then they translated it into classroom treaties, which are signed. And part of that was revisiting the mediation. (Principal, School F)

Teachers’ use of the Cool Schools programme in their classrooms was tied in to the school’s behaviour management policy or plan. This included the “steps” that teachers used to manage behaviour in the classroom. If off-task or disruptive behaviour in the classroom involved a conflict between students, then mediation was one of the first steps that could be taken to manage that behaviour.

You are always reinforcing it with your ongoing problems – if two groups or kids in the classroom had issues, you are always enforcing that. Listening to one side, then listening to the other, problem-solving with them. (Teacher, School D)

It is a requirement [that teachers use the programme in their classrooms]. It is a requirement they don’t mind. We do have to manage difficult classes and a fair number of difficult children. There is a high roll turnover, and this is a very culturally mixed school and I want teachers to stay, to feel secure and feel supported, and I want children to feel the same way. (Coordinator, School E)

We know now there are procedures that we have to follow when conflict happens, and a policy has been developed on behaviour management. We are always being reminded now that we have the Management Policy. (Teachers, School F)

Other ways the case study schools were implementing the programme (aside from the adaptations of the programme, which are described in the following subsection on Adaptability) included links with the Duffy Books programme, where children exhibiting positive behaviour were entered into a weekly draw for a Duffy book, using the Cool Schools activities to bring the class back together, and running the programme for parents.

We started a Duffy Books System, so [if] the mediators … see people displaying positive behaviour in the playground or if they mediate with someone and they think that someone did a really good job at the process, they write down the name of the person [and put it in the box]. I take that box over to assembly and … the good mediator of the week … [will] draw out a name and they give that child a Duffy Book. So we’re always trying to put them in positive roles. (Cool Schools Coordinator, School F)

I use some of the games [i.e., activities from the Cool Schools manual] to bring the class back together – like if you have a really bad day, just playing some of the games just helps to bring back that happy feeling to the class, it brings the tone back. (Teacher, School D)

And [we had] the [Cool Schools] parents meeting, which was attended well [20 to 30 each session]. (Deputy Principal, School D)

3.3.1.4 Why the Cool Schools programme was not being implemented

Of the 21 survey respondents that had undertaken the Cool Schools training in the past three years, four indicated that the school was not currently implementing the programme (see Table 13 above). In one of these schools, the programme had never been implemented.
The reasons given for not currently implementing the programme were all different; however, two answered that there was currently no need for the programme – either because the main “problem” children had left the school or simply because the Peer Mediators “had nothing to do”. In another school, the programme was “in suspension until we train new mediators next term”. While the four schools that were currently not running the Cool Schools programme shared some school characteristics (e.g., school type, size, nature of the roll), in other ways they were quite different.

One of these schools – the one that had never implemented the programme – was one of the case study schools. This school’s inclusion in the case studies allowed an in-depth investigation of the factors that prevented that school from implementing the programme. In that school, the decision to discontinue the programme was made quite early on.

*The decision to disband it was discussed at a staff meeting, and I guess a lot of the weight of that came from the teacher [who was to be the coordinator for the programme], because she undertook to do the training with the children and the things that she talked about were weighed up and the decision was made to not go ahead. ... it, became pretty obvious that it wasn’t going to work.* (Principal, School G)

A number of reasons were given as to why the programme was never implemented in the school. The most obvious reason was simply not having enough students in Year 6, the most senior Year level in the school. The coordinator reported that the Peer Mediators were chosen on the basis of “numbers” of potential Year 6s, only about 10, plus a few Year 5s that they thought were mature enough.

*The main reason [for disbanding it] was that we didn’t have the students to undertake the programme.* (Principal, School G)

*Realistically, it might work if we had Year 7 and 8s, but with Year 6s, they still want to be out there playing. ... You couldn’t put the Year 4s out there, because the Year 6s wouldn’t listen to them – you need the older, more mature students – which we didn’t have. And [you need] the numbers – if you’re going to have two on every lunchtime, you need at least 10.* (Coordinator, School G)

*Therein lies the problem, because if you start eliminating them [on the basis of suitability], then you end up with three or four.* (Coordinator, School G)

In addition to having low numbers of children to start with, most of the students decided that they did not want to take on the Peer Mediator role. A small number (3 or 4) did still want to do it, but this would not have worked out, as it would have meant they were on duty every lunchtime. One reason for the students not wanting to take on the role was identified as their wanting to be involved in physical activities at lunchtimes. Similarly, the senior students also had other responsibilities at lunchtimes.

*It was their attitudes to the programme – it wasn’t necessarily a bad attitude; it’s just that they didn’t want to be really involved in it. ... they didn’t want those sorts of responsibilities, they’d rather do other things in their lunchtimes.* (Principal, School G)

*[The] children at this school like getting involved in physical things at lunchtimes – they didn’t think it was that cool to be getting involved in mediation and that sort of thing. [By physical things, I mean] sports and cultural activities. ... there’s quite often lunchtime
In addition, the nature of the students at the school was seen as a reason for their not wanting to be involved in the programme.

Another reason is that there’s a feeling among our children that they don’t really like to stand out as whatever – tall poppies, or disciplinarians, or mediators – they want to very much be part of the group. Being a mediator puts them into a different sort of a role..., and I think that it’s with the area – being 98% Māori and being very much a whānau area … that becomes much more apparent. (Principal, School G)

Also it’s the family connection … most of the children here are related and they’ll deal with things within their own family rather than take it to someone else, and they don’t want to be seen as grassing on anyone, because when they get home, they’re going to get it. (Coordinator, School G)

A final reason why the programme could not be implemented was the maturity of the students, which affected their ability to fully understand the role of a Peer Mediator.

I think the maturity of the children was an issue. At the time of the training they were all Year 5s (end of the year), and there was a lack of maturity and the sorts of qualities that were required to follow the programme through, or their responsibilities through. I think it has more to do with this particular school – ... that particular bunch of children. (Principal, School G)

They ... weren’t mature enough. As I understand it [the Peer Mediators] aren’t meant to be “God” – they’re meant to mediate – and a lot of them thought they were out there being teachers on duty. And no matter how much I told them that they weren’t, ... they just couldn’t get it. (Coordinator, School G)

My view of Peer Mediation is that they both must want to solve the issue – which is quite a higher level of thinking ... they have to come to the mediator, the mediator doesn’t come to them. (Coordinator, School G)

### 3.3.2 Adaptability

As reported above, six survey respondents indicated that they had amended aspects of the Cool Schools programme before implementing it in the schools. In reality, respondents’ comments related more to later modifications to the programme, rather than those made before implementation.

Of those who commented on the amendments they had made, four referred to changes to the training and rostering of Peer Mediators. For example:

This year a lot of the peer mediation training was done within the senior classes with the coordinator pulling it all together.

Number of mediators on duty – 3 pairs.

Two of the schools had changed the Peer Mediation sheet that Peer Mediators use to record their mediations.
Staff in each of the case study schools were often contradictory about whether or not they had adapted the Cool Schools programme to better meet the needs of their school. This seemed to be due to varying interpretations of what is an adaptation or modification of the programme’s standard model of delivery. The adaptations and modifications to the programme were all made as a result of the school’s experience with the programme and in response to changing needs within the school.

The three case study schools that were currently implementing the programme could be characterised as having made only minor changes (to such things as the Peer Mediator roster) (School D), having built on the programme to make it better suited to their particular students and their skills (School F), and having integrated the programme into their existing processes and then having adapted and built on that (School E).

Key staff at School D felt that they had not modified the programme, but that they had not needed to do so. Minor modifications had been made in the way the Peer Mediators were organised.

*I don’t think we’ve modified it – I think it does meet the needs of our school. I think there might have been changes with how many kids go on [Peer Mediation duty] etc, but I don’t think the programme has been modified at all. And when we teach it, we really do teach to the book.* (Deputy Principal, School D)

*Only last year, [I had the problem] with having too many kids out there. Also last year because I had so many – I probably had about 40 – I didn’t have them on fixed days either. … By the time I got to Term 3, I said “these kids are on these specific days”.* (Coordinator, School D)

In School F, the principal believed the programme has been able to fit the circumstances of the school. The school’s Cool Schools Coordinator had made some adjustments to the way the programme was delivered, to better meet the needs of the students and the circumstances of the school. These adjustments included changes to the Peer Mediator roster, the provision of additional support (in the form of prompts) for Peer Mediators, and the provision of ongoing training for Peer Mediators.

*Because there are only about 20 fully trained mediators and some of them were finding it really exhausting to be doing the whole day, I changed it to them working half days each, like the teachers do duty. So the first ones work up till 1pm and then they have a shift change.* (Coordinator, School F)

*I’ve adapted the programme in different ways, like with the [clip-] boards when they go out, I’ve written the whole process out; some of them just have poor short-term memory or [poor] memory full-stop. They know how to do it, but they need the prompts [to use] sometimes when they’re nervous, especially if it’s children their own age.* (Coordinator, School F)

*The training had to be ongoing, and taught in the class in Language and not just in topic, but… the kids really had to commit to weekly meetings. And it was basically because of the academic ability as well, so I could not do one whole session like in the book, and them know [and understand it] … – it had to be slowed down a lot.* (Coordinator, School F)
The Coordinator felt that it was easy to make these sorts of changes.

*It is a flexible programme, it is easily adapted.* (Coordinator, School F)

As described above in some detail (in the subsection Similar or related programmes, under Transferability), School E had integrated the Cool Schools programme into its behaviour management policy, along with aspects of other programmes and approaches.

The first of the many adaptations made by School E were in the way the programme was introduced to the school and the fact that it was not introduced as a stand-alone programme. The Principal explained the reason for this latter approach.

> We started the programme in reverse to what they recommend. ... We trained peer mediators and got them going in the playground and then introduced it into the classrooms. ... I thought that was the best way to develop some good peer role models and then bring that into the classrooms and that took a couple of years. (Coordinator, School E)

Rather than look for alternatives we look for what we can build on – in that it is going to add to the effectiveness. (Principal, School E)

> We have not necessarily taken the best elements from each programme – just the building blocks that fit in. (Principal, School E)

Over the seven or eight years that the Cool Schools programme had been operating in the school, many other adaptations and additions had been made. The main change with regard to the Peer Mediators was that all Year 5 and 6 students were trained as mediators and all experienced being in that role during the year.

> Each classroom has a turn at providing the playground mediators, but every Year 5 and 6 is a mediator or can mediate. (Principal, School E)

We like to make [being a Peer Mediator] non-optional if we can, [but] some don’t like it. One of the advantages is that if you know the mediation process from the mediator point of view then when you are being mediated you know exactly what is going to happen and you can relate to it, [because] you have got first hand experience. (Principal, School E)

Another adaptation is actually a Cool Schools innovation – the use of a Peace Table, where students (or student and teacher) can meet to mediate an issue or conflict, following the guidance of the Cool Schools poster. This was implemented in slightly different ways by teachers.

> We have a Peace Table or a Peace Mat [in the classroom] and the children are taught how to mediate, and then when there is a problem they come to the table to mediate it. ... I don’t have a set mediator I just ask if anyone would like to mediate and they go to the Peace Table and they follow a set procedure which is written up [in the Cool Schools poster]. (Teachers, School E)

The poster usually signifies the Peace Area. I’m into pink, so I have a Pink Peace Place, a Pink Peace Mat. I have a Peace Lilly – I encourage [the kids] to feel the leaves because they are so smooth and they will just sit there and feel the leaves. (Teachers, School E)
Also part of Cool Schools, but not specifically mentioned by other schools, were class meetings, which happened regularly in School E.

*It is in the Cool Schools Programme to have class meetings. I personally take mine once a fortnight and we have issues that might come from the children, like they might tell me that somebody has been hitting a lot. I might have issues that I want to raise. We write a list on the board and go through it. One of the students could be the chairperson for the meeting. I have a class leader and it is a proper election. In my junior class we do positives as well as negatives.* (Teachers, School E)

*Every teacher will establish rules through their class meetings. So the class meetings are an important forum to determine the environment that we agree is acceptable in our classroom.* (Principal, School E)

Another adaptation – that seemed to be unique to School E – was the use of a Teacher Mediator in the playground alongside the Peer Mediators.

*[We introduced the Teacher Mediator] About 5 years ago. We had to do something about the situations which the peer mediators are not able to deal with. ... The Teacher Mediator wears a bib and they are in a set area in the middle area of the school and they have clipboards and we record all of the mediations. ... You can choose to go [to the Teacher Mediator] yourself, or the mediators can take you.* (Coordinator, School E)

The Coordinator had also recently revised the forms that the Peer Mediators use and changed their role to redirection rather than mediation.

*We had Peer Mediators having trouble with the forms ... and it seemed to me that the problems that the Peer Mediators were dealing with did not require a huge piece of writing. So I changed [the forms] again last year, and there is a very small piece of paper and the Peer Mediators now redirect the play, so they listen quickly and then they say, “you go and get a moon hopper out of the shed” .... That is another indicator of progress.* (Coordinator, School E)

Staff at School E felt it was easy to make these changes/adaptations to the programme; however, the Principal did not see these as changes as such.

*We have been doing it for so long we are always looking at ways to improve it and it has been adapted even though we still call it The Cool Schools Programme.* (Teacher, School E)

*[It has] Absolutely [been possible to integrate Cool Schools into the school]. We haven’t changed it, because we still follow the chart to the letter.* (Principal, School E)

In School G, where the programme had never been fully implemented, neither the Principal nor the Coordinator had attempted to adapt the programme to make it more suitable for their school.

*I’m not sure that we really did try to modify it from what was given. I don’t think we realised that we perhaps could.* (Principal, School G)

*None, really. ... [We] could have [modified it], but then we would have had to change some of the principles, like that the children have to want to be mediated.* (Coordinator, School G)
3.4 Effectiveness

3.4.1 Goals and targets for the programme

As noted above, 13 of the 21 survey respondents indicated that, before implementing the Cool Schools programme in the school, they “develop[ed] goals or targets for the school to achieve through the programme”. Most commonly, these 13 schools developed “goals/ targets for general ‘social’ improvements in the school (e.g., students wanting to come to school, students getting on well)” (10) and “goals/ targets for improvements in students’ attitudes (e.g., greater willingness to learn/try new things, improvements in self-esteem)” (10) (Table 15).

Also, these schools had commonly developed “goals/targets for specific (and measurable) improvements in the behaviours of students (e.g., a reduction in student absences, a reduction in instances of bullying)” (7) and “goals/targets related to school staff, management, or policy, rather than to the students (e.g., changes to the way the school deals with truancy, changes in teachers’ attitudes)” (7). Only two schools had developed “goals/targets for improvements in general academic performance (e.g., improvement in rates of completion of homework, improved grades)” before the school implemented the programme.

Table 15: Goals and targets developed before implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/targets</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for general “social” improvements in the school (e.g., students wanting to come to school, students getting on well)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for improvements in students’ attitudes (e.g., greater willingness to learn/try new things, improvements in self-esteem)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for specific (and measurable) improvements in the behaviours of students (e.g., a reduction in student absences, a reduction in instances of bullying)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets related to school staff, management, or policy, rather than to the students (e.g., changes to the way the school deals with truancy, changes in teachers’ attitudes)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for improvements in general academic performance (e.g., improvement in rates of completion of homework, improved grades)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable – no goals or targets developed before implementing the programme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=13) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 13, as data includes only those who indicated (in Q5) that, before implementing the programme, they had developed goals or targets for the school to achieve through the programme.

At the time of the survey, a similar number of respondents (12) indicated that the school currently had specific goals or targets for the programme (Table 16). Note that only eight of the schools that currently had goals or targets had developed goals or targets before implementing the programme.
Slight variations were evident in the sorts of goals and targets that schools had currently as opposed to those developed before the programme was implemented.

Almost all of these 12 schools had “goals/targets for general ‘social’ improvements in the school” (11) and “goals/targets for improvements in students’ attitudes” (10) (Table 17). Two-thirds had “goals/targets for specific (and measurable) improvements in the behaviours of students” (8). Smaller numbers had “goals/targets for improvements in general academic performance” (4) and “goals/targets related to school staff, management, or policy, rather than to the students” (4).

Table 16: Whether schools have goals for Cool Schools

Q14. Does the school currently have any specific goals or targets for the programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.

Table 17: Current goals for Cool Schools

Q14a. If so, what kinds of goals or targets do you have now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/targets for general &quot;social&quot; improvements in the school (e.g., students wanting to come to school, students getting on well)</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for improvements in students’ attitudes (e.g., greater willingness to learn/try new things, improvements in self-esteem)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for specific (and measurable) improvements in the behaviours of students (e.g., a reduction in student absences, a reduction in instances of bullying)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets for improvements in general academic performance (e.g., improvement in rates of completion of homework, improved grades)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/targets related to school staff, management, or policy, rather than to the students (e.g., changes to the way the school deals with truancy, changes in teachers’ attitudes)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)                                                             **</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=12) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 12, as data includes only those who indicated (in Q14) that the school currently had specific goals or targets for the programme.

The schools involved in the case studies had quite general goals, rather than specific targets, for the Cool Schools programme to achieve in the school. These included making the school a safer environment, reducing violence, reducing other undesirable behaviours, and giving students options for their behaviour.
Our Behavioural Programme [of which Cool Schools is a part] has always had goals to lower the incidence of anti-social or unacceptable behaviours. (Principal, School E)

To reduce the violence. We cannot change the community out there – my aim right at the start was social change within the school. It is quite simple: when you come to school, this is the way we do things here. (Coordinator, School E)

[The goals or targets for the Cool Schools are tied] In with the whole great need – we had to make the school a safe environment. (Principal, School F)

The main objective was for the playground to be a safer and more enjoyable place for children to ... play in, and for the resolving of differences of opinion – to be done in better ways. (Principal, School G)

Probably the goals would just be ... to make every child aware of the options they have. So that if they do have a problem, OK, fighting is one option, ignoring it is another option, but the option that they really need to aim for is resolution. (Coordinator, School D)

In School F, however, the Coordinator’s goal was to get to the point where the Peer Mediators had nothing to do in the playground, because there were no conflicts.

We basically wanted to ... get to a point where mediators are really bored in the playground because they have no problems to solve – and sometimes we have days like that. I told them from the start, we want to get to the point where you guys don’t have a job anymore. Like when they’re out there for maintenance, but they’re not having to solve 5 or 6 problems every day. (Cool Schools Coordinator, School F)

3.4.2 Monitoring effectiveness

Of the 17 survey respondents in whose schools the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme was currently operating, 13 indicated that their school monitored the effectiveness of the programme (Table 18).

However, only one school monitored the effectiveness of the Cool Schools programme by “monitoring progress against goals/targets” and only five did so by “collating and analysing measurable data” (Table 19). The most commonly reported methods of monitoring the effectiveness of the programme were qualitative methods: “getting feedback from students” (12 out of the 13 schools that undertook monitoring), “getting feedback from teachers” (10), and “observing students in the playground/classroom” (10).

Table 18: Whether effectiveness is monitored

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15. Does the school monitor the effectiveness of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.
Table 19: How Cool Schools is monitored

Q15a. If so, how does the school monitor its effectiveness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback/Method</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting feedback from students</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing students in the playground/classroom</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting feedback from teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collating and analysing measurable data</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting feedback from the school community (including parents/whānau)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring progress against goals/targets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=13) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 13, as data includes only those who indicated (in Q15) that the school monitors the effectiveness of the programme.

In all three of the case study schools that were currently implementing the Cool Schools programme, there was some form of informal or qualitative monitoring of the programme. The number of Peer Mediator forms, the sorts of conflicts detailed on those forms, and general observation in the playground or classroom accounted for most of the monitoring of the programme. Such monitoring seemed, however, to be more focused on identifying issues regarding individual students and observing Peer Mediators’ progress than monitoring the effectiveness of the programme per se.

Probably the only [formal] monitoring would be through the number of sheets we would … get back. … The other monitoring is just for us listing individual children just to see who is doing what. But the main monitoring would be generally how things are going out in the playground. (Coordinator, School D)

And obviously … [when you’re] on duty in the playground, you see what the tone is and whether the Peer Mediators are working… and see how well it’s going. (Deputy Principal, School D)

[We are analysing the data] In a minor way. At the end of each term I count up the number of mediations and say what they are for and tell the staff and I give them a comparison with the term before. It tells us whether we have fewer violent outbreaks, whether it is swearing, teasing, etc. (Coordinator, School E)

[We monitor the programme] Informally. … it is pretty much talking to the staff. Occasionally I will go and talk to a class. Most days I go out [into the playground]. (Coordinator, School E)

No [we don’t monitor the effectiveness] – only from observation, in an anecdotal manner, but I think we should. (Principal, School F)

[The Principal] and I are the ones that discuss the ongoing progress of the mediators. How we do that is we look at all of the Agreement Forms and I identify ongoing problems with certain students and … I can talk to the teacher [about it]. (Coordinator, School F)
One school also undertook student assessment after the teaching block on Cool Schools.

*We have assessment criteria in our planning and we have a look to see how the kids have developed the skills that we’ve taught them ... after the teaching blocks.* (Deputy Principal, School D)

This school argued that anecdotal or informal monitoring was a better indicator of progress than this formal assessment and that analysing data on the numbers of incidents was of limited value.

*I think informal assessment – the anecdotal stuff – is your best assessment of how it’s going. Because fights don’t start to [a] plan ... and when they do occur it’s how the children deal with it that a teachers observes or the Peer Mediator reports – that sort of thing.* (Deputy Principal, School D)

*There’s not really a lot of point keeping any data on how many fights there are this year compared to last year. ... It’s very hard to look at – I mean, a lot of the instances that are out there that the Peer Mediators were dealing with are at a trivial level.* (Principal, School D)

School E had data on academic achievement, but the Principal was unsure how much of this could be attributed to Cool Schools.

*We have a sense of academic achievement – we have data on that – but whether we would say it is attributable to Cool Schools is conjecture probably. We would say [the programme] is one of the contributing factors.* (Principal, School E)

*Good teaching has changed the academic achievements, but the culture has contributed to the environment where you can teach and focus on teaching.* (Principal, School E)

To assist schools in monitoring the school’s progress in the Cool Schools programme over time, the Ministry of Education provided some feedback forms for schools to use. Survey respondents who were currently operating the Cool Schools programme were asked how useful they had found these feedback forms for monitoring the effectiveness of the programme.

A total of five respondents had either not seen the feedback forms or had seen them but had not used them, leaving 12 respondents. Of these, five respondents reported that these forms were “not very useful” and another two said they were “not useful at all” (Table 20). Although four respondents indicated that the forms were “of some use”, only one rated them as “useful” and none rated them as “very useful”.
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Table 20: Usefulness of Ministry of Education monitoring forms

Q15b. The Ministry of Education has provided some feedback forms for monitoring progress in the Cool Schools programme over time. How useful have you found these feedback forms for monitoring the effectiveness of the Cool Schools programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of some use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable – Haven’t seen these forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable – The school has never used these forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.

During the period of the evaluation, the programme provider suspended the regular formal monitoring of the effectiveness of the Cool Schools programme in schools funded via the Innovations Funding Pool. Schools funded via other sources were monitored by the Cool Schools provider using a separate but similar form to that used for the current evaluation.

3.4.3 Programme outcomes

The (17) survey respondents in whose school the Cool Schools programme was currently operating were asked how successful, overall, they would say the programme had been for their school. Most commonly, these respondents rated the programme as “successful” (7) or “partly successful” (5). An additional three respondents rated it as “very successful”. (See Table 21.) Thus, respondents were not overwhelmingly positive about the success of the Cool Schools programme in the school.

Worthy of note is that all three respondents who rated the programme as “very successful” had had it in the school for at least three years.

Table 21: Successfulness of Cool Schools

Q16. Overall, how successful would you say the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme has been for your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not successful at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.
These 17 respondents were then asked in what areas the programme has been most successful – including any unexpected areas. Most commonly, respondents felt that the most successful area was in the mediation of conflicts in the playground (or classroom) and/or a reduction in the number of playground conflicts (6). For example:

- Reducing playground incidents.
- Resolving conflict in the playground and in the classroom.
- Reduction in conflict in the playground.

The same number of respondents (6) commented on the skills (such as communication skills, life skills, and self-control) that students had gained from the programme. For example:

- Providing students with strategies for life.
- Encouraging students to take responsibility for their own behaviour.
- Children are using mediation language with their conflict situations.

Respondents also felt that the Peer Mediators in particular gained skills or self-esteem from being in that role (4):

- Mediators who used to be bullies are now more responsible (and some make excellent mediators).
- Lifting self-esteem of mediators.

Those (17) who were currently implementing the programme were also asked in what areas the programme has been least successful – including any unexpected areas. Of these, four respondents indicated that there were no areas that had been “least successful” and two did not answer the question.

These responses were quite diverse; however, four respondents commented on the attitude or motivation of students. For example:

- With the Year 7 and 8, these children are very difficult to bring on board. Peer pressure plays a great part.
- Hard to get children motivated to be lunchtime mediators. They start off well and then fade.

Also mentioned by two respondents was the tendency for mediators to get bored if there are no problems to resolve.

The three case study schools that were currently implementing the Cool Schools programme described some quite extreme situations in the school before the programme was introduced. In each case, the issues included problems with student behaviour – such as fighting, bullying, and students walking out of class.
If we go back to 1991, 1992 ... it was pretty tough, there were a lot of fights. ... I’m making it sound like a riot-zone, but it was pretty bad. Desk throwing was not unknown. ... And there were some kids, you couldn’t wait for them to leave. (Teacher, School D)

That terrible word “shame” was just like every second word. This is how the kids went up to receive an award at assembly ... [stooped over]. (Teacher, School D)

I thought it was a hell hole, there was bullying, fighting, daily fights with dozens of children standing around encouraging the fighting. Staff distressed, staff not wanting to go into the playground, ... because they were intimidated by the older kids – 10 year olds. (Coordinator, School E)

Prior to the whole restructuring of the school, we had a lot of really severe behavioural problems. Quite severe bullying and fighting on a daily basis. It was not only in the playground but in the classrooms. (Coordinator, School F)

When I [first] came here ..., kids were not staying in the classrooms, they would be climbing on the roofs during reading.... They’d run out and it was a mission keeping them in the classrooms. It was a real bad situation, which is why we have the Commissioner in here, instead of the Board of Trustees. (Coordinator, School F)

[There were] Heaps of fights. Quite a few people were in sick bay. People were hurt. Some people were asking for money and lunch. People being bullied. Problems not being solved. ... Some people when they started to fight, the other person tried to damage the school. They kick the walls when they get angry. (Peer Mediators, School F)

In two of the schools, issues with the staff and the lack of a consistent approach to behaviour management were also identified. Also noted was the problem of angry parents coming into the school to confront teachers or other people’s children about an issue.

The circumstances were that each teacher operated independently of the others so there is no school-wide consistent approach, and as a result there were constant outbreaks of incidents between children. (Principal, School E)

There was [staff] intimidation of each other. Staff were struggling to manage. There was intimidation from parents, parents abusing the staff, parents coming into the school thinking they can abuse other people’s children and feeling entitled to do that. (Coordinator, School E)

There wasn’t strong leadership in the school at all, and it was just reflected in every way, including behaviour in the classroom and behaviour in the playground. (Coordinator, School F)

The children’s behaviour was one of the worse problems that we had to deal with. There was no policy – nothing had been done consistently across the school to help solve the problems. ... They’d get into a lot of fights and sometimes parents were involved. (Teacher, School F)

Since introducing the Cool Schools programme into the school, all those interviewed in all of the schools had observed some changes in the school. The most commonly mentioned change was a reduction in the number of incidents in the playground, the number of detentions or
fighting notices, the number of mediations conducted, and the incidence of bullying. This, in turn, meant that there were fewer incidents for teachers to deal with.

The number of fighting notices that I send out [now is] very few, whereas it used to be a common thing. ... An example, just the other day, a boy who had problems last year and the beginning of this year with fighting, he got into a really difficult situation ... and he turned and walked away ... and for that kid that’s a huge step and it means he’s internalised [the message]. (Deputy Principal, School D)

Probably the number of incidents [has reduced] – just on the number of reports back [from the Peer Mediators]. (Coordinator, School D)

[Fewer] incidents in the playground. ... Sometimes you got two or three mediations in a lunchtime a few years ago, but now there is a different tone in the school. Out in the back field you watch so many groups of children playing [nicely]. (Teachers, School E)

We have made progress because the children are saying, we haven’t got enough people to mediate. (Coordinator, School E)

We very, very rarely see fights. We never see fights with half the school standing around it. These days other children do not encourage other children to fight. (Coordinator, School E)

The major thing is an overall drastic decrease in bullying in all forms. A great reduction in fights. We do have fights but there is a great reduction. (Cool Schools Coordinator, School F)

The mediators sort out minor disputes. It is really good – they make my job so much easier. I have been at schools where there [have] been no mediators. (Teacher, School F)

Mediators changed a lot of people. There is no more fighting and that because of the mediators. There are not many injured anymore. ... No more bullying and fighting and that. [Kids] feel safe now.... Teachers get less problems to solve. (Peer Mediators, School F)

In School F, there was a case of a boy who had been a bully, but had turned around completely as a result of being a Peer Mediator. This boy was one of the Peer Mediators interviewed, and he freely shared his story with the Researcher.

There have been some drastic changes that I can explain, but you won’t really understand the impact. Like [Name] – when I first met him in Term 3, he was taking lunches off kids, and he started the mediation process in his class.... [Name] did the mediation process and in it we talked about empowering them as mediators and ... really putting it as a role of leadership, and that is just something he responded really well to. ... And he’s really good in the playground. (Coordinator, School F)

When I was in Year 6, I used to bully ... little kids, so I became a mediator. I looked at myself, how I was a bully, and I stopped. (Peer Mediator, School F)

Another positive outcome noted by those interviewed was that students had developed skills in such areas as leadership and problem-solving.
Certainly, right throughout, kids have gained problem-solving skills to a lesser or greater degree. (Deputy Principal, School D)

I think it is working really well, because we have got very good peer mediators who have obviously had good training. ... You do see the difference, and even in those kids, once they have had the training as peer mediators you do see leadership skills in [them] that don’t just get displayed during their peer mediator time. (Teacher, School D)

It also minimises the involvement of the senior children in problems.... It gives them a responsibility and keeps them busy during playtime. It develops that leadership quality in the children. ... Leadership, confidence. (Teachers, School F)

Because we are trying to turn the school right around, we have worked a lot on school culture... at that time of that terrible ERO Report, the Year 7 and 8s were very violent and very difficult and out of control. So we have really put an expectation upon them that they are the leaders, we require their cooperation, it is expected, and they are role models. We use them in lots of ways and get them to take lots of responsibilities. (Principal, School F)

As a spin-off of the Cool Schools programme, two teachers observed a change in their own behaviour.

I find myself monitoring my own behaviour. I don’t growl as much as I used to. I used to love the authoritative approach, where I am the boss – “Do as you’re told!” – but now I realise that I can also use I statements. You know, “I feel proud of you when you all settle down and work to the best of your ability, I’d like you to keep it up”. And it’s better than going, “what are you doing, why aren’t you doing your work?” That has been one consequence – it is positive. (Teacher, School D)

As a pretty top-down teacher ... I thought, “oh God”, but I enjoy it now, it makes you happier. I was an old fashioned teacher, but I think I have changed a little bit because of it. (Teacher, School E)

Some possible flow-on effects to students’ academic work were also mooted.

By whatever means the problem is solved, then they can get on with their work, so there is always an academic flow-on. The better you manage, the more able you are to teach. (Principal, School E)

There have to be flow-on effects to their academic achievement. (Teacher, School E)

[How Cool Schools helps with school work] No disturbing other people when they are trying to work. ...Helps you get on with your work. No running around in class. You can use the Peace Table. (Students, School E)

I suppose they are getting more work done because they are doing less in-class fighting. They work way better than they ever used to together as groups. (Coordinator, School F)

In School F, where the Cool Schools programme had been in the school for only two terms, the teachers added the proviso that it was still “early days” for the programme in the school.

We’re still working on it. ... We have to keep up the momentum. ... Next term we have to keep reinforcing it and keep it going. (Teachers, School F)
Students and Peer Mediators at the three case study schools that were implementing the programme reported having learnt a lot of things from Cool Schools. What they had learnt generally related to mediation and to behaviour management. The more sophisticated responses from Peer Mediators in School F was probably related to their being older than the other students interviewed.

If you have a problem, you can talk to them [Peer Mediators or teachers] and tell them what happened. (Peer Mediators, School D)

You use kind words. Keep your hands and feet to yourself. Use I statements. Don't pull anyone's hair. No back-chatting teachers. Don't pick a fight. Don't swear. Don't join in on fights when others are fighting. ... If you are in a fight, try and sort it out. Walk away. Tell the teacher. (Students, School E)

Everybody can change from being bad to good. Fighting doesn’t solve your problems. There are other ways to solve problems. You can always solve your own problems. ... There is no right or wrong answer. (Peer Mediators, School F)

Across the three case study schools, those interviewed often felt that changes in the school could not necessarily be attributed to the Cool Schools programme entirely, but that it had certainly played a part.

Lots of other things have happened apart from Cool Schools ... since then [1991/92]. ... But it’s just a different place. (Teacher, School D)

That [change in children’s behaviour] also comes because the whole structure of the school has been changed but [Cool Schools] has helped. (Teacher, School F)

I think Cool Schools was the major instigator in the change in the playground [because] the children knew the mediation process – owning their behaviours and taking the consequences. (Teacher, School E)

It has stood the test of time. (Principal, School E)

Few negative effects of the Cool Schools programme were noted by those interviewed in the case study schools, and some informants said there had been none. There had been some occasions, however, when students chosen to be a Peer Mediator had thought their role was to be the boss rather than a mediator, which is not the intention. One teacher related this to the whānau character of the school.

One negative is that a certain child that was made peer mediator, with the thought of “maybe this will help him keep on the straight and narrow”, actually turned into Attila the Hun and I guess that is a risk we take. And he terrorised the [other children]. (Teacher, School D)

Some of the mediators are beginning to take their job a bit too seriously – they have gone a bit control-freaky, but I think that has calmed down now. They were like little Hitlers. (Teacher, School F)

---

2 The role of the mediator is described as having power with but not over others.
That also comes with the character of the school – the whānau system – the oldest are always going to boss the little kids around. (Teacher, School F)

In one school, an increase in verbal abuse was noted as the instance of physical abuse decreased.

What I discovered last year was there was an upsurge in verbal abuse and a down swing in physical abuse. Last year we had a lot of verbal abuse of child to child or child to teacher and we became aware of that and think about how we are going to deal with it. (Coordinator, School E)

The Principal in the same school noted that the programme does not work for all students.

It doesn’t work for everyone. There is a proportion of children who will not respond to it, ... [or] they will not follow what they agree [to]. That is why you need steps after mediation. (Principal, School E)

3.4.4 Factors contributing to and/or detracting from success

All (17) respondents whose school was running the programme at the time of the survey were asked what they thought had contributed to the positive outcomes or successes of the programme. Most commonly, these schools reported that the training provided or the content of the Cool Schools programme contributed to the positive outcomes or successes they experienced (5). For example:

The training.
Training peer mediators.

It is easy to succeed in resolving conflict using the programme. The teaching sequence is well thought out, [is] sequential, and has variety.

Other determinants of positive outcomes for the programme in the surveyed schools were the commitment/dedication and effectiveness of the school’s Cool Schools Coordinator (4), the leadership and support of teachers (3), and the mediators or students themselves (3).

The key teacher who organises it is highly effective.

Our coordinator who is dedicated and enthusiastic. Our senior students who embrace leadership opportunities.

The enthusiasm and commitment of the mediators. The leadership from the teachers at school.

Classroom teachers supporting the programme.

For case study informants, one of the key factors that contributed to the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme’s effectiveness or success was the fact that the whole school was involved in and supportive of the programme. These comments also referred to the importance of having support for the programme from school management (e.g., the principal).

I think it’s that everybody is included – everybody’s doing it. ... And also the community involvement. I think the commitment of teachers to the programme, and that implies the
support of senior management to the programme. And the responses of the kids – ... they see it as part of the school. (Deputy Principal, School D)

Yes, it’s going to have the greatest impact if it’s part of the school-wide focus, if it’s part of the character of the school – it’s taught every year – it becomes part of what kids know as [School D]; the [School D] Way. (Principal, School D)

I think the factors that have contributed to the success would be the total school involvement in it, which I think would be the major reason for success. (Coordinator, School D)

Everybody is on board. All the staff, Principal, AP, DP, kids, parents – it is the only way you can do it. If you are going to make school-wide change you have to have school-wide involvement, so you have to be able to convince the people that it is a good thing to do. (Coordinator, School E)

Another good thing about it is that it is consistent around the school – we all do it, and we back each other up. Consistency is a huge plus for the programme. (Teachers, School E)

The principal is continuously making positive reference to the mediators at assemblies ... giving the teachers and children positive feedback about the mediators [that] ... it is a worthwhile job that they are doing. It is just the [school] management support of the programme. (Coordinator, School F)

Having a Coordinator in the school who drives the programme was also seen by case study informants as a factor in its success.

Having a person drive it. I think that’s essential. (Teachers, School D)

With programmes like this there has to be someone who drives it, someone who is convinced and wants to go out and do it. (Coordinator, School E)

[The Coordinator is a] wonderful coordinator. Hugely enthusiastic, very encouraging of leadership skills – a very empowering teacher actually. ... She is outstanding. She would be the most influential thing in the whole programme. (Principal, School F)

The response of students was also noted.

The biggest thing which has really been making it work is the kids – the mediators themselves determining what is going to make it successful and, as a result of that, the other kids react to them in a positive way. (Coordinator, School F)

The kids themselves – the fact that they have been willing to think, okay, it’s cool, it’s the leadership role and I want it. (Principal, School F)

And the responses of the kids – they’re willing, they’re trying ... and they talk to the Peer Mediators – they see it as part of the school. (Deputy Principal, School D)

The programme training – particularly the training for staff – was another factor seen by case study informants to contribute to the programme’s success or effectiveness. Related factors were the underlying concepts of the programme itself and the support from the programme provider.
The staff training day – without that I don’t think it would have been as effective.
(Teacher, School D)

Without that training day, it [would be] really hard to get people excited …. It was also like a team-building exercise for us as a staff. (Teachers, School D)

The programme itself is very good and sound. (Coordinator, School E)

The mediation process. In the thinking that every issue has an amicable solution.
(Principal, School E)

[The National Coordinator] being so accessible, and the resources are really good.
(Coordinator, School F)

Another factor contributing to the programme’s effectiveness was its placement in the school’s behaviour management plan.

All the other programmes around it, the things [in the behaviour management plan] that happened before it, and then all the things that happen after the mediation process, which sometimes includes … [coming back] to the mediation process. (Principal, School E)

Also if kids … physically fight, … they know they are going to get a detention, [so] they are more considerate to avoid fighting [and can choose to] … have [their problem] resolved with the Peer Mediators. If there wasn't that zero tolerance to fighting, then the Peer Mediators would have a lot more [incidents of fighting to deal with]. (Coordinator, School D)

When asked what had detracted from any positive outcomes or successes of the programme, survey respondents most commonly believed that variability in the level of commitment to the programme by teachers (sometimes as a result of there being new staff), or in their expectations of the mediators, detracted from achieving further positive outcomes or successes (4 of the 17 schools currently implementing the programme). For example:

Need to rely on teachers taking a peer mediation unit in the class and doing it well.

The few new teachers who have had unrealistic expectations of mediators.

We must "indoctrinate" – bring on board – new staff. Relieving teachers not keeping to the process.

The same number of respondents (4) said that nothing detracted from positive outcomes or successes of the programme.

Case study informants confirmed the variability in teacher commitment. As in the survey of schools, lack of teacher commitment to the programme was linked to teachers being new to the school. Related to this was the constant need to repeat the training.

New teachers who do not believe in it – it takes a long time. There is a lot to learn too.
(Teachers, School E)

The only thing that is holding it back is the teachers, but at the same time it is completely understandable because being first term there are so many things to deal with. A lot of
the teachers are new this year and some of the teachers think they know all about it, but don’t know really how to support the mediators effectively. (Coordinator, School F)

**Staff turnover.** (Principal, School F)

It would be nice to only teach it once – it relies on a constant revisit and a constant re-teach. Once you have taught it once you cannot assume that it is going to carry on in its full state, so you have to go back to “this is what it is about” quite regularly. Without the revisit every teacher would probably re-adapt it in their own way and you would lose it. (Principal, School E)

The schools in the case studies – which were low decile schools, with high Māori, Pacific, and refugee populations – also noted that lack of parental support for the programme detracted from its effectiveness. One teacher commented, however, that the Cool Schools programme did not necessarily conflict with the Māori approach of solving problems within the family/whānau.

Because of the nature of the school, there is a real lack of parent involvement in anything. The long term goal is to get the parents involved, just to understand the process. I need to think of a good idea how to attract parents to give that extra support. (Coordinator, School F)

**Parents. [Lack of] Family support.** (Teachers, School E)

[Speaking] from a Maori point of view, once I got used to it eventually, it really helps and [doesn’t have to conflict with the whānau approach]. You can run the two together. (Teacher, School E)

Other detracting factors mentioned by case study informants were lack of momentum when the teacher driving the programme at the school leaves, curriculum constraints, and external events that ran contrary to the messages of the programme (the high-profile war in Iraq, which was happening at the time of the interviews).

I think when it doesn’t work, ... is when there is not one particular teacher who is driving it. ... [If] the person who picked it up just had too many jobs and just did it half-pie.... You’ve got to have that one teacher, not just pushing the kids, but keeping us [teachers] on track ... – you need that monitor. (Teacher, School D)

Curriculum constraints when you have to fit in all of this, and you know this is important but you’ve also got to do this and you’ve also got to do this. I find that frustrating. ... but that’s with everything, every single subject is like that. (Teacher, School D)

War [in Iraq] – you tell children to sort out their own problems and then they see people blowing each other up [in the news]. (Teacher, School D)
3.5 Sustainability

3.5.1 Intention to continue with the programme

Survey respondents in whose schools the Cool Schools programme was currently operating (17) were asked to what extent their initial expectations for the programme had been met. As Table 22 shows, the majority of respondents indicated their expectations had been met to a “large” (10) or “very large” (2) extent. An additional four respondents said their expectations had been met “to some extent”. This finding is fairly consistent with the proportion of schools rating the programme as a “success” for their school (i.e., positive, but weighted more towards “successful” than “very successful”).

| Q19. To what extent have your initial expectations for the programme been met? |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Number of respondents       |
| To very large extent        | 2               |
| To a large extent           | 10              |
| To some extent              | 4               |
| To a limited extent         | 1               |
| Not at all                  | 0               |
| Total (n)                   | 17              |

Note: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.

Respondents were more strongly positive in their intention to continue or re-establish the programme in the future. All (21) survey respondents whose schools had run the Cool Schools programme in the past three years were asked how likely is was that their school would continue to offer the programme or re-establish it at a later date. Two-thirds (14) of these respondents answered that they were “very likely” to continue or re-establish the programme and an additional five respondents said they were “likely” to continue or re-establish it (Table 23). Only two respondents indicated they were “unlikely” to re-establish the programme – in both these schools the programme was not currently operating.

Respondents who said the school was “likely” or “very likely” to continue or re-establish the programme were asked what it was about the programme that makes them wish to continue (see Table 24). The large majority of these 19 respondents answered that this was because of “positive feedback from students” (16), because of “positive feedback from staff” (15), and because “the programme has successfully met goals/targets” (14). These respondents also commonly wished to continue with the programme because of “positive feedback from other stakeholders” (11) and because “the programme is cost efficient” (11).
Table 23: Likelihood school will continue or re-establish Cool Schools

Q20. How likely is it that your school will continue to offer the programme or re-establish it at a later date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 21 because 1 school had not undertaken Cool Schools training.

Table 24: Reasons schools likely to continue Cool Schools

Q20b. If “likely” or “very likely”, what is it about the programme that makes you wish to continue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback from students</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback from staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme has successfully met goals/targets</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback from other stakeholders (e.g., parents/whānau)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme is cost efficient</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n) **</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=19) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 19 because 19 respondents indicated their school was “likely” or “very likely” to continue with or re-establish Cool Schools.

When asked why the school was unlikely to offer the programme in the future, these two respondents who said it was “unlikely” both indicated that there was a “lack of interest/commitment from students”, and one indicated that “the school has other priorities”.

Certainly, all the case study schools that were currently operating the Cool Schools programme indicated that they would continue it. Their reasons were that “it works”, that it is having a positive impact, and that the students respond well to it. The students also supported keeping the programme, and Peer Mediators generally wished to remain in the role.

[We intend to continue with the programme] Because it works. And because the skills, the strategies that children learn are important life skills. So we really are committed – it’s a really good introductory topic for each year. And it sets the standard – it says “this is what we expect you to be like” – this is what we do at School D, this is how we treat ourselves, this is how we treat others. (Deputy Principal, School D)

We’re all in favour of it. (Teachers, School D)

Yes. I would say it will continue because it has been there for some time now and, while things are happening around it, it has its core place. It works. (Principal, School E)
It is working – it is doing all the things that we need it to do to improve the climate of the school, make school a good place to come to, and to teach children to be responsible for their own behaviour. (Coordinator, School E)

I believe in the programme, it has been an excellent programme for many reasons and it is having a positive impact at this early stage so of course we will continue it. We would only discontinue a programme that wasn’t working. (Principal, School F)

The case study school that had not implemented the programme was not likely to implement it in the future. Firstly, this was because they had done other things in the school instead of Cool Schools and this had had some impact on behaviour. In addition, some children previously identified as “problems” had left the school. Thus, there was not currently the need for the programme in the school. Furthermore, the issues that had previously arisen with the size and nature of the school would still be there.

We don’t see the need [to implement the programme]. I think they [the issues previously experienced in the playground] have been resolved. We’ve got a staff that’s much more involved with the children, more activities going on… and we haven’t got the same sorts of problems that we had then. (Principal, School G)

And I think we’re always going to, to a degree – with the size of the school – have difficulty getting children that would be able to follow the programme through, or want to take the programme through. I mean, I wouldn’t want to have to force children to take this job, and that’s what would end up having to happen. (Principal, School G)

3.5.2 Resourcing and support

Support from the programme provider to implement the Cool Schools programme on an ongoing basis was less than the support provided to help establish the programme in the school. While over half of the 17 respondents in whose schools the programme was currently operating reported that support was provided “to some extent” (6) or “to a large extent” (4), two-fifths answered that support was provided only “to a limited extent” (5) or “not at all” (2). (See Table 25.) However, this finding reflects the nature of the Cool Schools programme, in that the Cool Schools trainer’s role is to provide training to staff at the school and to then pass the responsibility for implementation of the programme on to the school itself.

Table 25: Ongoing support from programme provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12. To what extent does the programme provider (the Cool Schools trainer or the Peace Foundation) give the school support to help implement the programme on an ongoing basis (that is, after the training has been completed and the programme has been established in the school)?</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a limited extent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.
Informants in the three case study schools that were currently implementing the Cool Schools programme were generally happy with the level of ongoing support from the programme provider – even if the level of support provided was virtually none. In fact, they had only positive comments to make about the providers.

[The programme providers have] always been readily available. If you want advice on something, they’re very good. ... I think they’re wonderful. (Deputy Principal, School D)

[The training] was wonderful. You can imagine that if you hadn’t had that one day’s training that you’d sort of be winging it. Because we’d had the training, we could go to the class and use it quite effectively. (Teacher, School D)

[Support from programme provider] None. ... I was unaware that there was a support role that [the programme provider] could play. (Principal, School E)

I would not have any problem [phoning the National Coordinator if I had any problems]. ... [She] is helpful when you ask for help; she is pleasant, she encourages you. (Coordinator, School E)

In order to implement the Cool Schools programme in the school on an ongoing basis, survey respondents currently implementing the programme (17) most commonly reported having to “assign existing staff to the programme” (12). Respondents also commonly reported having to “purchase additional materials” (9), “use existing materials” (8), “make existing equipment available” (8), and “purchase additional equipment” (8). Slightly fewer respondents reported having to “allocate a shared space in the school to the Cool Schools programme” (6). (See Table 26.)

Because the ongoing cost of implementing the Cool Schools programmes is minimal, informants in the case study schools had no issues regarding the resourcing of the programme.

Table 26: Ongoing resources school provides

Q13. Which of the following resources has the school had to provide in order to implement the Cool Schools programme in the school on an ongoing basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assign existing staff to the programme</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase additional materials</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make existing equipment available</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase additional equipment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing materials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a shared space in the school (e.g., the school hall) to</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cool Schools programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a classroom or other space in the school to exclusive use by</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Cool Schools programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay ongoing fees to the programme provider</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ additional staffing on an ongoing basis</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=17) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 17 because, of the 21 schools that implemented Cool Schools, 4 were no longer running the programme.
Generally, those interviewed expressed their support for the Cool Schools programme. However, the community support for the programme was variable, and in School F, which had only recently introduced the programme, buy-in from staff was not (yet) 100 percent.

I was really sceptical – I first saw it when I was in training, and I thought, how the heck do kids do that! But I just saw it here and came to understand it more, and it works really well. (Teacher, School D)

I thought it was brilliant. It just becomes part of your everyday teaching. (Teachers, School E)

I had been at another school and that was Cool Schools totally and that was great, so when I came here and saw they had it, that was good. (Teacher, School F)

[Buy-in from staff] Not a hundred percent. ... It is not a lack of commitment from the new people, it is not quite understanding. They think it is a duty like dishes. They don’t quite understand that the mediators need support, and it’s a big ask. It is a challenging role. They think it is like road patrol and it’s not; it’s far more challenging. (Principal, School F)

We want peace, harmony, and goodwill in the school but also I want good staff; I want good staff to stay and for them to see that we have got a way of dealing with things. ... and obviously staff feel comfortable with it, because we have a very low staff turnover. (Coordinator, School E)

One of the parents brought up a cultural issue ... how can it work because how do you expect children to solve their own problems because culturally the man or the older person, what they say goes? So [the National Coordinator] answered [that] ... the kids sort it out but they know there is always a teacher there who is supporting them ... [and] the Peer Mediator is not there to solve the problem ... – they’re there to help [the kids] find their own solution. (Teacher, School D)

I certainly did not encounter any obstacles from the community. (Coordinator, School E)

Yes [I like being a Peer Mediator]. It's good. It's fun to do. (Peer Mediators, School D)

The children like it. The parents just turn a blind eye – they don’t want to know about it. Not interested. Those that do know don’t particularly support it. The child lives in two worlds. (Teachers, School E)

It is a really good programme. I respect the values of where it is taking you, starting with the little concepts and going bigger. (Coordinator, School F)

### 3.6 Discussion

In general, the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme appears to be adaptable to the needs and circumstances of a range of schools. However, the ability of the programme to operate in the school relies on having sufficient willing and suitable (e.g., mature) students to take on the role of Peer Mediator, although adaptations can be made.
Schools see the programme as having a good reputation, and the programme is generally considered to be successful. The areas in which it is most effective are in the mediation of playground conflicts and/or a reduction in the number of conflicts, students gaining valuable skills, and Peer Mediators, in particular, gaining skills and self-esteem from the role. These findings are consistent with previous literature on the programme (Barnes, 1994; O’Meara, 1996; Moses, 1998). However, systematic and rigorous monitoring of the programme and its effectiveness was not common among the participating schools.

Factors contributing to the perceived success of the programme are most commonly the programme training and content, the commitment and effectiveness of the Coordinator, and the school-wide focus and support. Although not specifically mentioned by schools as a factor contributing to its success, our observations from the case studies suggest that integration of the programme into the school’s behaviour management policy/plan appears to be an effective strategy for implementing the programme. It may be that schools do this as a matter of course.

Respondents were generally positive in their ratings of the success of the Cool Schools programme and the extent to which their expectations had been met. However, they were much stronger in their assertion that they would continue running or re-establish the programme, with the vast majority (19 out of 21) indicating that they were likely or very likely to do so. This finding may be due to schools initially having unrealistic expectations for the programme (or having unrealistic expectations about how soon results might be seen) but still seeing its value, or it may be due to the nature and severity of the problems in schools at the time they adopted the programme, rather than anything to do with the programme itself.

Because of the low cost of implementing the programme, resourcing does not appear to affect the sustainability of the programme. The key factor in sustainability seems to be more related to the ongoing commitment of school staff, which in turn is related to staff turnover. One way commitment within the school can be retained is through ongoing training for both staff and students, so that new arrivals at the school can be fully trained in the programme, and some schools evidently do this. Annual revisits by the programme provider, perhaps to clusters of schools in an area, would help to ensure that all staff in the schools are trained.

Because of the contestable nature of the funding through the Innovations Funding Pool, the Ministry of Education is required to review the funding of programmes through the Innovations Fund. The programme appears to represent good value for money – the initial outlay is relatively small (compared to some other programmes funded by the Ministry of Education), and the programme may impact on the entire school for a number of years.

However, schools could be encouraged to systematically collect quantifiable data that would allow assessments to be made about the programme’s effectiveness. In particular, baseline data could be collected prior to introduction of the programme, and comparisons made with data collected after the programme had been in place for certain periods of time.
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Appendix A: Questionnaires and interview guides
An Evaluation of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme Questionnaire for the School Principal

INTRODUCTION

As outlined in the covering letter, BRC Marketing & Social Research is conducting an evaluation of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme on behalf of the Ministry of Education.

As part of this evaluation, we would like to obtain feedback from schools that have recently been involved with the Cool Schools programme. This includes schools that undertook the Cool Schools training but never implemented the programme, through to schools that have run the programme successfully for some time.

This questionnaire is addressed to you as the Principal of the school. However, if you feel that someone else in the school is better placed to answer some of the questions, please feel free to pass the questionnaire on to that person or complete the questionnaire in consultation with them. (Questions relating to the process of introducing the programme to the school should ideally be answered by someone involved in that process.)

Please note that all responses are confidential, and will be combined with responses from other schools when we report our results to the Ministry of Education. Individual responses will not be reported either to the Ministry or to the Cool Schools Programme provider (the Peace Foundation).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Most of the questions in the questionnaire can be answered by circling the number alongside the most appropriate response option(s). Some questions require only one response, while others allow multiple responses (if applicable) – each such question is clearly marked.

Other questions invite you to provide a written response, either a number or a comment or description.

If you have any queries about this questionnaire or the evaluation, please contact Kathleen Murrow or Anthony Fraser at BRC on 0800 500 168 (or 04 499 3088 if you are in Wellington). You can also contact Kathleen by email at kathleen.murrow@brc.co.nz or Anthony at anthony.fraser@brc.co.nz.

When you have completed your questionnaire, please return it in the Freepost envelope provided to:

Freepost Authority No 2088 Wn
BRC Marketing & Social Research
PO Box 10-617
Wellington

as soon as possible.

BRC ID No. ________________
BACKGROUND AND TRAINING IN THE COOL SCHOOLS PEER MEDIATION PROGRAMME

1. Have staff at your school undertaken training for the Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme, delivered by the Peace Foundation, in the past three years?

(Please circle one option.)

Yes.................................................................1
No.................................................................2

If your answer to question 1 is “No”, please stop here, and return the questionnaire in the Freepost envelope provided. Thank you for your time.

1a. When was the **initial** training for the Cool Schools programme undertaken?

Month ________ Year ________

1b. Has the school also had “revisit” training for the programme?

(Please circle one option.)

Yes.................................................................1
No.................................................................2

1c. How many classroom teachers currently at the school have received either the initial training or “revisit” training in the programme?

Number ________

1d. How many classroom teachers are there currently at the school in total?

Number ________

2. Have students at the school been given training to be Peer Mediators for the Cool Schools Programme?

(Please circle one option.)

Yes.................................................................1
No.................................................................2

2a. **In total**, how many students have been trained to be Peer Mediators?

Number ________

2b. How many students are **currently** active in the role of Peer Mediator in the school?
ESTABLISHING THE COOL SCHOOLS PEER MEDIATION PROGRAMME IN THE SCHOOL

3. What was it about the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme that initially appealed to your school?  
   (Please circle as many as apply.)
   The programme had a good reputation.........................................................1
   The programme was being provided by a respected organisation..................2
   The programme was conceptually well-based..........................................3
   The programme came equipped with all necessary resources....................4
   The programme was free of charge to the school..................................5
   The programme was reasonably priced..................................................6
   The programme would involve all stakeholders.....................................7
   The programme would help address a major issue at the school...............8
   The programme would fit easily into the curriculum.................................9
   Other (please specify) .................................................................10

   ____________________________________________________________

4. In the past three years, has the school run any other programmes with similar or related goals or themes to Cool Schools?  
   (Please circle one option.)
   Yes..................................................................................................1
   No..................................................................................................2

   If your answer to question 4 is "No", please go to question 5.

4a. If so, what similar or related programme(s) has the school run?  
   (Please circle as many as apply.)
   Health Promoting Schools / Healthy Schools / Mentally Healthy Schools........1
   Eliminating Violence Managing Anger....................................................2
   Keeping Ourselves Safe........................................................................3
   Kia Kaha..............................................................................................4
   Project Adventure..................................................................................5
   The school's own programme...............................................................6
   Other (please specify) .........................................................................7

   ____________________________________________________________

4b. Have these other programmes been run in conjunction with Cool Schools or at a different time?  
   (Please circle as many as apply.)
   Before Cool Schools was introduced .....................................................1
   At the same time as Cool Schools is/was running..................................2
   After Cool Schools was discontinued..................................................3
   Not applicable – Cool Schools has not been implemented at all............4
5. **Before** implementing the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme in the school, did you (or someone else in the school) do any of the following? (Please circle as many as apply.)

- Consult with the wider community about adopting the programme ........................................... 1
- Develop goals or targets for the school to achieve through the programme ........................................... 2
- Amend aspects of the programme so that it was better suited to your school, your students, or the school environment ........................................... 3
- Agree on a way of monitoring the programme ........................................................................... 4
- None of these ............................................................................................................................. 5

5a. If the school developed goals or targets for the programme **before** implementing the programme, what kinds of goals or targets were developed? (Please circle as many as apply.)

- Goals/targets for specific (and measurable) improvements in the **behaviours** of students (e.g., a reduction in student absences, a reduction in instances of bullying) ........................................................................................................... 1
- Goals/targets for general "social" improvements in the school (e.g., students wanting to come to school, students getting on well) ........................................... 2
- Goals/targets for improvements in general **academic** performance (e.g., improvement in rates of completion of homework, improved grades) ........................................................................... 3
- Goals/targets for improvements in students’ **attitudes** (e.g., greater willingness to learn/trv new things, improvements in self-esteem) ........................................... 4
- Goals/targets related to school staff, management, or policy, rather than to the students (e.g., changes to the way the school deals with truancy, changes in teachers’ attitudes) ............................................................................................. 5
- Other (please specify) ..................................................................................................................... 6

Not applicable—no goals or targets developed before implementing the programme ..................................................................................................................................................... 7

5b. If the programme was amended in any way in order to make it more appropriate for your school, what particular changes were made?

- Not amended ........................................... 1

6. To what extent did the programme provider (the Cool Schools trainer or the Peace Foundation) provide support to help establish (or set up) the programme in the school? (Please circle one option.)

- To very large extent ........................................... 1
- To a large extent ........................................... 2
- To some extent ........................................... 3
- To a limited extent ........................................... 4
- Not at all ........................................... 5
7. Which of the following resources has the school had to provide in order to establish (or set up) the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme in the school?

(Please circle as many as apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Circle Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make existing equipment available</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase additional equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing materials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase additional materials</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign existing staff to the programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ additional temporary staffing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a classroom or other space in the school to exclusive use by the Cool Schools programme</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a shared space in the school (e.g., the school hall) to the Cool Schools programme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay a (one-off) establishment fee to the programme provider</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of these.............................................................................. 11

**Implementing the Programme in the School**

8. When was the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme first implemented in the school?

Month _________ Year _________

Never implemented ................. 1

9. Is the programme currently operating in the school?

(Please circle one option.)

Yes ......................................................... 1

No ......................................................... 2

If your answer to question 9 is “Yes”, please go to question 10.

9a. If the programme is not currently operating in the school – or if it was never implemented – please explain in detail why not.

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

If the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme is not currently operating in the school, please go to question 20.
10. In which ways is the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme currently operating in the school?  
(Please circle as many as apply.)
- Peer Mediators are on duty in the playground ...................................... 1
- Peer Mediators run mediation sessions in the classroom (e.g., beside the Cool Schools poster) ................................................................. 2
- Peer Mediators mediate between students with conflicts ...................... 3
- Peer Mediators reward students who are behaving well ...................... 4
- Classroom teachers teach conflict resolution skills to their classes ........... 5
- Students resolve their own conflicts using skills they have learnt ............ 6
- Other (please specify) ............................................................................ 7

11. How many classes in the school currently learn about conflict resolution in the classroom as part of the Cool Schools programme?  
Number ________

11a. And how many classes are there in the school in total?  
Number ________

12. To what extent does the programme provider (the Cool Schools trainer or the Peace Foundation) give the school support to help implement the programme on an ongoing basis (that is, after the training has been completed and the programme has been established in the school)?  
(Please circle one option.)
- To very large extent ................................................................. 1
- To a large extent ................................................................. 2
- To some extent ................................................................. 3
- To a limited extent ............................................................. 4
- Not at all ................................................................................. 5
13. Which of the following resources has the school had to provide in order to implement the Cool Schools programme in the school on an ongoing basis?

(Please circle as many as apply.)

Make existing equipment available ......................................................... 1
Purchase additional equipment ............................................................. 2
Use existing materials ............................................................................. 3
Purchase additional materials ................................................................. 4
Assign existing staff to the programme ................................................... 5
Employ additional staffing on an ongoing basis ......................................... 6
Allocate a classroom or other space in the school to exclusive use by the Cool Schools programme ................................................................. 7
Allocate a shared space in the school (e.g., the school hall) to the Cool Schools programme ................................................................. 8
Pay ongoing fees to the programme provider ........................................... 9
Other (please specify) ............................................................................... 10

None of these .......................................................................................... 11

14. Does the school currently have any specific goals or targets for the programme?

(Please circle one option.)

Yes ........................................................................................................ 1
No ......................................................................................................... 2

If your answer to question 14 is "No", please go to question 15.

14a. If so, what kinds of goals or targets do you have now?

(Please circle as many as apply.)

Goals/targets for specific (and measurable) improvements in the behaviours of students (e.g., a reduction in student absences, a reduction in instances of bullying) ................................................. 1
Goals/targets for general "social" improvements in the school (e.g., students wanting to come to school, students getting on well) .......... 2
Goals/targets for improvements in general academic performance (e.g., improvement in rates of completion of homework, improved grades) ................................. 3
Goals/targets for improvements in students' attitudes (e.g., greater willingness to learn/try new things, improvements in self-esteem) .................. 4
Goals/targets related to school staff, management, or policy, rather than to the students (e.g., changes to the way the school deals with truancy, changes in teachers' attitudes) ................................................. 5
Other (please specify) ............................................................................... 6
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### The Effectiveness of the Programme for the School

15. **Does the school monitor the effectiveness of the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme?**

   *(Please circle one option.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer to question 15 is "No", please go to question 15b.

15a. **If so, how does the school monitor its effectiveness?**

   *(Please circle as many as apply.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring progress against goals/targets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing students in the playground/classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collating and analysing measurable data</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting feedback from teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting feedback from students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting feedback from the school community (including parents/whānau)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15b. **The Ministry of Education has provided some feedback forms for monitoring progress in the Cool Schools programme over time. How useful have you found these feedback forms for monitoring the effectiveness of the Cool Schools programme?**

   *(Please circle one option.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of some use</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful at all</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable – Haven’t seen these forms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable – The school has never used these forms</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **Overall, how successful would you say the Cool Schools Peer Mediation programme has been for your school?**

   *(Please circle one option.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly successful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very successful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not successful at all</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16a. In what areas has the programme been most successful – including any unexpected areas?

None ........................................ 1

16b. In what areas has the programme been least successful – including any unexpected areas?

None ........................................ 1

17. What do you think has contributed to any positive outcomes or successes of the programme?

Not applicable – no positive outcomes ..................... 1

18. What do you think has detracted from any positive outcomes or successes of the programme?

Nothing ...................................... 1

CONTINUING THE PROGRAMME IN THE SCHOOL

19. To what extent have your initial expectations for the programme been met?  
   (Please circle one option.)

   To very large extent ........................................ 1
   To a large extent ........................................... 2
   To some extent ............................................. 3
   To a limited extent ........................................ 4
   Not at all ................................................... 5
20. How likely is it that your school will continue to offer the programme or re-establish it at a later date?

(Please circle one option.)

Very likely .........................................................1
Likely .............................................................2
Unlikely ..........................................................3
Very unlikely .....................................................4
Not sure ...........................................................5

20a. If “unlikely” or “very unlikely”, why is the school unlikely to offer the programme in the future?

(Please circle as many as apply.)

Ongoing cost of the programme ....................................................1
Lack of staff time to devote to programme ...........................................2
Lack of interest/commitment from staff ..............................................3
Lack of interest/commitment from students .........................................4
The programme has not met goals/targets ..........................................5
The programme has met goals/targets and is no longer needed ...............6
The school has other priorities ..........................................................7
Other (please specify) ..................................................................8

20b. If “likely” or “very likely”, what is it about the programme that makes you wish to continue?

(Please circle as many as apply.)

The programme has successfully met goals/targets .............................1
Positive feedback from staff ............................................................2
Positive feedback from students .......................................................3
Positive feedback from other stakeholders (e.g., parents/whānau) ..........4
The programme is cost efficient .......................................................5
Other (please specify) .................................................................6

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROGRAMME

21. Do you have any other comments to make about the Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme or your school's involvement in it?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
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Areas Of Questioning

1. Who is accessing the programme?
   • Characteristics of the school.
   • Characteristics of the students.

2. What modifications did the school make to the programme to make it better suited to their school?
   • Was it possible to make modifications?
   • Were these modifications successful?

3. How easy it is to set up and implement the programme in the school?
   • What was the process involved?
   • Did it go smoothly for the school? What didn’t go smoothly?
   • What kind of support did the programme provider give the school?
   • What resources did/does the school need to commit in order to establish and maintain the programme?
   • How well do students respond to the programme?

4. Is the programme effective?
   • Does the school monitor the effectiveness of the programme?
   • If so, how? What criteria do they measure against? What do they do with the information they collect?
   • Does the school have clear goals/targets for the programme?
   • Has the school observed any (other) positive change that can be attributed to the programme?
   • What factors have contributed to the programme’s effectiveness?
   • What factors have detracted from the programme’s effectiveness?

5. Is the programme worth continuing?
   • Does the school intend to continue running the programme?
   • Why? / Why not?
   • What recommendations would they make to other schools considering introducing this programme?
   • [questions around this] Is the programme workable/sustainable in terms of its reliance on teachers, students, volunteers, modestly paid young people, etc (as appropriate to each programme) to deliver the programme in the school on an ongoing basis?
### Appendix B: Tables from survey of schools (not used elsewhere)

#### Table 27: Cool Schools training

**Q1. Have staff at your school undertaken training for the Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme, delivered by the Peace Foundation, in the past three years?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 28: Reasons schools unlikely to continue Cool Schools

**Q20a. If “unlikely” or “very unlikely”, why is the school unlikely to offer the programme in the future?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest/commitment from students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has other priorities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing cost of the programme</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff time to devote to programme</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest/commitment from staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme has not met goals/targets</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme has met goals/targets and is no longer needed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total (n) ** | **

Note 1: Total may exceed the number of respondents that answered this question (n=2) because of multiple response.

Note 2: The total number of respondents is 2 because 2 respondents indicated their school was “unlikely” or “very unlikely” to continue with or re-establish Cool Schools.