Educational psychologist involvement with critical incident response

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology in the Faculty of Humanities.

2021

Rebecca Aelish Dunne

School of Environment, Education and Development.
Table of Contents

Abstract ............................................................................................................................................. 6
Declaration ........................................................................................................................................ 8
Copyright statement ......................................................................................................................... 9
Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................................ 10
Thesis introduction ........................................................................................................................... 11
  Researcher’s professional background ......................................................................................... 11
  Rationale for engagement ............................................................................................................. 11
  Research commissioning process ............................................................................................... 12
  Researcher’s position ................................................................................................................... 12
  Strategy of the thesis .................................................................................................................... 14
  Ethical Issues ............................................................................................................................... 16
  References .................................................................................................................................... 16

Paper One: School psychologist practice in response to a critical incident: A systematic literature review ........................................................................................................................................... 19
Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... 20
Introduction ....................................................................................................................................... 21
  Definition of a critical incident ...................................................................................................... 21
  The impact of a CI upon the school community ......................................................................... 21
  Critical incident response ............................................................................................................ 22
  The Educational Psychologist’s role in CI response .................................................................. 23
  Rationale and aims of the current review .................................................................................... 24

Method of the review ..................................................................................................................... 25
  Literature search strategy and review process ........................................................................... 25
  Data classification ....................................................................................................................... 26
  Data extraction and synthesis ...................................................................................................... 27
Findings ............................................................................................................................................ 34
  Overview of findings .................................................................................................................... 34
  EP practice in response to critical incidents .............................................................................. 35
  Strategies/actions .......................................................................................................................... 35
  The application of psychological theory and models ................................................................. 36
  Psychological intervention ........................................................................................................... 37
  Collaboration in CI work ............................................................................................................ 38
  Evaluation of practice .................................................................................................................. 40
  Barriers to CI response .............................................................................................................. 41
The role of the EP/SP in CI response ................................................................. 41
Future needs around EP/SP practice in relation to critical incidents - training .......... 42
Discussion ............................................................................................................. 44
  Summary of findings .......................................................................................... 44
  Implications for understanding/theory ............................................................... 45
  Implications for professional practice .............................................................. 48
  Limitations ......................................................................................................... 49
  Link to future research ...................................................................................... 49
Disclosure statement ............................................................................................ 50
Funding .................................................................................................................. 50
References ............................................................................................................. 50
Paper Two: Working collaboratively to create a legacy: the development of The Critical Incident Resource ........................................................................................................ 54
Abstract .............................................................................................................. 55
Introduction .......................................................................................................... 56
  Critical Incidents ................................................................................................ 56
  How people respond to a critical incident .......................................................... 57
  The role of the educational psychologist in critical incidents ........................... 57
  Educational psychologists’ response to the Manchester Arena bombing ............. 58
  Cross-service collaboration ............................................................................... 58
  Online resources ............................................................................................... 59
  Aims of the current study ................................................................................. 59
Method of the present study .................................................................................. 60
  Epistemological position .................................................................................... 60
  Design .................................................................................................................. 60
  Participants ........................................................................................................... 66
  Data gathering .................................................................................................... 66
  Data analysis ....................................................................................................... 66
  Ethical considerations ........................................................................................ 67
Findings: The process of developing the critical incident resource – ‘tciresource’ .......... 67
Phase 1 ................................................................................................................... 68
Phase 2 ................................................................................................................... 68
Phase 3 ................................................................................................................... 69
Phase 4 ................................................................................................................... 69
Phase 5 ................................................................................................................... 70
Phase 6 ................................................................................................................... 72
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Phase</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of findings</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about project management</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for professional practice</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for EPs</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for school leaders</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for The Department for Education</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to future research</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure statement</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Three: The dissemination of evidence to professional practice</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based practice and educational psychology</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-based evidence</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective dissemination of research</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination in Action Research</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research implications of Paper One and Paper Two</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for practice at the research site</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for practice at the organisational level</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for practice at the professional level</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devising a strategy for dissemination and impact</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Pilot Study – Thematic map for Research Question 1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Pilot Study – Thematic map for Research Question 2</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Pilot Study – Thematic map for Research Question 3</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Psychology in the Schools – Instructions for authors</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E: Educational Psychology in Practice – Instructions for authors</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F: Example of Researcher Diary notes</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix G: Example coding of group evaluation transcript using NVivo</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix H: NVivo coding summary by Node</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Ethics Application .................................................................................................................. 139
Appendix J: Ethics low risk approval ........................................................................................................ 163
Appendix K: Participant Information Sheet .............................................................................................. 164
Appendix L: Participant consent form ....................................................................................................... 170
Appendix M: PowerPoint from Sessions 1 and 2 of the task and finish group ........................................... 172
Appendix N: PowerPoint from Session 3 of the task and finish group ....................................................... 183
Appendix O: Google Documents evaluation form ....................................................................................... 188
Appendix P: PowerPoint from session 4 of the task and finish group ....................................................... 189
Appendix Q: PowerPoint from Session 5 of the task and finish group ....................................................... 202
Appendix R: Content analysis categories .................................................................................................. 208

Final word count (excluding appendices): 26,816

List of tables

Table 1: Data extraction table ..................................................................................................................... 27
Table 2: RADIO Model and research phases ............................................................................................... 59
Table 3: Dissemination strategy ............................................................................................................... 92

List of figures

Figure 1: A model of CI response .............................................................................................................. 47
Abstract

Critical incidents (CIs) affect all areas of life including school communities with negative impacts upon children and young people being reported. Research indicates that CI response is a strand of educational psychologist (EP) work that many educational psychology services (EPSs) are now offering across the UK and USA (Posada, 2006). By their very nature, CIs are sudden and unexpected therefore, this thesis examines how EPs may be involved with CI response and the ways in which an online resource could assist with preparedness and immediate response.

A systematic literature review (SLR) of the different types of support which EPs offer to schools following a CI was undertaken. An empirical study explored the possibility of creating an online web-based resource for EPs and school leaders when responding to a CI in their school community. This involved the adoption of action research principles with a task and finish group of five qualified EPs from the North West of England.

Eleven papers were identified within the SLR, detailing ways in which EPs respond to CIs within school communities. Findings revealed some similarities amongst practice with some key differences, particularly around EPs’ decisions to engage in direct work and influencing factors including capacity, training and service delivery response. Empirical research led to the development of a web-based resource for EPs and senior leaders to use in the event of a CI. Project management factors were found to successfully facilitate this including conceptual, human and technical skills. Implications for theory are considered including the proposal of a Model of CI Response, explaining why some EPs engage in direct work and others do not. Implications for EPs, school leaders and the DfE are discussed, alongside possibilities for future research.

Paper three considers the role of evidence-based practice for EPs and effective dissemination methods. Implications for professional practice in the field are outlined including the benefits of collaborative working, the need for EPs to become more digitalised and perceived barriers and facilitators to EP project work. A plan for dissemination details how the research will be shared in order to raise awareness, understanding and lead to action.
Keywords: educational psychologist; school psychologist; critical incident response, project management.
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**Thesis introduction**

This thesis aimed to explore educational psychologist (EP) involvement with critical incident (CI) response and the ways in which existing CI training materials could be developed to further support school staff and pupils. This introduction will provide a brief overview of the researcher’s background and theoretical perspectives in relation to axiology, ontology and epistemology. The commissioning process will be explained alongside an overview of the structure of the research including a pilot study carried out by the researcher, a systematic literature review (SLR), an empirical study and a plan for dissemination.

**Researcher’s professional background**

Prior to commencing the doctoral EP training, the researcher was a primary school teacher for eight years, working across both Key Stage One and Key Stage Two. During this time she was also a Special Educational Needs and Disability Coordinator for three years. This enabled the researcher to view the utility of an online resource from the perspective of school staff with an awareness of the ways in which they could support pupils and staff at the individual and whole-school level. The researcher has been a trainee educational psychologist since 2018 and has delivered training around CI preparation and response to other teams within a placement Local Authority.

**Rationale for engagement**

Whilst conducting some shadowing work prior to applying for the doctoral course, the researcher spoke with a Principal EP (PEP) who had carried out extensive work and research within the field of CIs. The researcher was interested to hear about how an EP may assist with CI response. This was an area which the researcher had not envisaged in relation to EP work but one which seemed important. When the topic was presented within the research commissioning process, the researcher assigned the topic a high preference. This was due to two factors: first, the topic seemed intrinsically important and the researcher felt that this was something an EP should prioritise knowing about; second, it was also a gap in the researcher’s experience and an opportunity to build up skills and knowledge in the important field of CI response.
Research commissioning process

This piece of research was initially commissioned by the North West Association of Principal EPs (NWAPEP) through the University of Manchester doctoral training programme. After receiving funding from the Department for Education (DfE) to create the CI training materials, the NWAPEP wanted to evaluate and evidence the outcomes of their earlier reactive work. Conversations between the researcher, her supervisor and the PEP who managed the funding from the DfE, indicated that the NWAPEPs had considered the use of an online resource to further support schools with their CI response, building upon the funding from the DfE. The researcher and her supervisor then attended a NWAPEP meeting in which the proposal for the research was discussed and agreed upon. The NW PEPs agreed that the creation of an online resource would help to maintain the ‘legacy’ of the original CI training materials. Within this meeting, a conversation around areas of interest for the SLR took place. The NW PEPs hoped to gain more information about appropriate ways in which EPs support schools following a CI so that they could align it with their current practice as an Educational Psychology Service (EPS). The researcher and NWAPEP as the commissioners, both agreed that the literature review and empirical research would be of value and relevance, ensuring the commissioning process was part of the collaborative nature of the action research design.

Researcher’s position

Axiology concerns the values and beliefs that a researcher holds (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2018). There were several values which influenced the way in which this research was conducted. Firstly, the research had a strong collaborative ethos, from offering the SLR to the NWAPEPs and having a task and finish (T&F) group made up of different representatives from a range of NW EPSs. This links to the researcher’s view that collaboration will enhance how something is embedded and raise its utility within the region. For this reason, it was felt that the nature of the commissioned research helped to maintain collaboration and provide focus for the research, rather than constrain it in any way. The researcher is supportive of life-long learning and consistently engages with continuing professional development. This led to a willingness to learn new IT skills and build a resource, rather than someone else doing it on behalf of the group. This allowed the
group to maintain ownership over the creation of the resource. The researcher was passionate about the topic and necessity of the resource and was therefore open to leading the project in order to oversee its completion. This required doing what was best for the project e.g. asking the group to do extra work, and taking responsibility for coordinating all of the project elements.

Research is guided by a set of beliefs, otherwise known as a paradigm, and this acts as a framework that researchers use to guide their actions (Killam, 2013). Paradigms can be defined as ‘basic belief systems based on ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p.107). Ontological assumptions which are concerned with the nature of reality and of things are said to lead into epistemological assumptions which are concerned with ways of researching the nature of reality and of things, namely ways in which knowledge is constructed (Cohen et al., 2018). All research methods are able to be traced through methodology and epistemology, to a particular ontological viewpoint (Scotland, 2012).

This research adopted a critical realist paradigm. Critical realism can be defined as, ‘A theoretical approach that assumes an ultimate reality, but claims that the way reality is experienced and interpreted is shaped by culture, language and political interests’ (Braun & Clarke, 2013). A realist ontology views a world that exists irrespective of one’s own beliefs and constructions (Maxwell, 2012). This research recognised that there are commonly agreed concepts such as the impact that CIs may have upon school communities and Paper One aimed to uncover which concepts in relation to CI response, that the EP community draw upon when supporting staff and pupils. Paper Two acknowledged the fact that CIs occur and can impact upon the school community and that regardless of personal constructs, CI training materials were available to be developed into a resource to support schools post-CI. There are certain social constraints that must be worked within and the empirical research aimed to have regard to these and create an effective and useable resource.

A constructivist epistemology recognises that one’s knowledge of the world is a product of their own construction and that through this, it is not possible to achieve an objective account which is free from our own perspectives (Maxwell, 2012). This ties in with the research in Paper Two which comprised a group of EPs in order to form a T&F group to
create an online resource for CI support. This project recognised that past professional and personal experiences of the group would have some impact upon their involvement and perception of CIs, as well as the ways in which they feel that EPs should respond to such events. The SLR adopted a constructivist epistemology as it recognised that there wasn’t one set way for EPs to respond to a CI and aimed to explore how a range of services worked within the context of their own perspective and service delivery models.

The methodology adopted a qualitative approach which links to critical realist ideas that there are multiple versions of reality, even for one individual, and that they will be closely connected to the context in which they occur (Braun & Clarke, 2013). This fits well with the research from Paper Two which followed the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) Model (Timmins, Shepherd & Kelly, 2003) of research. An alliance between action research and critical realism is recognised (Dick, 2004) and critical realism is said to be congruent with action research methods due to its cyclical inquiry and the drive to advance social change (Houston, 2010).

**Strategy of the thesis**

A pilot study supported this thesis (Dunne, 2019) by exploring EP and school staff views around the training that they had either delivered or received after the Manchester Arena bombing and their thoughts around the utility of the resources in case of a future CI. This study consisted of a qualitative focus group methodology made up of three EPs and one deputy head teacher. Focus group methodology is useful to highlight ‘beliefs, attitude, experience and feelings through interactions’ (Gibs, 1997, as cited in Litosseliti, 2003, p.16). Inductive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2013) was used to analyse the data, revealing twelve themes which mapped onto one of three research questions (RQ), with further subthemes in some cases. Related to RQ1 (Which specific elements of the training materials have worked well in supporting teachers’ understanding of critical incidents and why?) were the themes Barriers; Benefits; Useful elements of the materials; Adaptation of the materials and Facilitators of the materials (See Appendix A). RQ2 (Which parts of the existing critical incident training would be useful as an online resource in case of future critical incidents?) identified themes around Purpose; Face to face Vs. Online; Useful elements for an online resource and a Website to demonstrate best practice (See Appendix B). Finally, RQ3 (How
would online resources for critical incidents best be accessed?) created themes of Requirements for online access; Maintenance of an online platform and Intended audience (See Appendix C). Within RQ2, the focus group spoke about the usefulness of a website to demonstrate good practice where examples and advice relating to CIs could be sought. The group suggested elements to be included e.g. frameworks for practice and information about staff well-being, including senior leaders. Findings from the pilot study were shared with the T&F group during the first meeting of the empirical thesis research.

The systemic literature review (SLR) was offered to the commissioning body as part of the research and it was decided that they wanted evidence of effective EP CI response. Paper One aimed to explore more broadly, the ways in which EPs respond to schools and pupils post CI and whether the available research concluded the efficacy of particular EP approaches. The SLR was aggregative in nature due to the aim of identifying and synthesising available evidence in order to provide an overview of current literature related to the practice and possible efficacy of EP CI response. It was decided that studies would be included from 2000 onwards in order to maximise the relevance of the information, within an area which has developed over time e.g. the debate around the use of debriefing techniques (Aucott & Soni, 2016; Barboza, 2005; Deahl, 2000; Wei, Szumilas & Kutcher, 2010).

Due to the commissioning process, participants for the T&F group were recruited from NW services through purposive sampling via the NWAPEPs and university contacts. The aim of the empirical research was to work collaboratively in order to create a ‘legacy’ for the original CI training materials which were developed by NW EPSs in response to the May 2017 Manchester Arena bombing. The original materials had been designed as a reactive measure to support schools in the aftermath of the Manchester Arena CI and it was hoped that this hard work would not be lost over time. By creating an online platform, the initial materials could be used in a preventative way when responding to CIs. This was explored through the following research question: How can an online resource for CI training materials be created through the process of action research with educational psychology services? Action research was favoured as the origin of the CI materials was collaborative across different NW EPSs and the research wanted to carry forward the cross-service collaboration. It was felt that a working T&F group would honour this. Hopkins (2002)
defines action research as combining ‘a substantive act with a research procedure; it is action disciplined by enquiry, a personal attempt at understanding while engaged in a process of improvement and reform’ (as cited in Costello, 2003, p.42). This resonated with the research which wanted to build upon and improve the original CI materials.

Paper three outlines key concepts such as evidence-based practice in relation to EPs and effective ways of disseminating research. The key implications from Paper One and Two are identified such as a Model of CI Response which provides NW PEPs with a framework to highlight some of the factors which influence service delivery to school staff and pupils in the event of a CI. Alongside this, implications for school staff and EPs being able to use the web-based resource for both preventative and reactive work are identified and considerations for The Department for Education around combining funding streams for future research. In order to reach key communities and bring about positive change (Forchuk & Meier, 2014) a plan for dissemination for the findings from Paper One and Two is outlined.

**Ethical Issues**

A number of ethical issues were considered throughout Papers One and Two. One issue was around the sensitive nature of the topic / resource and the possibility that some EPs within EPSs, as well as teachers accessing the materials, may have been directly or indirectly impacted by a CI. The T&F group spent time reflecting upon this and consequently, a health warning was included on the home page. This is also the rationale behind having resource monitors in each EPS who will ensure that schools only access the resource with support and guidance from their link EP. Another consideration was around the inclusion of some of the video vignettes i.e. the headteacher testimony. As one of the Manchester Arena bombing victims was named in the testimony, the researcher needed to obtain written informed consent from the parents before including the video on the site.
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Paper One: School psychologist practice in response to a critical incident: A systematic literature review
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Abstract

Critical incidents (CIs) are sudden and unexpected, impacting upon all areas of life, including school communities. Since the 1990s, CI response has become part of what many school psychology services across the UK and USA offer (Posada, 2006). This aggregative systematic literature review aims to explore available research evidence on what school psychologists offer generally to schools and pupils following a CI and on any reported efficacy of such services, in doctoral theses and peer-reviewed studies published between 2000 and 2015. Two research databases and Google Scholar were searched and a total of 77 papers were found, eleven of which met the inclusion criteria. Ten were evaluated as medium or high methodological quality. A synthesis of the research revealed a range of practice within three main areas: strategies and actions, models to frame response, and psychological intervention. Despite similarities, this review highlighted differences of approaches between services, particularly around engagement with direct work. A model of critical incident response, based on The Business Service Model (Checkland & Scholes, 1993) is proposed as a way of explaining why some school psychologists engage in direct work whilst others do not. Implications for school psychology practice and future research are considered.
Introduction

Definition of a critical incident

Within the literature, the terms critical incident (CI) and crisis events appear to be used in the same context, usually dependent upon the country of origin. Schulberg (1974) offers a broad definition of a CI as ‘acutely time-limited, involving a sense of helplessness and the perception of threat’. More recently, McCaffrey (2004) outlines a crisis as ‘a situation which is outside the range of normal human experience, which would be markedly distressing to anyone, such as the death of a colleague (or colleagues), a child (or children); or a traumatic incident which resulted in a near death experience for a member (or members) of staff and/or a child (or children)’ (p.110-111). CIs can happen within all areas of life including within a school community. Beeke (2011) conducted a review of policy and literature around CIs and concluded a definition of a CI, specifically in relation to school settings. This was defined as, ‘A sudden or unexpected event that has the potential to overwhelm the coping mechanisms of a whole school or members of the school community. A serious or significant event, it is likely to be outside the range of normal human experience and would be markedly distressing to anyone in or directly involved with the school community’ (Beeke, 2011, p.13).

The impact of a CI upon the school community

Research by Petkova, Martinez, Schlegelmilch & Redlener (2017) indicates that pupils of all schooling ages are at some degree of risk from one particular type of CI, a terrorist attack, whilst Little, Akin-Little and Gutierrez (2009) state that exposure to some form of traumatic events is not uncommon for children and adolescents. Jimerson, Brock and Pletcher (2005) suggest that crisis events of any kind are likely to affect children and families in school communities by providing challenges to be overcome. Alongside this, Brock (2000) also found that trauma and CIs can result in problems around cognition and social functioning within young people. Exposure to trauma for children and adolescents puts them at a high risk of developing Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and negative behavioural, emotional and cognitive well-being outcomes (Gillies, Maiocchi, Bhandari, Taylor, Gray & O’Brien, 2016,). Evans and Oehler-Stinnett (2006) refer to natural disasters which may occur
e.g. hurricanes and floods, and emphasise the effects of these including relocation, economic loss, physical and mental health needs.

When CIs occur, they can impact upon wider systems such as a school and its associated community. Research suggests that teachers should be aware and familiar with appropriate interventions as they may be the most available adult around when a child or young person experiences a crisis (Ray, 1985). Educational settings can play a pivotal role within CI response and recovery as ‘Schools represent continuity for children in times of crisis. When a traumatic event directly strikes a school, it is important that the school continues as a supportive and stable part of the student’s environment’ (Dyregrov, 1993, as cited in Houghton, 1996, p.61).

This supports views that alongside supporting pupils in the aftermath of a CI, schools should maintain normal routines so that a sense of normality and security can be conveyed to the children and young people as well as the staff (Parkinson, 1997). An additional consideration around a school’s capacity to recover from a CI is that staff may lack the confidence to respond to such unique situations and this may lead to external professionals, for instance an Educational Psychologist (EP), supporting the school community.

**Critical incident response**

There is a growing body of literature in relation to CIs which demonstrates a wide variety of both prevention and intervention methods utilised by different professionals, with time trends advocating more heavily for some models of support. Significantly, the use of Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD) has remained contentious. CISD was developed by Mitchell in 1983 and is a psycho-educational approach which explores cognitive and affective aspects of a particular experience across seven phases (Aucott & Soni, 2016). Barboza (2005) reviewed CISD and concluded that little was known about its efficacy as an intervention whilst Deahl (2000) claims that demonstrating the efficacy of debriefing is complex and the debate around its use is not likely to be resolved in the near future. Wei, Szumilas & Kutcher (2010) undertook a systematic review which aimed to provide evidence and effectiveness of interventions such as CISD, Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) and Psychological Debriefing (PD). The domain of debriefing evolved into what is known as PD in the 1970’s
and from this, a range of different models, including CISD, developed in order to support military, emergency and incident response workers (Raphael & Wilson, 2000). The term CISM was introduced in the 1990’s and references the “overarching umbrella program/system,” of post-traumatic interventions targeted to support in the aftermath of trauma and CISD is seen as a subcomponent of CISM (Wei, Szumilas & Kutcher, 2010). Wei, Szumilas & Kutcher (2010) concluded that they are ineffective and potentially harmful and note that due to the evidence of possible harm in adults alongside a dearth of evidence of such interventions in schools, there is limited justification for implementing CISD, CISM or PD after a crisis in school settings. Aucott and Soni (2016) outline that the mixed findings around the use of CISD could be attributed to methodological flaws and inappropriate application however, they found the theoretical underpinnings to be flawed and advocate for the use of Psychological First Aid (PFA) as an alternative. PFA is appropriate for developmental levels across the lifespan (The National Child Traumatic Stress Network, 2017) and is based on eight core actions including safety and comfort and connection with social support.

Literature details a wide range of preventive and preparedness strategies in America (Brown, 2020) with crisis prevention, preparedness and response for crisis events being a standard part of how schools operate (Woitaszewski, Savage & Zaslofsky, 2020). Hobfoll et al. (2007) outline five principles for supporting in the immediate and short-term period following a critical incident. This includes promoting a sense of safety, promoting calm, promoting a sense of self and collective efficacy, promoting connectedness and promoting hope.

The Educational Psychologist’s role in CI response

It has been suggested that CIs are an example of a time when applied psychologists e.g. Educational Psychologists/School Psychologists1 (EPs/SPs), should use their knowledge of psychology in creative and innovative ways (Cameron, 2006). In 2013, the UK Department for Education (DfE) released guidance around the responsibility of LAs, as well as other

1 In the USA and most other countries, the term School Psychologist is equivalent to the practitioner Educational Psychologist in the UK.
services, when responding to CIs although the specific role that the EP/SP would contribute wasn’t clear. Posada (2006) explains that since the 1990s, CI response has become a part of what many Educational Psychology Services (EPSs) across the UK and USA offer. Farrell et al. (2006) found that EPs/SPs play a role in CI response, leading on the development of planned response, alongside professionals such as social services, Local Authority (LA) personnel and emergency services.

Reyes and Elhai (2004) identify public and professional expectation that EPs/SPs engage in counselling work with schools following a CI. Indeed, Morris (2011) refers to crisis counselling as ‘a ubiquitous feature’ of CIs however, others suggest that this isn’t the case. Dyregrov (2008) feels that teachers, as the adults with the best understanding of the children and each individual school’s culture, should provide any direct work. This is echoed by Klingman and Ben-Eli (1981) who suggest this work is best suited to the adult most closely identified with the natural setting.

Hennessey (2016) explored the impact of CI response work upon the EP/SP and found some participants showing symptoms of vicarious trauma with CIs being an unwelcome intrusion into their personal lives. Ambiguity around the role and lack of clarification in relation to multi-agency work were factors which caused stress, whilst ideas around training, supervision and professional and organisation support were identified as ways to alleviate the negative impacts of CI work.

**Rationale and aims of the current review**

This research was commissioned by the North West Association of Principal EPs (NWAPEP). The researcher was exploring the future utility of the CI training materials which were developed by NW Educational Psychology Services (EPSs) in response to the Manchester Arena bombing in May 2017. Regular feedback between the researcher and NWAPEP led to conversations around the focus of this piece of work. It was expressed that there can be an expectation placed upon Educational Psychology Services (EPSs) to respond in a particular way when supporting schools following a CI, including by offering counselling. From this, it was deemed useful to explore what EPSs do offer and the ways in which EPs/SPs respond during a CI. Accordingly, this aggregative literature review aims to explore available research
evidence on what EPs/SPs offer generally to schools and pupils following a CI and on any reported efficacy of such services.

Method of the review

Literature search strategy and review process

Between September 2019 and February 2020, the following databases were searched for relevant studies: PsycINFO, Google Scholar and EThOS. The key search terms included critical incident, crisis, suicide, terroris*, sudden death, sudden accident, bereavement, serious accident, accident/accidents, murder/homicide, assault, violence/violent attack, trauma, attack, counseling/counselling, debriefing (psychological)/debriefing, critical incident stress debriefing, psychological first aid, school based intervention/intervention, school psychologist/school psychologists, school psychology, educational psychologist/educational psychologists and educational psychology. Reference harvesting was also conducted using relevant studies linked to the research question.

Initially, 326 papers were identified in total and 249 were excluded after removing duplications and screening the titles. This left 77 papers which were screened based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria whilst reading the abstracts. The criteria included:

1. Written in English;
2. Written after 2000;
3. Must be primary empirical research rather than discussion or review paper;
4. Must specifically mention EP practice in relation to their CI response;
5. Refers to what EPs do to support schools after a CI.

This led to a further 66 papers being excluded as they did not meet the above inclusion criteria.
Data classification

The final 11 papers were read and examined by the first researcher. The weight of evidence framework by Gough (2007) was utilised and each paper was assessed in relation to:

1. methodological quality (WoE A);
2. relevance of focus (WoE C).

All 11 papers were reviewed using a checklist of criteria to assess the quality of each study. The researcher read each paper at least twice and a sample of roughly half of the studies (five papers) were read and coded by both the researcher and the research supervisor. Discussions took place in order to ensure a consistent approach was taken towards applying the quality criteria. This process indicated high levels of both pre and post-discussion agreement, 79.56% and 99.2% respectively.

Qualitative papers were evaluated using the review framework for qualitative evaluation/investigative research from The University of Manchester (Woods, 2020), which has previously been used in published systematic reviews of evidence (Akbar & Woods, 2019; Tomlinson, Bond & Hebron 2020; Simpson and Atkinson, 2019; Tyrell and Woods, 2018; Woods, Bond, Humphrey, Symes, & Green, 2011). This included 12 criteria such as appropriateness of the research design, well executed data collection and analysis close to the data. The checklist carried a maximum of 14 marks with two criteria being worth two marks each. In relation to WoE A, papers scoring 0-4 were classified as low quality, 5-9 as medium and 10-14 as high.

Quantitative papers were evaluated using the review framework for quantitative investigation research from The University of Manchester (Woods, 2020) (Flitcroft & Woods, 2018; Simpson & Atkinson, 2019; Tomlinson, Bond, & Hebron, 2020; Tyrell & Woods, 2018). This checklist consisted of 16 criteria such as appropriate participant sampling, appropriate data gathering method used and appropriate statistical analyses, with each carrying up to one point and a maximum score of 16. For these papers, those that scored 0-5 were classified as low quality, 6-10 as medium and 11-16 as high. For the one paper with both quantitative and qualitative elements, the highest score was taken into account.
Relevance of focus (WoE C) was also considered in relation to each of the remaining 11 studies. Studies were classified as medium focus for those which detailed the EP/SP practice and high focus if they also outlined the efficacy of such practice.

Data extraction and synthesis

Ten of the papers were found to be of medium or high quality with one scoring low for methodological quality. This study was still included due to a medium rating for relevance of focus but its lower methodological quality was taken into account during the synthesis of information. Each paper was read twice by the researcher with key information being extracted and presented in Table 1. The researcher also created summaries for each paper and used them to inform an aggregative synthesis of the information in each of the 11 studies (Gough, Oliver & James, 2017).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/ location</th>
<th>Study method/ design</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Research aims</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
<th>Implications for EP/ SP practice</th>
<th>WoE A</th>
<th>WoE C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamson and Peacock (2007) USA</td>
<td>Survey/ Quantitative</td>
<td>228 school psychologists (SPs)</td>
<td>To identify and detail the presence of school crisis intervention plans/teams</td>
<td>93% of SPs had dealt with crises; psychological debriefing was frequently used. 44.3% met with parents/community members; 98.2% had crisis intervention training</td>
<td>Strengthen crisis teams by periodic evaluations and parent/community representation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeke (2011) UK</td>
<td>Survey and semi-structured interviews/ Mixed methods</td>
<td>50 Educational psychologists (EPs) and 39 principal educational</td>
<td>To explore various aspects of EP practice in relation to CIs</td>
<td>Large proportion of PEPs see CI response as an appropriate task for EPs; majority of EPSs have a CI policy; wide variety of models/theories underpin EP response</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors and Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Study Purpose</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Impact of EPS relationship with LA on CI policy and practice; therapeutic work in the EP role e.g. trauma-focused CBT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees and Seaton (2011) UK</td>
<td>International Survey/Quantitative</td>
<td>277 EPs from around the world</td>
<td>To explore EPs/SPs crisis responses (collaboration, training, confidence)</td>
<td>70% received CI training post qualification; 83% employ collaboration. International differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International collaboration in order to develop an integrated model of practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwyer, Osher, Maughan, Tuck and Patrick (2015) USA</td>
<td>Vignettes/Qualitative</td>
<td>1 SP, 1 director of health services, 1 psychologist/administrator, 2 school nurses</td>
<td>To highlight “best practices” in crisis response by SPs and nurses</td>
<td>Three important factors for crisis response: formulating a crisis response plan through collaboration, training for all and drills conducted beforehand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPs and nurses working together as a collaborative, interprofessional approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medium Medium Low Medium
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Study Goals</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morrison (2007) USA</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews/Qualitative</td>
<td>18 SPs and 10 school social workers (SWs)</td>
<td>To explore the validity of the critical incident stress management (CISM) model for school-based crisis intervention</td>
<td>CISM procedures judged acceptable by SPs/SWs. CISM provides structured framework/approach, common language. Weakness in addressing needs of students from culturally diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>SPs to consider if selected intervention model and it’s professional development suits individual school contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickerson &amp; Zhe (2004) USA</td>
<td>Survey/Quantitative</td>
<td>197 SPs</td>
<td>To build upon previous surveys of SP experiences of school crisis preparedness, prevention and intervention</td>
<td>‘Crisis response teams’ including administrators and school counsellors was the most utilised and effective strategy. 93% gave referral information; 90% gave information about crises. Majority referred pupils and families to other services, provided individual counselling, used psychological first aid and debriefed students</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Research Objective</td>
<td>Findings / Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockhart (2012) UK</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews/Qualitative</td>
<td>EPs from seven LAs</td>
<td>To explore LA practice and propose a model of sustainable Critical Incident Response Teams</td>
<td>Range of support, initial phone calls and problem solving. Commonality protocols across context, people and process. Need to communicate CIRT role and develop strong working relationships with management/media to address confusion about counselling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver (2014) UK</td>
<td>Group interviews/Qualitative</td>
<td>5 EPs, 4 counsellors and 12 school staff</td>
<td>To explore responses to a CI involving suicides/suicide attempts; To identify exchanges between the school and external agencies; To improve multi-</td>
<td>Central categories of managing change, pivotal EP role, empowering others and collaboration. Schools best placed to support pupils; If ongoing worries, EPs carry out direct work. Publish guidance to schools outlining EPS role in CI response. Training needed on doctorate programmes and for practising EPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High | Medium |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bischof (2006) USA</td>
<td>Survey/Quantitative</td>
<td>272 SPs</td>
<td>To explore the SPs role in crisis intervention</td>
<td>Majority had some training in crisis intervention; ¾ were crisis team members. Barriers included time constraints and school personnel carrying out the crisis intervener role. SPs want additional time and specialised training, including at university level. SPs not consistently seen as mental health professionals. Broaden role with prevention and preparedness and learn from colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindley (2015) UK</td>
<td>Documentary analysis and semi-structured interviews/Qualitative</td>
<td>34 LA guidelines/8 EPs</td>
<td>To explore EP practice in the production and use of CI guidelines</td>
<td>Multi-agency teams provide additional skills and increase capacity. EPs conduct direct work with pupils to aid emotional processing; structured debriefing is uncommon. Counselling expectations should be challenged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPs knowledge and skills pivotal in supporting schools. LAs need multi-agency CIRTs in place with a central EP role providing training, consultation and psychological advice

| Seadler (2000) USA | Survey/Quantitative | 344 SPs | To explore SP involvement in Death-Related Crisis Intervention, Grief Counselling, Grief Consultation, and Death Education | 62% provided Death-Related Crisis Intervention, 50% Grief Consultation, 44% Grief Counselling, and 13% Death Education. Discussion was a popular activity within interventions Share coping strategies with pupils, teachers, parents, administrators and community. Raise awareness of developmental, cognitive, emotional and physical impact of grief and death | High | Medium |
Findings

Overview of findings

The final 11 studies were all investigations, with a variety of designs including the use of surveys, semi-structured individual interviews, group interviews, and case studies. Five studies used qualitative approaches, five used quantitative, and one utilised mixed-methods. Six of the studies originate from the USA and five from the UK; all were published or written between 2000 and 2015.

Some studies included participant groups beyond EPs/SPs. Seven studies utilised EPs as the sole participant group (Adamson & Peacock, 2007; Bischof, 2006; Hindley, 2015; Lockhart, 2012; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004; Rees & Seaton, 2011; Seadler, 2000). One paper reflected on the practice of both EP/SPs and Principal EPs (PEPs)/Chief SPs (Beeke, 2011), whilst another drew upon EPs/SPs and school social workers (Morrison, 2007). One study incorporated the views of an EP/SP, director of health services, psychologist and administrator and two school nurses (Dwyer, Osher, Maughan, Tuck & Patrick, 2015) and one employed a mixture of EPs/SPs, counsellors and school staff (Silver, 2014).

Four of the papers aimed to explore the EP/SP role within CI interventions, exploring their experiences of work in this area across different aspects such as collaboration, training and intervention. A further three explored EP practice through the production and use of written guidelines, plans and CI response teams. Two explored EP/SP practice through the reflection of specific models of intervention, one through examples of best practice for collaborative work during critical incidents and one through a focus on response to a specific type of crisis e.g. suicide, within one LA.

The aim of this review is to build a detailed picture of the ways in which EPs/SPs respond to CIs and how they support the impacted schools. A large variety of strategies were identified within the studies, including models which are drawn upon and interventions which are implemented. A number of wider issues were also prominent within the literature and each will be explored in more detail below.
**EP practice in response to critical incidents**

The studies outlined a range of ways in which EP/SPs might respond to a CI and support schools. Findings in relation to EP/SP practice can be further defined across three broad areas: strategies and actions, models to frame response and psychological intervention.

**Strategies/actions**

Within a survey of PEPs/Chief SPs, Beeke (2011) found that 91% responded to a CI within twenty-four hours, with work carried out across three levels: with school staff, with pupils and less frequently, with families; Silver (2014) also refers to work with external agencies. Practice with staff most commonly involves meeting with the senior leadership team (SLT), allowing information gathering, expression of staff concerns, identification of vulnerable pupils and negotiation of EP/SP role and response plan. Some practice involved a second consultation at the end of the first day to review practice and further discuss vulnerable individuals/groups. This allows EPs/SPs to draw on systemic strengths in the school and, importantly, help schools to retain a sense of ownership over the CI response, whilst supporting the school’s systemic ‘recovery’ (Beeke, 2011; Hindley, 2015). Empowering schools through the use of consultation was seen to allow them to retain a sense of control and was one of the most commonly named activities in several studies (Adamson & Peacock, 2007; Beeke, 2011; Bischof, 2006; Hindley, 2015; Silver, 2014). Advising on actions to be undertaken, managing emotional and psychological responses and signposting was mentioned by over half of the CI documents in Hindley’s (2015) paper. Work with families can involve activities such as providing information and signposting to services (Beeke, 2011) and the use of information giving was said to improve staff confidence (Silver, 2014). This was the most common practice identified by Nickerson and Zhe (2004) which was deemed slightly less effective than helping them to secure resources and reinstate normal routines. Consultation with parents about a crisis was the second most common response by participants in Bischof’s (2006) study but less than half in Adamson and Peacock (2007) engaged with this work. Beeke’s (2011) survey found that signposting was the most commonly used intervention, and individual debriefing the second most commonly used intervention, both with students directly and indirectly impacted by a CI. These interventions were largely seen as effective by the EPs/SPs. Nickerson and Zhe (2004) found
that EP/SPs work across the same three levels to support with CI response. When working with staff, it was found that the perceived most effective advice was to reinstate normal routine. Ninety percent of EPs/SPs provided teachers with referral information and 93% with general information about crises. The second highest action in terms of perceived efficacy was debriefing teachers although this was one of the lowest in terms of percentage of EP/SPs engaging with this practice. With pupils, referral was once again highly practised (95%) and seen as effective.

Lockhart’s (2012) exploration of the development and sustainability of critical incident response teams (CIRTs), outlined the support that is offered by seven LAs. It was found that EPSs were offering a wide range of support but the most mentioned was initial phone conversations or visits to gather the appropriate information and begin to problem solve, as was mentioned in all CI guidelines analysed by Hindley (2015). Six out of seven services provided leaflets and written materials around topics such as grief and children’s reactions and signposted to other services. All services mentioned debriefing with one specifying that they used to adopt it but now focus on psycho-educational activities, one mentioned it in relation to talking to staff at the end of a day, one said it was rare and another that it was only used when pupils had witnessed a traumatic event. Other activities such as working with parents or carrying out follow-ups were found in four or less of the services.

The application of psychological theory and models

Up to 45 models/theories were named in Rees and Seaton’s (2011) findings drawing upon a wide range of sources e.g. training, research journals. The most commonly named model was the National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA) model with only six and four mentioning Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) and Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD) respectively. Beeke (2011) noted that half of the EP/SPs who took part in semi-structured interviews mentioned psychodynamic theory, adversarial growth, and solution-focused methods, though cautioned that the latter practice could be seen as insensitive in CI situations. There was frequent reference to debriefing techniques but most EPs/SPs sounded a note of caution with this approach. EP/SPs within Silver’s (2014) paper draw upon Newman’s 2005 resilience theory and informational social theory but use
bereavement and grief theories in adapted ways rather than as a structured model for intervention.

**Psychological intervention**

Nickerson and Zhe (2004) found that individual counselling, PFA and an opportunity for pupils to process the crisis were the most popular actions after referral. Debriefing pupils was relatively common and rated as effective. Being part of a group to ‘process’ the event was rated as the most effective intervention with pupils. The most common response during and immediately after a significant crisis in Adamson and Peacock’s (2007) study was PFA and three LAs within Hindley’s (2015) study were guided by PFA principles in their CI response work. After consultation with staff and parents, individual counselling was the third most common activity in Bischof’s (2006) study.

Morrison (2007) explored the validity of the CISM model within schools and found that EPs/SPs and social workers felt it provided an orderly structure and set of actions to enable a common approach. Half of the participants felt it had limited applicability to school-aged pupils as the training focussed on adults whilst a quarter felt it didn’t address cross-cultural competence in school-based use. Three quarters felt that adaptations could be made to account for this. In terms of impact, 26 out of 28 participants felt the use of CISM resulted in socially significant outcomes for the pupil such as an outlet for emotional expression or identification of pupils who need more support. It was concluded however that the need for adaptation left the effective use of CISM dependent upon the skills and knowledge of the individual provider.

Adamson and Peacock (2007) found in their survey of EP/SP response that, in the days and weeks following a CI, almost half of participants (49%) carried out generic debriefing interventions; 18% used standardised psychological debriefing, 12% used CISD and 6% used psychological debriefing (PD). The various recipients of debriefing work were: 41% school staff, 31% students and 13% parents. CI guidelines within Hindley’s (2015) study mentioned the use of direct work across almost half of the documents: four guidelines use the term debriefing; one specifies the use of ‘structured group debriefing’ (not immediately, but usually within a month and after a funeral); one refers to PD; one highlights the need to
arrange more formal debriefing sessions. Three guidelines indicate that the offer of debriefing has been ceased.

Seadler (2000) surveyed EPs/SPs around the use of four specific psychological interventions: death-related crisis intervention, grief counselling, grief consultation and death education. Over the past three years, it was found that EP/SPs engaged with each intervention at 62%, 50%, 44% and 13% respectively, indicating that death-related crisis intervention was most commonly used by this sample of practitioners. Further investigation revealed that such practice was most common at the elementary school level which covers ages four to eight years, which is tentatively attributed to shortage of guidance counsellors and likelihood that older students may opt to talk to their peers. Those that engaged with grief counselling carried out around four sessions for group and individual sessions. For grief consultation, the most common consultees were teachers followed by parents and administrators. The main focus was coping skills followed by grief reactions, cognitive understanding of death and mourning stages and tasks.

Some studies reported that the participants explicitly tried to avoid direct intervention where school staff were best placed to support pupils (Silver, 2014). Hindley’s (2015) content analysis of 20 LA CI guidelines, found 13 specifying the nature of CI support whilst only nine referred to direct work. Four LAs directly ruled out the use of debriefing whilst four mentioned the term and indicated its possible use. Another emphasised that the response did not involve counselling. Hindley (2015) also interviewed EPs from eight LAs, finding that EPs engaged in direct client work in three LAs, did not do so in three others, and two did not mention direct work. Only one participant mentioned that structured debriefing was offered. Those EPs engaging in direct work highlighted the need to be responsive to a school’s needs, considering direct work to support emotional processing and normalisation of responses, but not including counselling or PD.

**Collaboration in CI work**

With the exception of two studies (Morrison, 2007; Seadler, 2000) due to the specific focus of the research, the majority of studies allude to the concept of collaborative and multi-agency work within CI response. In a survey investigating international perspectives in
relation to EP/SP CI response, Rees and Seaton (2011) found 83% of respondents had only ever carried out this type of work with others whilst 17% had worked alone on all or some occasions. When questioned about other professionals whom EPs/SPs may engage with, 29 different roles were mentioned with other psychologists being the most common, followed by counsellors and then social workers and social services. International comparisons between six countries (Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, UK and USA) found that the Netherlands had the highest rate of collaborative working at 100% with the UK having the highest levels of sole working at 37% (Rees & Seaton, 2011). Countries with less than ten survey returns were excluded from the international comparison. The six themes of advice within this survey call for partnership with CI response with three recognising the value of joint working, team work, joint pre-planning and multi-agency work. By comparison, Nickerson and Zhe (2004) noted that most commonly the other professionals involved are administrators and guidance counsellors then teachers and nurses. Beeke (2011) found that half of respondents working on a recent CI had worked with just one other professional or none outside of the EPS. Hindley (2015) reported that benefits of multi-agency teams for CI response included a variety of backgrounds leading to a broader skills range and increased capacity as CI response needs a ‘reasonably sized team’. Similar views were echoed in another study which reported that the range of perspectives and ability to facilitate referrals to other agencies were benefits of multi-agency work (Lockhart, 2012).

Adamson and Peacock (2007) investigated the structure and professionals involved in CIRTs, finding that a mixture of EPs/SPs, school principals, school nurses/other medical personnel, school counsellors and assistant school principals was common. One suggestion to improve teams was to include a parent representative as this was the least reported member of the team allowing for a link between schools and parents and keeping the parents and community informed. Dwyer et al. (2015) used case studies to demonstrate best practice in relation to multi-agency working suggesting that having clear roles and responsibilities, with communication and trust worked well. Also, administrative support and shared resources as well as a shared ‘common goal’. Conclusions indicated that trust and communication between EPs/SPs and school nurses were important and that these two professional groups could assist with establishing wider community links e.g. police, mental health services.
Themes within Silver’s (2014) paper include collaboration and multi-agency coordination. It was found that EPs/SPs aim to work collaboratively with others to adapt to the demands of a CI situation. These links with other professionals e.g. mental health services and counsellors, enable early identification, assessment and consequently intervention. Due to high numbers of people involved in CIs, Silver (2014) also emphasised the importance of clarity around roles and responsibilities.

**Evaluation of practice**

Within half of the studies, the theme of evaluation arose, specifically how EPs/SPs evaluate their CI response. Morrison (2007) stated that evaluation was important and should focus on the desired outcomes for staff and pupils, whilst paying close attention to developmental and cross-cultural needs. Nickerson and Zhe (2014) found that although EPs/SPs implement work at the staff, student and family level, less than half of respondents were involved in developing or evaluating the interventions that they implemented. Beeke’s (2011) survey amongst PEPs/Chief SPs highlighted 83% of respondents had evaluated CI support at EPS level through informal consultation with staff, with the second most common form of evaluation being questionnaires to school staff (33%). Amongst EPs/SPs, 63% were unsure how CI work was evaluated and 93% had never done this. In the semi-structured interviews, EPs/SPs reported using informal feedback from school and LA staff and self-evaluation (Beeke, 2011). Adamson and Peacock (2007) reported that for those surveyed who had a crisis team in their school, just over half evaluated the teams (53.5%) whilst 29.4% were unsure and 17% noted that they were not evaluated. Of those that were evaluated, almost half did so following a CI, around a quarter did so ‘periodically’, whilst 17% evaluated once a year and 6% twice a year. Different approaches across LAs were highlighted (Lockhart, 2012) with some having review meetings, using questionnaires/evaluations, self-evaluation forms and most commonly through the collection of anecdotal evidence. The ethical and sensitive nature of evaluating CI response was discussed in relation to whether and when to seek feedback from schools.
Barriers to CI response

A recurrent barrier across several of the papers is that of a lack of time which was perceived as the biggest barrier by many (Bischof, 2006; Dwyer et al., 2015; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004; Seadler, 2000). Dwyer et al. (2015) suggested that IT could assist with this through regular email correspondence or the suggestion of a central reporting system so that collaborative working with other services is still possible. After a lack of time, Seadler (2000) found the next four barriers to be that CI support was offered by other school personnel, a lack of training, lack of need and provided by non-school agencies. Bischof (2006) found the same barriers but with lack of administrative support instead of provided by non-school agencies.

Lockhart’s (2012) work revealed some perceived barriers specifically in relation to multi-agency work including difficulties coordinating responses from multiple services due to the infrequent occurrences of CIs, and some tendency towards a ‘scattergun’ school response, even though smaller scale CIs sometimes do not require a multi-agency response.

The role of the EP/SP in CI response

Some of the papers made reference to the EP/SP role in relation to CI support, whether that was the EP/SPs own perception of the role (Beeke, 2011; Bischof, 2006; Hindley, 2015; Lockhart, 2012; Seadler, 2000) or that of others (Beeke, 2011; Bischof, 2006; Lockhart, 2012; Silver, 2014).

Beeke (2011) indicated that how others viewed the EP role influenced CI response. For instance, the press or even other LA teams may have a view of the EP being there in the role of a counsellor and this impacts upon what schools think that EPs can offer. Lockhart (2012) identified issues around a pressure for CIRTs to rush in and offer counselling which can often go against protocol. The impact of the media can also fuel an inaccurate perception of the role with claims such as the ‘counsellors are going in’. Lockhart (2012) proposed that strong working relationships with the media would support this. Hindley (2015) found that one LA also indicated that ‘it is common for the media and public to associate the response to CIs with counselling. This is used as a generic term and does not reflect the research’ whilst another explicitly indicated that EPs/SPs were not a team of counsellors. In total, EPs in seven LAs reported that there tended to be an expectation that their support would involve
counselling, but all said that this fell outside the remit of EP/SPs and CIRTs. With this in mind, expectations about the use of counselling need to be regularly challenged (Hindley, 2015). Lockhart (2012) identified a general confusion around the role of counselling in CI support because of pre-conceived ideas about the role of psychologists which could lead to false expectations around CI work. EPs/SPs therefore need to clearly communicate the appropriate ways in which they can offer support, before CIs occur.

Silver’s (2014) semi-structured interviews revealed themes around the EP/SP role related to managing change with the role seen as a ‘vehicle for change’ at the LA and school levels, with high expectations and a view of the EP/SP as an ‘expert’ who can help to guide the CI response. In contrast, Bischof (2006) found that administrators may view the primary role of an EP/SP as conducting assessment and thus, little focus is placed on the role of crisis responder. It was inferred that the LA seeing CI work as a priority would assist with EPs/SPs being able to have the time and space to support with this type of work (Lockhart, 2012).

Both Beeke’s (2011) and Bischoff’s (2006) research found that EPs/SPs view CI response as an appropriate role, with many EPs/SPs seeing it as a primary activity for them (Bischof, 2006). EPs/SPs within Hindley’s (2015) study reported that multi-agency work would increase skills and capacity and suggested that EP/SPs would be well placed to take a key role in the team e.g. coordinator, consultant. On the other hand, there wasn’t a consensus amongst participants in Lockhart’s (2012) research and having past experience with CI work and an interest in the area were seen as indicators for an EP/SP being part of a CIRT. With a two to one majority, EP/SPs viewed death-related crisis intervention, grief counselling and consultation and death education as a suitable role (Seadler, 2000).

**Future needs around EP/SP practice in relation to critical incidents - training**

Several studies indicated ways in which EP/SP CI response practice could be supported moving forward. Hindley (2015) suggests a wider range of staff through multi-agency CIRTs with EPs/SPs maintaining a vital role in providing training, consultation and psychological advice. It is also suggested that EP/SPs could use knowledge of topics such as bereavement and share this with teachers, parents and the wider community through events such as in-service workshops or presentations (Seadler, 2000). Lockhart (2012) identified the benefits
of inter-LA liaison to share good practice. Silver (2014) found that clear guidance for joint working would enhance confidence and best use of resources, suggesting a synthesis of government planning, national legislation e.g. the Children Act (2004) and EPS and counselling service protocols to create a LA wide framework. Nickerson and Zhe (2004) recognise the role of EP/SPs in implementing response but suggest that moving forward, they have a larger role in programme development and systemic evaluation of crisis response.

EPs/SPs felt ongoing training would equip them with the skills and knowledge to respond to future CIs and that regular development would allow them to select models and strategies which were sensitive to the school context and ethos (Morrison, 2007; Silver, 2014). Beeke (2011) found that training within EPSs was now more common with half of PEPs stating that EP/SPs were only qualified ‘to some extent’, highlighting a perceived inadequacy of EP/SP training. Systemic theory was important in this study so a future suggestion is that EP/SP training focusses on the systemic impact of CIs.

Some studies suggested that initial professional training programmes/preparation programs could better prepare EPs/SPs for a role in CI response (Adamson & Peacock, 2007; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004); Rees & Seaton (2011) found that 70% of CI training was post-qualification and almost a fifth had received no pre-qualification training. There were also statistically significant differences within international comparisons of training received i.e. between the UK and Germany; France and Germany and the Netherlands and the UK (Rees & Seaton, 2011). Suggestions are made for an integrated model which is applicable across international contexts. Bischof (2006) found that the majority of EPs'/SPs’ CI training was received through conferences with 9% saying it was covered during a university/college course. Whilst 23% did feel very well prepared, 41% of EPs/SPs felt minimally, or not at all, prepared. It was suggested that access to those with first-hand experience could enhance the research and theory that is usually shared at a university training level. Dwyer et al. (2015) found that several case studies emphasised the benefit of regular group training to support teams with a shared knowledge.
Discussion

Summary of findings

This literature review aimed to explore EP/SP practice in relation to CI response when supporting schools. This was done through a systematic exploration of the research literature which referenced EP/SP activity in this area, from 2000 onwards; 11 studies were included which specifically mentioned the EP/SP role in CI response. All studies were rated as medium or high in terms of methodological quality (WoE A) and relevance of focus (WoE C), apart from one which was scored low for WoE A but medium for WoE C (Dwyer, Osher, Maughan, Tuck and Patrick, 2015). Study findings were synthesised to develop a clearer understanding of what EPs/SPs do in order to assist schools in the initial aftermath of a CI.

The studies highlighted three different groups that EPs/SPs work with during CI response: pupils, staff and families. Consultation is a common strategy, as well as referral to other services, signposting, advising and the sharing of psychological information. A variety of psychological models is used to frame CI response leading to a call for an integrated, internationally-relevant model of response (Rees & Seaton, 2011). The studies demonstrated that EP/SP response, whilst having some similarities, varies from one service to another, with some participants engaging in individual and group work as part of standard practice whilst others consciously do not. The studies reported variation in the use of debriefing, including PD and CISD techniques, and the efficacy of such.

Wider links are identified through themes of multi-agency collaboration including links with external professionals. EPs/SPs were found to work with a range of professionals and international comparisons highlighted that the UK had the highest levels of lone working in CI response (Rees & Seaton, 2011). One study indicated that another EP/SP was the most common professional to collaborate with (Rees & Seaton, 2011) whilst several highlighted the value of multi-agency collaboration and a wider range of professional roles involved with CI response (Adamson & Peacock, 2007; Dwyer et al., 2015; Hindley, 2015; Lockhart, 2012; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004; Silver, 2014). Inconsistencies were identified in relation to how EPs/SPs and EPSs evaluated CI response. Evaluation strategies varied from informal consultations with school staff, anecdotal feedback and questionnaires, to self-evaluation by EPs/SPs. One study found that PEPs/Chief SPs were aware of how CIs were evaluated whilst
EPs/SPs were unsure about this process (Beeke, 2011). Only half of the studies referred to evaluation, indicating a potential gap in practice.

Several barriers to EP/SP CI response were outlined, with time being frequently mentioned by participants within the studies and the issue around training identified as a common theme. One study stated a lack of training (Rees & Seaton, 2011) in contrast to Beeke’s (2011) increase in CI training for EPs/SPs. Two highlighted the value of training (Dwyer et al., 2015; Silver, 2014). Studies indicated that most CI training took place post qualification creating a sense that initial training programmes were not oriented to equipping EPs/SPs to participate in and be prepared for CI response once qualified (Adamson & Peacock, 2007; Beeke, 2011; Bischof, 2006; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004; Rees & Seaton, 2011). The perception of the EP/SP role by others was unclear, with the media fuelling the notion that EPs/SPs have a central ‘counselling role’ in response to CIs. Three studies showed that EPs/SPs themselves view CI work as central to their role; notably, involvement with this type of work is linked to an interest in, and past experience of, CI work.

**Implications for understanding/theory**

Common themes amongst EP/SP CI response include initial information gathering visits/phone calls and consultations with staff, though responses vary between services. Variation exists across different elements of response both nationally and internationally, particularly in the approach to and practising of direct work with individual/groups of pupils. This highlights a potential discrepancy of the type of CI response support one may receive depending on where they live. One LA may advocate for the use of direct work whilst one does not. As well as within country variations, one study also highlighted between country variations in the way that EPs/SPs work during a CI e.g. collaborative/multi-agency working. Variations in CI response may lead to a different experience for school communities including staff, pupils and parents, as well as EP/SP practitioners.

Baxter and Frederickson (2005) explored the issue of ‘value’ added by EPs/SPs and suggested that decisions around the strategic direction and developments within the profession should be based upon a shared set of values placing the rights of children and young people at the centre. They refer to The Service Business Model (Checkland & Scholes,
1993) developed by Normann (1984). Checkland and Scholes (1993) apply the service business approach to technology development and support within ‘Shell’ plc and identified the concept that some units provide services rather than products which can be evaluated, which can be problematic for units in large businesses that are not directly involved in production but assist with a ‘trouble shooting’ role.

Baxter and Frederickson (2005) relate The Service Business Model to EPs/SPs roles in both school settings and within the LA. When the key question is ‘who is my customer’s customer?’, then the purpose of the EP/SP provision is to enable the recipient e.g. school staff, to meet their customer’s needs. Having this as the focus allows the provider e.g. the EP/SP/EPS, and the recipient, to negotiate the type of service needed and ways in which it will be evaluated. Baxter and Frederickson (2005) directly apply The Business Service Model (Checkland & Scholes, 1993) to EP/SP consultation practice and talk about focusing on the school to pupil transaction meaning that the client for the school and the EP/SP will always be the pupil, even if they are not the direct recipient of the work. From this, Baxter and Frederickson (2005) suggest that this shifts conversations in EP-school planning and liaison from ‘what we can do for them’ to ‘what they want to achieve for the pupils’. Another implication raised is that evaluation of this work should then go beyond the school’s view to co-production between the service provider (EPS) and recipient of the ‘value added’ (e.g. children/parents).

Baxter and Frederickson’s (2005) application of The Service Business Model to educational/school psychology lends itself to thinking about the service that EPs/SPs/EPSs provide post-CI as illustrated below in Figure 1. Within this conceptual model, the distinction between direct and indirect work operationally exists in the difference between interactions A->B->C and A->B->A->C. Taking the scenario of offering direct work to pupils e.g. counselling or debriefing interventions, both EPSs that do and do not engage in this work, likely have the same aim of supporting the recipient e.g. school staff, to meet the needs of their customers e.g. the pupils. This could also extend to supporting other customers e.g. vulnerable school staff, parents/carers, due to the wide-reaching impacts of CIs. Consultations with staff (representing non-direct work A->B->C) would support the service recipient to support their customer, the pupils, through methods such as identification and monitoring of vulnerable pupils, information about developmental reactions to traumatic events and
signposting/referral. In this way, EPs/SPs are not carrying out direct work with pupils but working through others to meet their needs, whilst also empowering and up-skilling school staff. Clear parallels may exist here with other health professional roles (e.g. nurses, doctors, therapists), in which clients would readily identify a range and combination of intervention encompassing self-care advice and direct treatment or procedural intervention.

Work between the provider and the recipient could highlight the need for the provider to work directly with the customer (represented in the model by A->B->A->C). Evaluation of CI work was found to be varied and through adopting a model of CI response, negotiations could take place between the provider and recipient about the most appropriate ways to evaluate the impact of the work.

Three factors could affect EPs/SPs approach to CIs, including service delivery approach, capacity and training. These factors could contribute towards the EPS service delivery discrepancies found in this review. Each EPS will have its own rationale underpinning service delivery, which will be influenced by evidence, training, capacity and current general service delivery approach. Some services may have a CI response which is in line with their usual way of working e.g. a consultation model working through the recipient, whereas others may adapt their practice specifically for a CI e.g. incorporating direct work. For some EPSs, they may use a lot of direct work in their usual practice and thus, CI response can and should be seen as an extension to this. It may also be that some services will work in different ways depending on the nature, severity and scale of the CI. This links in turn to how EPs/SPs perceive their role in relation to CI response; some may feel that the whole EPS team has a role to play whereas others may consider that specialist team members should respond, which in turn links to confidence in professional competence around CI work. Services may have received/commissioned training around particular approaches to CI response, which may inform the way in which they work whilst some may base their response upon various evidence sources, which may be concluded from (un)successful local practice, or a review of published research. EPs/SPs reported drawing on a wide range of sources when responding to CIs including training and research journals (Rees & Seaton, 2011).

Consideration of school and agency capacity came up within the theme of collaboration, indicating that a multi-agency team would increase capacity to support schools post-CI;
training also affects EP/SP CI response work. The majority of training was provided post-initial professional qualification suggesting that there may be a lack of preparedness from the point of initial training, which could in turn lead to reduced confidence in competence around CI responding, and further, to EP role perceptions.

**Implications for professional practice**

The above findings have implications for EPs/SPs offering a CI response to school communities. Areas of inconsistency highlight ways in which EPSs could reflect on CI response and avoid client impressions of a ‘postcode [zipcode] lottery’. This review shows the positives of collaborative practice e.g. increased capacity, through an expanded skillset and effective utilisation of resources (cf. UK HMG, 2004).

EPSs/SPSs should incorporate CI response evaluation that is effective, sensitive and understood by all service providers, partners and users. Within the A->B interaction of Figure 1 (above), EPSs could evaluate with schools their planned CI responses, both direct and indirect. Adamson and Peacock (2007) further suggest improving community links by including parent representatives in LA CIRTS and, by extension, the processes for evaluation.
If EPs/SPs are not viewed consistently as mental health professionals, this will impede their contribution to CI response (Bischof, 2006). Before CIs occur, EPs/SPs need to clearly communicate the appropriate ways in which they can offer support, though it is acknowledged that effectiveness of such communication may be affected by the infrequency of CI occurrence, though transparently sharing with schools and other service users the model of CI support outlined in Figure 1 (above) might actively facilitate inter-professional understanding.

**Limitations**

Whilst this review highlights areas of EP/SP post-CI involvement, little ‘objective’ evidence was found on the effectiveness of different CI responses. However, the studies included in this review encompass only the UK and USA, albeit one study did utilise an international participant group from 16 countries. The 11 studies in this review date from 2000-2015, implying a dearth of evidence within the last five years. The search parameters and databases used within this review only identified published peer reviewed articles and thesis research. Therefore, other types of literature and documents e.g. books, were not accessed and it is possible that these alternative sources may have contained detailed high quality research reports.

**Link to future research**

The studies included in this study have detailed EPs'/SPs’ CI response within a school community but reveal less about why they respond in a certain way and adopt specific approaches. It would be useful to understand more about the decision points involved in EP/SP CI response, particularly around the decision to engage or not with direct client work. For instance, what are the factors that contribute towards EP/SP CI response direct work (e.g. age of the pupil(s), nature of the trauma, ethos or capacity of the school community, EPS/SPS service delivery model)?
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Abstract

Critical incidents (CIs) are sudden, unexpected events that have a significant impact upon children and young people (Beeke, 2011). In response to the Manchester Arena bombing in May 2017, North West (NW) educational psychology services (EPSs) created face-to-face training materials to support schools with CI response. In order to embed the legacy of this cross-service training initiative, the aim of this research was then to explore how these materials could be developed into an online resource through the process of action research. Supported by an IT expert, one trainee educational psychologist (TEP) and five EPs from across the NW formed a task and finish group and followed a seven phase process, including a pre- and post-phase. The Critical Incident Resource website was created, to support school leaders and EPs with school CI response. The online resource development highlighted key project management skills for the group including conceptual, human, negotiation and technical abilities.

Keywords: critical incident; resource; educational psychologist; schools; action research; project management.
Introduction

Critical Incidents

Schulberg (1974) broadly defines a critical incident (CI) as ‘acutely time-limited, involving a sense of helplessness and the perception of threat’. CIs may take place across different areas of life such as a school community. Through a review of policy and literature, Beeke (2011) created a definition of a CI centred around school communities:

‘A sudden and unexpected event that has the potential to overwhelm the coping mechanisms of a whole school or members of the school community. A serious and significant event, it is likely to be outside the range of normal human experience and would be markedly distressing to anyone in or directly involved with the school community’, Beeke (2011, p.13).

Beeke further expands on his definition with examples of what may constitute a CI:

‘It may be the result of an accident, criminal act, illness or natural disaster that affects members of the school community, school property or both. An act of suicide or attempted suicide by a member of the school community may also constitute a critical incident’, (Beeke, 2011, p.13).

CIs differ from other sad events such as bereavement. For instance, an individual within a school setting may lose a family member and whilst this may be distressing for the individual involved, it would not constitute a CI as it is unlikely to overwhelm the coping mechanisms of the school. The Beeke (2011) definition was adopted by the Task and Finish group within this research as it was felt that the definition encompassed both the individual and the systemic impact that can result from a CI, whilst being comprehensive enough to create a distinction between sudden and unexpected events that can overwhelm and sad events which may affect individuals within the school community.

Research suggests that children and young people (CYP) of all schooling ages may be at some risk of exposure to one possible type of CI, a terrorist attack (Petkova, Martinez, Schlegelmilch & Redlener, 2017). The frequency of exposure, for instance, constant threats versus a one-off event, could lead to prolonged developmental issues (Garbarino &
Kostelny, 1993) whilst Brock (2000) concludes that CIs will have a negative effect upon CYP’s cognitive functioning.

**How people respond to a critical incident**

It has been highlighted that during times of crisis, teachers could be the only adults available to support a pupil’s needs and consequently, should be both aware and familiar with intervention strategies which would be appropriate to the situation (Ray, 1985). Dyregrov, Dyregrov and Idsoe (2013) explored teachers’ perceptions of their role in supporting grieving pupils and found that they were aware of the importance of showing empathy towards this group but with most concluding that this group could be overlooked in schools. Within Hobfoll et al.’s (2007) paper around the five key principles of trauma intervention, the idea of connectedness is introduced, linking to social support. Within this, emotional understanding and acceptance alongside a normalisation of reactions and experiences could ultimately lead to a sense of community efficacy.

**The role of the educational psychologist in critical incidents**

Since school staff may not feel equipped to respond to a CI, educational psychologists (EPs) may be called upon to support a school community. Posada (2006) found that since the 1990s, CI response is a strand of work that many educational psychology services (EPSs) in the UK and USA offer to schools. EPs have relevant knowledge and skills to contribute towards CI response (e.g. trauma, developmental understanding, consultation, groupwork) but may not always be perceived by others as mental health professionals (Bischof, 2006). Hindley (2015) found that EPs’ own perceptions of their role in CI response highlighted them taking on a key role within multi-agency teams, as a coordinator or consultant. Almost all principal EPs (PEPs) within Beeke’s (2011) research viewed CI response as an appropriate role for the EPS. Lockhart (2012) suggested that work could be done prior to CIs in order to communicate to schools and the LA about appropriate ways in which EPs can offer support both before and after a CI.

A recent literature review explored EP response to CIs and found that EPs work across three levels: pupil, school staff and families (Dunne & Woods, submitted). Common activities
included initial information gathering, consultations with staff in which vulnerable pupils are identified, referrals and signposting. Findings varied across services, both nationally in terms of practising direct work and internationally around working patterns e.g. lone vs collaborative work. To account for both direct and indirect EP CI response, Dunne and Woods (submitted) propose a model of CI response (adapted from Checkland and Scholes, 1993) and extending the service business model proposed by Baxter and Frederickson (2005), which places the EP as the service provider working with the school recipient to provide a service for their customer, the pupils or wider school community, including staff and families.

**Educational psychologists’ response to the Manchester Arena bombing**

On 22nd May 2017, a bomb was detonated at a concert at the Manchester Evening News Arena in Manchester (England). This left 22 people dead, 250 injured and many more who were significantly affected both directly and indirectly. As a result of this, the UK government’s Department for Education (DfE) awarded the North West Association of Principal EPs (NWAEPEP) £185,000 to support schools with the recovery process. The NW EPSs worked together to create a set of training materials centred around two topics: CIs and community cohesion. Both of these topics were delivered as a full day training for school leaders. Eleven qualified EPs worked together to create the content, based upon their professional understanding and experience of CI response. This included theory related to trauma e.g. Adaptive information Processing and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and models such as Psychological First Aid. The quality of the materials was therefore invested through the professional training that the EPs had undertaken and the ongoing regulation of psychologists. The CI training materials aimed to enable school leaders to be prepared to manage CIs, to assess their school’s strengths and areas for development, to contain grief and trauma and to develop a city wide network of support; key topics centred around communication, support, bereavement and loss, trauma and recovery and adjustment.

**Cross-service collaboration**

A pertinent and unique aspect of the training materials which were developed is the cross-service collaboration which took place in order to both develop and deliver the training. At a
time when many EPSs are adopting a consultation model of service delivery, this idea of collaboration is significant. Notably, an evolving research base highlights the benefits of collaboration through consultation and learning methods (Babcock & Pryzwansky, 1983; Gardner, 2015; Laal and Ghodsi, 2012).

**Online resources**

Within a preliminary study (Dunne, 2019), EPs from a variety of North West Local Authorities (LAs) explored the concept of developing the CI materials into an online resource, concluding that this would be beneficial as a website to demonstrate best practice and protect the legacy of the materials. Notably, Song (2002) explains how the internet serves as a means to support information and share knowledge.

For the CI materials to maintain a productive purpose, knowledge around how to respond to a CI must be shared amongst professionals who will work directly in the school communities affected. Therefore face-to-face CI training materials were initially created with an audience of senior leaders in mind. Managers within school settings depend on certain levels of Information Communication Technology in order to carry out their roles effectively therefore, creating an online resource around CIs would facilitate access for all those who might benefit from it (Van Deursen & Helsper, 2018). Furthermore, Seabata (2013) found a ‘top down’ way of sharing resources to be the most beneficial strategy for sharing with schools when resources are limited.

Access to an online resource could also address the issue of utilising and maintaining resources across a variety of settings, as there is a risk that individually stored materials may be lost over time as a result of staff turnover, or may become fragmented or outdated.

**Aims of the current study**

This research area was first proposed to The University of Manchester by NWAPEP. The intention was that a trainee EP researcher would evaluate either the CI or community cohesion materials. Consultations between the university and NWAPEP helped to refine the focus of this research to carry forward the practical utility of the training materials. The research reported here aimed to explore the most appropriate way to create an EP CI
response resource which would help to preserve the ‘legacy’ of the original CI training materials. The researcher wanted this to be achieved in a collaborative cross-service manner, in line with the way in which the materials were originally developed across the different NW EPSs.

The following research question was explored:

- How can an online resource for CI training materials be created through the process of action research with educational psychology services?

**Method of the present study**

**Epistemological position**

This research adopted a critical realist epistemology. This can be defined as ‘A theoretical approach that assumes an ultimate reality, but claims that the way reality is experienced and interpreted is shaped by culture, language and political interests’ (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p.329). This is a mixture of realist ontology (a view that a world exists regardless of a person’s own truths) and constructivist epistemology (a view that we construct our own knowledge of the world without the possibility of being objective) (Maxwell, 2012). Critical realism indicates that the relation between the real world and the concepts we form of it is the focus of the research process (Danermark, Ekstrom & Jakobsen, 2005).

**Design**

This research incorporates an exploratory qualitative action research design (Phases 1-7, plus pre- and post-phases) following principles of the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) model (Timmins, Shepherd & Kelly, 2003). Action research is said to incorporate action, reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others (Reason and Bradbury, 2001). As a definition, ‘Action research combines a substantive act with a research procedure; it is action disciplined by enquiry, a personal attempt at understanding while engaged in a process of improvement and reform’ (Hopkins, 2002, p.42, as cited in Costello, 2003). Table 2 outlines the RADIO Model, mapping it against the seven phases of this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>RADIO Step (from Timmins et al. 2003)</th>
<th>RADIO activities (from Timmins et al. 2003)</th>
<th>Process/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre phase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Awareness of a need</td>
<td>Commissioned from host research institution by the chair of NW PEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Invitation to act</td>
<td>Meeting between researcher, supervisor and commissioner to discuss the directions of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clarifying organisational and cultural issues</td>
<td>Discussions with commissioner and deliverer around what worked well with initial training and evaluations of the initial training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a task and finish group of qualified EPs from the North West of England. As a group, decide on a clear view for the process and what the purpose of the online resource will be</td>
<td>Agreeing focus of concern</td>
<td>Negotiating framework for information gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifying stakeholders in area of need</td>
<td>The identification and involvement of major stakeholders in the research</td>
<td>Commissioner identified as NW PEPs and researcher attended a meeting to feedback on preliminary study and vision for the main project research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spend half a day reviewing all of the materials which were created post Manchester Arena attack</td>
<td>T&amp;F group reviewed materials and considered adaptations for an online resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a working group, spend a day developing, refining and adapting the materials so that they are suitable for an online resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The researcher, her supervisor and an IT expert from The University of Manchester will spend three days constructing the resource platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluations: the resource will be shared with the task and finish groups’ services and several TEPs will also take it to their placement service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>With the working group, clarify any final amendments from the Phase 5 findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gathering information</td>
<td>Information is gathered using agreed methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;F group worked in pairs to adapt training into a script for the online resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher transferred scripts onto a web platform, with support from the IT advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource prototype evaluation of the presentation, content and other possible improvements received from 10 EPSs (NW England/London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;F group evaluated prototype feedback and made amendments/additions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task and Finish Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Processing information with research sponsors/stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Task and Finish Group Evaluation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Agreed areas for future action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post phase</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Implementation of action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

accordingly. Resource named ‘TCIR’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluating action</th>
<th>begin receiving TCIR input via EPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each NW EPS has identified a 'resource monitor' who will attend annual evaluation meeting, beginning Sept 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participants**

The T&F group consisted of the researcher, a Trainee EP, and five qualified EPs from across the NW of England (Rochdale, Salford, Warrington, Wigan and One Education EPSs). The five qualified EPs comprised main grade, senior practitioners and senior EPs who all had an interest or active role in the area of CIs. They engaged with the project through opportunistic sampling. The project was additionally supported by a staff member with extensive IT expertise from the host institution, which was identified during Phase 1 as a skills need within the group.

**Data gathering**

A researcher diary was kept throughout the research process, documenting a mixture of practical information and actions, alongside personal reflections (Example of Researcher Diary in prose style – Appendix F). Research diaries are seen as a way of noting details, decisions and contemporaneous reflections of the research process (Engin, 2011; Gibbs, 2018; Silverman, 2013). The research built upon the original CI training materials which were written in June 2017 by NW EPs in response to the Manchester Arena bombing. In Phase 3, scripts were created to accompany the original slides. The evaluation during Phase 5 produced 29 feedback forms which were synthesised into a PowerPoint which addressed four key areas: content, layout, usability and suggested links/resources. An evaluation meeting took place between the T&F group in which the product and the process were evaluated. All meetings between the T&F group were audio recorded and used for preparation purposes for each meeting. The final outcome of the research produced a CI website titled The Critical Incident Resource.

**Data analysis**

The researcher diary was subjected to a basic content analysis, distinguishing between the product and the process of the research. Content analysis is a way of ‘making systematic inferences from texts and other forms of communication’ (Drisko & Maschi, 2016). Between each task and finish group meeting, the previous session audio recording was listened to by the researcher and for the benefit of the subsequent T&F group meeting a PowerPoint
presentation was created, summarising key points from the previous meeting and actions moving forward. The final T&F group evaluation meeting was audio-recorded, transcribed and then subjected to directed content analysis, with codes guided by evaluation question categories relating to process (facilitators/barriers) and product (utility/serviceability) (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) (Example of coding with NVivo – Appendix G; Nodes summary – Appendix H).

**Ethical considerations**

Before commencing this research, ethical approval was obtained through the host institution Research and Ethics Committee (October, 2019) (Ethics application – Appendix I; Ethics approval – Appendix J). In proposing the structure of the research, attention was given to the British Psychological Society Code of Human Research Ethics (2014) and the Health and Care Professions Council Code of Conduct and Ethics for Students (2016). The participants were not considered to be vulnerable as they were all qualified professional EPs who had volunteered to take part in the research due to an interest or specialism in the area of CI response (Participant Information Sheet – Appendix K; Consent form – Appendix L). Despite this, the researcher was aware that some of the content could still be distressing for the participants for a number of reasons e.g. personal circumstances and ensured that the participants knew that they could talk to the researcher or her supervisor if necessary and were able to take breaks from the sessions at any stage should they need it. During the process, time was given to explore the sensitive nature of the resource, with specific mention to staff and school leader well-being, resulting in a ‘health warning’ on the resource homepage.

**Findings: The process of developing the critical incident resource – ‘tciresource’**

The following section outlines the findings throughout each phase of the research process. Table 2 above outlined the links between each phase and the specific step of the RADIO Model e.g. Phase 1 relates to Steps 5 and 6 of the RADIO Model. Findings from the basic content analysis of the Researcher Diary, in which product and process was distinguished,
helped to inform the below break down of each phase. The T&F group evaluation within Phase 7 was transcribed and subjected to directed content analysis in order to ascertain elements of the process which had either facilitated or inhibited the use of the following design. The findings from this analysis are outlined within Phase 7 and inform the subsequent discussion.

**Phase 1**

Building on the findings of the preliminary study (Dunne, 2019), the group explored the aims and purpose of an online CI resource (Session 1 & 2 outline – Appendix M). These ideas were audio recorded and revisited during Phase 7. The group wanted to create a resource to be used before, during and after a CI which would provide information to educational settings and complement the face-to-face training which was delivered by NW EPSs. It would enable preparedness and consistency of approaches across EPSs and empower and give confidence to school senior leaders. The group wanted all NW EPSs to endorse the resource which would be research-based and inclusive of all NW EPS views. Time was also taken to reflect upon the appropriate audience for the resource. It was decided that EPs, senior leaders in schools, and Special Educational Needs and Disability Coordinators (SENCos), would be the intended audience. The group also felt that schools should use the resource under the direction of their link EP due to the sensitive nature of CIs and the aim of supporting staff well-being.

**Phase 2**

During the second half of the initial meeting, the group began to look through the available materials from the original face-to-face training, in order to familiarise themselves with the materials. This included the original PowerPoint presentation and a series of resources/support sheets e.g. ‘Information for supporting children after a frightening event’ handout and the monitoring matrix, which were shared with the delegates. Three members of the group had been involved in either the development or delivery of the CI training whilst two had not. This enabled a critical balance of investment and familiarity of the materials alongside objectivity. Discussions took place around some of the wording in the original slides e.g. ‘health alert’ versus ‘health warning’, and the areas of content that were
covered. Individual and group tasks within the face-to-face training were considered in relation to their suitability as an online resource.

**Phase 3**

The five EPs and the trainee EP researcher split into three pairs to script web content (Session 3 outline – Appendix N). The original training slides were used as a framework with six main areas being covered and each pair scripting two sections: introduction, communication, support and monitoring, bereavement and loss, trauma, recovery and adjustment. A homepage was also scripted and included by the researcher covering the background of the resources as well as highlighting a ‘health warning’ on use of the resource which was scripted by one of the EPs. A section for useful links and resources and feedback was also collated and included by the researcher. Throughout this phase, group members were mindful of the intended audience and possible ways in which the resource could be used e.g. by EPs delivering training to school or LA staff, by senior school staff within team meetings, or by individual EPs and school staff. Consequently, the scripts were written in a style which was accessible to both of the main groups of professionals who would be accessing the resource. As this phase predated the Covid-19 pandemic, the scripting took place in person at the host institution. This was particularly useful as each pair worked together on one laptop to discuss, write and edit the scripts, and also enabled conversations to be easily initiated between the wider group, if a particular topic required more detailed conversation. In the original outline for the phases, one day was set aside for Phase 3 however, each member of the group committed to a further half day session in order to finalise the scripts.

**Phase 4**

Once the scripts had been created by the task and finish group, the researcher spent some time building the resource using an online web creator platform. At this stage, the IT advisor guided the researcher on the best ways to do this and assisted with some basic tutorials before the resource was built. This enabled the researcher to build up their IT skills and create the resource in line with the vision which was informed by the wider T&F group. Therefore, when refinements/additions to web scripts/content were needed, the researcher
could quickly do this herself, rather than relying on someone else. Before sharing the resource as part of the wider regional evaluation, the T&F group checked over the final prototype resource in order to proof-check the scripts and to ensure that it was in line with their expectations.

**Phase 5**

Each of the EPs within the T&F group, including the researcher herself, shared the resource with their EPS as part of the evaluation phase. In addition, four doctoral student trainee EPs (TEPs) from the host institution shared the resource with their placement EPS, prior to which each TEP attended an online meeting with the researcher in which the resource was demonstrated and the aim and protocol of the evaluation phase was explained, so that they could effectively relay this to their respective EPS teams. An email was scripted and shared with the EPs and TEPs, which contained a link to the resource, a link to a Google evaluation form (Appendix O) and notification of the evaluation phase time period. The Google form contained prompts around three areas (content, layout and usability) and a fourth question around additional ideas for inclusion:

1. Content e.g. coverage, language, too much or too little information?
2. Layout e.g. ease of navigation, presentation and design, aesthetics?
3. Usability e.g. How clear is the purpose of the resource? How could it be used? Who could it be used with? When could it be used?

Are there any resources/links which you think would be useful to include?

The evaluation phase was left open for a month and harvested 29 responses from across 10 EPSs (nine from North England; one from a London Borough). Personal data were not collected meaning that differentiated analysis by job role (e.g. EPs, school staff) can not be reported.

The findings were collated by the researcher and presented to the T&F group as part of Phase 6 with a focus on both the positive comments as well as constructive feedback. The researcher also noted any significant suggestions which wouldn’t be feasible within the time scale of the research but could be considered as part of the annual maintenance group. For
instance, the inclusion of further videos to illustrate concepts, which would require sourcing narrators, scripting content and production of a recording. T&F group members were also sent the collated surveys to read through prior to the virtual meeting.

Feedback around the three areas included:

Content

Strengths:

- Relevant, covering the key areas of CI support
- Accessible language

Suggestions:

- Adopt consistent tone throughout the text
- Explain terminology e.g. self-efficacy
- Cite websites for the ‘useful links and resources’ section.

Layout

Strengths:

- Easy to navigate
- High quality design

Suggestions:

- Enlarge slides when clicked
- Embolden key terminology
- Make all design elements consistent e.g. drop down tabs
- Embolden statements to break up longer sections

Usability

Strengths:

- Purpose clearly outlined on the homepage
• Invaluable resource for schools to consolidate/refresh their knowledge of CI response

Suggestions for use:

• School leaders/EPs to cascade to whole school staff
• For training within wider LA teams
• To support families/carers
• Useful for all professionals working with children and young people

**Phase 6**

Building on from Phase 5, the group met to review the evaluation feedback and developed a list of actions to improve the resource (Session outline – Appendix P). Immediate actions were assigned to different group members whilst future considerations were discussed and an agreement was made about whether they were feasible in the current time scale or needed to be revisited in the annual maintenance meeting. In total, 16 changes were made including: a paragraph on the homepage to explain the way in which the materials had been adapted; additional resources such as a summary checklist and letter writing prompts for staff; edits to the website layout so that the slides could be clicked on and enlarged. The amendment process was supported with a clear task list with task allocations to the relevant T&F group members. Clear time scales and prompts, as well as a running record of progress, facilitated this stage of the research.

**Phase 7**

A separate meeting took place in which the T&F group evaluated and offered feedback around the process and the final product of the commissioned action research (Group evaluation outline – Appendix Q). One member was unable to attend the meeting and had a phone conversation with the researcher afterwards. The following questions were explored.

1. Do you feel that the product reflects the initial aims set out by the group in the first session?
2. How do you think that the product will be a beneficial resource for CIs?

3. What do you think were some of the facilitators during the research?

4. What do you think were some of the challenges during the research?

5. Are there any lessons/top tips that we can share for any similar endeavours?

6. Thoughts around the annual maintenance plan.

Seven main themes emerged from analysis of the T&F group evaluation: initial aims, audience, utility, facilitators, challenges, lessons and future directions (Appendix R). After revisiting the group initial aims established in the first meeting, the group expressed that the resource was ‘very centred around the original material’ and that it added to the original face-to-face training. The goal of having a research-based resource was mentioned by one member: ‘And it is psychological because we wanted it to be research-based which it is...but our commentary and that way that we’ve structured it explains it...to...a non-psychological audience’. Discussion also took place around the audience of the resource with a dual audience of CI teams, made up of EPs or multi-agency professionals, and school leaders. Another member also referred to using the materials for training purposes with wider LA officers who support with CI response. In terms of utility, members felt it would be helpful if people could look through the resource before a CI occurred and that ‘It would be a good reminder...to go back to the resources when something has happened’. The group suggested that the resource was helpful for building confidence in school staff, EP and CI team meetings. The group noted many facilitators to the process including the expertise from the members of the T&F group, made up of ‘knowledge and practice’ and the effective balance of both members who had been involved in developing the original materials, and those who had not. Having an IT advisor, smaller working groups when scripting, dividing tasks up and coming back together and EPS support for time release were also identified as facilitators. Having a key person to structure, co-ordinate and guide the process of the work, whilst also allowing space for reflection and team cohesion, was seen as helpful.

Coordinating diaries and IT knowledge demands were perceived as challenges, however the group felt that the latter was overcome with the IT support available. Establishing the ultimate purpose was seen as a challenge: ‘I think...another challenge I think...is...was establishing what the purpose was and...kind of sticking to that so we had quite a lot
of...debate...’. The group highlighted several factors which they felt had been useful and would perhaps assist a future group taking on a similar type of work, including:

- planning out provisional dates for the whole year
- time available to discuss ideas and be able to explore and agree on the process
- smaller working groups when scripting e.g. pairs
- first meeting in person to establish working relationships and virtual meetings at a later stage to assist with diary management/commute time
- plentiful access to laptops for pair work
- more direct availability of the IT advisor in group meetings
- recording the sessions to feed into each meeting

The group identified the annual maintenance meeting as an opportunity to build up links between LAs, raise the profile of the resource, and maintain the work and commitment that went into creating the resource.

**Post Phase**

Upon completion, the resource was shared with all NW PEPs who were asked to allocate a ‘resource monitor’ from within the EPS team. This EP would be able to share the resource with other team members, including new staff as part of induction. Each ‘resource monitor’ will be invited to an annual maintenance meeting in which the resource will be reviewed and any required adaptations will be discussed. The aim is for this meeting to act as a way of keeping the resource relevant and useful.

A hyperlink to the product of this research – the TCI Resource – is available at www.tciresource.co.uk
Discussion

Summary of findings

This research has evaluated a process of inter-service collaboration to develop a new CI resource into an online format - The Critical Incident Resource (TCIR) (www.tciresource.co.uk) - in order to preserve its legacy and provide a means by which to consistently extend and evaluate its use. The aims devised by the T&F group were centred around creating a resource which enabled preparedness, whilst empowering senior leaders to respond to a CI with enhanced confidence. Key lessons from this analysis include: the advantages of spending a significant proportion of time agreeing and understanding the brief/developing group cohesion; advance planning to ensure effective time utilisation and setting of goals for each group meeting; session recording to facilitate pre-meeting preparation to link achievements and resolutions from previous meetings to future directions; tasks monitoring and prompting against agreed timescales; and access to a specialist IT advisor/support which built capacity within the group, whilst allowing the direct T&F group to maintain ownership of the resource content. The T&F group concluded that an ‘annual resource maintenance meeting’ would allow the efficacy and utilisation of the resource to be evaluated, and for required adaptations to be critically considered across regional services. Revisiting the initial project aims, the T&F group agreed that the TCIR is a resource which will effectively support EPs and school leaders in responding to CIs. Training around CI response is highlighted throughout the literature as an area within which EPs feel less qualified upon completion of initial professional training (Adamson & Peacock, 2007; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004) with Rees and Seaton (2011) revealing that 70% of CI training was received post-qualification. Therefore, the TCIR will support with EP knowledge around CI response and support preparedness in this area.

Learning about project management

For future T&F groups, implications around effective project management will be essential in assisting the completion of collaborative projects such as this one. Project management can be defined as ‘the disciplined application of certain knowledge, techniques, tools and skills to create a unique product or service’ (Kenny, 2003). The US based Project
Management Institute produces the PMBOK Guide which details that ‘basic project management processes can “generally” be applied to “most projects most of the time”’ (2000, p. 3, as cited in Kenny, 2003). Goodwin (1993) characterises the skills required for effective project management as conceptual skills, human and negotiating skills, and in contrast to the PMBOK Guide, technical skills to a lesser extent. Alongside this, effective verbal and written communication skills are seen to assist the process. Pant and Baroudi (2008) emphasise the importance of human skills in order to facilitate effective project management, and focus less on the ‘hard’ technical skills.

Firstly, in respect to conceptual factors, time was given to collaborative conversations around establishing a shared aim and purpose amongst the T&F group. This enabled the group to develop a shared understanding in relation to the legacy, continuity and next steps.

Secondly, the human element of project management took into account the demographics and needs of the T&F group members e.g. setting out time scales in advance and carefully negotiating in-process changes to suit the group members and time constraints. Research indicates that time is one of the biggest barriers for EPs offering CI support (Bischof, 2006; Dwyer et al., 2015; Nickerson & Zhe, 2004; Seadler, 2000). Another element was drawing upon the wealth of experience that the T&F group had to offer and ensuring that group members took on tasks which utilised their individual strengths and skillsets. What really assisted the interservice collaboration was the investment that the T&F group made, in line with their professional interests and experiences.

Thirdly, negotiation was important throughout all phases, with the T&F group having a clear expectation of the time commitments at the beginning of the research. There was a need to be careful with the time that was available in order to optimise productivity through a clear start and end point.

Fourthly, in reference to the technical skills, there are several points to note in relation to this research. The technical skills of the researcher were supported by an IT advisor, linking to Goodwin’s (1993) view that technical skills are a lesser requirement than others. However, the end product was a website and this would not have been achieved without external support. In this context, it was necessary for someone with technical skills to be available to the group. As a project manager, it was important for the first researcher to
recognise early on that there was a need to seek this support. Whilst technical skills were complementary for the researcher, they were essential to the success of the end-product. Also, the approach of the advisor was geared towards capacity building so the T&F group were able to enhance their own IT skills and the first researcher is now able to build and launch her own website!

Finally, effective verbal and written communication was essential e.g. careful preparation before each session leading to visual resources to be used in each session and email prompts to remind the T&F group about deadlines/task responsibilities. Ultimately, a balance of softer human skills combined with harder technical skills, pushed this project forward to meet its initial aims and timescales in a collaborative manner. The findings section above documents a response to the original research question, ‘How can an online resource for CI training materials be created through the process of action research with educational psychology services?’ Through reflecting upon the key project management skills required, we are able to further identify factors which facilitated the creation of an online resource though the process of action research.

Implications for professional practice

Implications for EPs

This research has detailed a process of interservice collaboration leading to the creation of a CI web-based resource to support EPs within the domain of CI response. Implications for EPs first and foremost are that this resource could be used within their practice to support schools with which they work. The resource can be used both preventively and reactively although it is hoped that emphasising school preparedness would be prioritised. Individual EPs are best placed to advise on the most effective ways to share this resource with schools e.g. through the use of training around CIs or by identifying an appropriate member of staff (SENCo, senior leader) who would be able to support their staff in accessing the materials whilst also being supported by the EP themselves. The success of this project through the structure of a T&F group has highlighted the benefits of cross-service collaboration to extend expertise and capacity, whilst outlining several facilitators which facilitate the effective completion of such work. This links to benefits outlined in the literature around
collaborative and multi-agency work such as a broader skills range and increased capacity (Hindley, 2015) and a broader range of perspectives (Lockhart, 2012).

**Implications for school leaders**

Another aim of the project was to empower and increase the confidence of school leaders responding to a CI within their school community. It is hoped that access to this resource will allow school leaders and staff to feel more prepared in case of a CI whilst also providing them with knowledge around key topics such as trauma and bereavement. Alongside this they will have access to monitoring strategies allowing them to focus on both vulnerable pupils and staff in the event of a CI.

**Implications for The Department for Education**

This project has linked together two funding streams: the DfE Initial Training of Educational Psychologists (ITEP) funding the time of the researchers and the DfE Special Educational Needs (SEN) funding for the CI materials which were initially developed by NW EPSs. The success of this project highlights the value added by strategically combining these two funding streams. In future, the DfE may wish to consider linking the two together more widely in order to use ITEP funding to research a range of relevant topics in relation to SEN, mental health and CI needs.

**Limitations**

All five EPs within the T&F group worked for a NW EPS and the initial product had been developed in response to a specific CI. Therefore, the process of the work may be more heavily representative of one geographical location and its recent CI history. Links with wider EPS services across the country, or indeed internationally, through the resource maintenance arrangements that have been set up could assist in checking and developing the broader utility of the resource. During the evaluation stage it was difficult to recruit school leaders due to a variety of factors e.g. time commitments of school staff and restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic. It would be useful to explicitly collect evaluative feedback from school senior leaders as part of the resource maintenance arrangements, in
order to ensure that the resource fulfils its initial aim of empowering this group of professionals.

Links to future research

Future research could be centred around the evaluation and use of the TCI Resource website. This would ascertain whether the resource fulfils its original aims of empowering school leaders to respond to a CI as well as ensuring that utility and legacy are optimised. Furthermore, the evaluation of the process which guided the successful completion of this research will be used as a guide for a different piece of research which will focus on the parallel community cohesion materials developed by NW EPSs at the same time as the CI materials in May/June 2017.
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Paper Three: The dissemination of evidence to professional practice
Introduction

Part one of this paper aims to explore the concept of evidence-based practice considering related issues such as practice-based evidence. The second part will focus on effective dissemination of research and notions of research impact. The third section will summarise implications from Papers One and Two at the research site, organisational level and professional level. The final part will consider a specific strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination of this research as well as its impact.

Evidence-based practice and educational psychology

Evidence-based practice (EBP) is defined by the American Psychological Association as ‘the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture and preferences’ (2006, p.273). Briner (2019) explains that EBP is inextricably linked to the concept that by using evidence in either our personal or professional situations, it will increase the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes. He outlines that EBP is extending this principle so that it can be applied even more effectively. Briner (2019) states that EBP must be conscientious, explicit and judicious, as well as based upon multiple sources and a structured approach: ask, acquire, appraise, aggregate, apply and assess. Although being conscientious and explicit is important, EBP must be based upon locating the best evidence, meaning that not all evidence will be utilised, just the most reliable and trustworthy.

EBP is an area which receives a lot of attention across human services due to its perceived benefits for clients and concerns that it is not applied consistently in practice (Kennedy & Monsen, 2016). Frederikson (2002) referred to a traditional hierarchy of evidence (from Scott et al., 2001) which outlined and ranked seven types of evidence. At the bottom was individual opinion followed by expert consensus opinion and then case control and cohort studies. Above this was quasi-experimental trials and then randomised control trials. Finally systematic review of randomised control trials (RCTs) was at number two with several reviews of RCTs at the top of the list. Frederikson (2002) notes that EBP is not meant to replace professional expertise but instead integrate it with the most effective external evidence from systematic research. In this way, we would still need professional opinion to
weigh up the evidence and make a decision about whether it applies to an individual and is indeed relevant.

Kennedy and Monsen (2016) pose two dilemmas for the application of EBP. The first is linked to the work by Frederickson (2002). The hierarchy of evidence discussed ranges from an individual’s opinion right up to the pinnacle of systematic reviews of Randomised Control Trials. Kennedy and Monsen (2016) argue that by creating a construct of ‘best available research’ questions are raised such as who decides what is best and are some of the limited implementations of research findings in real-life context caused by particular research methodologies in the first instance. They propose that by prioritising one construct of scientific research, knowledge becomes obscured and value is not placed on practitioner judgement and the perspectives of the service users and contexts of EBP. Kennedy and Monsen (2016) outline the second issue as a lack of understanding of how a practitioner-researcher would effectively integrate evidence with their own existing skills, expertise and relevant service user views, albeit this could be considered as a misapprehension as definitions of EBP, as outlined above, do not prescribe a specific type of research evidence, nor do they exclude clinical judgement or client preferences.

It has been suggested that evidence-based practice in psychology (EBPP) is harmonious with principles of the scientist-practitioner model which has a core premise that outcomes can be improved by integrating clinical practice with clinically relevant research (Luebbe, Radcliffe, Callands, Green & Thorn, 2007). There is an expectation that applied psychologists, including educational psychologists (EPs), must adhere to the principles of EBP as outlined by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) as being ‘able to engage in evidence-based and evidence-informed practice, evaluate practice systematically and participate in audit procedures’ (HCPC, 2015, SoP 12.1). The British Psychological Society (2017) outline that ‘Psychologists should consider advances in the evidence base’ and ‘the need to maintain technical and practical skills and knowledge’ (p.5). Reason and Woods (2002) explored dyslexia in EBP and identified several considerations for practising EPs when considering support for their hypotheses and actions. These include the complex nature of EP work in which they will be required to maintain competing hypotheses. Also, EPs may be presented with a variety, wealth or dearth of evidence relating to these complex cases and must be able to exercise judgements about the reliability and validity of evidence whilst
establishing how to integrate multiple sources of evidence. Finally, there may be constraints e.g. time and role expectations, to collecting further evidence. If evidence is built up through a rejection of null hypotheses, applied psychologists must take care not to over-generalise on the basis of one experiment and have regards to the importance of replication (Simons, 2014).

Frederikson (2002) concludes that EBP will require a shift in EP practice so that there is more focus around evaluating interventions and outcomes for children and young people. She notes that even though the evaluation of outcomes is a core element of EBP, this type of practice has been seen as low urgency despite being perceived as high importance, with activities such as assessment taking priority, begging the question as to whether for EPs, evidence based assessment practice might be a more pressing priority.

O’Hare (2015) refers to the ‘four circles model’ of EBP for EPs outlined by Briner, Denyer and Rousseau (2009) and Barends, Rousseau and Briner (2014). The EBP definition within this model states that ‘Evidence-based practice is about making decisions through the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available evidence from multiple sources...’ (Barends et al. 2014, pg.4). The four circles represent various evidence sources including ‘Practitioner expertise and judgment, evidence from the local context, a critical evaluation of the best available research evidence, and the perspectives of those people who might be affected by the decision’ (Briner et al., 2009, pg. 19). O’Hare (2015) used a mixed methods approach in order to explore EPs understanding and use of evidence in their practice. He reflects on how this model fits with EP practice and concludes that by looking at this wider range of evidence, EPs are able to critically reflect upon all of the evidence which guides decision making. Although they may adopt a different weighting, all four of these evidence types inform EP decision making so in this way, EPs are engaging with EBP.

Through his research, O’Hare (2015) also identified some additional evidence which EPs found to be important when making decisions about practice. Firstly, ethical codes were highlighted as a source of evidence which could ultimately counteract other evidence such as that from a local context or practitioner judgement. Context was mentioned and EPs discussed that EBP is about deciding what may work within one particular context. O’Hare (2015) notes that a reference to the importance of the community of practice is a main difference between this research and the original ‘four circles model’ (Briner et al., 2009).
The experiences of colleagues was seen by EPs as an important factor. This extended version of the ‘four circles model’ could assist with understanding and application of EBP for EPs through a range of sources of evidence (O’Hare, 2015).

**Practice-based evidence**

Barkham and Margison (2007) highlight three points which make practice-based evidence (PBE) crucial. Firstly, as opposed to EBP, it indicates a ‘bottom up’ stance which begins with the practitioner, rather than a ‘top down’ approach in which evidence derived from RCTs is passed down to practitioners. Secondly, the concept that two approaches, EBP and PBE can co-exist and together, provide stronger evidence than one approach. Finally, PBE is seen to generate research questions which are grounded in practice and consequently, relevant to practitioners and the work that they conduct. They define PBE as:

*‘the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of current evidence drawn from practice settings in making decisions about the care of individual patients. Practice-based evidence means integrating both individual clinical expertise and service-level parameters with the best available evidence drawn from rigorous research activity carried out in routine clinical settings’* (Barkham and Margison, 2007, p.446).

Those in favour of PBE advocate for the safe trialling of techniques by practitioners with the goal of building up an ‘inclusive, practitioner-led research evidence base’ (Woods, McArdle & Tabassum, 2014). Barkham and Mellor-Clark (2003) advocate for a cyclical process in which the rigour of EBP and the relevance of PBE are not just seen as complementary, but both feeding into a wider knowledge base which is both rigorous and relevant to psychological practice.

**Effective dissemination of research**

Dissemination can be defined as:

*a planned process that involves consideration of target audiences and the settings in which research findings are to be received and, where appropriate, communicating and interacting with wider policy and health service audiences in ways that will facilitate research uptake in decision-making processes and practice* (Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan & Nazareth, 2010, p.2).
EPs are expected to be able to both conduct research and disseminate it, as outlined by the HCPC Standards of Proficiency: ‘be able to work with key partners to support the design, implementation, conduct, evaluation and dissemination of research activities and to support evidence-based research’ (HCPC, 2015, SoP 14.56).

There are said to be five purposes for dissemination including awareness, support and favourability, understanding, involvement and commitment (Harmsworth, Turpin, Rees & Pell, 2001). It is suggested that in order to effectively review the success of dissemination, researchers should establish clear outcomes at the beginning of their research and link them to the five purposes of dissemination. Harmsworth et al. (2001) also talk about dissemination across three levels including: dissemination for awareness, dissemination for understanding and dissemination for action. Around dissemination for awareness, Harmsworth et al. (2001) note the target audiences that do not need detailed knowledge of the research but it would be helpful for them to be made aware of the activities and outcomes of the research. Dissemination for understanding recognises that certain groups will benefit from the outcomes of the research and will therefore need to have a more thorough understanding of the research work. The final type of dissemination refers to action which in this instance, is described as a change by adopting the materials, products or approaches of the research (Harmsworth et al., 2001). This particular group will have the authority to bring about change within their organisation and will consequently need the appropriate understanding of the research in order to enact this change. Keen and Todres (2007) highlight three key features entailed in successful dissemination: tailoring approaches to the audience, in relation to content, message and medium; paying attention to the source of the message and enabling active discussion of research findings. Some feel that the researcher has a responsibility to ‘connect’ the reported outcomes of a piece of research with how it aids in advancing knowledge, if indeed it does (Harrison and McNeece, 2001).

Wilson et al. (2010) conducted a literature review in which 33 papers were identified, making explicit reference to a framework or plan for dissemination. Twenty of these studies referred directly to frameworks which were designed to be used by researchers. Of these 20, 13 were felt to be based on the Persuasive Communication Matrix, either explicitly or implicitly. This is originally based upon work by Laswell, in which persuasive
communications are described as ‘Who says what in which channel to whom with what effect’ (Wilson et al., 2010, p.9). McGuire (2001) suggests five elements which impact upon persuasive communications: the source of communication, the message to be communicated, the channels of communication, the characteristics of the audience (receiver), and the setting (destination) in which the communication is received (Wilson et al., 2010, p.9). Eight of the included papers also reference the Diffusion of Innovations theory which talks about ‘how, why and the rate at which innovations spread through social systems and populations’. Wilson et al. (2010) explain that this theory states that intrinsic characteristics of innovations determine the rate at which they will be adopted and that uptake is a gradual process based on five phases of innovation-decision processes: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation and confirmation (Wilson et al., 2010). Wilson et al. (2010) conclude that there are a number of frameworks available to support researchers in planning the dissemination of their work and that funders may consider encouraging researchers to adopt one of these theoretically informed models as part of the research process.

A further model considers the interrelated processes of diffusion, dissemination and implementation (Lomas, 1993). It describes diffusion as a passive term giving the example that those who receive diffused messages will already be open to receiving them. For instance, those reading a medical journal will be highly motivated people who will benefit from this form of communication around diffusion. Lomas (1993) describes dissemination as more active with implications around targeting the information for a particular audience so that messages will reach them, regardless of whether they were seeking it out. Implementation as a form of communication appears to extend beyond raising awareness and will need to overcome perceived barriers to the use of the information being shared (Lomas, 1993). Four areas are discussed in relation to understanding the process in which disseminated research is turned into local knowledge which in turn becomes embedded as part of changed practises: the Social-Influences model, Diffusion of Innovations theory, Adult Learning theory and marketing approaches (Lomas, 1993). Glasgow, Vogt and Boles (1999) work around the impact of public health research is framed by the RE-AIM Model which feels that interventions will be successful based on the interaction of five factors: reach, efficacy, adoption, implementation and maintenance.
Dissemination in Action Research

Lewin (1946) talked about action research having three core goals including the advancement of knowledge, the improvement of concrete situations and the improvement of methodology in the behavioural sciences. Sommer (2009) states that traditional dissemination methods will not suffice in meeting Lewin’s (1946) three goals of action research and that researchers will need to adopt innovative strategies in order to disseminate their work. When focussing on print media, action research needs to present different articles to a range of outlets. For instance, there should be variations of an article, not the same one published in different places. This might include a substantive piece in a technical journal which targets colleagues, an applied article in a periodical to target practitioners and methodological/reflective pieces in professional journals which aim to add to and strengthen action research practice (Sommer, 2009).

According to Forchuk and Meier (2014), disseminating the results and recommendations of a participatory action research project is ‘arguably the most important aspect’ and through effective dissemination, positive societal changes can take place. They state that if participatory action research is effectively disseminated, then the results can reach a number of stakeholders from those at policy and decision making levels to academic researchers and through this, it will lead to the promotion of positive outcomes within relevant communities (Forchuk & Meier, 2014). Forchuk and Meier (2014) refer to other research which claims that ‘It is vitally important to communicate results and interpretations with community partners and to present information in a way that is both informative and respectful’ (Montoya & Kent, 2011, p.1003).

Research implications of Paper One and Paper Two

The findings of Paper One and Paper Two have implications for practice at the research site, the organisational level and the professional level. This current research involves a systematic literature review which explores the ways in which EPs respond to a critical incident (CI), and an empirical study which is based upon the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) model of action research (Timmins, Shepherd & Kelly, 2003) and
comprising a task and finish group building upon original training materials in order to create a web-based resource for school leaders and EPs to use in the event of a CI.

Paper One evaluated and synthesised eleven studies which made reference to CIs and EP response. It was identified that EPs respond to CIs across three groups including pupils, staff and families and common responses included consultation, referral to other services, signposting and sharing psychological information. Whilst there were some similarities in response, variations were evident across EPSs in relation to direct work at either an individual or group level. A Model of CI Response was developed, based upon The Service Business Model (Checkland & Scholes, 1993). The Model of CI Response looked at the relationships between the service provider (EP/EPS), the service recipient (school staff) and the service recipient’s customer (pupils, school staff, parents/carers) and discusses the interactions which lead to some EPSs engaging with direct work as common practice. Wider factors around service delivery considered capacity, training and service delivery approach.

Paper Two outlines the process by which the task and finish group created a web-based resource titled The Critical Incident Resource (TCIR), for school leaders and EPs to use when preparing and supporting schools with a CI response. Project management skills which enabled successful completion of the initial aims were discussed: conceptual, human, negotiation, technical and verbal and written communication skills.

The implications for both papers at the research site, organisational level and professional level are outlined below.

**Implications for practice at the research site**

At the beginning of this research, the researcher met with the North West (NW) principal EPs (PEPs) in order to ascertain what would be a useful piece of research to feed into any gaps in awareness or understanding around CIs. Paper One answers questions posed by the NW PEPs around how EPs might respond to a CI and the request for evidence around why they should or should not engage with particular activities in order to support schools and individuals. The Model of CI Response now gives NW PEPs a framework for understanding some of the factors which impact upon their service delivery to school communities in the event of a CI.
Paper Two provides an overview of the structure of a successful project and the perceived facilitators and barriers by members of the task and finish group. This has implications for further project work which may be carried out by and/or commissioned by NW PEPs and EPSs, in collaboration with trainee EPs from The University of Manchester (UoM). This current research followed on from work which was built upon funding from the Department for Education (DfE) in the months following the Manchester Arena bombing and this was managed by one PEP within the NW of England. The production of a web-based resource will feed directly into the evaluation which this PEP will need to make of the ways in which the initial funding was utilised and any longer-term impacts of this.

**Implications for practice at the organisational level**

Paper Two has implications for school leaders in terms of both preparedness and knowledge of how to respond to a CI within their school community. It is hoped that the web-based resource, TCIR, will enable senior leaders to raise awareness of key areas of need related to CIs e.g. trauma and loss and bereavement, amongst the staff within their setting so that people feel prepared for a CI and confident in the most effective ways to respond. In fitting with this, there are also implications for the ways in which EPs can share the resource with school settings and appropriate members of staff. Furthermore, the resource has been identified as a useful tool with regards to training and upskilling all staff who work with schools communities in the aftermath of a CI e.g. Local Authority (LA) CI Response Teams.

**Implications for practice at the professional level**

Paper One highlighted a range of implications for practice at the professional level of EPs. For instance, inconsistencies in the range of services that EPSs offer to schools gives the impression of a ‘postcode lottery’ and this is something which the profession could reflect upon, in order to address equality of provision. The benefits of collaboration are illuminated within the review, linking back to the notion that joined up working will lead to improved outcomes for children and young people e.g. Children Act (2004), Working Together to Safeguard Children (2018). Another variation was the way in which EPSs evaluate their practice around CI response, indicating a gap which could be addressed on an individual basis by each EPS, working with schools in order to ensure that CI evaluation is sensitive and
relevant for all parties involved. A Model of CI Response which is outlined in Paper One identifies factors which may impact upon the way in which EPSs respond to CIs and their decisions around engaging with direct work including capacity, training and service delivery approach. This illuminates that a variety of responses occur based on many interacting factors within wider systems such as the EPS and LA ways of working. Concerns around EPs not always viewed as mental health professionals were identified within one of the studies in Paper One (Bischof, 2006). This has implications for the ways in which EPs as a profession may need to communicate and convey the ways in which they can work in order to support school communities, in relation to a CI. It was suggested that through sharing the Model of CI response with customers e.g. schools, they would have a wider understanding of the ways in which EPs work and why.

Paper Two also highlights broader implications around the need for the EP profession to become more digital in order to effectively share and maintain relevant resources. Part of the initial motivation behind the empirical research was to preserve the legacy of the initial training materials so that the effective collaborative work in response to the Manchester Arena bombing was not lost over time. For instance, EPs move between services and having a central bank of key resources, in this case through the web-based CI resource, ensures that effective tools are kept safely and in a way in which many people can access them easily. This also links to the suggestion that each NW EPS will appoint a resource monitor so that an annual maintenance group can keep the resource up-to-date and assess its utility and relevance.

Implications for the DfE were identified through Paper Two and the way in which two funding streams were combined in order to commission the current research: the DfE Initial Training of Educational Psychologists (ITEP) which funded the time of the researchers involved and the DfE Special Educational Needs (SEN) funding which led to the development of the CI materials by NW EPSs after the Manchester Arena bombing in May 2017. In Paper Two, the researcher highlights the value of combining the two funding streams and suggests that the DfE may consider this with future work in order to support research by TEPs across a wider and relevant range of topics, in order to support effective outcomes for children and young people.
Devising a strategy for dissemination and impact

Harmsworth et al. (2001) outline that for successful dissemination, the researcher needs to consider each of their target audiences or groups and the level of dissemination that is required. Benefits to the successful dissemination of research include reaching a number of key audiences which will lead to positive outcomes within important communities (Forchuk & Meier, 2014). The aim of this research was to support school communities in being prepared and equipped should a CI occur and this is hoped to be optimised through an effective dissemination plan. Some of the dissemination involved with this research was carried out incidentally through the launch of TCIR and this was planned for at the beginning, when the researcher outlined the phases which would be present throughout the process of the resource development, negotiating these with their supervisor and NW PEP commissioners.

Table 3 outlines the dissemination plan for this piece of research, drawing upon Harmsworth et al.s. (2001) levels of dissemination: awareness, understanding and action. The target groups are identified as schools, EPs/EPSs, Local Authority Services, the Department for Education and the research community. For each of these key target audiences, consideration is given to the method of dissemination, the intended outcome, the envisaged impact and ways in which the impact can be evaluated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Dissemination site/scope</th>
<th>Level of dissemination (Harmsworth et al., 2001)</th>
<th>Planned method of dissemination</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There will be a Resource Monitor in each EPS who can signpost EPs and school staff to TCIR. Access and use within schools in both a reactive and preventative manner.</td>
<td>Local schools in the NW will be better prepared to respond at a whole-school level to CIs. They will learn about key topics such as bereavement and trauma, through being signposted to TCIR by their link EP.</td>
<td>Feedback will be sought by going back to the schools who have been signposted to TCIR. Each Resource Monitor will bring data to the yearly review meeting such as the number of times TCIR has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of TCIR for school leaders to train staff around effective CI response, so that staff are prepared and have a level of understanding around ways to respond to a CI in the school community (Paper Two).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The Model of CI Response can be used by EPs to outline the support available to schools in the event of a CI (Paper one).

| Educational psychologists/Educational Psychology Services | Research site Professional | Awareness Understanding | Present TCIR at a NW PEP meeting. | NW PEPs will be aware of TCIR as a product of the commissioned research. | NW PEPs will understand what was created in order to enhance the legacy of the CI materials. They will have an understanding of how the resource is structured and its intended use. | Verbal feedback was gained from the NW PEPs within the meeting. Any suggestions were noted for later consideration e.g. disseminating TCIR more widely which is an agenda item at used/referred to schools. |

The Model of CI Response offers NW PEPs a framework for understanding why some services engage with direct work and others do not, linking back to their original query around offering...
- The EP profession may reflect upon inconsistencies in CI support for school communities (Paper One).

- An enhanced understanding of some of the facilitators and barriers for collaborative EP projects (Paper Two).

| Research site Professional Understanding Action | Email TCIR out to all NW PEPs. | NW PEPs will begin to use TCIR within their EPS and will share it more widely with their team. A resource monitor will be identified within each NW EPS. | The NW PEPs shared TCIR with their EPSs so all EPs within NW services have access to the resource, and can start using it within the service, LA and with school settings. | Evidence of some level of debate around tension of service inconsistency vs ‘responsiveness to local context’ in relation to CI response including some reference to Paper One. This may be from local or regional or national discussions, in person or the first annual meeting. |
- TCIR builds upon work completed by NW EPSs and will feed into evaluations by NW PEPs to the DfE.

- Factors around evaluation of CI response and professional collaboration are highlighted for EPs (Paper One).

- EPs need to become more digital in order to effectively maintain and share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Awareness Understanding Action</th>
<th>Publish Paper One in a professional journal – <em>Psychology in the Schools</em>.</th>
<th>Findings related to how EPs respond to a CI will be shared more widely with the international EP community.</th>
<th>Implications about EP practice will be accessed and taken on board by EPs within the UK and beyond.</th>
<th>Impact could be evaluated through ascertaining the number of downloads and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Awareness Understanding Action</td>
<td>Publish Paper Two in a professional journal – <em>Educational Psychology in Practice</em>.</td>
<td>The article would promote awareness of the facilitators and barriers to successful collaborative work within the EP profession. There would also be an increased awareness and usage of TCIR.</td>
<td>The reflections of the Task and Finish group will link into future cross-service collaborative EP work.</td>
<td>Impact could be evaluated through ascertaining the number of downloads and citations for the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant resources (Paper Two).</td>
<td>citations for the article.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organisational Awareness Understanding Action</td>
<td>Share findings of Paper One and Paper Two with CW&amp;C EPS in a team meeting whilst on placement.</td>
<td>The EPS will have an increased awareness of EP response to CIs and an understanding of why some engage with direct work whilst others do not. The EPS will also be able to reflect upon their practice and links with the Serious Incident Support Team (SIST).</td>
<td>EPS involvement with CIs within the LA may be enhanced and changed e.g. EPs becoming members of the SIST.</td>
<td>Feedback will be sought from the team around the usefulness of sharing the research findings and any ways in which they may impact upon individual practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Understanding Action</td>
<td>Yearly maintenance meeting to discuss the NW EPS representatives will be able to share the ways in which TCIR</td>
<td>Increased cross-service links in relation to EP CI response/practice.</td>
<td>Impact will be evaluated through the reported level of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
usage of TCIR and possibilities for wider dissemination e.g. nationally, beyond the NW (30.09.201). have been used within their service. Next steps related to wider dissemination e.g. DfE, nationally, will be discussed based upon perceptions of the success of TCIR.

uptake, proactive indications amongst the meeting attendees about plans to promote TCIR over the next twelve months, and the possibility of some EPs suggesting further use of online resources for other areas of their service delivery.
**Local authority services**
- Access to the use of TCIR for CI Response Teams in order to support local school communities in the event of a CI (Paper Two).
- Awareness of the appropriate ways to respond to CIs, based upon EP practice (Paper One).

| Department for Education (DfE) | Organisational Awareness | Training with CW&C Serious Incident Support Team sharing the output from Paper Two and conclusions about best practice from Paper One. | The SIST will have an increased awareness of how to respond to CIs, in line with recent literature. The SIST will have an action plan of next steps. | The SIST will have a strengthened CI response protocol and move away from debriefing techniques, and towards trauma informed approaches, in line with LA policy. | Impact was assessed through the use of evaluation forms, in which all attendees rated the training delivery and content as 5/5. The researcher will also have a meeting with the SIST leader at the end of Summer term to review progress towards the action plan. |

The researcher will speak to the DfE will be aware of the long
The DfE will be able to see the
1. DfE acknowledging
- Highlighted benefits from combining two funding streams when commissioning doctoral research (Paper Two).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research community</th>
<th>Research site</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For the efficacy and usage of TCIR to be researched as part of a doctoral thesis (Paper Two).</td>
<td>Work with UoM to commission a piece of research around the evaluation of TCIR.</td>
<td>This will feed into the need for doctoral thesis topics for TEPs, whilst also helping to evaluate the longer-term impact of TCIR.</td>
<td>The impact of TCIR will be highlighted through the findings of the research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the commissioning NW PEP about the possibility of feeding back to the DfE about TCIR.</td>
<td>term outcomes of the funding that they shared in order to support responses to the Manchester Arena bombing by NW EPSs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

benefits of combining two funding streams which will hopefully lead to more research like this in the future. The research commission published outputs will provide an evaluation of the impact of TCIR.  

2. DfE links any part of their SEND research strategy with the ITEP strategy.
Conclusion

In order to support evidence-based practice, EPs should be willing to work with key stakeholders in order to disseminate findings (HCPC, 2015, SoP 14.56). It is important to respond appropriately to CIs due to the adverse impact that they can have upon pupils and school communities. By their very nature they are sudden and unexpected and it is hoped that through creating TCIR, practitioners within school settings and wider e.g. LA staff, EPSs, will be better prepared to effectively support pupils and staff post-CI. This dissemination plan hopes to go some way to promoting the findings of this research so that key stakeholders are aware of how EPs can support schools.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Pilot Study – Thematic map for Research Question 1

RQ1: Which specific elements of the training materials have worked well in supporting schools understanding of critical incidents and why?
Appendix B: Pilot Study – Thematic map for Research Question 2

Purpose of the online resource

The need to establish a purpose

Face to face Vs. Online training

Online resources Vs. Online training

Purpose

RQ2: Which parts of the existing critical incident training would be useful as an online resource in case of future critical incidents?

Aspects to be included

Useful elements for an online resource

What there needs to be more of

Online presentation

Website to demonstrate best practice
Appendix C: Pilot Study – Thematic map for Research Question 3

RQ3: How would online resources for critical incidents best be accessed?

- Maintenance of an online platform
- Intended audience
- Danger of open access
- Requirements for online access
- Access granted with training attendance
- How to access the online resource
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Appendix F: Example of Researcher Diary notes

Reflections/Notes from Phase 1 & 2: recording 23.11.19

considering yearly C1 training (like ...)
+ idea of having Chris Services Officers (wider groups)
 \( \text{go in instead of C1s - increase capacity} \)

HW - important; acceptable

Legacy promised - plug gap

Group liked having BTT in pilote

RT: overworrying about triggering? HM: audience C1-used
SP: more open = more risk to it

BG: blanket health start \( \rightarrow \) some reactions more emotive

\( \text{Increasing LA concern/engagement in C1s \rightarrow our scope of this research (BG).} \)

\( \text{Crawford slip Technique \rightarrow RT = revealed TP, technophobic} \)

Interactive - share best practice (peer support = theme from SPs; support network = vital (RT))

BG: clarity around RT.

BG: interesting to see what universities do/in place for C1s \( \rightarrow \) our interests, outside of scope.
Appendix G: Example coding of group evaluation transcript using NVivo

P1: I think that’s a really good point...

P4: ...you know, in your meetings. Because we don’t...all our...people in [local authority B] who respond to critical incidents aren’t all EPS, so they’re from different teams...but there’s always...there always is an EP...but they go in...we go in pairs and we have regular critical incident team meetings where we do sort of update...how things are going and this would be helpful for that as well.

TEP: I think as well, I’ll mention it a bit later on, but around the idea of kind of...somebody in each [region] EPS service that’s...sort of in charge of this resource, is that makes sense, but maybe “in charge of” isn’t the right phrase...so if there is that person, I suppose it’s them keeping the awareness as well, isn’t it? And mentioning to colleagues, ‘Oh, don’t forget there’s that resource, you know, don’t just use it if a critical incident happens, you know, refresh yourself and look back over it and...’ Yeah, they’re kind of in charge and they know they’re coming along to these yearly meetings; it might help them to kind of keep the profile of it because what we don’t want is for it to...you know, take a year for us to develop it and get to where we’ve got and then for it to not be used at all...would be a shame.

P4: There can be maybe like a champion...

TEP: Yeah, ‘champion’ is a great word! Yeah...I like that word!

P3: I think if it was part of induction as well...it’d be helpful.

P1: That’s a good idea, yeah...part of induction. So we’re seeing it as having a dual purpose — both for critical incident teams themselves, whether they’re EPS or multi-agency like in [P4]’s case and then also for leaders in schools — is that what we’re saying? There’s two audiences really that it’s a beneficial resource for?

TEP: Hmm and we said, didn’t we, as well about the EPS as well, knowing their services and schools and stuff. And then we would know who to maybe...share it with in the schools as well. You know...
Appendix H: NVivo coding summary by Node

Coding Summary By Node

Task and Finish Group Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Classification</th>
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</thead>
</table>

Node
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Document
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
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P1: That’s a good idea, yeah...part of induction. So we’re seeing it as having a dual purpose – both for critical incident teams...themselves, whether they’re EPs or multi-agency like in [P4] ‘s case and then also for leaders in schools – is that what we’re saying? There’s two audiences really that it’s a beneficial resource for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 12:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P1: Yeah, so officers of the authority, yeah, because we’re probably going to be broadening out a bit more and...to get some...maybe some...yeah, LA officers who occasionally might be involved in visits to schools, so yeah, I think it would be good education for them as well. Or part of some training or follow up to some training, if we do some training for them, yeah.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 15:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P3: Coordinating diaries I know has been hard, hasn’t it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 15:07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P4: I’m just thinking on the IT side...I think IT was a bit of a challenge, but it was very ably met by [colleague]!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 15:08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P4: We didn’t really understand what could be done and what was possible and that…that influenced our direction...didn’t it, initially but we did have a lot of support with that...I don’t know really how that could be overcome in any other way really because it’s not until you’re thinking about what you want...you can see whether that’s...whether how and whether that is possible and what’s not possible...you know, like we wanted the...I can’t remember what we called it, like the comments board or the noticeboard or something and we...and we were told really that was going to be...that would have been too difficult and too difficult to maintain and to...

P2: So maybe...maybe like having that conversation a little bit earlier, we could have focused our conversation earlier knowing what we could and couldn’t do, in terms of ICT side of things. But I still think the initial brainstorming is good because you can kind of explore...all of your options and think about maybe things that could be done in the future, but in terms of the focus and remit of us...maybe having it around lunchtime on that first day might have been helpful.

P3: I think...another challenge I think...is...was establishing what the purpose was and...kind of sticking to that so we had quite a lot of...debate didn’t we, was it online training, was it supplementary...who was it for, so the audience and the purpose...I think obviously we’ve got there, you know, in a sense the material’s not...it’s difficult, isn’t it? We didn’t want it to just be accessible by anybody without that grounding of understanding and knowledge and just kind of...keeping the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>0.0902</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 13:31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

just the expertise from all of you, from different services, you know, you all work in different ways, so you’ve been able to share all that kind of...knowledge and practice, so I think that’s been really invaluable for helping the research

|    | RAD    | 24/11/2020 13:31 |

the other thing I thought about was [colleague]...and her IT skills, so I know I couldn’t have done it without, you know, [colleague] kind of prompting me and showing me how to do things first, so that’s been really useful.

|    | RAD    | 24/11/2020 14:54 |

P1: I was going to say that I thought it was helpful that we had a range of kind of...experience and...sort of...I don’t know how to describe it really, but...the stages of...EP...I think sort of like, newer and older EPs in the group...because for instance, I think [P2] has brought her actual doctoral work that she’s done...to the group, which has been really helpful so...it...we’ve got a combination of sort of hands-on experience on the ground...of crit experience and then we’ve got sort of actual research done by people in the group, like [P2] that’s been really helpful to draw on as well and those ways of thinking...so I think that combination has been really helpful...a lot of practical and

|    | RAD    | 24/11/2020 14:54 |

P4: Yeah and just like you were saying with the different experience being from different services...and some of us have been...some of us were involved in the original training materials and some of us weren’t and I think that’s been beneficial as well

|    | RAD    | 24/11/2020 14:55 |
and I’ve got to say you, [TEP], really…! You’ve been very calm and very…reflective and really helped to structure and move things on, but given a lot of opportunities I think for reflection, to really think about…what the purpose is…what we were aiming to do and…and it did take a lot of discussion, but I think it was really important discussion that we’ve…and we’ve continued that throughout…the time

having little working groups…has also been a really helpful strategy,

And that was really...really helpful to sort of divide up the tasks in that way, I think that was really helpful and then to keep coming back together and...and sort of move it on, the next step...I think that really helped it to progress throughout.

P1: I also think that giving the time for that gave...additional cohesion to our group and a sense of [00:27:09] within our

P3: Yeah, I just want to reiterate what [P4] said really about your skills as a facilitator...

P3: You know, I think it...you know, I think it’s made a massive difference, we’ve all felt we’ve had space to...to think, but at the same time, we’ve kept focused, which is no...no easy task is it? With a group of EPs!

P1: ...having support from...our EPSs, you know, to come on the...to be released [00:29:34]...uni to meet up.

TEP: That’s a really good point. Because I was able to go to one of the [region] PEP meetings...last June I think it was, so before we started the research and one of the things that [supervisor] and I mentioned was around...you know, asking the PEPs to mention it to their service, if anyone was interested, but we kind of stressed as well, you know, you’d need to give them some flexibility and time to be able to attend the meettines. so I think that would be important for the next project moving forward as well...sort of that...

TEP: I do think that...that first session where we could all meet was quite valuable
P4: And it gives you that time to sort of...to socialise and chat and talk about things that are not necessarily critical incident related...just to sort of build those relationships and...that understanding of where we’re all coming from.

you know, maybe other groups wouldn’t be as successful but I do think that it’s helped, the way you’ve all kind of engaged with it and approached it and taken it on as well, so thank you...for that.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 12:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 12:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 15:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 15:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was kind of thinking, you know, we’d have different signposting for different areas...that was actually sent out as an email to the PEPs but I think because of the time and everything else that was going on, the feedback from that was quite limited, so I wonder whether that was something that could be...thought about as well, moving forward, you know, in the sort of maintenance group...in a year’s time, you know, is there any more that we can add to it, are there any resources we’ve come across and...you know, maybe signpost it in that way.

Yeah, they're kind of in charge and they know they're coming along to these yearly meetings; it might help them to kind of just keep the profile of it because what we don’t want is for it to...you know, take a year for us to develop it and get to where we’ve got and then for it to not be used at all...would be a shame.

would be, you know, can we have somebody from each [region] psychology service who would, you know, kind of be the champion for this resource, so that will be the person that kind of knows...how to access it, they can share it with new people on induction or share it with, you know...wider members of the team, cascade it down to the rest of the EPs and you know, talk about how they should share it and safe ways to do that. And then hopefully those people would kind of be...I know not everyone will be able to make it, but the kind of people that would then be happy to come along to that yearly meeting...where we kind of look at, you know, how’s gone, how’s it been used...in the first one...and discuss any questions around...does anything else need adding in? Do we need to make, you know, the resource more regional? Add in more personalised things?

I think it’s important that we do...it does continue because it’s taken a lot of work and commitment to get to this point and we want to make sure that it is maintained and not lost, don’t we?
P2: I think it’ll be a nice way to... build on those links in between local authorities and sort of share good practice and... yeah, I think it... I’d be happy to join the maintenance group.

how quickly things can change and... advice and approaches so... it might be in a year’s time that, you know, a lot of lessons have been learnt from this pandemic and there’s a lot more resources or... links or things that we should include, you know, maybe it will be that we include a section around global pandemics... you know in a year’s time, so it’s just... having that sort of safety net and opportunity to... keep building on it, so we don’t want... you know, in three years’ time someone to look at it and say. That’s really outdated and not useful at all.

after a critical incident... a huge amount of information isn’t necessarily the most important thing... that something about those interpersonal skills and the connection and the relationships... and maybe the principles because I think we’ve got a lot of important principles in our... in the website as we’ve done it... as a resource, sorry, as we’ve done it and yeah... so whilst I’m sure that we will be able to add... further resources. I’m just a little bit wary about... thinking of more information as being the holy grail...

P4: Hmm, we don’t want to overwhelm, so part of the role of the group would almost be to... to be critically evaluating what...
I think those who’ve been to the training before did find it was a complement to the face-to-face training.

In terms of it complementing the face-to-face training, we’ve not…digressed, have we, from…those original materials we had…we’ve used, you know, we’ve just added to them, haven’t we and you know...

P2: I think the only ones that maybe haven’t been touched on quite as much as…or where there’s like variation, so sort of…I think we talked about maybe putting in some local…resources for different local authorities…which I think might be the variation that we’re referring to there…and then…just considering different settings, but this is a more general resource so I feel like…maybe those things could be added or adapted over time...

P3: I think because it…I mean it sounds kind of obvious, but it’s very psychological isn’t it, which is what we wanted everyone to be was psychologists! But the theory…really should be able to be applied to each setting, shouldn’t it…anyway…and the material adapted by the people who know their context and their setting rather than…the other way round, if you know what I mean. So I think it does meet that purpose of systems to be aware of...

P4: And it is psychological because we wanted it to be research based which it is…but our commentary and the way that we’ve structured it explains it…to…a non-psychological audience...

P3: I was thinking about the…when we had the focus group [TEP], we talked a lot about the kind of safety element, didn’t we, of doing this online – just looking at the last bullet point…I think…I think it does feel safe, I mean I don’t know if I’ve had any feedback about that, about…you know...

P1: Yeah, I mean so even maybe booking up some dates at the beginning of the year, I don’t know whether that would be…whether that would be helpful for the new…for the community cohesion group because I know there were some times when I was getting quite anxious about…when I was holding dates open and thinking, ‘Oh gosh, are they…you know, going to be…when are they going to be sort of confirmed?’ And it’s just…a logistical nightmare...
P1: Well, that’s what I was just thinking…if you had…yeah…in a way…I know that you had the whole thing sort of pencilled in anyway in terms of roughly when…the sort of…the milestones of the research would be through the year, but maybe…yeah, so if you did pencil in some dates…then at least people would have them in their diaries and would be knowing that they’d have to commit that amount of time. even if it wasn’t that date. maybe.

P2: I was wondering if maybe…having [colleague] come in a little bit earlier on that day because I think we spoke with her at the end of the day? Was it?

P2: So maybe…maybe like having that conversation a little bit earlier, we could have focused our conversation earlier knowing what we could and couldn’t do, in terms of ICT side of things. But I still think the initial brainstorming is good because you can kind of explore…all of your options and think about maybe things that could be done in the future, but in terms of the focus and remit of us…maybe having it

so yeah, it kind of goes back to that…having that time, doesn’t it, of being able to talk about one, the aims but also the purpose and…why you’re there I suppose and what you’re going to do with it.

OK…so yeah, linking it to that then, so are there any lessons or top tips that we can share with the next group? So I’ve already written down around…for the timings maybe planning out provisional dates for the whole years at the beginning, so people know what time they’ve got to commit, what they need to commit…that IT support being available to answer any questions around the vision, so that the group knows what they are able to do and maybe having that quite early on, like [P2] said…to sort of guide the aims and the vision…that time as well at the beginning to brainstorm, to agree, to explore what your focus is…around the aims and around the…purpose we said was quite useful, although it took some time. I suppose if people know that that’s a commitment at the beginning, it’s…it’s kind of OK.

P4: I was going to say, the working groups having little working parties to do specific tasks, that was really helpful.

and this might link in with lessons or top tips, I’m not even sure what the lesson is, but certainly the challenge…because it’s not quite the same, is it? Us meeting online like we are now…compared to coming in to uni, meeting face-to-face and so…giving some consideration to how…I don’t know…how that can be…that challenge can be met really…and I don’t know if anyone has got any tips about that.

P4: It’s like online team building…

P1: So I’m wondering whether…I don’t know, I mean…would there be an opportunity to have a socially distanced meeting of the people involved for the next one? Even if most of the following work was done online, say to have a face-to-face meeting that you could manage to socially distanced, I don’t know.
P4: I think we needed...we needed enough like laptops and things like that to be able to physically do things...logistically...parking helped! But as...

P1: And then we got sort of refunds and things for parking as well, didn’t we?

TEP: Yeah, yeah, it’s a good point, it kind of takes the pressure off having to fit and scribble every word that everyone says, you know, I’m just making sort of brief notes, but...it does free you up to kind of...be present, yeah. And it’s just been helpful, so...before our second session, I listened back to the recording from the first session because obviously we’d covered and spoke about so, so much in that first session...so yeah, so it was useful to kind of have that and be able to reflect back on it as well...yeah.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>0.0505</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>24/11/2020 12:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So most useful if they’ve already had opportunities to look at it and...you know, more at their leisure than in a highly pressured situation. It would be a good reminder...to go back to resources when something has happened.

| 2  | RAD    | 24/11/2020 12:16 |

Yeah, so you’re saying that it’s not going to necessarily be the greatest use when you’re just looking at it immediately...when a critical incident has just happened, it’s something that’s...best looked at beforehand,

| 3  | RAD    | 24/11/2020 12:22 |

but try and have kind of...in team meetings kind of regular kind of role plays or...you know, kind of critical incident discussions in the team, but it doesn’t always happen and...just to try and keep people’s confidence up so that if a critical incident happens in their school, they’re ready and I think this is...this would be a great supplement to that type of approach.

| 4  | RAD    | 24/11/2020 12:23 |

P4: No, I was just going to say the same...really the same thing that as an EP, when you’ve not been...involved in a critical incident for a while...you do sort of lose your confidence sometimes a little bit and you do need to sort of hit the ground running and to have something that’s easily accessible...is...is going to be helpful. But I like the idea of going back to it...

| 5  | RAD    | 24/11/2020 12:23 |

P4: ...you know, in your meetings. Because we don’t...all our...people in [local authority B] who respond to critical incidents aren’t all EPs, so they’re from different teams...but there’s always...there always is an EP...but they go in...we go in pairs and we have regular critical incident team meetings where we do sort of update...how things are going and this would be helpful for that as well.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By Initials</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24/11/2020 12:24</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P3: I think if it was part of induction as well...it'd be helpful.

You know...so...yeah, I think it’s...this could be a useful reminder and refresher for EPs...yeah.

TEP: It’s, you know, just listening to what you’re all saying, it’s quite nice to think actually it’s sort of got a multi-functional purpose across slightly different roles and you know, from my point of view, I think, ‘Oh, that’s quite nice to know that you know...it hopefully will be really beneficial to different kinds of people.’

P1: And then there’s that idea of...teaching something to someone else is a good way of reinforcing your own learning and so...if heads or leaders ____________ [00:22:01] have gone on the training and they...help to...cascade some of the learning through sharing the resource with their other leaders in their schools, that’s a good way of them reinforcing their own learning after the training, hopefully.
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- Postgraduate Taught (PGT)
- Undergraduate (UG)
- Postgraduate Taught + Undergraduate (the study will be conducted by BOTH an UG and PGT student; note: this is rare)

B2.13 IMPORTANT: BEFORE CONTINUING:

Look on the left hand side of the screen for the 'share' button. Push this button, enter the appropriate email address and be sure to tick all the relevant boxes in the pop up window.

I confirm that I have pushed the share button on the left hand side of the screen and 'shared' this form with my supervisor.

C01: Compliance & Monitoring

Please note: Everyone is required to complete the compliance & monitoring questions below, whether you are completing a Proportionate University Research Ethics Committee (UREC), full UREC or Division/School template application.

IMPORTANT NOTE: If you will be travelling abroad for your research, and in particular to what is considered to be a risky or dangerous area of the world, you must ensure that you have completed the appropriate Division/School based risk assessment, had this approved by appropriate individuals within your Division/School and checked with the University’s Insurance office regarding travel insurance. The ERM system WILL NOT inform the University’s Insurance office of your travel plans automatically (unless you are performing clinical activity) and it is therefore the responsibility of all members of staff and supervisors to contact the Insurance office prior to obtaining ethical approval. Please note that specific areas of the world will require additional approvals and this should be taken into consideration when planning a timeline for seeking ethical approval.

C1. Will your research involve any of the following:

Before answering this question please ensure you click on the help bubble to read the guidance information which includes definitions of each of the terms below. Tick all that apply.

- the use of invasive techniques on participants
- the use or collection of human tissue
- the physical testing of participants
- the use of psychological intervention (please DO NOT tick this option if you are only administering standard psychological tests/questionnaires)
- the ingestion or inhalation of any substance by participants
- the use of a medical device or a potential medical device
- None of the above

D01 - 02 General Project Information: Resubmission and titles

D1. Is this a re-submission of a project that has previously received an unfavourable ethical opinion?

- Yes
- No

21 April 2021
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D2. Short title of your research project (200 character max)

Developing and disseminating critical incident training materials

D2.1 Formal title of your research project (if different to short title)

D03 Dates of Data Collection/DMP/Data Collection

D3. Will you be collecting data during the course of the research project?

Please note, data refers to any information being gathered about a person or organisation. This information can include specifics such as thoughts, beliefs or characteristics and can be in different formats such as written notes, questionnaires, observations, audio recordings, films, photographs, social media postings or bodily samples.

☐ Yes
☐ No

D3.1 Proposed start date of data collection

Please ensure this date is far enough in the future to allow for the ethical review process to take place. The Committee will be unable to grant approval to applications which feature a start date that is in the past.

27/09/2019

D3.2 Proposed end date of data collection

30/06/2020

D3.3 Please attach a copy of your Data Management Plan:

Please note: if you are not collecting any data for this project, please read the guidance information in the help bubble for additional instructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Version Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Management Plan</td>
<td>Data Management Plan Thesis.pdf</td>
<td>08/08/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.9 KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D04 Data Protection Training

21 April 2021
All staff and students at the University of Manchester are responsible for ensuring they are familiar with the data protection policies and processes and follow these when conducting their research projects. Under the new General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) the University is required to provide assurances and safeguards to all research participants that their data will be treated confidentially and will be protected as set out to the relevant data protection legislation. To support this, please complete the relevant question below to confirm that you have undertaken the required Data Protection Training or discussed the University's requirements and expectations with your supervisor.

D4. Please tick each statement below to indicate that you understand and will adhere to data protection regulations and The University of Manchester’s data protection policies.

For more information, please see the University’s Records Retention Schedule and SOP for Recording of Research Participants.

- I will ensure that paper data (e.g. consent forms) are stored in a locked cabinet that only the research team has access to.
- I confirm that all electronic data will be stored on University servers such as my P drive or on the research drive of my supervisor or University approved cloud services e.g. Dropbox for Business.
- I will NOT use external hard drives, USB sticks or any other portable device to store personal identifiable data as they are subject to loss or theft.
- I will NOT use personal devices for the recording of audio, video or photographs. (Please refer to the SOP for Recording of Research Participants for more information).
- I understand that if I need to use a portable device to record and transfer data, this device should be University of Manchester owned and encrypted, the data transferred to a secure server as soon as possible and must be deleted from the portable device following the transfer. (If an encrypted device is not available you will need to make specific arrangements with respect to securing data as soon as possible and this must be detailed in your ethics application).
- I will NOT store data on cloud based services other than Dropbox for Business approved by the University.
- I will ensure that all data are anonymised/pseudonymised as soon as possible to protect the confidentiality of my participants.
- I will only collect the personal information that is required to answer my research question and as approved by the ethics committee.
- I understand that personal information should be deleted as soon as it is no longer required. If keeping the contact details of participants to contact them about future research or to share findings of my project, I will store these in a separate password protected file or database held on University servers or approved cloud services.
- I understand that all data should be stored in accordance with the University’s Records Retention schedule and must be kept for the period as specified in my data management plan or approved ethics application.
- I understand that my supervisor MUST be listed as the data custodian for my project and I must ensure that I transfer custody of all paper and electronic data to them before I leave the University.
- I understand that I SHOULD use encrypted devices when analysing my study data if not accessing the data directly from my P drive or other secure University server.
- I understand that I MUST ensure that when I am transcribing or analysing data that it is done in a way in which other people are NOT able to see any personal data on my devices.
- I understand that if I wish to share study data with other researchers or retain the data for use in future studies that I MUST ensure this is explicitly mentioned in the participant information sheet and consent form.
- I understand that ONLY University of Manchester or study specific email addresses/phone numbers can be used by researchers for their research projects.

Project Specification: L1-L3
WARNING: You are now completing the ethical review form for the School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED). If you are not affiliated with SEED, then please return to Question A5 and select your correct Division/School from the list of options.

Please note: This template allows SEED to provide ethical approval for research projects that comply with its terms and conditions. It should only be used for low and medium risk research projects conducted by undergraduate students, postgraduate taught students and postgraduate research students. If you are conducting a high risk research project, you must submit go to the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) for review.

If you are a member of SEED staff you must submit your research project to the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) for review.

This form covers research that:

- Involves only participants who are non-vulnerable adults able to give informed consent
- Involves children and young people in an educational setting/accredited organisation who have an opportunity to assent and where parental/guardian consent can be provided
- Will obtain informed consent (or assent) from all participants
- Does not involve physically invasive procedures
- Does not involve activities that pose a significant risk of causing physical harm or more than mild discomfort
- Does not involve activities that pose a significant risk of causing psychological stress or anxiety
- Does not require participants to take part in activities that pose a significant risk of having an adverse effect on their personal well-being (e.g. physical and psychological health), social well-being (e.g. social standing, social connectedness) or economic well-being (e.g. employment, employability, professional standing)
- Does not involve collecting or revealing data that enables individuals, groups or organisations to be identified in such a way that they could experience significant negative effects on their personal, social or economic well-being
- Does not involve activities that pose a significant risk of harming the researcher(s)

This form does not cover research that:

- Involves data from NHS patients
- Involves data relating to NHS staff that is not limited to non-sensitive questions about their professional role
- Involves users of other UK Health Department services

* Please confirm the following:

I declare that this project is being conducted by a student under the supervision of a University of Manchester member of staff.

L1. Please select your institute/discipline area:

Select one option

- Architecture
- Geography
- Global Development Institute
- Manchester Institute of Education
- Planning and Environmental Management

L1.1 If you are a student on the M. Ed Psychology of Education Programme, please tick the box below:

I confirm I am a student on the M. Ed Psychology of Education Programme.

21 April 2021
L2. Please clarify the specific project or study that you will be conducting:

Select one option

- Doctorate Research: Pilot/Fieldwork projects (PGR)
- Doctoral Research: Thesis/Publications (PGR)
- Professional Doctorate: Placements (PGR)
- Professional Doctorate: Thesis (PGR)
- Dissertation (UGT/PGrT)
- Course unit project (UGT/PGrT)

L3. Please clarify whether your project or study is classed as low or medium risk:

Please see the Help Bubble to the right of this question for detailed information about medium and low risk research projects.

- Low Risk
- Medium Risk

L3.1 Please confirm which of the following criteria are applicable to your project:

**Type of Participants (choose one option)**

- Adults who are able to give informed consent.
- Children in an educational setting, who are able to provide assent and a parental/guardian opt-in consent procedure has been established.

**Mandatory Criteria (ALL must be ticked)**

- Participants are NOT classed as vulnerable or dependant.
- Topics are NOT of a contentious and/or sensitive nature.
- Topics are NOT distressing.
- Topics are NOT of a confidential nature.
- There is NO risk of physical, emotional or psychological harm to participants.
- Ethical issues DO NOT include the risk of breaking confidentiality due to safeguarding concerns or disclosure requirements.
- Ethical issues DO NOT include the risk of possible coercion of participants.
- Data collection will take place in a public or semi-public space/building (i.e. high street, University campus, school building) or in a domestic environment familiar to the researcher (i.e. family home or friend’s residence).
- Data collection will take place within normal working hours and at a time convenient to participants.
- Data collection will take place exclusively within the EU or EEA.

**Optional Criteria (tick all that apply, if applicable)**

- The research will capture video, audio or photographic material and the researcher is able to guarantee controlled access to authorised viewing during analysis.
- Any public screening of the video, audio or photographic material captured by the researcher will be subject to the consent agreement with the participants.
- The research requires the collection of personal data, but data will be anonymised prior to analysis and write up or presented in a format which the participant has explicitly agreed and consented.

**Ethical Considerations: L4**

21 April 2021
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L4. Are participants from any of the following groups?

Tick all that apply
- NHS patients
- Children under 16 years who are being researched outside of an educational setting or accredited organisation.
- Adults with learning difficulties who are being researched outside of a supportive environment
- Adults who have a terminal illness
- Adults with mental illness
- Adults with dementia
- Adults in care homes
- Adults or children in emergency situations
- Prisoners or criminals
- Young offenders
- Users of illegal drugs or illegal substances
- None of the above

L5.

L5. Does the research involve physically invasive procedures?
- Yes
- No

L6.

L6. Does the research involve physical testing?
- Yes
- No

L7.

L7. Does the research involve the use of psychological tests for clinical purposes?
- Yes
- No

L8.
L9. Is it likely that taking part in the research will cause significant levels of embarrassment, distress or anxiety for participants?

- Yes
- No

L10. Is it likely that taking part in the research will cause significant levels of fatigue for participants?

- Yes
- No

L11. Does the research require participants to take part in activities that pose a significant risk of having an adverse effect on their:

- personal well-being (e.g. physical and psychological health)
- social well-being (e.g. social standing or social connectedness)
- economic well-being (e.g. employment, employability or professional standing)

- Yes
- No

L12. Will the research involve personally or socially sensitive topics likely to lead to significant levels of distress?

- Yes
- No
L13. Is there a significant likelihood that the research will uncover activities or events that should be reported to the authorities?

Please note: this includes illegal or potentially harmful activities.

☐ Yes  
☐ No

Research Project Details: L14

L14. What is the principal research question, in lay terms?

Limit response to 750 characters. This MUST be in lay language and should not be a cut/paste of your theoretical or intellectual rationale.

In relation to the training materials which were developed by local Education Psychology Services after the Manchester Arena attack,
1. Which elements will form the content of an online resource related to the critical incident training materials?
2. How should an online resource related to the critical incident training materials be presented and how will it be accessed?

L15

L15. How have the quality and suitability of the research design and methods been assessed?

Tick all that apply

☑ Independent internal review (e.g. review by academic supervisor/advisor, research centre/research group at the University of Manchester)
☒ External review (e.g. review by the funder of the research, methodological/technical expert, research centre/research group or commercial organisation not at the University of Manchester)
☑ In the case of a student research project reviewed by supervisor(s)
☒ Other

L16

L16. Please confirm the following:

☑ I confirm the design and methods of the study are appropriate for the question(s) being asked and the researcher(s) has addressed potential threats to validity, accuracy and/or integrity.

You MUST tick the box above in order to submit this form.

L17

21 April 2021
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L17. How many people will participate in the research, in total?

L17.3 If you will be using more than one group of participants, please explain why and how your total number will be broken down into specific groups:

This includes if you have experimental and control groups.

4 qualified Educational Psychologists (EPs) will take part in the decisions made by the task and finish group.
1 person will help the researcher with the IT side of things e.g. building an online resource.
3 trainee EPs will help to evaluate the finished product.

L18

L18. How was the number of participants decided upon?

Please select at least one option

☐ Statistical sampling. The sample size is large enough to provide adequate power for appropriate statistical tests concerning statistical significance, effect size and confidence intervals.

☐ Theoretical sampling. The number of participants is estimated to provide sufficient data such that further increases would likely yield no significant additional insights concerning the topic under investigation.

☐ Purposive sampling. The number of participants is based on access to the subject group most appropriate for answering the research question(s) under investigation (e.g. critical case sampling, key informant sampling or snowball sampling).

☐ Convenience sampling. The number of participants is based on selection of the most accessible subject group, to control costs in terms of time, effort or other resources.

Research Methods: L20
L20. Does the research involve any of the following data collection methods?

Tick all that apply

- Method validation
- Interviews
- Focus Groups
- Paper based surveys/questionnaires
- Electronic or online surveys/questionnaires
- Standard, copyrighted psychology questionnaires/tests
- Field observation (including participant observation)
- Child/infant behaviour observation
- Ethnography
- Visual methods (such as those used in Anthropology)
- Case study
- Social Network Analysis
- Diary methods
- Assessment (such as those used in Education research)
- Intervention
- Recordings (audio, video, photographs, etc)
- Use of pre-existing media (photographs, video, etc)
- Creative practice as research (such as drama or music pieces)
- Cognitive psychology/psychophysiology (e.g. perception, attention, memory, language, emotion)
- Cognitive neuroscience (e.g. EEG, eye-tracking, pupillometry, or related measures)
- Clinical, social or personality psychology (e.g. hypothetical scenarios, role playing, group interactions, personality/state/traits scales)
- Other qualitative methods (e.g. discourse analysis, interaction analysis, conversation analysis)
- Other on-line or electronic methods (e.g. netography, on-line research, textual analysis of digital sources)
- Any other method not listed above

L20.1 Please attach either a copy of the data collection tools you plan to use (e.g., questionnaires) or a very brief protocol describing the procedure (stimuli, responses, conditions manipulated, etc.)

If performing a study with more than one data collection tool please ensure you include documents for each (i.e. interview topics, guides, focus group schedules, questionnaires/surveys, etc)

**IMPORTANT:** If you are administering standard, copyrighted psychology questionnaires/tests to participants you MUST provide a description of the questionnaire/test to the Committee using the approved description form. Please ensure you use a separate form for each test and label each document with the name of the corresponding test before attaching to this question in the application form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Version Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional doc</td>
<td>Phase 1 Outline for CI study</td>
<td>Phase 1 Outline for CI research.docx</td>
<td>12/08/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.8 KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L20.2 Please briefly describe your methodology:

Please ensure your description is written according to the guidelines below:

- Provide responses in bullet point format and limit responses to no more than 2 sentences per bullet point.
- One or more bullet points must explain the background of the project.
- One or more bullet points must explain how participants will be identified, approached and recruited.
- Describe exactly what will happen to participants, how many times and in what order.
- Provide responses which are as clear and concise as possible

After the Manchester Arena attack in May 2017, the Department for Education awarded funding to the local Educational Psychology Services in order to support their response to the critical incident (CI). The funding was used to develop a set of training materials related to critical incidents and community cohesion, which were used with senior leaders from local schools.

This research will adopt Action Research principles and follow the RADIO Model in order to work alongside a task and finish group of five people (4 qualified Educational Psychologists (EP) and 1 trainee). The aim is to maintain the legacy of the CI training materials should a future CI occur. A preliminary investigation found that several EPs and a member of school staff felt that having the materials as an online resource would be beneficial.

The researcher attended a meeting of North West Principal EPs in order to share her thesis ideas with the group. This was then relayed to local Educational Psychology Services who asked their EPs to email the researcher if they were interested in taking part in the research.

The research will be broken up into six phases:

Phase 1 - As a task and finish group, establish the purpose of the online resource.
Phase 2 - Review of the current critical incident training resources as a task and finish group.
Phase 3 - Resource development, refinement and adaptation as a task and finish group.
Phase 4 - The researcher, her supervisor and an IT expert, to construct the resource platform (The task and finish group will be invited to attend this as an optional extra).
Phase 5 - User evaluation with the IT expert, the researcher, her supervisor and three trainee EPs from the researcher’s cohort.
Phase 6 - Clarification of final adaptations from Phase 5 with the task and finish group and then finalise clarifications with the IT expert.

L20.3 Please provide additional information below regarding recordings:

Please describe the content of the recordings and how they will be recorded/stored.

The four sessions which involve the qualified Educational Psychologists (EPs) will be recorded. The content will involve conversations between the EPs, who will be in the task and finish group, and the researcher (a trainee EP). The conversations will be about the refinement and development of the critical incident training materials which were developed by local Educational Psychology Services after the Manchester Arena attack in May 2017. They will be recorded on a University device and stored after each session, transferred onto the University of Manchester P Drive before the researcher leaves the University premises. The recording will be immediately deleted off the recording device.

L20.4 Please confirm the following:

I confirm that I have read, understood and agree to adhere to the guidelines and processes as outlined in the Recording of Participants in Research Projects standard operating procedures.

L21
L21. What do you consider to be the main ethical issues raised by the methodology and how will you address them?

Please provide details in the box below and structure your answers into a bulleted list.

Before taking part, the participants will receive a participant information sheet which will allow them to give informed consent.

Consent forms will also be signed by each participant before the research begins.

The consent form reminds participants that they have the right to withdraw at any stage.

Anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the research. All data collected will be anonymised and pseudonyms will be used in the formal write up of the work. Participants will be reminded at each stage not to share information about the other participants outside of the research setting.

Consent: L22

L22. Will the researcher(s) obtain direct informed consent/assent to take part in the research from all participating individuals?

☐ Yes
☐ Not required as this project will access social media data available to the general public or other routinely available online content for which informed consent is not required.

L23

L23. How will the consent be obtained or verified?

Please note, this section refers to the information being given to adults (or parents only).

☐ Written consent (please use the University template)
☐ Verbally (please explain recording method in the box below)
☐ Implied (with the return/submission of a completed questionnaire/survey)

L23.1 Please declare the following:

- The researcher(s) will provide an information sheet to all persons invited to take part that explains in concise and clearly understandable terms:
  1. who is conducting the research
  2. why it is being conducted (including the true purpose of the research)
  3. why they have been asked to take part
  4. what it requires of them (including the amount of time they will be required to commit and what they will have to do)
  5. what will happen to the data they provide
  6. whether and how their anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained
  7. that their participation is voluntary and they are free to withdraw at any time without detriment (where possible)

- The researcher(s) will ensure that participants sign/mark a consent form to indicate that they have received sufficient information about the research and are happy to take part.
- All information sheet(s) and consent form(s) to be used are attached below.

☐ I confirm all of the above declarations.

The declaration above MUST be ticked in order to submit this form.
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L23.2 Please attach a copy of your GDPR compliant consent form(s):

**WARNING:** Your application will be returned to you and incur substantial delays unless you use the new GDPR compliant templates. Please see the help bubble attached to this question for additional guidance.

For secondary data analysis studies only, please provide proof that the analysis you wish to perform falls within the original consent of data subjects.

This must be attached in order to submit your form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Version Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td>Consent Form.docx</td>
<td>16/06/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.6 KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L23.3 Please attach a copy of your GDPR compliant participant information sheet(s):

**WARNING:** Your application will be returned to you and incur substantial delays unless you use the new GDPR compliant templates. Please see the help bubble attached to this question for additional guidance.

For secondary data analysis studies only, please upload a copy of the permission letter from the data controller or external organisation in support of the project.

This must be attached in order to submit your form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Version Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information Sheet</td>
<td>Participant Information Sheet</td>
<td>Participant Information Sheet.docx</td>
<td>18/06/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.8 KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L24-L25

L24. Will you be including participants who are under the age of 16?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

L26-L27

L27. Will the researchers give participants at least 24 hours to decide whether or not to take part in the research?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

21 April 2023
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L28. Are participants from any of the following groups? 

Tick all that apply

- Children under the age of 16 in an educational setting or accredited organisation
- Adults with learning difficulties in familiar, supportive environments
- I will not have any direct contact with participants from either of these groups, but they will be approached to participate in my study via a gatekeeper (i.e. a teacher) and will be completing a questionnaire/survey.
- None of the above

L29

L29. Could participants be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the researcher(s) (e.g. students taught or examined by the researcher(s), clients of the researcher(s)).

- Yes
- No

L30-L31

L30. What are the inclusion criteria for participants?

- Participants will be included only if they have experiences and/or characteristics relevant to the research question(s) being investigated.

You MUST tick the box above in order to submit this form.

L31. What are the exclusion criteria for participants?

- Participants will be excluded only when they do not have experiences or characteristics relevant to the research question(s) being investigated.

You MUST tick the box above in order to submit this form.
L32. How will participants be approached and recruited?

Tick all that apply

☐ The researcher(s) will approach participants directly and will:
  1. provide sufficient information to enable informed consent
  2. not pursue non-responders beyond two reminders, and
  3. maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of responders and non-responders

☐ The researcher(s) will approach participants indirectly via a third party and the third party will ensure any and all information:
  1. is not coercive,
  2. is limited to information that prospective participants need to determine their eligibility and interest,
  3. does not state or imply a favourable outcome or other benefit beyond what is outlined in the participant information sheet and does not emphasise payments/inducements, using means such as large or bold type, and
  4. contains information that is accurate, honest and socially responsible regarding who is conducting the research, its purpose, risks/benefits, requirements of taking part, contact details for further information

☐ Participants will be recruited using an advertisement or equivalent communication (e.g. posters, flyers, block email, social media invitations/announcements/pages) and the researcher(s) will ensure that any and all information:
  1. provide sufficient information to enable informed consent,
  2. not pursue non-responders beyond two reminders, and
  3. maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of responders and non-responders

☐ Not applicable as this is a secondary data analysis of existing data/samples

L32.1 Please attach a copy of any introductory letters or emails that will be sent to gatekeepers or used to recruit participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Version Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Permission</td>
<td>NWAPEP Meeting 8th June 2019</td>
<td>NWAPEP Meeting 8th June 2019.docx</td>
<td>06/06/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7 KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L33

L33. Will participants receive payment or other incentives for taking part in the research?

☐ No

☐ Yes, but the payments and/or incentives provided will not be sufficiently coercive to over-ride freely given consent, taking into account the financial status of the participants targeted. Specifically, the sums involved will only cover reasonable out of pocket expenses (e.g. travel expenses), reasonable recompense for time given to take part in the study, Psychology credits at standard rate for this type of research and/or will be in the form of a prize draw.

Risks to Researchers: L34
L34. Where will the data collection take place?

Tick all that apply.

☐ In a University building on campus.
☐ In the researcher’s residence/accommodation
☐ Off-campus in a public space (e.g. a high street or café) in the UK that poses no significant risk to the safety and well-being of participants and researchers
☐ Off-campus in a public space (e.g. a high street or café) in a safe international setting which poses no significant risk to the safety and well-being of participants and researchers.
☐ Off campus at a private building or institutional setting (e.g. the premises of a work organisation, participant’s place of work or private residence) in the UK that poses no significant risk to the safety and well-being of participants and researchers.
☐ Off-campus at a private building or institutional setting (e.g. the premises of a work organisation, participant’s place of work or private residence) in a safe international setting which poses no significant risk to the safety and well-being of participants and researchers.
☐ SALC Linguistics/English Language Students ONLY: My project will be primary or practice research conducted in a public space or building within normal working hours, or in a domestic environment familiar to the researcher, within normal working hours or at a time convenient to participants.

L34.1 You MUST agree to the following condition:

☐ The researcher(s) has reviewed the Division/School’s risk assessment for office environments.

L34.4 Please specify the exact location

Ellen Wilkinson Building, Room 5.14

L35

L35. Will any of the researchers be required to collect data alone in an off-campus setting?

Please note this does not include gathering survey results or social media data from a computer in your own residence/accommodation.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Conflicts of Interest: L36

L36. Do any of the researchers have any direct personal involvement (e.g. financial interests, share-holdings, personal relationships, etc.) in an organisation involved in sponsoring, funding or guiding the research that may give rise to a possible conflict of interest?

☐ Yes
☐ No
L37
L37. Is any organisation directly involved in sponsoring, funding or guiding the research that may give rise to a possible conflict of interest?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Reporting Arrangements: L38

L38. How do you intend to report and disseminate the results of the study?
Tick all that apply
☑ Peer reviewed scientific journals
☐ Book/chapter contribution
☐ Published review (e.g. ESRC, Cochrane Review)
☐ Internal report
☐ Conference presentation
☐ Thesis/dissertation
☐ Assessed course unit submission
☐ Other (e.g. creative works)

L39

L39. How will the results of research be made available to research participants and communities from which they are drawn?
Tick all that apply
☑ Written feedback to research participants
☐ Presentation to participants or relevant community groups
☐ Other (e.g. video/website)
☐ Results will not be made available

Research Sponsorship: L40

L40. Are you in receipt of any funding for your study (either internal or external)?
☐ Yes
☐ No

L41
L41. Who will be responsible for governance and insuring the study?
- The University of Manchester
- Other organisation

Supporting Documents: L42

Please use this section to attach any additional documentation that you have not attached previously in this form. If you do not need to attach any additional supporting documentation, please tick the box at the bottom of the page.

The supporting documents that you may have already been required to attach are:
- Interview guide
- Focus group topic guide
- Questionnaire(s)
- Statistical review
- Advertisements/e-mails/recruitment text
- Social media recruitment text
- Consent/assent form(s)
- Participant information sheet(s)
- Letters from gatekeepers/letters of permission

Examples of documentation that you may wish to attach include, but are not limited to:
- Translated documents
- Verification of translated documents
- Distress protocol/brief sheet
- Lone worker policy/procedure
- Confidentiality agreements
- Ethical approval from partnering institutions
- Local insurance arrangements
- Completed risk assessment forms

L42. Additional supporting documentation

☐ I confirm that all required supporting documentation for this project has been appended.

Final Declaration: L43

L43. In order for your application to proceed to review, please confirm the following:

- To the best of my knowledge the information that I have provided here is accurate and I understand that any deliberate attempts to withhold necessary information or mislead the School Research Ethics Committee will result in my project being given an unfavourable decision.
- I understand that while I have completed this form for undergraduate/postgraduate research, the School Research Ethics Committee may escalate my application to the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) if my research is deemed to be high risk.

☐ I confirm both of the above declarations.

You MUST tick the box above in order to submit this form.
Required Signatures

Final Declarations

1. The information in this form is accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief and I take full responsibility for it.
2. I agree to abide by the ethical principles underlying the Policy on the Ethical Involvement of Human Participants in Research and the University’s Code of Good Research Conduct.
3. If the research is approved I agree to adhere to the terms of the full application as approved and any conditions set out by the review body in giving approval.
4. I agree to notify the review body of any amendments to the terms of the approved application (both minor and major), and to seek a favourable opinion from that review body via the formal process before implementing the amendment.
5. I agree to submit annual progress reports setting out the progress of the research as well as end of study reports, as required by the review body for all UREC proposals.
6. I understand that research records/data may be subject to inspection by the review body for audit purposes. In addition, I understand that research records/data for those studies that use human tissue, medical devices or pharmaceutical products may be subject to inspection by regulatory authorities for audit purposes.
7. I understand that the information contained in this application, any supporting documentation and all correspondence with the review body or its operational managers relating to the application
   ○ Will be held by the University until at least 5 years after the end of the study or at least 10 years for those studies involving medical data.
   ○ May be disclosed to the operational managers of the review body in order to check that the application has been processed correctly or to investigate any complaint
   ○ May be seen by auditors appointed to undertake accreditation of the University (where applicable)
   ○ Will be subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and may be disclosed in response to request made under the Act except where statutory exemptions apply
   ○ May be sent by email to members of the review body
8. I understand that information relating to this research, including the contact details on this application, will be held by Infonics Ltd, and that this will be managed according to the principles established in the Data Protection Act 2018.
9. I confirm that I have not included any sensitive personal information including a curriculum vitae or identifiable information about my racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or similar beliefs, trade union membership, physical or mental health, sexual life, commission of offenses and/or criminal proceedings.

IMPORTANT: Please ensure you request the signatures of the PI or supervisor (if required).

The system now features an automatic submission function which will automatically submit your application (usually within 60 seconds) after all required signatures are obtained as described below.

Please ensure you remain signed into the ERM system until the screen refreshes and you receive confirmation that a) your signature has been accepted and b) your application has been successfully submitted.

You will receive an email confirmation of the submission for your records. Please check your junk mail folders.

WARNING: Once you have signed the form, it will be locked and if you wish to make further changes you must 'unlock' the form, which will break any signatures already obtained.

For staff projects, if you are NOT the PI, you must obtain their signature (using the request button below).

For student projects, if you are NOT the supervisor, you must obtain their signature (using the request button below).

For student projects, if you ARE the supervisor please ensure you sign the form.
Signature of the Primary Supervisor

To sign this form please look on the left hand side of your screen for an action button called Sign that has a picture of a pencil on it. Please push this button and this button only to sign the form.

Please note that if you are the student requesting your supervisor’s signature that by pressing this request button you are confirming that the application is complete, accurate to the best of your knowledge and ready to be signed off by your supervisor for further processing by relevant Division/School/UREC colleagues.

Signed: This form was signed by Prof Kevin Woods (kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk) on 13/08/2019 07:17
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Environment, Education and Development School Panel PGR
School for Environment, Education and Development
Humanities Building, Street 1, 117
The University of Manchester
Manchester
M13 9PL
Email: PGR.ethics.seed@manchester.ac.uk

02/10/2019

Dear Miss Rebecca Dunne, Prof Kevin Woods

Study Title: Developing and disseminating critical incident training materials

Environment, Education and Development School Panel PGR

I write to thank you for submitting the final version of your documents for your project to the Committee on 13/08/2019 07:17. I am pleased to confirm a favourable ethical opinion for the above research on the basis described in the application form and supporting documentation as submitted and approved by the Committee.

Please see below for a table of the titles, version numbers and dates of all the final approved documents for your project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Permission</td>
<td>NWAPEP Meeting 9th June 2019</td>
<td>08/09/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td>16/06/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information Sheet</td>
<td>Participant Information Sheet</td>
<td>18/06/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management Plan</td>
<td>Data Management Plan Thesis</td>
<td>08/08/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional...</td>
<td>Phase 1 Outline for CI research</td>
<td>12/08/2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This approval is effective for a period of five years and is on delegated authority of the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) however please note that it is only valid for the specifications of the research project as outlined in the approved documentation set. If the project continues beyond the 5 year period or if you wish to propose any changes to the methodology or any other specifics within the project an application to seek an amendment must be submitted for review. Failure to do so could invalidate the insurance and constitute research misconduct.

You are reminded that, in accordance with University policy, any data carrying personal identifiers must be encrypted when not held on a secure university computer or kept securely as a hard copy in a location which is accessible only to those involved with the research.

For those undertaking research requiring a DBS Certificate: As you have now completed your ethical application if required a colleague at the University of Manchester will be in touch for you to undertake a DBS check. Please note that you do not have DBS approval until you have received a DBS Certificate completed by the University of Manchester, or you are an MA Teach First student who holds a DBS certificate for your current teaching role.

Reporting Requirements:

You are required to report as follows:
1. Amendments: Guidance on what constitutes an amendment
2. Amendments: How to submit an amendment in the ERM system
3. Ethics Branches and address system
4. Data breaches

We wish you every success with the research.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr Kate Rowlands
Appendix K: Participant Information Sheet

Developing and disseminating critical incident training materials

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research study [as part of a doctoral thesis for the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology]. Before you decide whether to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Who will conduct the research?
Rebecca Dunne – Trainee Educational Psychologist.
Manchester Institute of Education, The University of Manchester.

What is the purpose of the research?
After the Manchester Arena attack in May 2017, funding was awarded to the North West Association of Principal Educational Psychologists and with this, a range of training materials for critical incidents were developed. A preliminary study which investigated the critical incident training materials, found that the creation of an online resource would be helpful in maintaining the materials in case of future critical incidents. This research aims to review, revise and develop the materials into an online platform. Through action research and a collaborative approach, a working party will clarify the purpose and audience for the critical incident materials before deciding what format the online resources will take.

Why have I been chosen to take part in the research?
You have been chosen as a practising Educational Psychologist in the North West region, who has developed or presented the critical incident training materials or has an interest and/or area of specialism in relation to critical incidents. The researcher hopes to recruit five participants in total in order to create a working party of six – five Educational Psychologists and the researcher, a TEP.

What will I be asked to do if I take part?
If you decide to take part in this research, you will be invited to participate in a working party with five other people. It is anticipated that the research will have six phases – Please see the table below for an overview and estimate timeline of each phase. As a member of the working party, you will be asked to attend four of these phases: Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3 and phase 6. When the working party has been established, dates for each phase will be decided as a group, in order to suit the availability of all members. You will be welcome to join in with Phase 4 and 5 if you wish, however, these phases are optional and not a requirement of taking part in this research. As with any sensitive area of discussion, you should consider if you feel able to participate in relation to your own feelings and experiences.
The sessions will take place at The University of Manchester with refreshments provided and travel expenses covered. There are no direct risks to you taking part in the research, depending on your feelings towards this area, but it would help to inform the future of the critical incident training materials and support schools and young people in the future, should a critical incident occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish a working group of qualified EPs from the North West of England. As a group, decide on a clear view for the process and what the purpose of the online resource will be.</td>
<td>End of September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spend half a day reviewing all of the materials which were created post Manchester Arena attack.</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a working group, spend a day developing, refining and adapting the materials so that they are suitable for an online resource.</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The researcher, her supervisor and an IT expert from The University of Manchester will spend a day constructing the resource platform.</td>
<td>January – March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>User evaluation session. The researcher will recruit three TEPs from her cohort in order to take part in this phase. The IT expert will show the TEPs how to navigate the online resource. They will then take this knowledge and resource back to their placement setting and show it to their team. At a later stage, they will feed back their evaluations of the resource to the researcher.</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>With the working group, clarify any final amendments from Phase 5 findings. Finalise any adaptations with the IT expert. Send out the resource link and information to North West PEPs.</td>
<td>May 2020 June 2020 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What will happen with the data collected?**

In order to undertake the research project, we will need to collect the following personal information/data about you:

- Your current professional role;
- An audio recording of the working party discussions which will be obtained during the four phases and consist of voice only. The recording will be analysed anonymously and used to inform the discussion of an academic piece of writing.

Only the research team will have access to this information.

We are collecting and storing this personal information in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018 which legislate to protect your personal information. The legal basis upon which we are using your personal information is “public interest.
task” and “for research purposes” if sensitive information is collected. For more information about the way we process your personal information and comply with data protection law please see our Privacy Notice for Research Participants.

The University of Manchester, as Data Controller for this project, takes responsibility for the protection of the personal information that this study is collecting about you. In order to comply with the legal obligations to protect your personal data the University has safeguards in place such as policies and procedures. All researchers are appropriately trained and your data will be looked after in the following way:

The study team at the University of Manchester will have access to your personal identifiable information, that is data which could identify you, but they will anonymise it as soon as practical. However, your consent form and contact details will be retained for five years and stored securely on the University of Manchester P Drive system, along with the audio recording and transcribed text. If the audio recording needs to be transcribed, this will be done through a University approved transcriber who use password protected methods to obtain the data. All data will be transferred securely on University premises i.e. this will be done on campus, using a University of Manchester computer. The analysis of the transcript may be accessed during future thesis research throughout 2019-2021.

You have a number of rights under data protection law regarding your personal information. For example, you can request a copy of the information we hold about you, including audio recordings. This is known as a Subject Access Request. If you would like to know more about your different rights, please consult our privacy notice for research and if you wish to contact us about your data protection rights, please email dataprotection@manchester.ac.uk or write to The Information Governance Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, M13 9PL. at the University and we will guide you through the process of exercising your rights.

You also have a right to complain to the Information Commissioner’s Office, Tel 0303 123 1113

Will my participation in the study be confidential?

Your participation in the study will be kept confidential by the study team and those with access to your personal information as listed above. The audio recordings will be used to create a transcript and this will be carried out by a University approved transcriber who is aware of the GDPR protocol. All personal information will be removed from the final transcript. The recording will be stored on the University of Manchester P Drive and deleted from the audio recording device as soon as it has been transferred.

The transcription will be anonymised as well as any participant details in the academic write up of this study as the data will be reported in such a way that individuals cannot be readily identified. Each individual will be identified via an assigned participant ID only known to research team.

What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to yourself. However, it will not be possible to remove your data from the project once it has been anonymised and forms part of the dataset as we will not be able to identify your specific data. This does not affect your data protection rights. You will not be able to decline the audio recording once you have
agreed to be a participant as it will be essential to your participation in the study. During the study, you should be comfortable with the recording process at all times and will be free to stop recording at any time.

Will my data be used for future research?

When you agree to take part in a research study, the information about your health and care may be provided to researchers running other research studies in this organisation. The future research should not be incompatible with this research project and will concern Educational Psychology and its response to critical incidents. These organisations may be universities, NHS organisations or companies involved in health and care research in this country or abroad. Your information will only be used by organisations and researchers to conduct research in accordance with the UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research.

This information will not identify you and will not be combined with other information in a way that could identify you. The information will only be used for the purpose of health and care research, and cannot be used to contact you regarding any other matter or to affect your care. It will not be used to make decisions about future services available to you.

Will I be paid for participating in the research?

You will not be paid for taking part in this research. Refreshments will be provided during each phase and travel expenses will be covered.

What is the duration of the research?

Initially, all participants will be required to complete a consent form which should take a minimal amount of time. Your involvement in the research will last for four sessions, ranging from September 2019 to June 2020. The sessions may vary from half a day to a full day e.g. 10am to 5pm. The researcher has explained these time commitments to North West Principal Educational Psychologists. There will also be a small amount of correspondence (most likely, via email) between the researcher and the Educational Psychologists, prior to Phase 1, in order to arrange dates for each phase.

Where will the research be conducted?

The research will take place at:

Manchester Institute of Education,
School of Environment, Education and Development,
Ellen Wilkinson Building,
The University of Manchester,
Oxford Road,
Manchester,
M13 9PL.

The exact room location will be confirmed by the researcher prior to each phase of the study.
Will the outcomes of the research be published?

The researcher is conducting this study as part of her doctoral thesis, which will be undertaken from 2019-2021. The findings from this research will form the main part of a doctoral thesis as part of the researcher’s doctoral training. The researcher may submit this research for consideration to be published as part of the researcher’s doctoral thesis, upon completion in 2021. If this occurs, the researcher will inform you.

Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) Check (if applicable)

The researcher has an up-to-date enhanced certificate from the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Who has reviewed the research project?

This research has been reviewed by the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee.

What if I want to make a complaint?

Minor complaints

If you have a minor complaint then you need to contact the researcher in the first instance.

By email: Rebecca.dunne@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

By telephone to The University of Manchester: 0161 275 3511

You can also contact the researcher’s University Supervisor:

Kevin Woods

Kevin.woods@manchester.ac.uk

Formal Complaints

If you wish to make a formal complaint or if you are not satisfied with the response you have gained from the researchers in the first instance then please contact

The Research Governance and Integrity Manager, Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, by emailing: research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk or by telephoning 0161 275 2674.

What Do I Do Now?

If you have any queries about the study or if you are interested in taking part then please contact the researcher:
By email: Rebecca.dunne@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

By telephone to The University of Manchester: 0161 275 3511

This Project Has Been Approved by the University of Manchester’s Research Ethics Committee
[2019-7903-11647]
Appendix L: Participant consent form

**Developing and disseminating critical incident training materials**

**Consent Form**

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet (Version 1, Date 16/06/2019) for the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to myself. I understand that it will not be possible to remove my data from the project once it has been anonymised and forms part of the data set. I agree to take part on this basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I agree to the phases that I take part in being audio recorded (Phases 1, 2, 3 and 6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I agree to maintain confidentiality after each phase and not share any of the other working party members names or views with a wider audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books, reports or journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I agree that the researchers may retain my contact details in order to provide me with a summary of the findings for this study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I agree to take part in this study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Protection**

The personal information we collect and use to conduct this research will be processed in accordance with data protection law as explained in the Participant Information Sheet and the Privacy Notice for Research Participants.

________________________  ________________________
Name of Participant        Signature               Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the person taking consent</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[One copy of the consent form will be kept by the participant and one copy (original) will be stored securely by the researcher]
CRITICAL INCIDENT
TASK AND FINISH GROUP
SESSIONS 1 & 2

AGENDA

• Pilot study findings
• Exploration of CI training materials
• Tea and coffee
• Lunch
• Continue research exploration
A1 FOCUS GROUP – APRIL 2019

3 EPs and 1 DHT from a SEMH PRU
Theme 1: Benefits

Benefits of the materials included the practical advice, the ability to support a school's needs and the school being ‘...in a position to continue to monitor and support the young people’. Also, the materials are user-friendly, a useful framework and they allow for a level of preparedness amongst schools.

Benefits of the training included positive impressions of the training days e.g. opportunities to work in professional groups allowed the attendees to think about how they would make immediate use of the given information. Requests for CI involvement had decreased following the training which led the focus group to suggest that schools were in a stronger position to support themselves as a result.

Theme 2: Barriers

Barriers to implementing the materials included staff communication. Also tied to this was the concern that staff wouldn’t have the confidence to disseminate it and then follow-up appropriately. Another barrier was seen as funding and the fact that although the Local Authority provides an initial response to a CI, schools must then commission on-going support. Staff turnover and too many competing initiatives were also perceived as barriers.

Barriers to delivering the training included time as the EPs felt that there was a lot of material to work through on the day and consequently, some elements ended up a little bit rushed. It was also suggested that the topic of CIs wasn’t prioritised as an area for training and that staff may put it to one side until it affects them directly.

Theme 3: Useful elements of the materials

Communication resources; A clear and comprehensive framework which can act as an aide memoire in order to provide guidelines or an overview of what to do when a CI occurs; The monitoring matrix which allowed staff to identify vulnerable pupils and adults; The evaluation tool was seen to aid this, as participants felt that once it was completed, staff could reflect on their plans to support young people and staff and what could be put in place both internally and externally.
Theme 4: Adaptation of the materials

The focus group felt that some adaptation of the materials was necessary. Some services have added in more material about a certain area such as bereavement or even shortened topics such as communication, whilst being mindful of the content. The group stated the importance of knowing your setting and using that to expand certain areas.

Theme 5: Facilitators of the materials

Delivering the training yearly and not just as a one off, post Manchester Arena attack. One EP service was doing this and felt that it was an effective way to overcome the problem of staff retention and turnover and allowed several staff within the same setting to access the training. One participant suggested that Local Authority support would also increase capacity and would help to raise the profile of the materials.
Theme 1: Purpose

The need to establish a purpose, one participant saw it as the initial priority, ‘...these intended outcomes, that for me, that would be the first job...if you were developing any online resources, is really kind of bottoming that out...what are we wanting to achieve...’ and concluded that the first job would be answering the question, ‘...what’s the purpose of it?’.

Different ideas around the purpose of the online platform included its role as a safety net which would be scaffolded and there for people to ‘...access information as and when and why they need to access it’. The participants felt that it was important to preserve fundamental knowledge or information so that people can have access to it. The resource could provide convenient and key information or guidance about CIs online and act as a point of reference. Another purpose would be to assist with staff turnover, which was identified as a barrier to the effectively utilising the materials.

Theme 2: Useful elements for an online resource

Aspects to be included - a list of definitions related to CIs, a framework for procedures, ideas of what should be included in a variety of scripts and guidance for contacting the parents. Also, there should be signposting to other helpful websites and a list of contacts and resources. It was felt that ‘...the importance of identifying who’s vulnerable following a critical incident’ should be included along with a link to the monitoring matrix. The communication resources were highlighted as useful and participants wondered if a subsection about this area would be helpful within the online resource in order to promote a ‘shared consistent message’.

Online presentation – an interactive factor. It was suggested that this could help to translate some of the ‘heavy duty’ information and illustrate some of the points. It was also indicated that without any face to face interaction online, it ran the risk of being tokenistic.

What there needs to be more of - There should be an expanded section around bereavement if the materials were made into an online resource and tried to draw a distinction between types of bereavement. The participants also mentioned that head teachers had requested more information about bereavement following the CI training.
**Theme 3: Website to demonstrate best practice**

Having ‘examples of best practice’ and ‘... it would be good if you did have a website to advise that that is really best practice’. This area of discussion led the participants to talk about the ‘handy’ nature of such a resource and suggest how it could be used.

**Theme 4: Face to face Vs. Online**

**Online resources Vs. online training** - One EP clarified that there was a difference between what was meant by online resources and online training.

**Face to face Vs. online training**. One participant spoke about the idea of breaking the online content up into half hour modules which people could work their way through at their own leisure. Other participants raised issues around the idea of having training online, for example, ‘...But I think that there are elements that are lost through doing online training, which you do have in a face-to-face group situation’. Another participant mentioned that her online training experiences had felt ‘tokenistic’ in the past. It was felt that attending the CI training in person had benefits.
Theme 1: Intended audience

One participant questioned whether it would be just for school staff and logged into via a portal or whether it would be open access. Another question raised was whether the content would be accessible only to senior leaders given that the materials ‘were designed for senior leaders’ and felt that the audience of the resource would ‘impact quite a bit’ on the actual content that would be included. One EP suggested that ‘...in an ideal world you’d have that supplementing the face to face training...’ There were also concerns around the negative impact of people accessing the resource. Questions were raised about whether the audience would expand beyond senior leaders into the wider school community such as governors.

Theme 2: Requirements for online access

How to access the online resource was an issue discussed by the participants. One suggested that different Local Authority intranets would host the platform as a result of the fact that the materials should be ‘tailored’ to each authority in order to make them ‘priorities’. Another suggestion was that you could get a login to access the resource if you attended the face to face training.

Access with training attendance was a frequent sub-theme. A suggestion was that in order to have access it would be helpful to have had someone from the school who has been to the training, preferably someone in management or several senior managers. When discussing how useful the monitoring matrix is, another participant again echoed the crucial need for training attendance, ‘So I mean all of that really would be helpful to have an EP to talk it through with or whatever or would have been helpful to have gone on the training...’. The danger of open access was discussed. Linking into the theme around intended audience conversation turned towards whether the resource would be open i.e. accessible to the public, or protected access i.e. password protected. Participants expressed feeling ‘uncomfortable’ about open access and wondering if the materials needed ‘to be unpacked by people with some expertise and experience’. Another concern was around members of the public reading the online content and feeling ‘traumatised’ or ‘triggered’. The participants suggested having a health warning as part of the online resource, in the same way that the trainer would verbally warn attendees about the sensitive nature of the content and the need to take time out or debrief if necessary. A coaching arrangement was also suggested but this wasn’t deemed feasible if the resource was open to public access.
Theme 3: Maintenance of an online platform

The group wondered if any ‘potential plans could be put in place’ to make sure that the information was kept updated. One participant suggested that ‘Maybe we should have a North West group that meets up, I don’t know, every two years...’ in order to ‘review it...and look if there’s any issues...and up to date research’. A further suggestion was that a group of interested trainees could meet yearly and this could extend to interested practitioners. The participant felt that the review group could glean insights from practitioners out in the field as well as trainees who have ‘their fingertips on recent research’. One member of the group talked about how information progresses and ideas about how best to support people change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish a working group of qualified EPs from the North West of England. As a group, decide on a clear view for the process and what the purpose of the online resource will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spend half a day reviewing all of the materials which were created post Manchester Arena attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a working group, spend a day developing, refining and adapting the materials so that they are suitable for an online resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The researcher, her supervisor and an IT expert from The University of Manchester will spend three days constructing the resource platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>User evaluation session. The researcher will recruit three TEPs from her cohort in order to take part in this phase. The IT expert will show the TEPs how to navigate the online resource. They will then take this knowledge and resource back to their placement setting and show it to their team. At a later stage, they will feed back their evaluations of the resource to the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>With the working group, clarify any final amendments from the Phase 5 findings. Finalise any adaptations with the IT expert. Send out the resource link and information to North West PEPs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• Which elements will form the content of an online resource related to the critical incident training materials?

• How should an online resource related to the critical incident training materials be presented and how would this be accessed?

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF AN ONLINE RESOURCE FOR THE CRITICAL INCIDENT TRAINING MATERIALS?
WHAT WOULD AN ONLINE RESOURCE FOR CRITICAL INCIDENTS LOOK LIKE?

HOW WOULD THE ONLINE RESOURCE BE ACCESSED?

E.g. Would it be open access or password protected?
HOW WOULD THE ONLINE RESOURCE BE SUPPORTED?

E.g. Would there be facilitation from a school Educational Psychologist?

HOW REALISTIC DO THE SIX PLANNED PHASES FOR THIS RESEARCH SEEM?

If okay, which dates would be suitable for phases 2, 3 and 6?

Evaluation phase (5) – okay for TEPs!
Appendix N: PowerPoint from Session 3 of the task and finish group

CRITICAL INCIDENT
TASK AND FINISH GROUP

PHASE 3

AGENDA

• 9.30 am – Arrival / tea and coffee
• 10.00 - 10.30 am – Brief feedback on the slides
• 10.30 am – Tee to advise on the ‘technical’ info!
• 10.45 - 12.30 pm – Workshop session (Scripting)
• 12.30 pm – Lunch
• 1.15 – 1.45 pm – Group feedback around morning workshop (if necessary)
• 1.45 – 2.30pm: Session 5 – Workshop session
• 2.30 – 2.45 pm: Break
• 2.45 – 3.30 pm : Workshop session continued
• 3.30 – 4.00 pm: Group feedback – Where are we up to? Next steps? A.O.B.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• Which elements will form the content of an online resource related to the critical incident training materials?

• How should an online resource related to the critical incident training materials be presented and how would this be accessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish a working group of qualified EPs from the North West of England. As a group, decide on a clear view for the process and what the purpose of the online resource will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spend half a day reviewing all of the materials which were created post Manchester Arena attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a working group, spend a day developing, refining and adapting the materials so that they are suitable for an online resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The researcher, her supervisor and an IT expert from The University of Manchester will spend three days constructing the resource platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>User evaluation session. The researcher will recruit three TEPs from her cohort in order to take part in this phase. The IT expert will show the TEPs how to navigate the online resource. They will then take this knowledge and resource back to their placement setting and show it to their team. At a later stage, they will feed back their evaluations of the resource to the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>With the working group, clarify any final amendments from the Phase 5 findings. Finalise any adaptations with the IT expert. Send out the resource link and information to North West PEPs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Last session we explored the following questions:

What is the purpose of an online resource for the critical incident training materials?
What would an online resource for Critical Incidents look like?
How would the online resource be accessed? E.g. Would it be open access or password protected?
How would the online resource be supported? E.g. Would there be facilitation from a school Educational Psychologist?
How realistic do the six planned phases for this research seem?
Evaluation phase (5) – okay for TEPs?

What is the purpose of an online resource for the critical incident training materials?
For EPs and school leaders, who have attended the face-to-face training.
An information point should CIs occur → enabling people to be proactive rather than reactive.
What impact do we want the resource to have? → preparedness.
It would aid a consistency of approach based on best practice and research e.g. variation between different Psychology Services. It would contain core information for CIs.
Empowering school/senior leaders should a CI occur → confidence.
To have information about all of the elements which the group deem as necessary.
First step → Endorsed by all EPSs within the North West.
A recap if you’ve accessed the face-to-face CI training. A compliment to the face-to-face training. One leader in the setting must have accessed the face-to-face training.
Why would someone want to access this resource? It’s research based and incorporates the views of various EPSs.
What would an online resource for Critical Incidents look like?

Multimedia – not just all words! Videos could demonstrate how to use some of the materials e.g. the monitoring matrix.

Signposting relevant to different LAs as well as national (Need to email PEPs and ask for this information).

Live noticeboard → spoke about the fact that this would need someone to moderate it regularly. Further discussion indicated that this would be too much maintenance.

How would the online resource be accessed?
E.g. Would it be open access or password protected?

Some parts open and some password protected (with access if you’ve attended the face-to-face training)

How realistic do the six planned phases for this research seem, including the evaluation phase?

Evaluation Phase:

People would like to take the ‘first draft’ resource back to their services and gain feedback from their teams.

RT spoke about asking HTs to help as well. Each service could ask a HT to come along when they evaluate it → Would you use it or not?

Like the idea of having:

1. A team meeting of EPs or a sample from the service.

2. A one-to-one meeting of each group member with a school leader (1 hour at their school) in order to discuss what they think of the resource (2 who have and haven’t accessed the training). The group will begin to think about potential HTs.

The group will then feed this back during Phase 6.
General Ideas:

Some of the conversation in the afternoon was around technical matters e.g. can we have password protection?
Is an online forum possible? Who would host the resource (LA/uni)?

Group to update the resource on a yearly basis → possibly the current task and finish group + others?

Ideas about timers, embedded video etc… Anything is possible!

Moments for reflection → doesn’t necessarily make it training. Optional rather than mandatory.

‘Is this training or a resource?’ conversation → Resource to create longevity of materials.

Some extension of the materials by adding in videos, information etc…

Next: setting out what we definitely want on the screen.

‘It’s the training online, not online training’.

Other considerations:

• Colour scheme? SA has suggested black and yellow, to tie in with the Manchester bee theme

• Logo?

• URL name?

• Next steps – Phase 4 and 5

• Any homework? If we’ve added in videos or want demonstrations, who will be able to help with this?
Appendix O: Google Documents evaluation form

**Questions**

**The Critical Incident Resource Evaluation**

**Form description**

**Email address**

Valid email address

This form is collecting email addresses: Change settings

1. **Content** e.g. coverage, language, too much or too little information?

   Long-answer text

2. **Layout** e.g. ease of navigation, presentation and design, aesthetics?

   Long-answer text

3. **Usability** e.g. How clear is the purpose of the resource? How could it be used? Who could it be used with? When could it be used?

   Long-answer text

4. **Are there any resources/links which you think would be useful to include?**

   Short-answer text
THE CRITICAL INCIDENT RESOURCE (TCIR)

EVALUATION PHASE – 1ST JUNE 2020, 1.30PM

AGENDA

1.30 – 1.45 Check in – how is everyone?
1.45 – 2.45 Feedback from the evaluation phase and discussion
2.45 – 3.15 Break
3.15 – 4.30 Discussion, reflection and action plan/next steps

Recording of meeting

Please note, if anyone needs to mute their mic and see to a personal situation at any time, please do! I know we’re all trying to work from home as our ‘new normal’.
FIRSTLY, THANK YOU AND WELL DONE!

There was some really positive feedback and lovely comments!

‘It is such an excellent resource that really summarises CI support and could be used in so many ways. Can’t wait to be able to start using it’.

‘…which is absolutely fantastic and so comprehensive. You should be really proud of it.’

‘I love it – from the way it looks to the detailed content’.

‘This is an excellent resource of such high quality! You and the team should be very proud of yourselves – you have clearly worked hard on this. This will in no doubt be a hugely valuable resource for schools across the North West, and beyond’.

EVALUATION FEEDBACK

• We had 29 responses

• 3 (possibly 4) were from school staff (2 LA schools, 1 academy trust)

• At least one PEP
EVALUATION FEEDBACK – QUESTION 1 (29 RESPONSES)

1. Content e.g. coverage, language, too much or too little information?

- The language is easily accessible and the topics covered are good
- Excellent content and relevance
- Information is well presented and covers a wide range of topics relevant to critical incident response. Language is accessible. I liked the notes next to each slide
- Strengths: A clear rationale for the site and introduction. Priority around support and recognition of support for leadership and staff as priority. Research and professional guidance referred to in an accessible way. Inclusion of post traumatic growth. Accessible amount of information and language used. Covered key areas for CI support.

What can we do?

- Check for and take out repetitions.
- Blurb/notes to remain in one voice throughout and across sections.
- Can the Hobfoll 5 explanations be simplified so that it is more user friendly? → group decision, only appeared once as a recommendation.
- Include the full reference for Hobfoll et al, 2007 → do we know where this reference comes from?
- Some psychological/key terms e.g. 'self-efficacy' are used and then only described lower down the page. Helpful to include a 'key terms' page and then include a hyper link to this within the text?
- Trauma section - It says CAMHS don’t diagnose PTSD - I wasn’t aware of that! If they don’t, who does?
What can we do? Continued

• Make the slides larger when you click on them → I will look into this as it was mentioned a few times.

• Key statements/words in bold.

• One query - in the Impact section you start to talk about what needs to be done to meet need rather than staying with what the impact for those affected would be... all useful information but I wonder if it would be better elsewhere. Its OK to stay with the needs for a bit without going into what to do about it, maybe???

• The Health Alert slide in Intro – include statement about the school leaders being mindful of the wellbeing of staff who are accessing it - in other words to issue their own health warning and provide follow up support if needed to staff?

• Recovery and Adjustment section - Exercise - The placement of the exercise in this section looks slightly out of place. Maybe the intro sentence could be slightly adjusted, eg "Here is an opportunity for you to think back to the principles and strategies presented through the resource so far and to apply them to a scenario.

Future thoughts?

• A content summary at the end of each section (support activities or reading list/key texts, example letter templates or policies as referred to in communication section).

• Enough on staff support? - we mention it in a couple of places and there is the Our Own Feelings in the Bereavement and Loss section. Maybe discuss this in our group?

• More videos to explain concepts.

• A summary checklist of what to do in the event of a critical incident with reference to the detailed sections. Even if the document is familiar, at the time of an incident school leaders will just need a prompt sheet to support them in the first few hours of response.
**EVALUATION FEEDBACK – QUESTION 2 (29 RESPONSES)**

2. Layout e.g. ease of navigation, presentation and design, aesthetics?

- I found the layout easy to navigate. I used my mobile phone to access the resource which although was much smaller text, I can refer to this at any time should I need to. Again it’s clear, with the home page, introduction etc.
- High quality design and layout! Easy to navigate with helpful links.
- I love the 'branding' with the bee and colour scheme. The site is very easy to navigate. The tabs are clearly labelled to support locating information needed. I think the website is very accessible and appealing.
- Strengths: Easy to use layout, can be used based on topic or linearly. Spaced well and accessible. Nice colour system. Felt comforting.
- Loved the bee theme throughout. Liked that video links were included. Navigation bar at the top of the slides made it easy to find specific sections.

**What can we do?**

- Key statements in bold – stand out and break up longer text (Mentioned a few times in relation to there being quite a lot of information).
- Tabs drop down – all or some? (Mentioned several times).
- I think that the offender’s religion and ethnicity does not need to be mentioned (This is referring to a slide from the original training).
- Support and monitoring page – take out abbreviations? i.e. HR and EP? (I can do this).
- Could the reason for the bee theme be clearer on the homepage? (e.g. picture of the Manchester bee logo).
- Bereavement and loss section might be easier to navigate if you could jump down to different subheadings (e.g. developmental understanding, SEND, suicide), depending on what you needed. Perhaps as a drop down menu on the main heading (this appears to be in place for some sections but not others).
- A lot of comments about the slide and text size (I will sort this so that the slides ‘pop up’ when clicked on).
What can we do? Continued

• Slightly confused about the PowerPoint slides and the info being next to each other → there were a couple of comments about the slides being on the page too; do we need to make the reason for this clearer on the homepage?

• Remove notes from the PowerPoint slides in the resources section?

• Some sections sound like facilitator notes. All directed at new reader?

Future thoughts?

• Links to other relevant sections/resources within text.

• For the 'support and monitoring' page, could the second PowerPoint (support process) be made into a flow chart which runs down the left side? May just be a bit bigger/clearer and give a bit more visual emphasis to the page?

• A voice over / recording and the notes as additional points! More like a recorded webinar format....?

EVALUATION FEEDBACK – QUESTION 3 (29 RESPONSES)

3. Usability e.g. How clear is the purpose of the resource? How could it be used? Who could it be used with? When could it be used?

• Resources were explained throughout and certainly would support all staff.

• Clear purpose of the resources set out on homepage.

• I think once you delve into the information, it is useful for critical incidents more widely

• I think it is an invaluable resource for schools to be able to refer back to refresh/consolidate their practice.

• To be honest now I've downloaded it I shall refer to it more as being on paper can be less efficient. I already have the matrix set up on our systems as we've used it before. This is a really efficient resource and I've enjoyed revisiting it again.
Purpose:
• School leaders might disseminate in their own schools, used in SENCO clusters etc.
• Following a critical incident / to 'train up' crit response groups within schools.
• Used to inform specific staff in school and utilised and adapted to be talked through with whole school staff, with the modifications to make it relevant to individual schools.
• A point of reference for any critical incidents that occur / As refreshment for everybody who had the initial CI training / For whole staff training.
• Used by all professionals involved in working with CYP.
• To support the parent/carers and families of those affected.
• Accessed as staff training by selecting relevant elements dependent on the incident. Could tailor the sharing of information dependent on staff confidence and capability and previous training.
• Although developed pre COVID-19 the information was relevant and could even be applied to this situation and others clearly.
• Use this for staff training / to refer staff to guide bereavement support / a central place for an overview of critical incident support / as a training plan to be delivered face to face or online.
• Used by a number of services supporting children and young people.

Purpose:
• Could be used by leaders that haven't been on the training (I think too much time has lapsed for this) and used to cascade the info by a head or EP to the wider school or newly appointed heads?!
• Clear and understandable for both schools and psychologists/ other agencies. Could be used effectively by these services/ individuals to: skill them up into theory/response/preparation checklist type approach.
• Function as a reference document during a critical/ traumatic incident to help EPSs and schools respond appropriately.
• It is clear that the purpose of the resource is to inform professionals about what constitutes a critical incident - good as a supportive resource after completing training.
• The resource appears to be a preventative resource for a CRIT. It could be used in staff training as a resource and then again following an incident.
• This resource could be used to support training for schools and teams within LAs. Training may increasingly be done virtually and this resource would definitely make this easier.
• It could also be used as a reference point for people who have attended the training in terms of responding to critical incidents and disseminating information to all staff and planning CPD activities.
Future thoughts?

• Going forward, it could be used to share good practice across the North West (e.g. case studies of timely and effective CRIT response/support, with appropriate consent from those impacted of course).

• Could aspects of it be used with Social care colleagues?

• Good to use with the CI response team.
• Adapt versions for CI training days.
• You could make it up into a guidance booklet to have in school.

• There is scope to extend and develop it over time so that it reflects new knowledge and understanding.

EVALUATION FEEDBACK – QUESTION 4 (26 RESPONSES)

4. Are there any resources/links which you think would be useful to include?

• The resource contains links which by simply clicking on them takes the reader to that piece of information, so for me there’s enough.
• Overall looks very clear and seems a helpful resource :) 
• Great list of resources and links
• No-very comprehensive :)
• Good range of resources and links to external services/ charities included.
• I think there was a good variety of tasks, information and opportunities for discussion that it worked well. I cannot think of any other resources or links that would be useful.
• Great list of resources and links.
**What can we do?**

- Direct links to the services listed in the useful links and resources section (they can be turned into hyperlinks).
- **Anna Freud website for Mental Health.**
- Kooth for emotional well being in YP.
- List of books for younger children e.g. muddles, puddles and sunshine or the day the sea went out.
- Bereavement support services and maybe apps from the Royal College of Psychiatry (Heidi to check)?
- **Direct towards the Local Offer in their area?**
- Elsie Ever After?
- **Young Minds?**
- The Little book of Bereavement for Schools by Ian Gilbert?
- **Child Line?**
- **PFA information, especially Psychological First Aid in Schools from The National Child Traumatic Stress Network and Adversity and Trauma Informed Practice from Young Minds.**
- Direct schools to the their local Live Well websites for local charities / support groups etc.
- Also websites: Grief Encounter and Cruse.

**Future thoughts?**

- National Autistic society have some resources for learners with ASC. NSPCC also have resources and links.
- Example policy and letter templates, book lists, activities that could be done with CYP e.g. memory boxes, resources for children and young people, e.g. the book of plasters.
- More video clips of key points e.g. the AIP video. Might bring content 'alive', esp for the recovery and adjustment section, as there's a lot more diagrams and longer chunks of text.
- Bereavement policies? Letter for children? Child Bereavement UK guidelines for schools (I think we decided early on that it wouldn't be suitable to include these as schools need to personalise their letters etc.)
- Booklist - e.g. books for teens to read, picture books for little ones to read with an adult.
- A link about self-care for staff.
- 'I could see it being developed over time as it is used with schools'.
- Prompt sheet 'What to do in the event of an incident' - Broken down into 1st 10 mins/1st hour/1st day etc with links to key people in LA - to be completed by schools as part of their policy.
OTHER INFORMATION

• Video of a head teacher testimony – KW has set a date to do this on 22nd September (Dependent upon university being open). The video will be added to the resource once it is available.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1 comment – content was repetitive of the slides. Our goal was to script the slides so this seems okay to me?

BG → is there a link we could include for PFA?
NEXT STEPS:

• What needs to be done now?  • Who needs to do it?

NEXT STEPS:

• Evaluation of the process and product → would you prefer to do this electronically on a short form or have a half hour coffee and chat as a virtual meeting?
DID WE FULFIL OUR INITIAL AIMS?

Something for before, during and after a CI
Systems to be aware of (different in nursery, PRU etc…) Information for educational settings Reach → NW – all authorities to endorse it Compliment the face-to-face training Senior leaders → Empower and give confidence Impact = preparedness and consistency of approach across EPS Core information with some variation Research based – incorporates views of NW services Audience to feel it is a safe space to learn

HOW WE ENVISAGED IT MIGHT LOOK…

Multimedia → not just writing!
Parts open and parts password protected (We spoke about the logistics of this with Tee)
Video demonstrating how to use resources/tools
Link to local offer (!)
Relevant signposting as a tab (ask PEPs for contacts → did in evaluation)
Notice board (We ruled this out as an onerous task with implications)
MOVING FORWARD

• RD will now work towards announcing the resource to NW PEPs in July 2020 and gaining a contact from each service

• RD will keep the group updated about this and let them know when it is being sent out

• RD will present it to the NW PEPs at a meeting in the Autumn

• Maintenance group to meet on an annual basis – all invited (email me if you want to talk about this separately) / set a date for September 2021
PURPOSE OF THE SESSION:

A chance to reflect upon what we have done and offer any feedback on the process, as well as the product that we have created.

Is it okay to record this?
OUR INITIAL AIMS IN SEPTEMBER 2019

Something for before, during and after a CI
Systems to be aware of (different in nursery, PRU etc…)
Information for educational settings
Reach → NW – all authorities to endorse it
Compliment the face-to-face training
Senior leaders → Empower and give confidence
Impact = preparedness and consistency of approach across EPS
Core information with some variation
Research based – incorporates views of NW services
Audience to feel it is a safe space to learn

HOW WE ENVISAGED IT MIGHT LOOK…

Multimedia → not just writing!
Parts open and parts password protected (We spoke about the logistics of this with Tee)
Video demonstrating how to use resources/tools
Link to local offer (?)
Relevant signposting as a tab (ask PEPs for contacts → did in evaluation)
Notice board (We ruled this out as an onerous task with implications)
Do you feel that the product reflects the initial aims set out by the group in the first session?

How do you think that the product produced will be a beneficial resource for CIs?
What do you think were some of the facilitators during the research?

What do you think were some of the challenges during the research?
Are there any lessons/top tips that we can share with the next group?

MAINTENANCE PLAN

Any comments around this?
THANK YOU FOR EVERYTHING!!!!
## Appendix R: Content analysis categories

Codes for directed content analysis of task and finish group evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from evaluation session</th>
<th>Code for analysis of transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the product reflects the initial aims set out by the group in the first session?</td>
<td>Initial aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think that the product produced will be a beneficial resource for CIs?</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think were some of the facilitators during the research?</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think were some of the challenges during the research?</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any lessons / top tips that we can share with the next group?</td>
<td>Lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance plan: Any comments around this?</td>
<td>Future directions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>