



## FiN STIL\* Conference, Stavern, Norway; May 2007

**Einar Christiansen** head of the Lillegården kompetansesenter opened the first day by thanking Amanda and Chris for introducing Framework to Norway.

**Tom Williams**, PEP East Ayrshire reported on the Scottish evaluation of Framework in 48 primary, 4 special and 9 secondary schools. The headlines were that 79% of headteachers said that it was a good approach to behaviour in their schools and 75% saying that it fits well with existing strategies. 80% said that it added positively to their behaviour policies with 72% saying that it was a positive approach to disruption.

70% Head Teachers reported that they were no longer seen as the first point of call, 80% felt that the BeCo role was a good opportunity for staff development and 68% said that Framework offered peer support for teachers in their schools.

There was concern over the issue of confidentiality of teachers' completed checklists, lack of time and experienced staff going to the Behaviour Coordinator feeling it to be seen as an admission of failure. Tom reported that analysis of recent HMCI (Scottish OfSTED) reports suggested that morale was higher in Framework schools.

**Maggie Fallon**, newly appointed Positive Behaviour Team Manager in the Support for Learning Team of the Scottish Executive, told the conference about the work in 30 authorities in Scotland. The project there is called 'Staged Intervention' and 'Peer Mentoring Teams' and has been recommended in successive Executive reports.

Maggie reported on the constant media reporting of concerns about behaviour which had led to the most recent survey in 2006. She felt that the work that she was doing with the Positive Behaviour Team would continue to be supported by the new Scottish Nationalist Administration. A further report (Discipline Stakeholder Group Action Plan) recommending SI/FfI is due to be published soon.

She described some of the other work of her team, particularly mentioning the Framework-compatible work on the motivated schools.

References:

McLean, A. (2003) The Motivated School London: Paul Chapman  
2006 report:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/09/28125634/0>

Framework in Scotland:

<http://www.betterbehaviourscotland.gov.uk/initiatives/staged/accessforall/framework.aspx>

Motivated Schools:

<http://www.betterbehaviourscotland.gov.uk/initiatives/accessforall/themotivatedschool.aspx>

**Gier Autstad**, head teacher of Klevtrand primary school and **Berit Løseth Hauge**, head teacher of Kolvikbakken secondary school, reported on their experience of Framework in Norwegian schools. The key message of the Norwegian experience is the importance of teachers working together rather than the individual teacher-Beco model of the original Birmingham structure. This communal approach is very reflective of the norm for teachers in Norway

### **Harry Daniels' keynote talk**

Professor Daniels started his lecture by recalling that it was he and his colleagues at Birmingham University who had first suggested that Arne Østli and the visiting group from Lillegården kompetansesenter visit Framework for Intervention in 2000.

The core of the lecture was a review of recent work about definitions and labels in special education. He argued that the ideal educational transaction was where the child's needs and the educational intervention were seen as a continuous interaction- the danger of categorisation was that interventions come to dominate the child's needs.

Citing Rose (2005) on the misuse and limitations of neurological data in support of labels, especially ADHD, Professor Daniels went on to list a number of authors (Roger Slee, Michael Rutter(!)) who have questioned the validity of the term representing a discrete 'condition'. He talked of Swedish research that described the labelling process in school interaction between parents and staff (Hjörne and Säljö 2004). This research, based on discourse analysis, showed while the diagnosis of ADHD was seen as reassuring by the parents, it was the institution that convinced the mother that a diagnosis was necessary for a solution. In meetings, professionals were: "forced to be quite flexible when connecting the broad range of contradictory behaviors and attitudes to this particular syndrome". There was no real problem-solving in the meetings or real discussion of the child's pedagogical needs.

Hjörne and Säljö conclude:

"The ADHD diagnosis is symptomatic but our results indicate that it is read as pointing to a clear and definite cause that is indisputable, and that in a deterministic manner limits the possibilities of children to participate in, and profit from, school practices. Considering the growing number of children who are claimed to suffer from such handicaps, the acceptance by educators of medical categories of this kind is indirectly a powerful statement with regard to who fits into mainstream schooling in late-modern society. In this manner, the medical categories do a concrete job by placing this particular discussion outside political and ideological considerations." p.22

Levy et. al.(1997) summarise a position nearer to Professor Daniels' thinking: "findings suggest that ADHD is best viewed as the extreme of a behaviour that varies genetically throughout the entire population rather than as a disorder with discrete determinants".

It was proposed that the best alternative approaches would treat problems as results of interactions between individuals, systems and structures; to treat children as participating individuals rather than passive recipients and for

providers to operate on plan-do-review-learn cycles as the basis for planning and provision. Professor Daniels reviewed his work with Teacher Support Teams as an approach towards such as outcome pointing out the many similarities between these and Framework for Intervention.

He pointed out that that thinking around social inclusion is far better developed than the mechanisms and thinking required to support it through multi-agency working. A common set of values and beliefs will be needed for the process to work. In many current multi-agency meetings agreement is 'theatrical' rather than real- professionals know to respect each others' professional identities and do so over the needs of the clients. A great deal of development of ways of communicating and creating learning environments is needed if multi-professional teams are going to work in inclusive and interactive ways that respond to the needs of individuals rather than the needs of the professionals.

#### References:

Säljö, R. and Hjörne E. (2004) "There is something about Julia"- Symptoms, categories, and the process of invoking ADHD in the Swedish school: A case study. *Journal of Learning, Identity and Education*, 3(1), 1-24

Levy F, Hay DA, McStephen M, Wood C, Waldman I. (1997) Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: a category or a continuum? Genetic analysis of a large-scale twin study *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. Jun; 36(6): 737-44

Rose, S. (2005) *The 21st Century Brain: Explaining, Mending and Manipulating the Mind* London: Jonathan Cape

**Hanne Jahnsen**, Senior Adviser and FiN STIL coordinator described the introduction of Framework to Norway. The system used is faithful to the British original, but with more emphasis on teachers cooperating on solution finding, reflecting Norwegian traditions of working. In addition, in many schools the initiative prompted whole school working on environmental issues – using the checklist as baseline for whole-school issues.

### **Hedmark University College Evaluation**

**Kari Nes** reported to the conference on the independent evaluation carried out by her colleagues in 6 FiN STIL schools. The report is to be published soon on the Lillegården kompetansesenter [Fin STIL website](#) . The results are notable for being very close to the evaluation in Scotland with similar comments being made. 70% of the expressions of concern eventually led to substantial change in behaviour and of the 11 individual cases examined 9 showed clear progress. Comments included: "We have been helped to structure the knowledge and competence we already had" and "We are more conscious about what is going on, what we do and how it works. Great to learn that it really works to focus on what is positive". Teacher felt more positive about their own ability to solve behaviour problems.

There were some significant differences in usage between the schools with one school producing 56 checklists! The way that the project was introduced had a major effect on the attitude of teachers, but the quality of the school based training was valued by most. The results emphasised the importance of selecting the right BeCo. The checklist was thought to be of value in all situations by half the teachers by was highly rated by nearly all for working at school level. Some said that the checklist was too long. Statistical analysis of the checklist showed a

high level of reliability (in many schools more than one teacher filled in the checklist at the same time). The researchers concluded that this made the checklist a reliable tool to use for self evaluation of schools' learning/behaviour environments.

Baselining was carried out in almost all cases and was valued by teachers. There were some frustrations over paperwork where it wasn't fully understood or where teachers felt under time pressure. All teachers emphasised the importance of teacher collaboration. Support from the trainers and headteachers was emphasised. Introduction on a more 'bottom-up' basis was recommended.

**Amanda Daniels** reviewed the history of Framework from its inception in 1997 and **Chris Wright** talked about the essential components of the project. **Hugh Williams** spoke about some of the barriers experienced in England and talked of the changes in the national government which are starting to move towards a more conducive environment for Framework ideas to prosper.

\* Framework i Norge. System for Tidlig Intervensjon i Læringsmiljøet =  
Framework in Norway: System for Early Intervention in the Learning Environment