

EVALUATION PROTOCOL

Evaluation of DARE 25: A clustered randomised controlled trial

Sheffield Institute of Education and
Sheffield Hallam University

Principal investigators: Eleanor Formby, Ben Willis and
Martin Culliney

Evaluation of DARE 25: A clustered randomised controlled trial

Evaluation protocol

Sheffield Institute of Education, Sheffield Hallam University

Principal investigator(s): Formby, Willis, Culliney

PROJECT TITLE	Evaluation of DARE 25: A clustered randomised controlled trial
DEVELOPER (INSTITUTION)	Life Skills Education
EVALUATOR (INSTITUTION)	Sheffield Institute of Education, Sheffield Hallam University
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S)	Eleanor Formby, Ben Willis, Martin Culliney
PROTOCOL AUTHOR(S)	Martin Culliney, Eleanor Formby, Ben Willis
TRIAL DESIGN	Two-arm, cluster randomised controlled trial with randomisation at the school level
TRIAL TYPE	Efficacy
EVALUATION SETTING	School-based
TARGET GROUP	Y6 Pupils
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	121 schools, 3881 pupils
PRIMARY OUTCOME AND DATA SOURCE	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (online survey)
SECONDARY OUTCOME AND DATA SOURCE	Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale (online survey)

Protocol version history

VERSION	DATE	CHANGES TO DESIGN AND REASON FOR REVISION
1.1 [<i>latest</i>]	19.1.22	Amendments to align with final SAP and report (SDQ measurement, missing data treatment, minor drafting edits).
1.0 [<i>original</i>]		

Table of contents

Protocol version history.....	1
Table of contents	2
Study rationale and background.....	2
Intervention	4
Impact evaluation	6
Research questions or study objectives	6
Design.....	6
Randomisation	7
Participants	8
Sample size calculations.....	8
Outcome measures.....	9
Compliance	10
Analysis	11
Implementation and process evaluation.....	12
Research questions	12
Research methods	12
Analysis	13
Cost evaluation	14
Ethics and registration	14
Data protection.....	14
Stakeholders and interests	15
Risks	15
Timeline.....	16

Study rationale and background

DARE 25 is a programme designed to help young people take safer and healthier choices and reduce offending behaviours including hate, knife, drug and alcohol related crime. Year 6 pupils will participate in ten one-hour lessons delivered by a trained DARE officer. The lessons will take place in the child's regular classroom. The class teacher and classroom assistants will be present, although the session is led by the DARE officer. The lessons will involve a combination of role play, age-related scenarios, group skills sessions, discussion groups, reading and writing exercises and/or other interactive methods.

The original DARE model [in the US D.A.R.E.] is a school-based drug use prevention programme that was taught by a police officer. This project uses an adapted UK version of the project delivered by Life Skills Education that has expanded content including sessions on risky behaviours and offending. Crime solutions has given the original USA programme a 'no effects' rating, from more than one study. High quality evaluations (multiple RCTs) from the USA have shown the original D.A.R.E model to be ineffective, harmful, or to have no effect on drug and alcohol use of young people who take part in the programme (West & O'Neal, 2004). However, DARE 25 is based on an adapted UK version of the programme which has yet to be evaluated in its current form.

The UK D.A.R.E programme, from which the present intervention has been developed, was evaluated by independent academic researchers in England using data collected in 2015/6 (Evans and Tseloni 2018)¹. This study used pre- and post-intervention online questionnaires with 1496 pupils from 51 schools. It found significant differences between intervention and control samples regarding the extent of change observed on four of the programme's nine learning outcomes (getting help from others, improving communication and listening skills, knowledge about alcohol and drugs, and making safe choices), in favour of the intervention group. The evaluators stated that further research into medium- and long-term effects of the programme are needed.

There is a need for the current trial as the intervention has incorporated additional content which were not previously part of the programme. The last evaluation of DARE also had several shortcomings. Firstly, it did not use well known, validated outcome measures; and the scales adopted had low internal validity as noted by the authors (Evans and Tseloni 2018:246). The sample was imbalanced in that while most participating pupils were in Y6, some were in Y5, with a higher proportion in the control group (5% compared to 30% in the intervention group). The intervention was delivered through four different models, with only 57% of schools adopting the approach where all sessions are led by a DARE Officer as opposed to a teacher. This trial addressed each of these issues. Furthermore, while DARE25 has been delivered in Nottingham and surrounding areas for 25 years, it has not been scaled up to the degree attempted in this trial, in terms of including not only a larger number of pupils and schools, but also a wider geographical area.

The deliverers note that although the rights to deliver D.A.R.E. branded programmes were agreed in 1996, all formal links with the originating bodies have now been removed, and the project developed, still retaining the core focuses of:

- Working with young people aged between 9 and 16 years old. DARE 25 works with Y6 pupils in primary schools.
- Aiming to improve young people's decision making skills about their use of drugs and alcohol, enabling them to make safer and healthier choices, and consequently reducing their

¹ Emily Evans & Andromachi Tseloni (2019) Evaluation of the UK D.A.R.E. Primary programme, *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 26:3, 238-249

offending behaviours and specifically drug and alcohol related crime. Knife and hate crime has been added as a theme to the DARE 25 programme.

- Delivery by 'DARE Officers', recruited for their experience and knowledge of "working with drug and alcohol related consequences in the community".

The programme to be evaluated here is a universal life skills education programme. The underlying programme theory draws on Bandura's Social Learning Theory. The delivery partner explains it thus: "Bandura's theory of social modelling is a very powerful method of education. If children see positive consequences from a particular type of behaviour, they are more likely to repeat that behaviour themselves. Conversely, if negative consequences are the result, they are less likely to perform that behaviour. Novel and unique contexts often capture students' attention, and can stand out in the memory."

The overall key Research Question identified by Life Skills Education is "What is the impact of the DARE 25 programme upon the rate of offending (knife crime, hate crime and drug related crime and ASB) of those randomised to receive DARE25 compared with those randomised into the control group?" This question is not answerable within the timescale, so we focus on the issue of propensity to engage in behaviours that place young people at risk of offending. Long term follow up will be enabled through the YEF data archive, following the current evaluation period. To justify future progression to a larger effectiveness trial, we would want to see evidence of positive change from the impact and/or process evaluation.

Intervention

WHO

This intervention is aimed at primary schools pupils. This programme is delivered in school during class time; the intention is for all Y6 pupils in participating schools to take part. Recruitment to the trial was conducted at the school level and was the responsibility of the delivery team. A list of schools was supplied to the evaluators. Instructions for securing a place on the project were designed by the evaluators and sent to schools by the delivery team. Schools were asked to send pupil data directly to the evaluators once parent information letters had been distributed, and were also asked to allow participating pupils to complete the baseline testing in class prior to the recruitment deadline.

WHAT

Delivery takes place in school. DARE Officers, who are trained by the delivery team, lead the intervention sessions in the classroom. Pupils are given a workbook that contains learning materials and role-playing exercises. The logic model at the end of this document shows how the intervention is hypothesised to work. Essentially, it is a curriculum-based programme, delivered in schools by an external provider (i.e. the DARE Officers). The pathways to impact are both knowledge provision and skills-development. The mechanisms are the expertise of the DARE Officers and the associated DARE 25 resources.

Further information about the intervention can be accessed here:

<https://lifeskillseducation.co.uk/resources/the-dare-primary-programme/>.

HOW MUCH

The intervention is delivered across ten sessions. Under ideal circumstances, these are scheduled once per week. All delivery for intervention schools is due to take place during the Summer term 2020/21. Delivery for control schools is planned for 2021/22. Control schools also receive a payment of £250.

WHEN

The programme was scheduled to be delivered in four phases, each taking place during one school term. The first two terms feature delivery in schools that form part of a feasibility study. This was in Spring term 2020, which was curtailed by the Covid-19 outbreak. No delivery took place during Summer 2020, with the second cohort of the feasibility study postponed until Autumn 2020.

Following school closures from March to September 2020, the revised plan for the main trial phase was to evaluate the programme being delivered to schools in Spring (January-April) 2021 (Cohort A) and Summer 2021 (Cohort B). Baseline testing for Cohort A was carried out in late November and early December 2020. Randomisation was conducted on December 3rd, 2020.

Delivery for Cohort A treatment schools was scheduled for Spring 2021, with outcome test data to be collected at the end of delivery (scheduled for late March 2021). However, school closures from January 4th to March 8th 2021 meant that this was no longer possible. It was agreed that treatment schools from Cohort A would receive the intervention in Summer term (April to July 2021).

Baseline testing for Cohort B took place in March 2021, with randomisation on 19 March. Delivery is scheduled from April to July 2021, alongside Cohort A. Outcome test data for both Cohorts will be collected in June/July 2021.

All schools randomly allocated into the control group will receive the DARE 25 programme during the 2021/22 school year. These schools will also receive a £250 payment upon submission of outcome data. Pupils at schools that are randomly allocated to the control group are taught under 'business-as-usual' conditions during 2020/21. Control group data stored in the YEF data archive therefore relates to pupils in Y6 during 2020/21, who do not receive the intervention at any stage as part of this trial, allowing meaningful comparisons with the intervention group in future research. This aspect of the design is to facilitate understanding the longer-term effects of participating in DARE 25.

The current Y5 cohort in control schools receive the intervention during the 2021/22 academic year, when they are in Y6. These pupils do not contribute any data to the trial. This was mainly intended to incentivise recruitment through a guarantee that all schools

would receive the intervention either during 2020/21 or 2021/22. No evaluation activity is scheduled for 2021/22. By this point, pupils participating in the baseline and outcome tests as Y6 pupils in 2020/21 will have left their primary school.

Impact evaluation

Research questions or study objectives

1. *What is the impact of DARE 25 on behavioural and emotional problems among Y6 pupils as measured by the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire?*
2. *What is the impact of DARE 25 on problem behaviour frequency among Y6 pupils as measured by the seven dimensions of the Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale?*

Design

This efficacy trial uses a two-arm, two-level design, with pupils clustered into schools. The unit of randomisation is the school. The allocation ratio is 50:50, but as randomisation was blocked by geographical area and these were unevenly sized with some odd numbers, the overall number of schools at randomisation was uneven (63 intervention, 58 control). Schools were recruited in two cohorts, as detailed above. The primary outcome is the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). The secondary outcome is the Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale (PBFS), to be analysed as seven separate dimensions as detailed below. Data for these measures was collected directly from pupils using an online survey administered in class at pre- and post-intervention.

Table 1: Trial design

Trial design, including number of arms		Two-arm, cluster randomised controlled trial
Unit of randomisation		School
Stratification variables (if applicable)		Geographic area
Primary outcome	variable	Behavioural and emotional problems
	measure (instrument, scale, source)	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire Total Difficulties score, pupil self-report version (online), 0-40 scale
Secondary outcome(s)	variable(s)	Problem behaviour frequency
	measure(s) (instrument, scale, source)	Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale (online survey, pupil self-report), analysed as seven separate subscales: Physical Aggression Verbal Aggression Relational Aggression Overt Victimisation Relational Victimisation Delinquent Behaviour Substance Use
Baseline for primary outcome	variable	Behavioural and emotional problems
	measure (instrument, scale, source)	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire Total Difficulties score, pupil self-report version (online), 0-40 scale
Baseline for secondary outcome	variable	Problem behaviour frequency
	measure (instrument, scale, source)	Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale (online survey, pupil self-report), analysed as seven separate subscales (listed above):

Randomisation

Randomisation was undertaken by the evaluation team. Schools were randomly allocated to the treatment or control group at two separate times: December 2020 for Cohort A, and March 2021 for Cohort B. Randomisation was at school level and was blocked by geographical area. In essence, this means that a separate randomisation was performed for each area within each cohort. This approach ensures that sample sizes are well balanced in each area, with the aim of managing workload for the delivery team.

The method of randomisation was as follows: all schools are assigned a value through a random number generator in Microsoft Excel, the schools are sorted by the random number within geographical areas, and treatment/control allocation is assigned by the ABABAB pattern within each area. Schools were informed of their allocation immediately. Notification was withheld from those yet to complete baseline testing until this was done. The end of term was the deadline for this. For Cohort A, 69 schools were randomised; 61 of

these complied and were informed of their allocation, eight did not proceed with the trial. For Cohort B, 72 schools were randomised, 60 complied in time to be included in the trial, giving a total sample size of 121 schools. Schools that did not comply with the evaluation requirements were not baselined or informed of their randomisation status. As such, they are not included in the attrition calculations presented in the final report.

Participants

Recruitment to the trial was managed by the delivery team and was conducted at the school level. The delivery organisation is based in Nottingham and focussed recruitment efforts on primary schools located within approximately one hour's drive. Specifically, randomisation was blocked by geographical areas, with schools split into six groups: Derbyshire North, Derbyshire South and West Midlands, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, South Yorkshire, and West Yorkshire. A variable representing 'area' will therefore be included as a covariate in the analysis.

The intervention is aimed at Y6 pupils and is intended to be delivered in class. In recruited schools it is expected that the entire Y6 cohort participates, with the exception of pupils withdrawn by their parents or carers. As such, there was no screening of individual participants, and the only eligibility criterion was that pupils were in Y6 during the 2020/21 school year (although as mentioned above, Y5 pupils at control schools in 2020/21 will receive the intervention during 2021/22).

Sample size calculations

Sample size was determined by the number of schools that the delivery team was able to recruit to given the trial design and timeframe. As recruitment took place during a period of disruption to schools caused by Covid-19, including two national lockdowns in which schools were not fully open, this proved challenging. Power calculations are presented for 121 schools, the total number taking part.

Power calculations take into account uncertainty over the level of pupil level pre/post-test correlation, estimated to lie between 0.5 and 0.7. The Intra-cluster correlation is estimated to be between 0.168 and 0.217. These figures are based on previous studies using the same outcome measure²³.

2 Findon, J., Cadman, T., Stewart, C. S., Woodhouse, E., Eklund, H., Hayward, H., Le Harpe Golden, D.D., Chaplin, E., Glaser, K., Simonoff, E., Murphy, D., Bolton, P., McEwen, F. (2016). Screening for co-occurring conditions in adults with autism spectrum disorder using the strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A pilot study. *Autism Research*, 9(12), 1353-1363.

3 Yao, S., Zhang, C., Zhu, X., Jing, X., McWhinnie, C. M., & Abela, J. R. (2009). Measuring adolescent psychopathology: psychometric properties of the self-report strengths and difficulties questionnaire in a sample of Chinese adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(1), 55-62.

Calculations were conducted in Excel using the formula from Bloom et al (2007)⁴ and then checked using the powerup! software.

Participants were Y6 pupils clustered into schools. The design takes no account of class groups in schools. As mentioned above, it is anticipated that the entire Y6 cohort in each school takes part in the trial. There is an average cluster size of 32 pupils, ranging from seven to 72. The difference in cluster size is mostly explained by differences in school size, with some very small rural primaries taking part in the study along with larger schools.

Table 2: Sample size calculations

		Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Minimum Detectable Effect Size (MDES)		0.22-0.24	0.21-0.24
Pre-test/ post-test correlations	level 1 (participant)	0.5	0.7
	level 2 (cluster)	0.25	0.25
Intracluster correlations (ICCs)	level 1 (participant)	-	-
	level 2 (cluster)	LOW=0.168, HIGH=0.217	LOW=0.168, HIGH=0.217
Alpha		0.05	0.05
Power		0.8	0.8
One-sided or two-sided?		2	2
Average cluster size (if clustered)		32	32
Number of clusters (schools)	Intervention	63	63
	Control	58	58
	Total	121	121
Number of participants	Intervention	1979	1979
	Control	1902	1902
	Total	3881	3881

Outcome measures

Impact of the programme is assessed through two measures. The primary outcome measure is the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire Total Difficulties Score. The secondary outcome measure is the Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale, which will be analysed as seven separate sections. All participating pupils will undertake both of these surveys in school at both pre- and post-intervention. Data is being collected electronically, using the website Qualtrics.

4 Bloom, H.S., Richburg-Hayes, L. and Black, A.R. (2007) Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 30–59

The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a brief behavioural screening questionnaire for 3-16 year olds. It contains 25 items on psychological attributes, some positive and others negative. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire is being used by YEF across its projects to create consistency and comparability between different evaluations. Further information about the SDQ is available here: <https://www.sdqinfo.org/>.

The Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale (Farrell et al 2016)⁵ contains 26 items asking about the frequency with which a young person has engaged in problem behaviour (aggression, delinquency, or substance misuse) or been victimised by other people. These are grouped into seven categories: physical aggression, verbal aggression, relational aggression, overt victimisation, relational victimisation, delinquent behaviour, and drug use. Owing to the distinct nature of these dimensions, each will be analysed separately as secondary outcome measures.

PBFS was selected as an outcome measure due to alignment with the aims of the intervention. This research instrument was adapted slightly so that questions were phrased in a way that would be understood by pupils in England. Adaptation was limited to Anglicisation of the language and none of the content was fundamentally altered. The questionnaire document used here is available on request.

Compliance

Compliance is being measured at the school level. The intervention is delivered over ten in-class sessions, ideally scheduled weekly over ten weeks. However, the current trial is taking place against the backdrop of continuing disruption due to the Covid-19 pandemic. At the time of writing, there are instances of school pupils, staff and personnel from the delivery team undergoing periods of isolation as a result of exposure to the virus. This increases the risk that the intervention will not be delivered as intended. As such, at the end of the trial, participating schools will be categorised into the following groups:

- 1) Fully compliant (ten in-class lessons over ten weeks, plus graduation ceremony)
- 2) Intervention completed, but over condensed period or with remote sessions
- 3) Intervention not completed (school does not finish ten lessons plus graduation)

These categories were agreed with the developer. There was originally a category for schools that did not complete ten lessons plus graduation yet still took part in outcome testing but no schools were reported by the developer to fit these criteria. It could be argued that these compliance thresholds are excessively strict, but the developer emphasises the importance of finishing the programme, which takes place in schools over a relatively short period. Also worth reiterating is that compliance is attributed at the school level and it is still possible for pupils to have missed sessions as individual attendance records were not provided to the evaluators.

⁵ Farrell AD, Sullivan TN, Gony EA, Le AH (2016) Assessment of adolescents' victimization, aggression, and problem behaviors: Evaluation of the Problem Behavior Frequency Scale. *Psychological Assessment*. 28(6):702-714

Analysis models will be conducted to compare each of these groups to the control group. This will be limited to the primary outcome measure in the first instance, but in the event that any significant effects are discovered, analysis for the relevant subgroup will be extended to include the secondary outcome measures. The delivery team will provide detail on the number of sessions completed in each school, including the graduation ceremony, and the number of these sessions that were delivered remotely or in the same week, as a measure of how closely it has been possible to adhere to the intended schedule. The final report will present this data in full using descriptive statistics.

If possible, pupil level compliance will be measured through a simple binary indicator of whether a pupil has completed the programme and been awarded a graduation certificate. It was agreed that collecting pupil level data to monitor attendance at each DARE 25 session would not be feasible.

Further detail on analysis of compliance will be presented in the SAP.

Analysis

Analysis will be conducted through multilevel modelling, with pupils clustered into schools. The intention treat sample is to be used in all models unless otherwise stated. Post-intervention test scores will be used as outcome variables in the analysis. All models will contain the group allocation and baseline score as covariates. Additional models will contain a covariate representing geographical areas, and whether the school was in cohort A or B.

Effect sizes will be calculated using Hedges' *g*, as specified in the following equation, where *T* is the treatment mean, *C* is the control mean, δ_{sch}^2 is the school level variance and δ_{pup}^2 is the pupil level variance:

$$ES = \frac{(T - C)_{adjusted}}{\sqrt{\delta_{sch}^2 + \delta_{pup}^2}}$$

The headline effect size will be calculated from the group allocation coefficient in the full analysis model (including geographical area and cohort), with the unconditional variance used as the denominator. The effect sizes will be reported along with confidence intervals and p-values to reflect statistical uncertainty. Analysis will be conducted using the 'mixed' command in Stata.

Implementation and process evaluation

Research questions

1. What are the key factors which influence successful delivery of the DARE 25 programme?
2. What are the perceptions of pupils, teachers and deliverers about the effectiveness and appropriateness of the programme?
3. What fidelity issues are observed during the trial?
4. What does the trial indicate about scalability?

Research methods

Table 3 provides an overview of data collection methods to address the IPE research questions. Our sampling approach to selecting school case studies and teacher interviews will be informed by the following principles⁶:

- Geographical variation across the regions represented
- A range of pupils taking part from each school
- Variation of DARE Officers (aim for a different DARE Officer for each school selection)
- Aim for a range of DARE Officer length of experience in the role.

A similar set of principles was applied when sampling for the 6 DARE Officers interviewed but with an incentive of a £20 Amazon voucher. Originally the intention was to speak to DARE Officers as part of a pre-existing LSE face to face event, but this was not possible due to Covid-19. This set of sampling principles aims to mitigate the risk of systemic bias towards certain characteristics and to gain broad insights from across the programme. Core members of the research team will lead on data collection and analysis of the IPE data.

⁶ We intended to sample by delivery method but all schools participating employed face to face delivery by a DARE Officer.

Table 3: IPE methods overview

Data collection and data/sources	Data analysis methods	Research questions addressed	Implementation/ logic model relevance
Semi-structured interviews with Project Lead (LSE) undertaken at three time points across the duration of the project	Thematic analysis	RQ1, R2, R4	Inform logic model (annex A) and aid understanding of whether the programme was delivered as intended and led to expected intermediate outcomes
Observations of up to 10 DARE 25 lessons ⁷ from across a variety of schools		R3, R4	Understanding how consistently the programme is delivered by different DARE Officers in different school contexts. Provide insights on potential scale-up.
Semi-structured DARE 25 Officer interviews x 6	Thematic analysis	R1, R2, R3	Perceptions of inputs and impacts of programme. Understanding of DARE Officer contextual variables
Semi-structured interviews with the class teacher of the pupils receiving the DARE 25 programme x 10 (feasibility cohort)	Thematic analysis	R1, R2,	Perceptions of inputs and impacts of programme. Further understanding of school level contextual variables
'Virtual' school case study visits x 14 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured teacher interview • Semi-structured senior leader interview • Pupil focus group 	Thematic analysis	R1, R2	Perceptions of inputs and impacts of programme. Further understanding of school level contextual variables

Analysis

Given the key focus of the evaluation is to test of the logic model, the analysis approach taken will be primarily deductively driven but with sufficient flexibility to permit the capture of emergent and unforeseen themes coming out of the data. All interviews will be audio-

⁷ The original intention was for the research team to undertake these in person but due to Covid-19, we have requested that LSE provide us a selection of videos [with suitable consent] of DARE Officers being filmed delivering lessons to inform our understanding of fidelity.

recorded (subject to appropriate consent) and then fully transcribed. These transcripts will be uploaded to Nvivo. An analysis framework will be created underpinned by both the research questions and key dimensions of the Theory of Change (see Annex A logic model). This analysis framework will be represented by appropriate nodes and sub-nodes with detailed descriptors to encourage consistency of coding across the research team. At an early stage of analysis, the IPE research team will all code some transcripts using the analysis framework as a guide. This will be followed by a team analysis meeting to assess the extent of the inter-rater reliability of coding decision making and to present an opportunity to address any inconsistencies and ambiguities and to refine the analysis framework and descriptors as is appropriate.

Thematic cross-area and within area analysis will be deployed, using coding themes drawn from the research questions and theory of change. The thematic analysis will utilise a Framework Analysis (Smith and Davies, 2010⁸) approach. This involves gaining an initial overview of the data, building an initial framework drawing on the research questions, then detailed coding or charting data according to themes from the framework and finally interpreting the data within the framework.

Cost evaluation

As this trial was funded as part of the YEF launch round cost evaluation was not required.

Ethics and registration

The trial has been approved by the University's ethical review committee. Reference number: ER27796305

The trial has been publicly registered: <https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN23403781>

Data protection

Personal data from participating pupils is collected and stored securely in a password protected folder accessible only to members of the evaluation team. The SHU evaluation team will comply with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR legal basis: public task Article 6 (1e)) and the SHU Data Protection Policy Statement. After the evaluation is finished (in 2022), the pupil data collected (name, UPN, DOB) will be sent to the Department for Education (at which point SHU cease to be responsible for the data), where the pupil data will be deleted and replaced with a pupil matching reference number (pseudonymisation). It will then be transferred to the ONS Secure Research Service to be stored in pseudonymised form to allow future research into the relationship between participating in DARE 25, educational attainment and criminal records. No pupils will be individually identifiable in the data archived.

⁸ Smith, K. & Davies, J., (2010). Qualitative data analysis In: L. Dahlberg & C. McCaig, eds. *Practical Research and Evaluation* (145-159). London: Sage Publications.

Stakeholders and interests

For this study, the evaluation team is as follows:

Dr Eleanor Formby: project director, responsible for all aspects of the study and its overall direction; lead on reporting.

Ben Willis: project manager, responsible for day to day management and communications with YEF, delivery partners and other stakeholders; key role in reporting.

Dr Martin Culliney: statistical lead, responsible for statistical approach, data collection, and analysis.

Professor Mike Coldwell: oversight of all SHU evaluations funded by YEF in the initial round of evaluation grants.

Sean Demack: statistical oversight.

The delivery team is led by Peter Moyes, CEO of Life Skills Education.

The evaluation manager at YEF was Amy Wells, who was replaced in this role by Jack Martin in Spring 2020, who in turn was replaced by Lucy Brims in Spring 2021. The YEF grant manager was originally Chan Allen, replaced in Spring 2021 by Richard Hunte.

Risks

The main risk for the impact evaluation is schools not doing the outcome assessment. There is a narrow window to collect this data, between the intervention finishing and the end of the school year. The intervention team is aware of the risk and is planning for their delivery staff to use their existing relationships with schools to encourage compliance. In control schools, requests to complete the assessment will be accompanied by information about delivery for the following school year. Another risk is school dropout, which could be caused by Covid-19 outbreaks or other factors. Options for mitigating this risk are limited given the tight timeline. The delivery team has been contacting schools to make them aware of pupil assessment requirements. The evaluators have offered to assist with this during the final weeks of term to increase completion rates.

Focus groups with pupils remain the biggest risk factor in the IPE strand. Our preference is to undertake the case study fieldwork after the completion of the intervention so participants can reflect on the whole programme. However, as with the outcome assessments, this creates pressure to complete 14 case studies in a short period of time. To mitigate this risk we are: contacting schools to set up case studies from May, bringing additional capacity onto the fieldwork team, and reviewing whether to bring forward some of the interviews (particularly with pupils) based on the level of case study sign up and any feedback about the amount of burden on schools during the last weeks of term.

Timeline

Table 4: Timeline

Dates	Activity	Staff responsible/ leading
When?	What?	Who?
Jan 20-Apr20	Delivery to FC1	LSE
Feb 20	Initial interview with LSE programme manager	SHU/LSE
Sep 20	Ethics approval cohort A/B	SHU/YEF
Oct 20	Second interview with LSE programme manager	SHU/LSE
Oct 20	Collection of FC2 MOUs	LSE > SHU
Oct-Dec 20	Delivery to FC2	LSE
Oct-Nov 20	Cohort A recruitment, share school details	LSE > SHU
Nov-Dec 20	Cohort A baseline tests, randomisation	SHU
Dec 20	Share user satisfaction survey FC2	LSE > SHU
Dec 20	Delivery staff interviews	SHU/LSE
Dec 20-Apr 21	Sampling/arranging/undertaking FC2 staff interviews	SHU
Feb-Mar 21	Cohort B recruitment, share school details	LSE
Mar 21	Cohort B baseline tests, randomisation	SHU
Mar 21	Randomise Cohort B	SHU
Jun-Jul 21	Case studies (Cohorts A and B)	SHU
Apr-Jul 21	Delivery to Cohorts A and B	LSE
Jun-Jul 21	Outcome testing cohorts A and B	SHU
Oct 21	Report; recommendation for next phase	SHU
2021/22	Delivery to control schools	LSE

Annex A - Logic Model for DARE 25

Inputs (i.e. the intervention activities):

Infrastructure

Staff are recruited with specific skills to become DARE officers, who undertake 6 days training to learn how to deliver the programme contents. They are observed once per term by a supervisor who quality assures their delivery.

Programme activities

The DO will use the lesson plan as a guide to the range of activities they will facilitate to enable learning to take place.

Programme resources

DO training programme, DARE 25 lesson plans, videos and workbooks.

Theory behind the intervention - how will it work?

By delivering 10 x 1-hour DARE 25 lessons followed by a graduation ceremony young people who graduate through the DARE 25 programme will have the skills to make informed decision about the risky behaviours explored in the programme. The mechanisms are essentially **factual input** to build knowledge (e.g. on drugs and associated risks) and **skills development** through role play, practicing decision-making, resistance strategies, etc (which builds on theories of social learning).

Implementation outputs:

3,136 pupils will graduate from the DARE 25 programme each term for four terms .

Enabling outputs: DARE Officers

- Recruitment of a new team, training and mentoring
- Enhancing knowledge about risky behaviours and skills in working with our materials
- Shaping beliefs and attitudes of team
- Building confidence
- classroom activities

Enabling outputs: School staff and settings

- Improved systems and process of recruiting schools
- **What else?**

Final outcomes **within evaluation** for participants/children:

Improved decision-making skills, knowledge, communication skills, confidence and knowing where to go for help

Intermediate outputs:

- Schools are engaged; teachers are informed
- Parents/carers are supportive
- Pupils are actively involved and attending lessons
- Workbooks are completed; learning is brought together in the graduation

Final outcomes **beyond evaluation** for participants/young people:

- Reduced engagement in crime
- Improved health outcomes

Contextual factors:

- Each geographic area has its own challenges and emphasis
- Leadership in the school, teacher's willingness to build on the lessons beyond the fixed lesson, classroom behaviour and school discipline, current challenges in the schools such as inspection and results outcomes
- Parental contribution/engagement
- Political emphasis both locally and nationally, availability of funding, local and national media events
- Other programmes being used in the school



youthendowmentfund.org.uk



hello@youthendowmentfund.org.uk



[@YouthEndowFund](https://twitter.com/YouthEndowFund)

The Youth Endowment Fund Charitable Trust

Registered Charity Number: 1185413
