



Appendix I:

Section 4: Methodology for case studies

The case study examples that are included in this document are considered a 'first round'. We set out to provide case studies to illustrate implementation examples of good practice and a more detailed analysis of lessons learned to assist those considering implementing the strategy in their own setting. However the reality is that many programmes have not been examined with respect to their effectiveness and it is even less likely that they will have been evaluated using a rigorous research design that includes a comparison group and a look at behavioural and injury outcomes. As a result many programmes could not be included as case studies in this version, but it is anticipated that as more programmes receive adequate evaluation additional examples can be added.

Case studies were sought and selected based on the following criteria:

- Example programme addresses issues of priority within Europe (based on injury burden).
- Example programme met our definition of good practice.
- Example programme corresponds with one of the good practices identified.

- Example programme has been implemented and evaluated (both process and outcome evaluations completed) in a European setting and found to be effective.

In addition to the selection criteria, where possible we also attempted to select case study examples that reflected a range of resource intensities (e.g., a range of costs to implement) and implementation levels (e.g., national, regional or local). Case studies were also selected to try and reflect the efforts from as many areas of Europe as possible. Case study examples were sought in a snowball approach through various sources including members of the European Child Safety Alliance and other child injury prevention and safety promotion experts. In addition, internet searches and selective reviews of the recent literature were used to identify additional potential case studies.

For each potential case study selected, a contact person was identified and a research associate contacted him or her to ascertain that the potential case study met the inclusion criteria. Once this was established, available documentation was examined and a standardised interview was conducted that sought and summarised the following information:

- Implementation level (at what level was the strategy focussed – national, regional or local?)

- Strategy approach (which of the 3 E's was used – education, engineering, enforcement or a combination?)
- Setting of intervention (where did the intervention take place?)
- Target audience for the intervention (at who was the intervention aimed?)
- Resource intensity – an indication of the resource intensity required [€ = up to €20.000/year, €€ = €20-90.000/year, €€€ = €100-299.000/year, €€€€ = €300-999.000/year, €€€€€ = €1.000.000 plus/year]*
- Background for the initiative (including rationale, driving force, timeframe and major partners)
- Aim & objectives of intervention
- Key steps / actions in intervention
- Evaluation of intervention
- Lessons learned (including barriers and facilitators, advice to countries and issues around transferability)

*The resource implications provided should be interpreted carefully. First they do not include in-kind support which in many cases far outweighs the actual budget spent on the implementation of a strategy. Second although the resource intensity estimates provided come from the project personnel themselves, it is important to remember that costs vary by country for many things such as people's time, printing of resources, etc. As a result the resources required when looking at transferring a strategy from one setting to another may vary from what is reported here.





- References
- Contact information for intervention

Following each interview, the case study was written up in a consistent format, which included the addition of the evidence statement supporting the strategy. Case studies were then returned to the contact for confirmation and clarification before being added to the guide. Of note, three of the cases studies - Safe Road to School in Faro, Portugal; Bicycle Helmet Campaign, Denmark and Child Resistant Packaging for Chemicals, Netherlands - are enhanced expansions of case studies originally collected for the WHO for the Children's health and environment case studies summary book⁹³

Finally it is important to note that the cases studies included in the following section are an initial attempt to illustrate examples of existing good practice. The European Child Safety Alliance invites submission of additional case study ideas that meet the criteria described above for inclusion in future editions. Please forward case study ideas to secretariat@childsafetyeurope.org



IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL	National, local
APPROACH	Education
SETTING	Schools, community
TARGET AUDIENCE	Schools, parents, children 3 to 14 years old
RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS	€€
EVIDENCE BASE:	School-based injury prevention education has the potential to increase safety-related knowledge and behaviour. ^{1,2}

Background

Risk Watch is a school-based safety education programme to develop the risk assessment skills of children aged 3 to 14 years. The programme provides a multi-agency approach to delivering risk awareness, as opposed to risk avoidance with the overall objective of improving the Health, Safety and Wellbeing of young people.

Risk Watch is intended to be flexible so that injury prevention and risk awareness can be taught as a stand-alone unit or integrated into core curriculum subjects such as numeracy, literacy, writing skills, science or health promotion. The programme is based on children’s developmental stage and the risks they face. It provides an experiential learning process with a chance to practice prevention behaviours, following guided decision-making.

Risk Watch links between the classroom and the home environment to enable parents and carers to be involved. This involvement may lead to the home environment being improved by the provision of safety equipment or in a change of carers’ behaviours and attitudes. It is designed to provide an enjoyable experience for the child and the teacher based on evidence that fun events are more likely to be repeated and remembered.

The eight areas of teaching are as follows:

- Motor Vehicle Safety

- Fire and Burn Prevention
- Choking, Suffocation and Strangulation Prevention
- Poisoning Prevention
- Falls Prevention
- Weapons Injury Prevention
- Bike and Pedestrian Safety
- Water Safety

Risk Watch can be delivered in a number of ways:

- A nine-hour Intensive Programme. Teachers spend one hour per week to present information for one risk area, followed by one activity from Risk Watch in Action.*
- A 20-hour Comprehensive Programme. Run throughout the school year, it covers one risk area for one to two hours per month, followed by activities from the Risk Watch in Action section and visits by safety experts from the community.
- A Variable Programme. This is a student-centred approach, combining student learning from Risk Watch in Action with teacher input from Risk Watch content information.

Teachers are provided with resource boxes containing extra material for each topic. For example, the fire and burns box may contain a smoke alarm, telephone, oven gloves, flammable materials, match boxes, a range of safety booklets and posters, and information on the local Ambulance Service.

The teacher is supported in the programme by a local community coalition comprising of professionals who link into the teaching objectives. The core group usually includes representatives from Health, Police, Fire and Education Departments. As they form a working group and start to formulate a strategic and local implementation plan, additional co-opted members from other appropriate community groups and businesses are encouraged to assist. The vision is that the coalition is the driving force in a community, providing support and direction to teachers, soliciting help from the public and business sector, and effecting change in surrounding environment to make it safer for children in local communities.

Policy Background/Driving Force

Accidental injury is the leading cause of death for children aged 0 to 14 years in the UK. Children from poorer families are five times more likely to die as a result of injuries as those from a wealthier background. Road crashes are the leading cause of unintentional injury among children and young people. (Almost 5,000 children (under 15 years) were killed or seriously injured on British roads in 2001). An average of 50 children under 11 years old are killed in fires every year and

* Risk Watch in Action is a series of complementary extension activities.



over 1,600 are injured. The cost of home accidents in the UK has been estimated at £25 million per year.

The Highland Council, in partnership with Highland and Islands Fire Brigade and Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service decided to take action and become involved in the first phase of the UK pilot of Risk Watch because of the alarming injury statistics among children.

Risk Watch meets a number of national priorities, including those in relation to Community Planning; Community Safety; Youth/Social Justice and Health and Safety Commission's strategy of early education in risk assessment skills.

Risk Watch is intended to impact upon the high incidence of anti-social behaviour in and around schools, helping to meet the objectives of the Scottish Executive's Social and Youth Justice agendas and its commitment to improve community safety at the neighbourhood level.

In addition to meeting many of the current educational priorities, it helps address Health and Safety Executive targets to ensure a reduction in accidents and injuries for school leavers going into industry by equipping young people to identify and reduce risk.

The UK Government Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 places an obligation on local Fire Services to play an active role in community fire safety and provides funding for such activities. The Fire Service thematic review of 'Working With Young People' highlighted that Fire Service personnel would gain in terms of staff development, from working on projects such as Risk Watch by providing a positive role model to children and, ultimately, children are a powerful way of spreading the fire and safety prevention message to family, friends and other people.

Partners

- Highland and Islands Fire Brigade and Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Scottish Executive
- Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM),
- Highland Council

In Scotland, Steering Group membership includes:

- Chief Fire Officers' Association (Scotland)
- Scottish Executive Fire Division (Scotland)
- Association of Chief Police Officers (Scotland)
- Health and Safety Executive
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents
- Maritime & Coastguard Agency
- Scottish Community Safety Network
- Scottish Road Safety Campaign
- HMI Education in Scotland
- Health Promoting Schools Unit
- Learning and Teaching Scotland

Aims & Objectives

- To teach children and their families the skills and knowledge they need to reduce the risk from unintentional injuries;
- To change the attitude and behaviour of young people towards personal safety;
- To improve the health, safety and wellbeing of young people

Evaluation

Over 1,000 children in seven primary schools participated in the Phase 1 pilot for the evaluation during 2003/04.2 Teachers followed the nine-hour Intensive Programme described above, with support provided by Safety Agency and/or Coalition members. In addition, a Schools' Coordinator was appointed to liaise with schools and safety agency members, and support teachers.

The evaluation included twelve focus groups with a total of 87 students. In addition, each student participating in Risk Watch was pre- and post-tested. Parents were invited to school meetings to present their views on the programme. Interviews were completed with 21 Coalition members. Feedback was also obtained from teachers and other representatives of the education system.

Students provided very positive feedback, indicating great enjoyment and learning from the Risk Watch programme. Many pupils reported feeling empowered by the programme, and felt able to help should an emergency arise. Where pre- and post-testing was rigorously carried out, statistical findings were indicative of a promising effect on children's performance on the test.

At the end of the Phase 1 pilot, pupils and teaching staff attended one of two one-day conference to feedback their experiences of using the programme. Following a very positive response at both evaluation days, the Scottish Executive and



Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service agreed to extend the programme to a broader range of schools.

In Scotland, the programme expansion meant that it was offered to schools in every region, giving a much more robust sample to gauge its success.

The Phase 2 pilot will be evaluated using a range of methods in each of the pilot areas, including:

- In-depth study into behavioural change;
- Measuring knowledge at an experiential safety centre;
- Teacher/pupil feedback forms.

Key Steps

- Set up a multi-agency Safety Coalition.
- Examine local accident/injury statistics.
- Select schools.
- Provide training for schools and Community Coalitions.
- Monitor and support delivery of programme.
- Examine feedback
- Share results

Lessons Learned

The programme needs to be targeted at schools in areas where risk is highest. Teachers are under great pressure to deliver core curriculum subjects and preparation and teaching time is limited. Risk Watch has been developed by teachers to fit in with core curriculum subjects and relevant teaching materials are already provided.

The key to its success is continued co-ordination and cooperation of coalition members and continuity of funding.

Barriers

- Teachers require ample lead-in time (several months) to incorporate the material into their development plans.

Facilitators

- All Scottish local authorities must have a Community Safety Partnership consisting of multiple agencies concerned with safety. Because this group was already in place, implementation of the Risk Watch curriculum was more straightforward.
- The Fire Service has been in a position to act as a champion for Risk Watch for two main reasons:
- The Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 gives Fire Services a remit for community fire safety.
- Risk Watch was developed by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) in the USA, so was naturally marketed to the Fire and Rescue Service Directorate at the ODPM.
- The flexibility of the Risk Watch programme means that teachers can deliver material in a variety of ways varying in resource requirements. Also, they can present all material themselves, or bring in safety personnel for special sessions.

Advice to Countries/Transferability

- The Risk Watch concept was originally developed by the NFPA in the USA and adapted by primary teachers for use in the UK.
- Flexibility was allowed by NFPA in adapting the content of the programme to suit localised safety advice and safety needs.

- Close liaison with NFPA Europe representative is highly recommended.

References, Additional Information

1. Frederick, K., Bixby, E., Orzel, M., Stuart-Brown, S., & Willett, K. (2000). An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Injury Minimisation Programme for Schools (IMPS). *Injury Prevention*, 6, 92-95.
2. NFPA USA. (2001). Final report of the three-year evaluation of Risk Watch. Available at: <http://www.nfpa.org/riskwatch/pdfs/3yrfinalEvaluation.pdf>
3. East House Research. (2004). Risk Watch: Findings from a pilot study in the UK. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. Available at: http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_fire_documents/page/odpm_fire_031223.pdf

See also:

<http://www.nfpa.org/riskwatch/>

or contact:

Judy Comoletti, jcomoletti@nfpa.org (USA) or
Sultan Javeri, sjaveri@nfpa.org (Europe)

Contact

Name: Cathie Way
Address: Highland and Islands Fire Brigade
16 Harbour Road
Inverness, Scotland
IV1 1TB
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0) 1463 227 180
Fax: +44 (0) 1463 227 154
E-mail: Cathie.way@highland.fire-uk.org

