

Process Evaluation of the  
Safety Rules OK! Program

Prepared by the

Centre for Health Promotion Research  
Curtin University of Technology

1999

# PROCESS EVALUATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## SAFETY RULES OK! PROGRAM

### Contributors

Alexandra McManus  
Manager  
CHPR

Barbara MacDonald  
Research Assistant  
CHPR

Assoc. Prof Donna Cross  
Managing Director  
CHPR

Sarah Baxendale  
Research Assistant  
CHPR

## Schools participating in process evaluation (primary unless stated)

Allenswood  
All Saints Junior College  
Augusta  
Boulder  
Byford  
Capel  
Cassia  
Cervantes  
Chapman Valley  
Condingup  
Cunderdin District High School  
Dalmain  
East Carnarvon  
East Maylands  
Edgewater  
Emmanuel Christian  
Flinders Park  
Gibbs St  
Gosnells  
Grace Christian  
Jarrahdale  
John Calvin  
Joondalup  
Joondalup ESC  
Kununurra District High  
Maida Vale  
Marantha Christian College  
Marangaroo  
Mt Lockyer  
Mt Pleasant  
North Kalgoorlie  
Orange Grove  
Perenjori  
Pt Kennedy  
Rossmoyne  
St Annes  
St Joseph's Waroona  
Serpentine  
Southlands Christian  
Tom Price Senior High  
Waddington  
Warnbro  
West Busselton  
West Leeming  
Westonia  
Wickham District High  
Willagee  
Wundowie  
Wyndham  
Yangebup  
Yandeyarra Community

## **ABSTRACT**

Safety Rules OK! is a whole school approach to injury prevention which adopts environmental, educational and promotional strategies to work towards injury free schools. The program is designed to support safety curriculum activities in the classroom and assist schools to meet their duty of care responsibilities.

The Safety Rules OK Program was piloted in the Education District of Narrogin in 1995, and in Bayswater and the Inner City Health District in 1996. Based on the success of the pilot program, the Safety Rules OK Program was offered to all schools with a primary facility in Western Australia commencing in Term One 1998.

The Centre for Health Promotion Research (CHPR) was employed by the Injury Control Program of the Health Department of Western Australia (HDWA) to conduct a cross-sectional process evaluation of the Safety Rules OK! Program from January 1998 until November 1999.

Fifty of the 150 schools who were involved in the Safety Rules OK Program, participated in the process evaluation (26 rural and 24 metropolitan). Information was collection from SROK Program Coordinators by telephone interview at a time and date chosen by them between 15<sup>th</sup> November and 26<sup>th</sup> November 1999.

Coordinators were asked to comment on the following aspects of the Safety Rules OK Program: concept, support networks, training workshop, manual, promotional materials used, the success of the program, and sustainability of the program after Term One, 2000 when it will cease in its current format.

Overall the Safety Rules OK Program was well accepted in the schools surveyed. Injury rates decreased and staff and students were generally more awareness of safety issues within the school environment. The in-service training and the manual were highly regarded by teachers who attended training sessions. The SROK Program was well supported by other staff within schools and safety was a key factor in the uptake of the program by the school community.

## Table of Contents

	Page
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Aims and objectives	
2.1 Aims	2
2.2 Objectives	2
3.0 Methodology	2
4.0 Results	
4.1 Results of telephone interviews from schools	
4.1.1 Concept	3
4.1.2 Support networks	6
4.1.3 Training workshop	7
4.1.4 Manual	9
4.1.5 Promotional materials	13
4.1.6 Success of the SROK Program	14
4.1.7 Sustainability of the SROK Program	15
5.0 Limitations	
6.0 Summary of results	
6.1 Concept	17
6.2 Support networks	17
6.3 Training workshop	17
6.4 Manual	18
6.5 Promotional materials	18
6.6 Success of the SROK Program	18
6.7 Sustainability of the SROK Program	19
7.0 Conclusions and recommendations	19

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

‘Safety Rules OK!’ is an injury prevention program based on a health promoting school philosophy, which aims to increase safety awareness and reduce injury in schools.

The program is modelled on the ‘school safe cycle’, a step process to identify injury causes and implement injury prevention strategies.

Fundamental to the program is the formation of injury prevention committees which coordinate the program. The committee consists primarily of students, as student ownership of the program will more likely encourage lasting changes in prevention behaviour and safety attitudes.

Safety Rules OK! is a whole school approach to injury prevention which adopts environmental, educational and promotional strategies to work towards injury free schools. The program is designed to support safety curriculum activities in the classroom and assist schools to meet their duty of care responsibilities.

‘If a school does not currently have a high injury rate, continual reinforcement of safety awareness and injury prevention strategies is still vital to ensure that the injury free record is maintained. The increased awareness will also hopefully extend to the home, road, recreational activities and into the workplace later in life.’

Safety Rules OK! Manual December 1997

The Safety Rules OK Program is based on the following injury prevention philosophies:

- School-based injury prevention initiatives are most effective when the whole school community, including parents, are involved;
- Students are encouraged to positively replace unsafe behaviour with safe behaviour;
- The focus is on injury prevention rather than accident prevention. Injuries are not simply ‘bound to happen’, they have causes and, therefore, can be prevented;
- Students are encouraged to enjoy their everyday activities. Injury prevention aims to help them with their skills and knowledge rather than stifle the natural curiosity and enthusiasm of children: and
- Injuries result from an interaction with unsafe environments and unsafe behaviours.

The Safety Rules OK Program was piloted in the Education District of Narrogin in 1995, and in Bayswater and the Inner City Health District in 1996. Based on the success of the pilot program, the Safety Rules OK Program was offered to all schools with a primary facility in Western Australia commencing in Term One 1998.

The Centre for Health Promotion Research (CHPR) was employed by the Injury Control Program of the Health Department of Western Australia (HDWA) to conduct a cross-sectional process evaluation of the Safety Rules OK! Program from January 1998 until November 1999.

## **2.0 AIM AND OBJECTIVES**

### **2.1 Aim**

Safety Rules OK! aims to reduce the incidence and severity of school injuries and increase safety awareness in the school community.

### **2.2 Objectives**

- To assist schools to conduct injury surveillance within their environment;
- To assist schools to form injury prevention committees or take on the program as part of existing student, safety or health committees;
- To assist schools to identify and modify or remove hazards;
- To encourage school communities to implement prevention strategies to make their environment safer;
- To offer resources and curriculum activities that will contribute to student safety education; and
- To assist schools to develop school injury prevention policy or incorporate as part of existing safety or health policy.

## **3.0 METHODOLOGY**

In 1997 and 1998 all primary schools in Western Australia were invited to participate in the Safety Rules OK! Program. A total of 150 schools were recruited into the program over the two years (97 rural and 82 metropolitan). As part of the Safety Rules OK Program, one teacher from each school was offered professional development and therefore became the nominated coordinator of the program.

The Safety Rules OK Program staff employed by the Health Department of Western Australia chose 50 schools to participate in the evaluation. Another 50 schools were chosen at random by the CHPR Project Coordinator from the list of schools involved in the Safety Rules OK! Program. Coordinators of the Safety Rules OK Program from the 100 schools, were contacted by facsimile in the first week of November, to confirm their availability for telephone interviews between 15 and 26 November 1999. They were asked to nominate two times and dates in which they would be available for a 20 minute telephone interview. Fifty five teachers responded, however five were unable to complete interviews due to time constraints, therefore 50 telephone interviews were completed (26 rural and 24 metropolitan). The remaining 45 teachers who were invited to participate, did not reply to correspondence sent to them.

A twenty-two item questionnaire was developed to assist with interviews. Forty-five interviews were conducted by one interviewer to ensure continuity of administration and data collection. This interviewer was conversant with the Safety Rules OK! Program and with the Education Department of WA's Curriculum Framework and Student Outcome Statements. The remaining five interviews were conducted by a Project Research Assistant from the CHPR.

Teachers were asked to comment on various aspects of the Safety Rules OK! Program such as: concept, support networks, training workshop, manual, promotional materials, success of the program and sustainability of the program within their school. Questions were open-ended and all teachers' comments were recorded by the interviewer. Responses from telephone interviews are listed separately for rural and metropolitan schools.

All telephone interviews were completed by 26 November 1999 . All comments made by teachers' were then recorded in full and listed in table form to allow comparison between responses from rural and metropolitan teachers'. From these tables, recommendations for revision of the Safety Rules OK Program were devised.

## 4.0 Results

All teachers were asked the same questions and all comments were recorded in full. These comments were then amalgamated in table form. Tables include both rural and metropolitan teachers' responses for ease of comparison.

### 4.1 Results of telephone interviews from rural (n=26) and metropolitan (n=24) schools

#### 4.1.1 Concept

*Q1. What attracted your school to the Safety Rules OK Program?*

The main themes provided by coordinators as to why their school decided to be involved in the Safety Rules OK Program related to safety in the school environment (60%) and funding received by schools as an incentive to join the program (18%).

**Table 1. Reasons schools were attracted to the Safety Rules OK Program**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
Safety aspects relating to safety in playground	16 (62)	14 (58)	30 (60)
Funding	4 (15)	5 (21)	9 (18)
Development of safety policy/risk management policy	3 (11)	2 (8)	5 (10)
Safety flyer	3 (11)	5 (21)	8 (16)
Promoting safe play areas	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
School nurses suggestion	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Compliments existing syllabus	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
The challenge	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Teacher suggested uptake of program	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Professional Development	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	2 (4)
Teaching students to respect their school	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Used program in previous school	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Was involved at another school		1 (4)	1 (2)
Duty of care		1 (4)	1 (2)
Was a pilot school for Safety Rules OK Program		1 (4)	1 (2)
Saw program advertised on television		1 (4)	1 (2)
We are a health promoting school		1 (4)	1 (2)
Unknown		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q2. How did your school use the Safety Rules OK concept?*

Most schools involved in the SROK Program used the resources to promote a safer school environment. Many also favoured a whole school approach incorporating all school levels, plus support staff. Creation of policy including risk management and health policies were also addressed using the SROK Program resources.

**Table 2. How schools used the Safety Rules OK Program**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
To develop or update policies e.g risk management, health	6 (23)	4 (17)	10 (20)
To increase awareness of potential hazards in playground	4 (15)	4 (17)	8 (16)
As part of a whole school approach	4 (15)		4 (8)
To form a safety committee	3 (11)		3 (6)
To make the school a safer environment for students	3 (11)	7 (29)	10 (20)
To develop a comprehensive safety program including SROK, Safe Routes to School, Sunsafe, Bike Ed, Road Safety	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
To focus on safety in playground	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
To add to existing Schools' safety consciousness	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
To conduct a program with one Year 6/7 class	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
To form a student Council	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
To include the school gardener in our safety program	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
To conduct safety audits	1 (3.8)	3 (11)	4 (8)
Included SROK Program in curriculum	1 (3.8)	2 (8)	3 (6)
To reduce injuries through increased awareness	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
To update school safety rules	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Used in conjunction with Keep Australia Beautiful	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Incorporated in Risk Management Plan	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
School nurse coordinated program in two schools	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Used injury report form	1 (3.8)	3 (11)	4 (8)
To facilitate a peer medication program		1 (4)	1 (2)
Devised posters on safety		1 (4)	1 (2)
In conjunction with Safety Week		1 (4)	1 (2)
To increase technology in the school		1 (4)	1 (2)
As basis of logo/motto competition on road safety		1 (4)	1 (2)
To keep safety issues as a priority in the school		1 (4)	1 (2)
In conjunction with Kidsafe, Bike Ed and Sunsafe programs		1 (4)	1 (2)
To highlight unsafe practices on the school oval		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q3. What strategies did your school devise to improve safety and reduce injuries within the school population that were successful?*

Strategies used by schools to improve safety and reduce injury were many and varied. The most popular strategies that proved successful were: regular safety audits of the playground and surrounding areas; use of injury report forms to record all injuries sustained; various competitions to increase awareness of safety in and around the school; and election of safety monitors to act as reference points.

**Table 3. Successful strategies used by schools to improve safety and reduce injuries in the school environment.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Conducted Safety Audit	16 (62)	13 (54)	29 (58)
Roadwise / Bike Ed	12 (46)	3 (13)	15 (30)
Posters	7 (27)	6 (25)	13 (26)
Injury report forms used	7 (27)	1 (4)	8 (16)
Upgrade playground equipment/areas and checked regularly e.g sandpits, fencing, trees, shade domes	6 (23)	1 (4)	7 (14)
Safety monitors	5 (19)	4 (17)	9 (18)
Committee formed	4 (15)	3 (13)	7 (14)
Assembly safety reports	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	3 (6)
Safety signs painted on walls	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Awards at assembly	2 (7.7)	2 (8)	4 (8)
Competitions	2 (7.7)	3 (13)	5 (10)
Safe routes to school	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Independent audit	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Student council	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Safe play including water play and hat policy	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	3 (6)
Included in curriculum/ teacher lesson plans		2 (8)	2 (8)
Noticeboard used for safety facts	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety facts in newsletter	1 (3.8)	4 (17)	5 (10)
Parliamentary system used to select monitors	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Told others about safety	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Weekly reports	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
P&C helped financially	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Gardener assisted	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
General awareness increased/ safety talks/ safety tips	1 (3.8)	4 (17)	5 (10)
Taught to respect culture	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Fire drill	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Free sunscreen	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Litterbug program	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Asthma friendly	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Risk Management Policy	1 (3.8)	1 (4)	2 (4)
Farm safety	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Updated first aid kit	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety week	1 (3.8)	4 (17)	5 (10)
First aid course for Year 7s	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Peer mediators used		1 (4)	1 (2)
Safety Houses promoted		1 (4)	1 (2)
'Spot the hazard' conducted monthly by principals, parents, gardener		1 (4)	1 (2)
Car park monitored for unsafe practices		1 (4)	1 (2)
Electrical equipment checked		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q4. What strategies did you try that weren't successful? Why were they unsuccessful?*  
 Almost all strategies used by schools were successful (22/26 rural and 19/24 metro). Of those that did encounter problems most involved difficulties in enlisting student assistance (2/26 rural and 4/24 metro). One rural school found the Safe Routes to School Program unreliable as the coordinator was overworked, and one metropolitan school had a poor response to a competition held. The remaining rural school did not answer this question.

#### 4.1.2 Support networks

*Q5. What support, if any, did you have from other teachers, schools or the community?*

On the whole support from within the school community for the Safety Rules Program was high, particularly from other teachers' (18/26 rural and 16/24 metro). Several schools also used the school nurse as a reference point (5/26 rural and 2/24 metro).

**Table 4. Support received for Safety Rules OK Program**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
Teacher support	18 (69)	16 (67)	34 (68)
Lots of support	5 (19)		5 (10)
School nurse	5 (19)	2 (8)	7 (14)
None	3 (11)		3 (6)
P&C financial support	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Principal support	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	3 (6)
Network with other teachers in district	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Internet site	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Gardener	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Monthly maintenance surveys	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Parents	1 (3.8)	5 (21)	6 (12)
Bike Ed	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Community	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety policy endorsed by all teachers	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Police	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Local council	1 (3.8)	2 (8)	3 (6)
Written into school plan for 2000	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Little support from teachers		3 (13)	3 (6)
Safety House Coordinator was very helpful		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q6. Did the regular newsletter and support phone calls every term assist your school with the continued implementation of the program?*

Support of the regular newsletters and phone was high (23/26 rural and 17/24 metro). Six schools did not appreciate the interruption to their already busy routine (2/26 rural and 4/24 metro), three metropolitan schools thought they were of little use and the one remaining rural school was undecided

*Q 6a. How were they helpful? Why*

Over half of all schools in the program thought the newsletters were worthwhile as they provided relevant information and helped to keep the focus on safety within the school (16/26 rural and 16/24 metro). The telephone calls were not appreciated in many schools as they interrupted class time and were not always considered necessary (6/26 rural and 9/24 metro). Several teachers suggested it would be more efficient and less time consuming if school program coordinators contacted HDWA staff as and when required.

**Table 5. Teachers' opinion of the worth of regular newsletters and support phone calls from SROK staff.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Newsletter good	16 (62)	16 (67)	32 (64)
Phone calls good	9 (35)	4 (17)	13 (26)
Phone calls not always necessary	5 (19)	4 (17)	9 (18)
Useful information/ good reminder	4 (15)	4 (17)	8 (16)
Motivating	3 (11)		3 (6)
Good to see what other schools are doing	3 (11)		3 (6)
We would ring up SROK people if we had problems so their calls aren't needed	1 (3.8)	2 (8)	3 (6)
More copies of newsletter needed	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
New ideas	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Not helpful at all	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Newsletters received altogether this week	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Too busy for phone calls		2 (8)	2 (4)
Too much contact		1 (4)	1 (2)

### 4.1.3 Training workshop

*Q7. Was the training workshop a convenient way to in-service this program with teachers in your school?*

Teachers appeared to enjoy the training workshops and were enthusiastic in their comments regarding the explanation of the SROK Program manual and their ability to ask questions and discuss aspect of the manual in a supportive environment.

**Table 6. Was the training workshop a convenient way to in-service this program with teachers in your school?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Yes	22 (85)	18 (75)	40 (80)
Training workshop was well conducted and appreciated	10 (38)		10 (20)
Training workshop was conducted at our school	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Didn't attend training workshop	2 (7.7)	5 (21)	7 (14)
Did not answer/comment		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q 8. What aspects of the training workshop were helpful to you in implementing the Safety Rules OK program in your school?*

Having the time to read, digest and discuss the content the Safety Rules OK Program manual, was thought by teachers', to be the most helpful component of the training workshop and assisted them in implementing the program with confidence, in their school.

**Table 7. Aspects of the training workshops that were helpful when implementing the Safety Rules OK Program in schools.**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
It was helpful to have the manual was explained in detail	21 (81)	17 (71)	38 (76)
Group discussion	13 (50)	15 (63)	28 (56)
All aspects were excellent/helpful	3 (11)	2 ( 8)	5 (10)
Focus on safety was good	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2 )
Being able to ask questions was great	1 (3.8)	2 ( 8)	3 ( 6)

*Q 9. How could the training workshop be improved?*

Almost all teachers who responded were satisfied with the training workshop ((23/26 rural and 17/24 metro). One rural teacher suggested more ideas about what other schools are doing would be helpful. A metropolitan teacher suggested a list of contact names and addresses of approved play equipment and soft fill suppliers could be provided to coordinators. Two rural and six metropolitan teachers did not comment.

*Q 10. What follow-up, if any, would have been useful?*

Seventy percent of respondents (21/26 rural and 14/24 metro) did not think any follow-up training was necessary. It should be noted however that only 58% of metropolitan respondents said they did not require follow-up training.

**Table 7. What follow-up training would have been useful**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
None	21 (81)	14 (58)	35 (70)
Newsletters	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2)
Phone calls	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2)
Half day PD as follow up	1 (3.8)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 4)
A network meeting after WA Week		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)
In-service training for all teachers		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)
In-service training for new coordinators		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)
Did not answer/comment	2 (7.7)	6 (25)	8 (16)

*Q 11. Would the program be able to be implemented in schools if no Professional Development was available?*

Almost all schools felt professional development via the training workshop was essential to the continued successful implementation of the Safety Rules OK Program.

**Table 8. Would the SROK Program be able to be implemented in school if no professional development was available?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
No	22 (85)	21 (87)	43 (86)
PD essential for full benefit of program	15 (58)		15 (30)
Unsure	2 ( 7.7)		2 ( 4)
Only if the manual was available	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2)
Vital because schools are bombarded with lots of information and if PD wasn't offered the program wouldn't stand out	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2)
Coordinator does not have a manual		3 ( 13)	3 ( 6)

#### **4.1.4 Manual**

*Q 12. Was the information in the program manual readily adaptable for use in your school?*

All schools except one from each group (25/26 rural and 23/24 metro) thought the information in the program manual was readily adaptable for use in schools. Of the two schools who did not answer in the affirmative, one rural school had no manual and the other metro school did not answer this question. Several of the schools thought the manual was an excellent resource.

*Q 12a. What sections of the manual you used, worked in your schools? Why?*

Almost half of both groups of schools thought all aspects of the manual they had used worked in their school (12/26 rural and 13/24 metro). Several schools also noted the sections used were effective in their school (See Table 9).

**Table 9. Sections of the SROK manual used that worked in schools.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
All aspects worked	12 (46)	13 (54)	25 (50)
Used most of the sections and all worked	10 (38)	13 (54)	23 (46)
Curriculum links appropriate to age group	5 (19)	4 (17)	9 (18)
Safety audit	4 (15)	2 ( 8)	6 (12)
Injury report forms	2 (7.7)	2 ( 8)	4 ( 8)
Proformas	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2)
Directory	1 (3.8)	1 ( 4)	2 ( 4)

*Q 12b. What sections of the manual you used did not work for your school? Why*

All sections used worked in all but two schools (25/26 rural and 23/24 metro). One rural school was unable to get the resources they required and one metropolitan school found the safety audit form was too hard for Year 6 students to use.

*Q 13. How could the content of the manual be improved to make it easier for you to use?*

**THEME: MANUAL EXCELLENT**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Fine/ good/ excellent resource as is	22 (85)	22 (92)	44 (88)
Ideas used at other schools	10 (38)		10 (20)
Easy to use	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Comprehensive	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
More activities for younger children required	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
More lesson plans	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Master copies of certificates so we can photocopy them	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Contact names and telephone numbers of approved play equipment and soft fill should be included		1 (4)	1 (2)
Safety Week resources could be included/ improved		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q 14. How could the organisation of the manual be improved to make it easier for you to use?*

Almost all rural schools (25/26) and all metropolitan schools (24/24) thought the manual was well organised in its present form. One rural school did not comment as they did not have a copy of the resource.

*Q 15. Which of the classroom strategies did you use? (See Table 10)*

**Table 10. Classroom strategies used in SROK Program in schools**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Discussions/presentations/ group work	18 (69)	12 (50)	30 (60)
Posters/ games/ competitions	13 (50)	11 (46)	24 (48)
Safety audits/ identified hazards/ car park/ home	8 (31)	9 (38)	17 (34)
Some that fitted into the curriculum framework/ lesson plans	5 (19)	3 (13)	8 (16)
Safety monitors	4 (15)	7 (29)	11 (22)
Internet site	4 (15)		4 (8)
Video made of unsafe playground practices/ watched video on safety	3 (11)	1 (4)	4 (8)
Peer work/ student committees	3 (11)	2 (8)	5 (10)
Safety talks – bush/ camping/ sport/ first aid/ police	3 (11)	7 (29)	10(20)
Puppet plays/ role plays	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Mural of SROK logo painted on local PCYC wall	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Assemblies	1 (3.8)	2 (8)	3 (6)
Collaborative learning techniques	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Injury report forms	1 (3.8)	1 (4)	2 (4)
Teaching students to respect themselves/their school	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Whole school approach	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Sections of the manual photocopied for teachers		4 (17)	4 (8)
None	1 (3.8)		1 (2)

*Q 15a. Which classroom strategies would you use again and why?*

Table 10 lists classroom strategies that schools indicated they would use again. As mentioned previously, the majority of strategies used by schools worked well. The most popular strategies used were classroom discussions, presentations and group work (16/26 rural and 11/24 metro).

**Table 11. Strategies schools would use again from the SROK Program**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
All worked well	18 (69)	24(100)	42 (84)
Discussions/ presentations/ group work	16 (62)	11 (46)	27 (54)
Curriculum links/ lesson plans easy to follow	5 (19)	3 (11)	8 (16)
Safety monitors	4 (15)	7 (29)	11 (22)
Safety audits/ identified hazards/ car park/ home	4 (15)	9 (38)	13 (26)
Internet site	3 (11)		3 (6)
Video of unsafe playground practices	3 (11)	1 (4)	4 (8)
Sections of the manual photocopied for teachers		3 (13)	3 (6)
Safety Talks - bush/ camping/ sport/ first aid/ police	2 (7.7)	7 (29)	9 (18)
Committee	2 (7.7)	2 (8)	4 (8)
Posters/ games/ competitions	2 (7.7)	10 (42)	12 (24)
Identified hazards	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Bush/ camping safety	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Role plays	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Collaborative learning techniques	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Conflict resolution	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Puppet plays	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Peer work	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Injury report forms	1 (3.8)	1 (4)	2 (4)
Assembly	1 (3.8)	1 (4)	2 (4)

*Q 16. Which of the whole school strategies did you use? (See Table 11)*

**Table 12. Whole school strategies that teachers would use again.**

Safety talks – traffic, farm, sports, bush, games, sun	12 (46)	4 (17)	16 (32)
Safety audits/ identified hazards/ car park/ home	10 (38)	7 (29)	17 (34)
Assembly awards	9 (35)	5 (21)	14 (28)
Posters, competitions	9 (35)		9 (18)
Newsletters	4 (15)	2 (8)	6 (12)
Injury report forms	4 (15)	2 (8)	6 (12)
Signs	2 (7.7)	2 (8)	4 (8)
Videos	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	3 (6)
Safety monitors	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	3 (6)
Safety week	2 (7.7)	8 (33)	10 (20)
A total approach to safety/ manual	2 (7.7)	1 (2)	3 (6)
Encouraged students to wear shoes and hats	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Used the Life Education van	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Changed school rules	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Provided free sunscreen for all	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Developed safety policies e.g. no hat no play	1 (3.8)	1 (4)	1 (2)
Peer medication		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q 16a. Which whole school strategies would you use again and why?*

Schools used an extensive and varied list of strategies encompassing a whole school approach. Almost all strategies used were effective (24/26 rural and 24/24 metro).

**Table 13. Whole school strategies teachers would use again.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Would use all strategies as they were all effective	24 (92)	24 (100)	48 (96)
Safety audit/ identified hazards	11 (42)	7 (29)	18 (36)
Safety talks – farm, bush, road, sport	10 (38)	2 (8)	12 (24)
Posters/ games/ competitions	9 (35)	11 (46)	20 (40)
Assembly awards	8 (31)	3 (13)	11 (22)
Newsletter	4 (15)	2 (8)	6 (12)
Injury report form	3 (11)	1 (4)	4 (8)
Video	2 (7.7)	1 (4)	3 (6)
Whole school approach to increased safety	2 (7.7)	2 (8)	4 (8)
Safety monitors	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Keep Australia Beautiful Campaign	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Internet	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety week – well received	1 (3.8)	7 (29)	8 (16)
Life Ed van	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Peer mediation		1 (4)	1 (2)
All classes used manual		1 (4)	1 (2)
Safety messages over Public Address System daily		1 (4)	1 (2)
Polices e.g no hat no play		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q 17. Did you include any parent strategies in the Safety Rules OK Program conducted in your school?*

Over half of all schools included parent strategies in the Safety Rules OK Program conducted in their school (17/26 rural and 14/24 metro, 62%). However, many schools did not (9/26 rural and 10/24 metro, 38%).

*Q 17a. If yes, what parent strategies did you use and how successful were they?*

Newsletters (13/26 rural and 10/24 metro, 46%) and assemblies (4/26 rural and 2/24 metro, 12%) were the most common parent strategies used by schools as part of the SROK Program.

**Table 14. Successful parent strategies used in Safety Rules OK Program**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Newsletter – most parents read the newsletter	13 (50)	10 (42)	23 (46)
Assemblies - lots of parents attend	4 (15)	2 (8)	6 (12)
P&C supportive	3 (11)	1 (4)	4 (8)
Parents helped with Bike Ed	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety in car park – ongoing problem		1 (4)	1 (2)
Parents involved in making safety video – good response		1 (4)	1 (2)
Surveys – good response		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q 18. Did you use the Safety Rules OK Program in conjunction with any other resources?*

Half of all schools used the Safety Rules OK Program in conjunction with other resources (17/26 rural and 9/24 metro, 52%). Resources used are listed in Table 15 below. Almost 40% used the program on its own (9/26 rural and 10/24 metro, 38%).

*Q 18a. If yes, what resources did you use?*

**Table 15. Resources used to supplement the Safety Rules OK Program**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
Health syllabus-curriculum framework	9 (35)	5 (17)	14 (28)
Bike Ed	6 (23)	2 (8)	8 (16)
Road safety e.g. Roadwise	3 (11)	4 (17)	7 (14)
Internet sites e.g. Worksafe	3 (11)	2 (8)	5 (10)
Fire brigade	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Guest speakers	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Library books	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety pamphlets	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Police	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Local council	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety videos	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Gardener	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Plumber	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Drug Education	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Safety House		2 (8)	2 (4)
Parking signs		1 (4)	1 (2)
Sunsafe		1 (4)	1 (2)
Surf Safe		1 (4)	1 (2)
Feeling safe book		1 (4)	1 (2)
Traffic code book		1 (4)	1 (2)

#### **4.1.5 Promotional materials**

*Q 19. Did your school buy any promotional resources eg pens, pencils etc to support the Safety Rules OK Program?*

Over half of the schools in the program did not buy promotional resources to support the project (14/26 rural and 14/24 metro, 56%), however, almost as many schools did (12/26 rural and 10/24 metro, 48%). Resources purchased are listed in Table 16 below.

*Q 19a. What did you purchase?*

**Table 16. Resources schools purchased to support the SROK Program?**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
Pens used as prizes	7 (27)	3 (13)	10 (20)
Pencils used as prizes	7 (27)	7 (29)	14 (28)
Badges	3 (11)	7 (29)	10 (20)
T Shirts	1 (3.8)	2 (8)	3 (6)
Pencil cases		3 (13)	3 (6)
Stickers		3 (13)	3 (6)
Rulers		1 (4)	1 (2)

*Q 19b. What purchases best supported the program and why?*

Pens and pencils were used as prizes (14/26 rural and 6/24 metro, 40%) and badges were used to identify safety monitors (3/26 rural and 5/24 metro, 16%). One metropolitan school reported badges broke several months ago and they were still waiting for replacements. Pencil cases were popular in the metropolitan schools who used them (4/24). Very few schools used the t-shirts (1/26 rural and 2/24 metro, 6%) as most found them too small for Year 6 and 7's. Stickers were popular in one metropolitan school.

*Q 19c. How long will these promotional resources continue to be offered?*

Schools indicated they would have a great deal of trouble continuing the safety Rules OK Program without funding or support.

**Table 17. How long will promotional resources be offered in your school?**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
On going	6 (23)	2 (8)	8 (16)
Only if funding available	4 (15)	3 (13)	7 (14)
Not sure	2 (7.7)	4 (17)	6 (12)
Will stop at the end of the year		4 (17)	4 (8)
Badges are quite expensive if you need a few		1 (4)	1 (2)

#### **4.1.6 Success of program**

*Q 20. How successful do you think your school was at getting the safety message into the school and the school community?*

**Table 18. How successful were schools at getting the safety message across?**

Response	Rural (%) n=26	Metro (%) n=24	Total (%) n=50
Very/ quite successful	26 (100)	18 (75)	44 (88)
One successful with one class		1 (4)	1 (2)
Safety awareness increasing		1 (4)	1 (2)
Slowly introduced this year – not sure		3 (13)	3 (6)
More successful run as a Junior Red Cross Circle		1 (4)	1 (2)

Note: A Junior Red Cross Circle is run as a club where students meet and discuss various first aid concerns within the school. The Circle is supported by the state branch of the Australian Red Cross. One school suggested the Safety Rules OK Program could incorporate this concept.

*Q 21. How did you measure the success of the program?*

Most schools measured the success of the program by a reduction in injuries in and around the school environment and an increase in the level of awareness of safety by students, teachers and support staff (See Table 19).

**Table 19. How the successful of the SROK Program was measured.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
More safety conscious	18 (69)	10 (42)	28 (56)
Less injuries	10 (38)	11 (42)	21 (42)
Unsafe play areas identified and fixed	9 (35)	2 ( 8)	9 (18)
Safety policy now in place	2 (7.7)	1 ( 4)	3 ( 6)
Reduction in detentions	1 (3.8)		1 ( 2)
Winning logo/motto adopted as School Motto		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)
Just starting to get the message		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)
Safety committee working well		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)
Positive feedback from teachers and students		1 ( 4)	1 ( 2)

#### **4.1.7 Sustainability of the Safety Rules OK Program**

*Q 22. The SROK program in its current form will cease at the end of term one. What would assist you to keep safety on your school agenda e.g. Risk Management Policy, activities linked to curriculum framework, SROK internet site?*

All school coordinators of the Safety Rules OK Program were unaware the SROK Program was ceasing at the end of Term One, 2000.

Schools indicated they require all Safety Rules OK Resources currently provided (13/26 rural and 8/24 metro, 42%) to be sent to them on a regular basis if the program is to continue in their school. Others indicted the internet site would have to be more accessible and updated regularly. Several would not be able to continue the program in their school if the current financial incentives were not available (See Table 20).

**Table 20. Assistance required by schools to keep safety on the school agenda when the SROK Program ceases at the end of Term One 2000.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Rural (%) n=26</b>	<b>Metro (%) n=24</b>	<b>Total (%) n=50</b>
SROK Program resources to be sent regularly	13 (26)	8 (33)	21 (42)
Update internet site regularly	5 (19)	1 (4)	6 (12)
Curriculum framework links required	4 (15)	3 (13)	7 (14)
Funding needed	4 (15)	4 (17)	8 (16)
Will continue program as is	4 (15)		4 (8)
Directory of other schools in program to allow networking	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
Guest speakers still required	2 (7.7)		2 (4)
If continue to send newsletters regularly	1 (3.8)	2 (8)	3 (6)
Information on current safety legislation required regularly	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Lesson plans for Phys Ed covering sports safety required	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Reminder sent at beginning of each year	1 (3.8)	1 (4)	2 (4)
Giddy Goanna program would be good	1 (3.8)		1 (2)
Unhappy program will not continue as is		3 (13)	3 (6)
A contact person in the Health Department of WA		1 (4)	1 (2)
WACSSO could put safety features in their newsletter		1 (4)	1 (2)

## **5.0 LIMITATIONS**

The results of this evaluation are cross-sectional in nature and have limited validity. Care should be taken in generalising these results to the entire population of schools in WA. The response rate equates to one third of the schools who chose to participate in the Safety Rules OK Program (50/150), it is not representative of the total number of schools in WA. (All schools in WA with primary school-aged children were invited to participate in the SROK Program) Higher response rates would have increased the validity and generalisability of these findings.

Coordinators of the Program was contacted by facsimile and asked to nominate two times and dates they would be available during a two-week period in November. Confirmation of times and dates were sent by return facsimile. Interviews were conducted by telephone at the nominated times and all the requirements of the questionnaire were fully explained before commencing. Several coordinators were unable to complete their interviews at the specified times and could not reschedule, therefore they did not participate in the evaluation.

## **6.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

Of the 100 schools that were invited to participate in the qualitative evaluation of the Safety Rules OK! (SROK) Program, 50 agreed (26 rural, 24 metropolitan). This is one third of the total schools involved in the SROK Program in 1998 (n=75) and 1999 (n=75).

The 50 schools involved in this evaluation represent 27% of rural and 29% of metropolitan schools who participated in the Safety Rules OK Program during 1998 and 1999.

### **6.1 Concept**

Sixty percent of respondents (16 rural, 14 metro) became interested in the SROK Program because of their interest in the safety aspect of the Program. Other reasons given were funding (18%, 4 rural 5 metro) and the safety flyer (16%, 3 rural 5 metro). Most respondent schools used the SROK Program to promote safety within their schools through policy development (20%, 6 rural 4 metro) and increased awareness of safety in the school (See Table 2).

Strategies used by schools to improve safety and reduce injuries that proved successful were safety audits (58%, 16 rural 13 metro), posters (26%, 7 rural 6 metro), injury report forms (16%, 7 rural 1 metro), safety monitors (18%, 5 rural 4 metro), upgrading of play equipment/ playgrounds (14%, 6 rural 1 metro), and safety committees (14%, 4 rural 3 metro).

### **6.2 Support network**

School coordinators reported most strategies used were successful (82%, 22 rural 19 metro). Sources of SROK support from within the schools were many, with the most reporting support from other teachers (68%, 18 rural 16 metro).

The majority of respondents thought the newsletters and support telephone calls (80%, 23 rural 17 metro) assisted them with the continued implementation of the SROK Program. Thirteen schools thought the telephone contact, at times, was inappropriate or not necessary (18%, 2 rural 7 metro) and they would rather phone program staff if any problems occurred.

### **6.3 Training workshops**

School coordinators thought the training workshop they attended (80%, 22 rural 18 metro) was worthwhile and essential to the successful implementation of the SROK Program. The components of the workshops respondents felt were most beneficial were: explanation of the manual content (76%, 21 rural 17 metro) and group discussion (56%, 13 rural 15 metro).

Improvements suggested were: more information about strategies used by other schools, and provision of a list of approved contacts for safe play equipment and soft fill for play areas in schools. A follow-up was not considered necessary by almost all respondents (70%, 21 rural 14 metro), however, two schools suggested follow-up would be helpful for new coordinators.

Eighty six percent (22 rural 21 metro) of coordinators reported the SROK Program would not be implemented if the professional development training workshop was not available.

#### **6.4 Manual**

Ninety six percent of respondents (25 rural 23 metro) felt the information in the manual was readily adaptable for use in schools. All sections of the manual were used by 50% (12 rural 13 metro) of respondents. The sections most utilised were the safety audit and injury report forms. Class discussion was the most popular classroom strategy used (60%, 18 rural 12 metro) however, all strategies used were reported as being successful.

Overall the manual was thought to be a very good resource that was well set out and easy to follow. Some improvements suggested were improved links with the Curriculum Framework and Student Outcome Statements associated with appropriate sections in the manual. More activities for lower primary school were also requested.

Several schools incorporated parent strategies with the most successful being information disseminated through the school newsletter (46%, 13 rural 10 metro).

The SROK Program was used in conjunction with other resources. The most frequently used resources were the curriculum framework (28%, 9 rural 5 metro) and road/bicycle safety (32%, 9 rural 7 metro) such as Bike Ed, Roadwise and the Traffic Code Book.

#### **6.5 Promotional material**

Promotional resources were purchased by some schools (44%, 12 rural 10 metro). These included pencils (28%, 7 rural 7 metro), pens (20%, 3 rural 7 metro), badges (20%, 3 rural 7 metro) and t-shirts (6%, 2 rural 1 metro).

Pens and pencils were used as prizes and badges were worn by safety monitors. Some problems arose from badges breaking and replacements not being received. The largest t-shirts available were also too small for some Year 6 and 7 students. Schools reported they would require assistance with funding to continue offering resources in 2000.

#### **6.6 Success of the SROK Program**

Most schools rated the SROK Program as either very successful or quite successful (88%, 26 rural 18 metro). Success was measured by reduction in injury rates (42%, 10 rural 11 metro) and increased awareness of safety (56%, 18 rural 10 metro).

## 6.7 Sustainability of the SROK Program

School coordinators were surprised to learn the program in its current form was ceasing at the end of Term One 2000. Many felt their school would be unable to sustain the program after this time. Several said they may be able to continue if resources were sent at regular intervals (42%, 13 rural 8 metro), the website was continually upgraded (12%, 5 rural 1 metro) and funding continued (16%, 4 rural 4 metro).

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall the Safety Rules OK Program was well accepted in the schools surveyed. Injury rates decreased and staff and students were generally more awareness of safety issues within the school environment. The in-service training and the manual were highly regarded by teachers who attended training sessions. The SROK Program was well supported by other staff within schools and safety was a key factor in the uptake of the program by the school community.

Coordinators were disappointed to learn the program may not continue as its success resulted in less injuries and increased awareness of safety within their school environment.

Recommendations from this evaluation include:

1. *The manual should be linked to the Education Department of WA Curriculum Framework is essential.*

Schools are continual sent resources, however, if they do not directly link to the framework provided to teachers they are less likely to use them. Although schools reported the manual to be an excellent resource, it could be used more effectively if all sections were directly linked to existing curriculum requirements.

2. *Lessons and activities should relate directly to student outcome statements*

Teachers could more readily use lessons and activities if they were directly related to student outcome statements within the Education Department of WA Curriculum Framework. At present, activities and lessons provided in the manual must be adapted or modified by teachers for their lessons plans and student assessments.

3. *Additional activities are required for lower primary students.*

There are limited activities in the manual that relate specifically to lower primary schools. Additional lessons and activities are required.

4. *Professional Development training is required for new coordinators*

Teachers or support staff who inherited the SROK Program Coordinator's position were not provided with any professional development. Training was considered essential by respondents to fulfill the commitments of this position.

5. *A contact person from the SROK Program should be available for coordinators to telephone, as required.*

Coordinators would like to have a contact name and number from the SROK Program available to them if they require assistance at any time.

6. *Continued funding is essential to maintain the successful implementation of the SROK Program.*

Schools require continued funding and SROK resources for the continued successful implementation of the Safety Rules OK Program in their school after the program ceases at the end of term One, 2000.