

Final Evaluation Report – Executive Summary SoundProof Plus Make Some Noise

Dr Ornette D Clennon
02.04.09

Centre Contacts:

Sheila Till, Darwin Centre (CEDARS)
Simon Cawley, Abbey Hulton Unit (CAMHS)
Anthony Marks, Orme Road (CEDARS PRU)
Lillian Hollinsworth, Biddulph Centre (CEDARS PRU)
Simon Snewin, Wolstanton (Newcastle) (CEDARS PRU)
Richard Ward, Werrington Centre (Children in Care)
Trevor Ankers, Cannock Centre (Children in Care)

Artists (Practitioners):

Ornette D Clennon, Si Waite and Clare Fernyhough
(Assistant Artist)

Project Time scale:

September 2007 – December 2008

Contents

Preface	p.3
Introduction	p.3
Any significant differences in response between interim and end project interviews – Evidence of the journey travelled	p.3
Final Evaluation update on Aims and Objectives	p.4
Final Evaluation update on Quality of Communication/Collaboration	p.4
Final Evaluation update for Artists' Skills	p.5
Final Evaluation update on Issues and/or learning relating to project co-ordination, logistics and delivery	p.5
Final Evaluation update on role of young people as equal partners	p.6
Final Evaluation update on Evidence of pupil learning	p.9
Final Evaluation update on Evidence of personal/social objectives being met	p.9
Final Evaluation update on Evidence of Artist learning	p.10
Final Evaluation update on Evidence of Partner learning and their appreciation of the work	p.11
Final Evaluation update on the role of partnership in working this project	p.11

Preface

This executive report is intended as a summary of the main report. The key findings and recommendations that are listed in this report will have corresponding page references for ease of reference in the main report.

Introduction

Any significant differences in response between interim and end project interviews/questionnaires – Evidence of the journey travelled

As the interim evaluation meeting was held too late in the programme to effect major structural changes, the journey travelled can only be witnessed in the INSET training sessions which happened across the entire programme. This development was significant, as it substantially increased the settings' ownership and investment in the programme (with perhaps one exception).

The learning of the artists also seemed to deepen and reflect the settings' increased investment, as the programme progressed. Both artists seem to form a strong template for relationship building in their settings. Ornette developed an increasingly deeper understanding of the significance of creative expression in a therapeutic setting, leading to a future therapy-based collaboration at the Darwin Unit. Si seems to have deepened his reflection and analysis of relationship building skills, as he pinpoints how the clear establishment of session boundaries is important when working in his settings.

However, the ongoing nature of evaluation and feedback during the programme meant that it could evolve relatively quickly as it responded to the needs of the settings. This was due to strong communication between the artists and Make Some Noise. As a result of the interim report this strong communication also occurred between Make Some Noise and the settings as development meetings were held.

The following points emerged from the interim report as issues that needed to be tracked and evaluated in the final report. Progress in these areas will appear in the final evaluation updates at the end of each interim report.

- Staff INSET sessions need to be carefully monitored to ensure that staff develop the skills necessary to lead music technology sessions of their own
- For the Children in care Centres and Pupil Referral Units (PRUs), other types of mixed weekly and time specific residency approaches must be trialled to see if any improvements can be made to the attendance figures

- Development meetings should be regularly programmed into the project so that they can act as evaluation meetings, giving everyone the chance to take stock of the programme
- Development meetings with the Darwin and Abbey Units need to be arranged to ascertain their understanding of partnership working and their resources to do so
- Both Artists should keep and submit regular session updates to MSN to enable more thorough monitoring and evaluation

Final Evaluation update on Aims and Objectives

A celebration evening took place at the Abbey Hulton Clinic (20.11.08) where attendance certificates were awarded to the participants. Art work from the Darwin Centre remains unrealised due to a lack of equipment and software. A meeting was held to discuss ways of implementing the recommendations from the interim report.

For more details, see main report pp6-15

Final Evaluation update on Quality of Communication/Collaboration

One of the foci to be tracked for the final evaluation was the progress of building in development meetings into the programme structure. This had a profoundly positive impact on communication between the settings and Make Some Noise.

Development meetings should be regularly programmed into the project so that they can act as evaluation meetings, giving everyone the chance to take stock of the programme

. Key Findings

- The development meeting opened up significant opportunities for further work at the Darwin Centre
- The development meeting enabled Make Some Noise to re-establish the parameters for its second residency at the Abbey Hulton Clinic
- It is not clear if any development meeting took place at the LACs as this part of the programme had ended before the interim evaluation meeting.

Key Recommendations

- Development meetings should be programmed as milestone meetings in advance of the start of the project

For more details, see main report pp16-21

Final Evaluation update for Artists' Skills

The skills of the artist remained consistently high and no visible development in this area was noted. However, there was an impact on their learning, which will be discussed later.

For more details, see main report pp21-23

Final Evaluation update on Issues and/or learning relating to project co-ordination, logistics and delivery

Key Findings

- At the Darwin Centre attendance was greatly affected by the motivation of participants studying music at GCSE level
- At the Abbey Hulton Clinic attendance was high due to limited participant numbers and a shorter residency format
- Attendance at CEDARS Wolstanton was high due to the strong involvement of the teacher and the fact the participants have to attend sessions as part of the PRUs lesson structure. In contrast, the LACs had a lower attendance due to the voluntary nature of attendance and high staff turn over

Key Recommendations

- A mixed residency/weekly format needs to be trialled in future projects

This last recommendation was actually a final evaluation focus:

For the LACs and PRUs, other types of mixed weekly and time specific residency approaches must be trialled to see if any improvements can be made to the attendance figures

Although this was discussed in the interim evaluation meeting (see appendix). It was too late to trial this format as the LAC programme had actually finished before the interim evaluation meeting.

Key Findings

- There was not enough time between the interim evaluation meeting and the final evaluation to try the mixed format

Key Recommendations

- The interim evaluation meeting needs to be held in the middle of the project to allow time for changes to be made when identified

For more details, see main report pp26-29

Final Evaluation update on role of young people as equal partners

The following case studies illustrate the participants input into their learning.

Case Studies

At the Darwin Unit, one of the participants gave a longer interviewed response (conducted by the artist) about the benefits she derived from the SoundProof Plus programme. The questions for the interview were devised in collaboration with staff at the Darwin Unit (see *Development meeting with Sheila Till 6.11.08*):

Please rate your mood at the beginning of this music session where 1 is low and 10 is high

4/5

“at the beginning because of why I’m here and things like that”

Please rate your mood at the end of the music session where 1 is low and 10 is high

10

Can you explain the difference between the above results?

“Music is what I really enjoy and it’s what I want to do hopefully when I’m older and when I’m learning things about something that I really enjoy and when I know that things are improving and the things that I’m doing and the things that I’m creating myself, it makes me feel very good about myself and the things that I’m creating”

Do you feel that is there any benefit in taking time out of the academic subjects to pursue music?

"I think music is a big part of everyday life and I think even if you haven't taken it as a subject, everyone still has a taste and a favourite kind of music and I think that it's really, really important that everybody understands how you can create your own kind of music and how....you can create music which has an effect on other people and create stories from it.....I think it's very important that people learn how to do that"

Do you see the music sessions as 'work' or 'fun'?

"I think...both. I think work as in sort of... revising and learning techniques that can be used would be sort of work but I think it could be fun as well because I think creating and composing your own style of music and adding your own influence from yourself is fun but it also can be work as well because obviously you've got apply all the techniques to do it"

How would this differ from what you'd be doing at school? How do these sessions differ?

"I think these sessions differ because...I'm recording my violin, my own instrument on the computer and I'm modifying it in different ways which I wouldn't have been able to do at school...interesting rhythms and things.....It's really exciting"

How do you value the sessions on a scale of 1 to 5?

(1=not at all. 2=Quite a lot. 3=A lot. 4=A great deal. 5=They are very important to me)

5

When is a good time to hold the sessions – mid morning, after lunch?

"I think after lunch probably best...because there's quite a lot of clubs at school...during lunchtime...in the afternoon there tends to be sports or games...I think....if it wasn't compulsory to some things like that then you could also...for those who are musicians who want to do music, then you could take time out after lunch or during lunchtimes to do this kind of things"

How best can we fit music (as a non academic subject)?

"If we get together as one group or we split apart and we make it a couple of days per week. I think it can be done as an academic subject but it can also be

done as a non academic like we do have 'options'... it could be part of 'options' it could be part of doing 'PSE'....I think it could become an option that people can do"

What has music meant to you, in terms of these sessions? Has it helped you deal with the stuff you have to deal with?

"Yeah, it has....When I'm composing music or creating something.... you can express yourself through the music by the way you play or what you write down and I think you can really feel like you've let it all out and it's sort of like therapy, in a way"

Lauren's End of Darwin Project Interview 08 – Soundproof Plus 3.12.08

Other end of project interviews for the Darwin Unit can be read in the appendix

Here is a case study from the LAC Tunstall:

Brad is a young person in care from Stoke-on-Trent. He began attending the Soundproof Plus music technology project in early 2008. He was a keen budding rapper who was really keen to learn how to write his own beats and record his vocals.

At the beginning of the project, Brad was interested in copying other artists' beats. However, once copyright principles and the benefits of original creation were explained, he soon began working on his own ideas (although we progressed to this by doing a version of a 50 cent tune).

MC Brad's rapping style was emulating American gangsta hip-hop. His lyrics would be about driving cars and using guns and he would deliver them in an American accent. When he was challenged about this (through asking if he could drive, if he owned or used guns or if he was American) his response was defensive and there was a "make or break" moment. This proved to be the turning point, and MC Brad has been developing his own style that reflects his life as a teenage lad from Stoke.

MC Brad's care workers have reported that his participation in the project has helped him find a new voice to express himself. They say that Brad's angry outbursts (that would involve smashing up furniture) are much less frequent as a direct result.

Nearly a year on, and Brad is now studying with local arts organization, Unity to further his knowledge of music technology. He has achieved his Bronze Arts Award and is now working towards his silver. He is saving up for his own laptop and software so he can make music in his own time. He has written and recorded

several songs that illustrate his rapid development as a lyricist, rapper and producer.
MC Brad – Case Study by Si Waite (artist)

For more details, see main report pp32-33

Final Evaluation update on Evidence of pupil learning

Key Findings

- At all the centres, educational achievement was underpinned by opportunities to creative self-expression and behavioural improvements

Key Recommendations

- Holistic delivery of educational targets where personal and social objectives are kept in focus is essential when working in this sector

For more details, see main report pp36-42

Final Evaluation update on Evidence of personal/social objectives being met

Key Findings

- The main focus of both artists has been to generate therapeutic outcomes in their sessions
- Setting staff needed more time to be convinced of the therapeutic outcomes in the sessions

Key Recommendations

- A more formal measure (similar to that of the SIPs) needs to be adopted in all sessions to evaluate therapeutic outcomes
- The settings need to be clearer as to how they would measure therapeutic outputs
- The programme at the PRUs and LACs would benefit from ten week rather than eight week blocks

For more details, see main report pp46-52

Final Evaluation update on Evidence of Artist learning

Key Findings

- Ornette's learning came from exploring the how far creative self-expression can be taken in a therapeutic setting
- Si's learning came from establishing boundaries (between taking a personal interest in the participants and the sessions' structure) and finding ways of encouraging his participants to take responsibility for their behaviour

Key Recommendations

- None

One of the interim recommendations in this section was a final evaluation:

Both Artists should keep and submit regular session updates to MSN to enable more thorough monitoring and evaluation

Following the interim evaluation meeting both artists have submitted regular session updates (see accompanying CD). Si Waite has also submitted photographs that provide a visual document of his sessions (see accompanying CD).

Key Findings

- Both Artists have submitted regular session updates

Key Recommendations

- None

For more details, see main report pp57-59

Final Evaluation update on Evidence of Partner learning and their appreciation of the work

Evidence of partners' appreciation of the work - Partners' likelihood to continue supporting was significantly impacted by the following final evaluation focus:

Staff INSET sessions need to be carefully monitored to ensure that staff develop the skills necessary to lead music technology sessions of their own

Key Findings

- An INSET session was held at Darwin but more sessions would have been helpful
- The training series held at the Biddulph and Orme Centres were found to be very helpful
- Setting staff not directly involved with the INSET sessions seem to benefit indirectly from their colleagues' training

Key Recommendations

- INSETs should be developed and programmed at the very outset of future programmes, as they significantly contribute to the setting's ownership of the programme

For more details, see main report pp62-68

Final Evaluation update on the role of partnership in working this project

The INSET training sessions have very much demonstrated the willingness of the settings to participate in a partnership in this project. This has already been discussed earlier. The Arts Awards played a significant role in the work with the PRUs, as the portfolio building activity of the Awards gave a much needed structure to the programme of sessions. The setting staff said that the delivery of the Arts Awards "given us something to work toward", as they recognised "the importance of having a specialist staff into school." (*Soundproofplus Teachers End interview - Biddulph 12.08*).

This is interesting as there appeared to be a more inherent structure present at the Darwin and Abbey Hulton units. The Darwin unit already worked with the national curriculum's KS4 GCSE (Key stage) as well as offering AS Level study for the older students. The Abbey Hulton clinic already had a strong clinical focus and structure to its ongoing activities.

For more details, see main report pp70-74