



EBPU
Evidence Based
Practice Unit

A partnership of



HeadStart Phase Two: What approaches have been sustained locally?

Sally Marriott, Kate Dalzell

June 2020



Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
1. Introduction	5
2. Methodology/ Approach	5
3. Findings	6
a. What aspects of the approach had been sustained and in what form?.....	6
b. What funding had been used?.....	7
c. Enablers of sustainability	9
d. Challenges to sustainability.....	12
4. Discussion and implications.....	14
Appendix A: Where are they now?	16
Birmingham.....	16
Cumbria	17
Lewisham	18
Middlesbrough.....	19
More about HeadStart.....	20

Executive Summary

This report brings together learning from a series of interviews with senior staff in local partnerships who took part in the phase two HeadStart programme but did not progress into phase three. The interviews sought to understand local experiences of sustaining HeadStart approaches following the end of phase two funding in 2016.

Interviewees in Birmingham, Cumbria, Lewisham and Middlesbrough revealed a mixed picture in relation to the continuation of activity. Overall there was a continued commitment to the priorities that had underpinned partnerships' involvement in HeadStart, and aspects of activity and approaches had been sustained through a combination of local public sector resources, funding bids and local implementation of national initiatives.

Ability to access funding, and the remit of funding streams that subsequently became available, were considered to be a key influence on where and how activity had been sustained: while some of these were flexible in meeting the local vision (such as local authority and school budgets), others (such as Future in Mind, Mental Health Support Team Trailblazer funding, or charitable grants) had more specific remits.

Interviewees identified a number of common factors that had supported efforts to sustain the work, including:

- HeadStart having provided the space to pilot new approaches;
- HeadStart having established buy-in both at the senior leadership level, and in a cadre of lower level leaders able to operationalise the vision and to work effectively across mental health and school contexts;
- a collaborative approach to working with schools;
- the continued involvement of children and young people;
- the maintenance of a shared vision embedded in the governance structures for partnership working; and
- fit with national initiatives.

A key challenge to sustainability was considered to have been the changing nature of local priorities, in turn often a reflection of changes in priorities nationally. This shifting environment was felt to contribute to difficulties in overcoming fragmentation in the support offer across services. Staff turnover was also seen as a barrier to sustaining approaches, particularly in relation to staff in schools.

Phase three partnerships may find it helpful to draw on learning from these four areas, which suggested that:

- maintaining the local vision is important, and at the same time, flexing to align with developing national or local priorities supports continuation of the work;
- sustaining HeadStart activity may be supported by identifying mechanisms through which to maintain collaborative working arrangements with schools, and through which to support the continued involvement of young people;
- partnerships may find it helpful to acknowledge the pivotal role of key individuals, and to give consideration to how succession planning or local governance arrangements can buffer the risk associated with this
- areas have an opportunity to capitalise and build on the strengths (and competitive advantage) that HeadStart has prompted in the area – in developing a local vision and approach, trialling activity, and influencing local systems supporting children and young people.

The interviews suggest HeadStart phase 2 had enabled areas to be more prepared in their thinking and better positioned to maximise the potential benefits of new opportunities (for example new funding rounds or policy initiatives). Further to this the work was felt to have raised the profile and recognition of mental health as a priority for support locally, in a way that had been reflected in ongoing resource allocation by schools and local authorities.

1. Introduction

The National Lottery Community Fund (TNLCF) commissioned the HeadStart Learning Team to undertake an enquiry into how the HeadStart approach had been sustained in partnerships involved in Phase 2 of the programme, and factors that had influenced this. This report sets out findings from a series of interviews undertaken with partnerships who were involved in Phase 2 of the HeadStart programme but did not progress to Phase 3. The key findings reflect on the different aspects of the approach that had been sustained and the form this took; the resources supporting this; and common themes arising in relation to factors that had enabled sustainability, and factors that had posed challenges to sustainability.

2. Methodology/ Approach

Participants were selected purposively from among TNLCF and Learning Team contacts from HeadStart Phase Two delivery. Those invited to interview were selected from among senior staff formerly involved with the programme and still working in the locality, as these individuals were considered to have the knowledge, partnership relationships, and exposure to strategic decision-making to support an informed overview and understanding of the legacy of HeadStart in their local area.

Participants in the research worked in four of the six local partnerships which participated in HeadStart Phase Two between 2013 and 2015 and did not progress to take part in HeadStart Phase Three. These were Birmingham; Cumbria; Lewisham and Middlesbrough. Representatives from Southampton and Knowsley did not respond to invitations to participate in the research. Five people participated in the research. They had held a range of roles in their local HeadStart partnerships and included programme leads, school leads and VCS leads.

Data was collected through semi-structured interviews with individual participants, carried out over the phone. Ethical approval for the work was granted by the UCL Research Ethics Committee (reference **7963/002**) **Interviews were recorded, transcribed** and analysed to identify themes arising in relation to the following areas:

- What elements of HeadStart had been sustained and how
- Factors that had enabled the work been sustained, and challenges in sustaining the approach

Quotes and comments in this report have been anonymised to protect the confidentiality of research participants.

3. Findings

a. What aspects of the approach had been sustained and in what form?

The picture across the four partnerships was very mixed in relation to the continuation of activity or approaches initiated in Phase 2 of the HeadStart programme. In some areas there has been a clear line of continuity from the HeadStart programme in certain facets of activity, however many have also found opportunities to deliver on the strategic vision they had for HeadStart in the implementation of national policy initiatives and developments; while others have continued to support HeadStart goals by bidding for or attracting additional funds.

Ability to access to funding, and the remit of funding streams that subsequently became available, has therefore been a key influence on where and how activity had been sustained: while some of these were flexible (such as local authority and school budgets), others (such as Future in Mind and Mental Health Support Team Trailblazer funding) had more specific remits.

An overview by area of activity that has been carried forward is provided in Appendix A: this reflects activity that interviewees themselves identify as being associated with or linked to HeadStart Phase 2 explorations. In brief summary:

Middlesbrough

In Middlesbrough the focus for HeadStart Phase two had been on giving all children and young people the support to build resilience and achieve good mental health. Interventions had continued with the aim of delivering this vision, including: HeadStarters (training young mental health champions); academic resilience training for school-based staff; a whole school approach underpinned by improvement grants; and youth engagement events.

Birmingham

The Birmingham HeadStart model was described as having had a focus on ethos and culture (rather than activity). Ongoing work to support this was delivered through a mentally healthy schools approach, based on working towards principles drawn from the YoungMinds Academic Resilience Approach. This approach had supported 20 schools every year over the last three years.

Cumbria

The HeadStart approach in Cumbria was described as having had a focus on systems change and doing things differently to prevent young people's needs escalating to a level of requiring specialist mental health support. This was described as having continued through the delivery of a range of early intervention and targeted interventions in school, youth and community settings - now overseen by a local VCS organisation rather than Cumbria council – and funded by the council and grants from the TNCLF Partnerships and Collaboration Fund.

Lewisham

The interviewee from Lewisham described the HeadStart model as having been based around workforce development, online counselling and other therapeutic resources to support those who would not traditionally meet Social Care, Mental Health and Educational Health Care Plan thresholds. They described having continued to deliver on this agenda through integrated commissioning arrangements, and through activity delivered by the family Support Service, Local Transformation Plan and Mental Health in Schools Trailblazer.

b. What funding had been used?

Interviewees described several different approaches to funding the continuation of HeadStart initiatives. No area had secured a large grant equivalent to the HeadStart funding provision offered through TNLCF. While some interviewees were specific about the amounts and source of funding, others preferred to describe this at a high level. All five types of funding source were identified as having enabled sustainability in HeadStart approaches:

Future in Mind

Interviewees in all four areas stated that the launch of Future in Mind (FiM), and funding linked to their Local Transformation Plans (LTPs) had helped them in continuing some elements of their HeadStart approach. Future in Mind came online in 2015 and brought additional resource for mental health into local areas across the country. Use of this resource tended to be directed toward specialist mental health provision: in keeping with this, in some Phase 2 areas these funds were used for targeted elements of the approach such as providing counselling in schools or securing online counselling provision, while lower level interventions or broader workforce development were supported more partially through this source.

Local Authority

Interviewees in all four areas said that Local Authority funding had been used to sustain some aspects of their HeadStart approach. There was a lack of clarity as to which specific budgets within the local authority funding had been drawn from: the tendency appeared to be for this to include combinations of small pots of funding offered from various budgets or offered as match funds, with amounts ranging between £30,000 and £150,000. In one area, TNLCF funds would have increased capacity in an existing service to better meet need: cessation of funding meant these services continued to be offered but at lower capacity. In another area the £1.5 million that had been budgeted by Public Health as 'match funding' against what had been anticipated from TNLCF remained in place as an allocation spread across the 5 years.

Mental Health Support Team Trailblazers

Two of the HeadStart Phase 2 areas had made successful applications to be 'Wave 2' trailblazer areas for this programme (with teams be operational from January 2020). The interviewee from one of these areas mentioned this in interview in relation to sustaining the work of HeadStart.

This national programme, jointly funded by NHS England and Department for Education, will support teams providing interventions to address mild to moderate mental health difficulties, as well as helping staff in a school or college setting to provide a 'whole school approach' to mental health and wellbeing. The teams will act as a link with local children and young people's mental health services and will be supervised by NHS staff.

Individual school budgets

Interviewees reported that the recognition that HeadStart was a good approach had been reflected in some schools' commitment to funding elements of this work using their own budgets, or to provide resource 'in kind' to keep the approach alive.

While interviews did not convey that all schools within each area had committed to the same amount or resource, or were delivering the same level of interventions, they did convey that the raised profile of mental health and wellbeing, brought about through the Phase 2 pilots, has resulted in this work being seen as a higher priority for resource. In one area, schools had collaboratively contributed to a funding pool of between £500,000 and £600,000, while in another area schools had been directly funding pastoral care, learning mentors and school counsellors.

Charitable grants and programmes

Interviewees mentioned two further sources of funding:

- A small grant secured from Nesta for trialling an approach in a small number of sixth forms and colleges
- Funds of approximately £600,000 secured from TNLCF Partnership Fund to deliver support around mental health and wellbeing in specific communities.

Key points emerging

Interviews suggested that two factors were key in the availability of funds for the continuation of HeadStart activities.

The first was alignments with national initiatives going online, particularly *Future in Mind* and the Green Paper *Transforming Children and Young People's Mental Health Provision*, with subsequent support for implementation through Local Transformation Plans and MHST Trailblazers. Interviews highlighted that HeadStart Phase 2 work had enabled areas to be more prepared in their thinking and better positioned to maximise the opportunities presented: for example, one area felt this had helped them to a successful outcome in their bid to become an MHST Trailblazer.

Secondly, the funding allocations made by schools and local authorities were felt to reflect the way in which HeadStart Phase 2 had generated widespread discussion, raising the profile of this agenda and increasing recognition of mental health as a priority, and the need for mental health and wellbeing support to be resourced accordingly.

c. Enablers of sustainability

While the approach to continuing HeadStart had differed from area to area, interviewees identified a number of common factors that had supported efforts to sustain the work.

Space to test new approaches

Interviewees reflected that within existing budgets at the local authority level there isn't always the opportunity to step back and explore new ways of working; timescales between setting budgets and committing to full scale delivery are often tight. They also commented that discussion and decisions about how budgets are allocated are often based on demonstrating where something has already had success. They felt therefore that the opportunity to pilot an approach had offered valuable space to reflect on how mental health

and wellbeing support could be best delivered, as well as the ability to test new theories without having to compromise on budgets for other provision.

For example, the interviewee from Lewisham said that the pilot and the time to develop a scaling-up plan had been a helpful process in itself, “the process got everybody talking, and [we] were ready for it, people were crying out for it, people were already talking about resilience.” Another area felt similarly, “I’m forever grateful to the Lottery for making us do the legwork.”

The right people at the right level

Interviewees emphasised the importance of having had support and buy-in from senior leaders within the local authority and partnership organisations, in addition to the input of lower level leaders able to operationalise the vision. At the strategic level the key figures who were mentioned included a Director of Public Health, a Director of Children’s Services and several Chief Executives of partner organisations. In one area for example, weight was given to the role of the Director of Children’s services in moving the HeadStart approach forward and driving systems change: she was described as having been building “fantastic relationships” in that locality for over 20 years.

At the operational level, interviewees also felt that having people who understood the cross-over between mental health and school environments supported a good outcome for the work. One interviewee described the benefits of having had a former Head Teacher in a Schools link role: “that’s absolutely crucial, because they’ve been able to go in and really understand what it’s like, understand the pace, understand the calendar year in schools, understand the system they are using. And compliment those rather than jar against them.”

Working collaboratively with schools

There was a consensus across all interviewees that a top down approach with schools was not helpful and that, to create sustainable approaches, standards and expectations needed to be developed collaboratively. As mentioned previously, the involvement of education staff in steering groups and sitting on panels had enabled this process. This was highlighted by one interviewee who stated “what you need is a set of principles that schools work to, that then they construct themselves what that means in practice, based on their own personal context.”

Interviewees suggested that this collaborative approach had embedded ethos and principles at a much deeper local level. One stated “whether you’re a primary, a secondary or a post-16, actually everyone’s aware of the framework

and the standards.” They went on to explain that the more schools that come on board and endorse the new ways of working, the more other schools wish to be involved , “...you’ve been to an event or talked to someone from another school and then they will be like “Oh we want to be part of that”.”

The interviewee in Birmingham highlighted how they had maintained collaborative working by setting up communities of practice: “every half term, we bring schools together to share what they are doing...the fact that we get 30 to 40 people in a room, with a school hosting, putting on lunch...it’s genuinely building a community of people who are trying to get this stuff sorted.”

The continued involvement of children and young people

Some interviewees described how young people had continued to be involved in their area (a way of working that is a key element in the HeadStart programme) either in designing services, monitoring delivery or by offering support themselves. The HeadStarters in Middlesbrough, trained as peer mentors, provided an example of children and young people supporting one another: “if children have got other children or young people to talk to, it’s actually far more powerful...they are trained in a way where they might not be able to give you the answers but can signpost you...”

The interviewee from Cumbria described the way they had fully involved children and young people in the service commissioning process when developing a model for the “Building Emotional Resilience” programme: “we sat down with groups of young people in each of the localities including things like looked-after children and said, “what is it you would want if you needed these services?”...then we said “this is what young people want, put in a tender.””

Another example came from Lewisham where the interviewee described the ‘Alchemy Project’ they have set up through their CAMHS service through which “a number of young people that are doing co-production work, we’ve got young advisors...that go out into the communities and they do group sessions.”

Maintaining a shared vision

Interviewees reflected that sustainability was enabled where the individuals involved in the HeadStart programme remained in a position from which they could continue to drive forward the approach, and that this had ensured a consistency around the vision which is being strived for.

In Middlesbrough for example the “HeadStart” branding had been sustained: the interviewee from this partnership said that everyone would recognise what

HeadStart was, and the 'HeadStart Subgroup' continues to exist as a specific subgroup of the Local Transformation Board. An interviewee in another area felt that while the name 'HeadStart' has not been retained, the area continued to use the vision that had been developed: "I was attending a meeting looking at the CAMHS transformation process, we were looking at the visions across seven [local areas]...our vision came out as the strongest and that was the one we developed through HeadStart. Every year we revisit it with our partners, with our young people and families, and it hasn't really changed."

A third area similarly reflected that its vision had remained the same, with a very similar project being taken forward, albeit by a delivery different partner: by continuing to feed into strategic discussions with the Local Authority and NHS Commissioners the interviewee felt that this had served to maintain that system wide vision. The fourth area reflected that it had continued to have "a very active, senior HeadStart board, which continues to meet today, but under a slightly different name - a lot of the original people are still involved."

Fit with national initiatives

Whilst it wasn't explicitly expressed as an enabler by all those who were interviewed, all interviewees cited some major national agendas that have been introduced since the end of HeadStart Phase Two. These were mainly discussed in funding terms (as above). One interviewee also highlighted that these initiatives have paved the way for better conversations and made the HeadStart principles easier to roll out,

"...everybody knows, you turn on the radio, you turn on the TV, you listen, it's everywhere. Everybody is talking about it. Mental Health and Wellbeing is huge. There is a huge national agenda.." Another interviewee said that their plan for phase three had been aligned with proposals in the Green Paper: "we were almost like a green paper trailblazer without even knowing it."

d. Challenges to sustainability

Some common challenges also emerged in the course of the interviews as opportunities for learning. While some interviewees were able to share mitigations that had been identified in their areas, others were continuing to grapple with these issues.

Changing local priorities

Interviewees reflected that it had been necessary to shift the focus of their approaches or priorities to reflect the requirements of the funding available to them. This was raised with reference to third sector funding where this had

been secured, and similarly, although Future in Mind and DfE funding streams had been helpful they were not an exact match to HeadStart priorities. Interviewees reflected that what had emerged in consequence was still quite a fragmented approach. One interviewee for example described how “there is still a fragmentation of services, GPs and schools not being clear about the offer and what’s available and how to get access.”

This challenge did not appear to have been overcome in any areas, although one interviewee suggested that the Department for Education funded Mental Health and Schools Link Programme might help to address this. The interviewee in Middlesbrough described how their work with schools sought to keep mental health high on the education agenda through setting “whole school approach standards”: for schools to achieve the bronze standard of their framework governors had to be on board, and for silver they had to demonstrate how they would sustain the model.

Just as interviewees identified having the right people in place as a key enabler of sustainability, staff moving on to new roles or out of the area was identified as a key challenge. This was raised particularly in relation to school staff. One interviewee explained that, “one of the reasons [schools] drop out is because of staff changes. Staff churn...that’s one of the big issues.” This was being tackled through a key support worker helping to keep schools on board. Another area had similarly invested in a dedicated member of staff to monitor and facilitate the work and keep it on schools’ agendas. Interviewees also mentioned the general-school mailing system and “Heads’ Forums” and other events as providing opportunities to sustain awareness of the work.

4. Discussion and implications

The findings shared above are based on a limited range of perspectives, reflecting the responsiveness of the six partnerships to the request to participate. Responses may also have been influenced by the context for the enquiry, in which interviewees represented areas that had been unsuccessful in securing ongoing HeadStart funds: interviews provided an opportunity to reflect on and demonstrate ongoing local commitment and tenacity in delivering on this agenda and sustaining the work in spite of this set-back. Those interviewed held senior positions: their comments reflected a strategic standpoint on HeadStart in those areas in contrast, for example, to perspectives that may be held by middle managers, frontline staff, or views of children and young people as to how HeadStart has been sustained.

Overall interviewees reflected a continued commitment in their local areas to the vision and aspirations that had been associated with their engagement in HeadStart. While it had not necessarily been possible to deliver activities in the same way or to the same level that would have been enabled by continued HeadStart funding, aspects of activity and approaches had been sustained. This had been enabled through a combination of local public sector resources, funding bids, and approaches taken in implementing national initiatives. Factors that were seen to be enablers in sustaining the HeadStart models included: buy-in from senior leadership; the availability of operational managers who were competent in cross-sector working; a collaborative approach to working with schools; embedding the involvement of children and young people; maintaining a shared vision; and a good fit with national initiatives.

Interviewees felt that Phase Two funding had provided their localities with an opportunity to move ahead of the curve and to test theories in a safer space. Overall, the enquiry suggested that HeadStart acted as a catalyst for forward thinking on the early intervention for children and young people's mental health and wellbeing agenda; interviewees felt it had placed their areas in a strong position to engage with other emerging initiatives and opportunities and had provided them with a firm basis to build upon. All of those who were interviewed felt that HeadStart had been a valuable programme that had helped with wider stakeholder engagement, and particularly in gaining school buy-in in their areas.

Phase three partnerships may find it helpful to draw on learning from these four areas, which suggested that:

- maintaining the local vision is important, and at the same time, flexing to align with developing national or local priorities supports continuation of the work;
- sustaining HeadStart activity may be supported by identifying mechanisms through which to maintain collaborative working arrangements with schools, and through which to support the continued involvement of young people;
- partnerships may find it helpful to acknowledging the pivotal role of key individuals, and to give consideration to how succession planning or local governance arrangements can buffer the risk associated with this; and that
- areas have an opportunity to capitalise and build on the strengths (and competitive advantage) that HeadStart has prompted in the area – in developing a local vision and approach, trialling activity, and influencing local systems supporting children and young people.

Appendix A: Where are they now?

Birmingham

Birmingham HeadStart was the only partnership that was led by a VCS organisation, The Children's Society, during phase two. It partnered with other established services such as Birmingham Education Partnership, Barnardo's (who were to deliver interventions) and Compass Housing (who were to lead on young people engagement). From the outset, the Birmingham HS model was looking at ethos and culture as opposed to interventions and so it is not surprising that no specific 'interventions' have carried on under this banner; the term "HeadStart" does not appear to be in use anymore across Birmingham.

The work that has continued centres around the ethos from phase two by giving schools a set of principles to work towards, based around the YoungMinds Academic Resilience Approach, then helping them to identify gaps and build action plans based on their own context. Essentially, these principles are very similar to those that have been published by the Department for Education within "Transforming children and young people's mental health provision: a green paper."

The plan was to support 20 schools every year and within those settings work with the Head Teacher, Leadership Team and appointed Mental Health Lead; this would take a 'district approach' and partner an outstanding school with a school facing more challenges. Three years on and they have now consistently achieved that goal and have supported 60 schools to appoint mental health leads and develop action plans for becoming mentally health schools. The core package for each school includes support from the team based in the Birmingham Education Partnership to carry out the following:

- Audit and self-assessment against the principles
- Training for 'young leaders'
- Delivery against the action plan
- Screening of all incoming year 7 pupils (this can be done using a measurement tool but is most commonly achieved by the pupil writing a letter to their new form tutor to tell them about themselves and the tutor goes through these to decide what support could be helpful).

Cumbria

The Cumbria approach is focused on systems change and doing things differently to prevent young people needing support from Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). During phase two, the work was led by Cumbria County Council. However, when they were unsuccessful with the bid to move into phase three, a decision was made to change the brief and scope of the work and refocus on supporting the coastal towns in other ways. This work is led by Cumbria Youth Alliance, a VCS organisation, and was awarded funding from TNLFCF under the Partnerships and Collaborations fund. This work is ongoing, bringing in approximately £200,000 per year for three years and is match funded by Cumbria County Council, 0-19 Copeland/Barrow, Walney Regeneration Community Fund, Street Games and United Utilities Legacy Fund. It delivers the following interventions:

- Together We - Peer lead and physical activity offer in schools
- SAFA - Self harm workshops in schools
- CADAS - Body Image targeted community groups + Risk taking behaviour workshops schools and youth settings
- Furness Academy - School focussed intervention supported by outreach work.
- The Well - 25 Young Farmers groups across Cumbria Coastal Communities
- Always Another Way - Now linked to NCS programme so in community settings
- Chance Camp - Sports coaches, Officials, Umpires and Mangers training ins schools
- Ewanrigg - MHFA Lite workshops Community Centres and Schools in Allerdale.
- Carlisle Mencap - SOKA autistic programme using community settings
- Spiral - Planned to start 5/8/19 in schools including PRU's
- You Bring the Band - Barrow in Furness Youth Music Programme
- Drop Zone Barrow to run two six-week, summer programmes; one mainstream and one special needs
- Dodge Ball Copeland
- Summer Programmes Allerdale CYA team
- Summer Programmes Whitehaven Harbour - Copeland
- Embrace to develop a range of open and distance learning for all to access re emotional resilience
- Peer Led Education - appointment of a gap year peer educator - CYA
- Rosehill Theatre - production
- On the Wire - Chris Salt - film involving young people from West Cumbria
- Walney Youth Project - one to one support and group work for young people

Some of these programmes are delivered within school settings but many are also being delivered into youth and community settings and with targeted groups.

Lewisham

The model in Lewisham was originally based around workforce development, online counselling and other therapeutic resources to support those who would not traditionally meet Social Care, Mental Health and Educational Health Care Plan thresholds. Some of the elements were already in place and the TNLCF monies could have been used to expand that provision. There is an integrated commissioning model still in place across Lewisham; the Local Authority commission on behalf of the CCG and so there was opportunity to look across both areas and see where resources could be pooled. Therefore, the main elements which have sustained as part of the HeadStart approach include:

Family Support Service

Sitting within the Early Help provision, it focusses more around supporting children and their mental health in the home when other issues are occurring (e.g. domestic violence, trauma, parental mental health difficulties). There is less of the therapeutic element to this as would have been with HeadStart funding.

Activity under the Local Transformation Plan

Aspects of this including

- The development of the Children's Wellbeing Practitioner programme, which enables more junior staff to deliver evidence-based interventions, such as CBT approaches, to children and young people who fall below the CAMHS threshold. As part of the programme, self-coping strategies are developed in partnership with the child's family.
- Increased opportunity for self-referral access into evidence-based services via the relatively new Young People's Health and Wellbeing Service, the Kooth online counselling service, the 24/7 crisis line and the online self-referral process for eating disorders.
- Multi-disciplinary arrangements in the CAMHS Virtual School which provides an enhanced 'early intervention' mental health offer to Looked After Children (LAC) and builds confidence amongst teaching staff and foster carers in relation to poor mental health.

- A trauma informed training and supervision approach within the Youth Service and wider partners, demonstrating that mental health, wellbeing and resilience are at the centre.

Mental Health in Schools Trailblazer

To be delivered from January 2020 in a reasonably small number of schools (approx. seven or eight). To spread this resource out, an emphasis has been placed on helping schools to map out their needs and be more targeted in their provision.

Middlesbrough

Middlesbrough have maintained their HeadStart vision, “Giving all Middlesbrough's children and young people the necessary support to build resilience to achieve good emotional health”, and there is a mixture of interventions still being delivered and these are:

HeadStarters

The HeadStarters Pathway is an ASDAN accredited education course to enable and empower young people and develop awareness and understanding of emotional health and wellbeing. The pathway is helping to create an army of mental health champions across Middlesbrough to increase awareness and understanding of mental health in emotional wellbeing in young people as well as giving these students the necessary skills to build resilience in themselves and their peers. At the time of interview, there were c. 780 HeadStarters.

Academic Resilience Training

Academic Resilience supports pupils to achieve good educational outcomes despite adversity and enables schools to develop strategies to build resilience in all students. The Academic Resilience Approach (ARA) is based upon the evidence-based Resilience Framework developed by Boing Boing. ARA training is offered to all school-based staff in Middlesbrough and includes the following:

- Understanding Academic Resilience and its benefits for your school
- Recognising key theories of resilience and the relationship between risk, protective factors and resilience
- Identifying your own resilience and that of the children, young people and families you work with
- Understanding workplace resilience
- Identifying vulnerable children and those at risk
- Learning how to strategically build systemic resilience into your work

- Focused on school culture and support for schools.

Youth Engagement Events

These vary from an annual festival to an annual conference; the HeadStarters help to develop and deliver these events.

Whole school approach and HeadStart School Improvement Grants

A set of standards have been developed, which have bronze, silver and gold levels, to help schools assess and recognise what needs to be in place to deliver a whole school approach. In order to help schools achieve those standards, one off grants are available. This is an application and award process where schools can apply for an implementation grant of up to £30,000 to cover things such as curriculum changes, pastoral leadership training through to development of a sensory room.

More about HeadStart

Started in 2016, HeadStart is a six-year, £67.4 million National Lottery funded programme set up by The National Lottery Community Fund, the largest funder of community activity in the UK. HeadStart aims to explore and test new ways to improve the mental health and wellbeing of young people aged 10 to 16 and prevent serious mental health issues from developing.

To do this, six local authority-led HeadStart partnerships are working with local young people, schools, families, charities, community and public services to design and try out new interventions that will make a difference to young people's mental health, wellbeing and resilience. The HeadStart partnerships are in the following locations in England: Blackpool; Cornwall; Hull; Kent; Newham; Wolverhampton.

The Evidence Based Practice Unit (EBPU) at the Anna Freud Centre and University College London (UCL) is working with The National Lottery Community Fund and the HeadStart partnerships to collect and evaluate evidence about what does and does not work locally to benefit young people now and in the future. Partners working with the EBPU on this evaluation include the Child Outcomes Research Consortium (CORC) and the University of Manchester. This collaboration is called the HeadStart Learning Team. Previous partners in the HeadStart Learning Team include The London School of Economics (LSE) and Common Room.