A psychological service contribution to nurture: Glasgow's nurturing city

Sam March & Maura Kearney

📅 Published online: 09 Jun 2017.

✎ Submit your article to this journal ↗

📊 Article views: 173

🔍 View related articles ↗

▣ View Crossmark data ↗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ARTICLE

A psychological service contribution to nurture: Glasgow's nurturing city

Sam March and Maura Kearney

Glasgow Psychological Services, Glasgow, Scotland

ABSTRACT

This article details the work undertaken in Glasgow to develop a range of nurturing approaches across establishments. Glasgow Psychological Service (GPS), in conjunction with Glasgow education colleagues, used the nurture group principles as developed by the Nurture Group Network, and extended and adapted these to give more detail and direction as to how establishments apply them. These, referred to as 'Glasgow's Extended Nurturing Principles', were the basis from which GPS created a universal training framework to help develop awareness of the principles, their underpinning theory and their application, for 8000 staff in 313 education establishments. In addition to this, GPS contributed to Glasgow Education Service's whole local authority strategy of using nurture principles to embed school improvement and self-evaluation by developing a tool called 'How Nurturing is Our School?'. This tool offers a more targeted approach to support schools to self-evaluate their current practice in terms of a nurturing approach and to develop an action plan for improvement. The article reports on the positive impact of nurture within Glasgow. Nurture has been a substantial part of a success story in education in the city which can point to a clear reduction in pupil exclusions, an increase in attendance and a dramatic improvement in Glasgow establishments' capacity to hold on to the most vulnerable young people.).

Introduction

There is well recorded evidence in the UK to highlight the effectiveness of Nurture Groups (Cooper and Whitebread 2007; Sanders 2007) as a supportive response to meeting attachment and social needs for children and young people. The traditional 'targeted group' model is one which has been well received and the outcomes for children well documented (Reynolds, MacKay, and Kearney 2009; March and Healy 2007). The current and ongoing focus in Glasgow has been how to apply the nurturing principles at a whole school level, reflecting local need and national priorities. To support this initial universal approach, a double-pronged methodology of capacity building and self-evaluation has been put in place. All Glasgow establishments – early years, primary and secondary schools – were part of this. This article outlines the efforts of Glasgow Psychological Service (GPS) as a central driver of the implementation of all of the above in order to develop Glasgow's wider aim of progressing 'Towards the Nurturing City'. This highlights Glasgow's commitment to widening nurture beyond targeted intervention for a select few children to an approach which encompasses and supports all of Glasgow's children and young people.

CONTACT Sam March ✉ sammarch@north-ayrshire.gcsx.gov.uk
Present address of Sam March is North Ayrshire Psychological Service, Irvine.

Progression of nurture nationally

Nurture groups have been a recognised intervention for children with social and emotional issues since the 1970s. Originally introduced in the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA), they were a systemic, targeted response to the large number of children identified as entering school with a significant profile of this type of need. The groups were characterised by what was on offer, in terms of a social development curriculum, adherence to core 'nurture group principles', the size of the group and greater adult to child ratio, the physical environment layout, assessments used, and the training provided. Reynolds, MacKay, and Kearney (2009) noted that, while popular in the days of ILEA, from that point on nurture groups dwindled in prevalence and the evidence base remained thin, despite endorsement by the Warnock Committee (1978). From the late 1990s, there has been a substantial resurgence in the number of nurture groups, and accompanying interest and focus on 'nurture' in practice and research. Reynolds, MacKay, and Kearney (2009) went on to cite a number of reasons for the possible resurgence of nurture groups in the UK, including an increasing school exclusion trend, the approach being highlighted at a UK government level as good practice, a wider context where attachment theory was increasingly influential and the recognised prevalence of poor mental health in young people. Roffey (2016) provides an up-to-date summary of the adversities many children and young people currently experience in the United Kingdom, while setting out the need for 'whole-child, whole-school wellbeing in challenging contexts' (p. 30).

Nationally and locally, there has been growing interest in widening nurture to whole school, or universal level, to ensure that the well-being of all children and young people benefits from a nurturing approach from staff. Some studies have noted the positive impact for all when nurturing principles have been applied at a whole school level (Lucas 1999; Colwell and O'Connor 2003; Doyle 2004). Early studies focused on schools that had nurture groups and were largely small-scale case studies which reported qualitative changes. Cooper and Whitebread (2007) noted that schools with nurture groups appear to work more effectively with pupils with social and emotional need than schools without a nurture group. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education in Scotland (HMIE) (2009b) cautioned that, at this point; 'schools are less successful in fully integrating the work of the nurture groups into their wider approach to meeting learner needs' (p. 10), suggesting an additional need for nurture to exist at an establishment and leadership level.

Doyle (2003) identified some of the factors that were considered key to implementing the approach at a whole school level, including a social development curriculum, physical adaptations, a focus on play, nurturing behaviour management, and staff peer observation. Cooper, Arnold, and Boyd (2001) also agreed that nurture groups could support mainstream schools (and the inclusion agenda) by helping them expand their capacity for meeting the needs of children with social and emotional issues. They noted from interviews with 79 staff that 96% expressed a belief that there was a positive whole school impact from having nurture groups in the school. In West Lothian, Binnie and Allen (2008) reported that 81% of staff in schools with nurture groups reported that there had been a positive impact on the whole school ethos. These authors also highlighted the usefulness of good quality multi-agency working and support for children and families, in making progress towards a nurturing school in a short period of time. Lucas (1999) made it clear that, while not offering a blueprint, key factors like aims and objectives, consistency of approach, the role of the senior management team, induction, a nurturing curriculum, and an approach that in essence was inclusive were all essential. In most of these studies, the nurture group was seen as the agent of change and vital in moving the school on.

Nurture within the local authority context

Within Glasgow, the first four nurture groups were opened in 2001 as a sensitive response to the pupil population with additional social and emotional support requirements. Initially, through small-scale evaluation measures and qualitative feedback, it became apparent, that within the

city, these were highly valued by parents, children, young people, educationalists, and other professionals. The initial evidence (Kearney 2005; March and Healy 2007; Gerrard 2006) added to the emerging national evidence base on nurture groups. The nurture approach in Glasgow was scaled up and further evaluative information included clear evidence that young people made good educational progress, in addition to social and emotional progress when compared to controls. Reynolds, MacKay, and Kearney (2009) carried out a research study of 32 schools: 16 nurture groups and 16 control group schools. The aim of this was to provide clearer educational measures of progress. The Boxall Profile (Bennathan 1998), the assessment universally used in Nurture interventions to measure progress and consisting of Developmental Strands and the Diagnostic Profile, showed significantly better results over time in both, and there was significant improvement compared with literacy baseline assessment (MacKay 2006). Measures included phonological awareness, early reading skills, and concepts of print.

Rationale for universal approaches to nurture

Within the Glasgow context, there remains a high level of challenge and opportunity in of meeting the needs of children, young people, and families. Over decades, a vast amount of column inches has charted grim statistics from a range of sources, covering Glasgow health, educational and life chances, e.g. Gray et al. (2012). However, these authors would argue that substantial progress had been made, across a range of key indicators, specifically in education, with evidence of increased attainment, reduced exclusion, improved attendance, and a growing proportion of positive school leaver destinations. These will be detailed in a later section of this article. The work by Glasgow staff on nurture has been at the heart of some of those improvements, but it is recognised that substantial challenges remain.

At the outset of the development of nurturing approaches in Glasgow, psychologists observed that the predominant model of behaviour management in schools in the local authority would be one heavily influenced by the principles of behavioural psychology, with a non-relational approach and ethos often characterising these (Fontana 1984) and holding sway in many educational establishments. The words of Weare (2006), resonated strongly:

> Many settings … continue to focus mainly on poor behaviour and use sanctions and punishments as their main strategy for improving behaviour …. A classic conundrum emerges whereby adults pay most attention to the kind of disruptive behaviour they claim not to want … There is now a good deal of work on the kind of positive, emotionally and socially healthy environments that help promote good behaviour and the growth of … emotional wellbeing …. such environments are those that get the right balance between warmth, participation, the encouragement of participation and autonomy, and the setting of clear boundaries and expectations – where the ethos is positive and the focus is on good rather than bad behaviour. (p. 121)

As well as needing the targeted resource of nurture groups, to meet the specific challenges within the city in promoting children's health and well-being, there was a perceived need to develop the universal/whole school nurturing approaches to ensure that a supportive ethos and environment were part of all pupils' day-to-day experience.

In addition to the ongoing level of challenge within the city, it can be posited that a number of factors offered a rationale for whole school, universal nurturing approach. The developing legislative and policy context (e.g. the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014) supported such development. The importance of health and well-being and the understanding of how this affects children's learning and development is recognised increasingly in Scotland and reflected in a number of Scottish Government strategies and approaches, such as Getting It Right For Every Child (2014), *Happy Safe and Achieving Their Potential* (2005), the Early Years Framework (2008), Curriculum for Excellence: Overview (2004), and Towards A Mentally Flourishing Scotland (2009). There is recognition that universal approaches to supporting well-being, such as whole establishment nurturing approaches, make sense from an early intervention point of view. As cited in Stone (2013), the Christie Commission report (2011) estimated that, in Scotland, up to 40% of public

spending goes towards covering the costs of failing to intervene early. A strong business case is made by Elliott (2016), who asserts that supporting and challenging schools to achieve social, emotional, and health outcomes delivers 'significant individual, societal and public sector benefits.'

Furthermore, McGrath and Noble (2010) and McLaughlin and Clarke (2010) both review what the latter authors describe as a 'large and powerful body of evidence' that points to the importance of relationships in schools. The first authors reported on studies of 11 Australian schools; these studies highlighted the importance of schools making well-being a priority, planning for a relationship culture that focuses on positive peer relationships, having effective leadership that values well-being and personal growth, and incorporating a whole school behaviour management programme. McLaughlin and Clarke (2010) cited 133 papers over 15 years that highlight the importance of relationships in schools, i.e. teacher–pupil and pupil–pupil relationships. These authors make the link between relationships, school connectedness, and academic outcomes, and make an argument for a greater emphasis on the social goals of education (see Curriculum for Excellence, building the curriculum 4 skills for learning, skills for life, and skills for work Scottish Government Curriculum for Excellence: Building the Curriculum 4. 2009). This evidence has been recognised in Scotland at national level, so that policy guidance focuses on supporting good outcomes through promoting positive relationships.

> Developing good relationships and positive behaviour in the classroom, playground and wider community is essential for creating the right environment for effective learning and teaching. Where children and young people feel included, respected, safe and secure and when their achievements and contributions are valued and celebrated, they are more likely to develop self-confidence, resilience and positive views about themselves. This applies equally to all staff in the learning community. (Better Relationships, Better Learning and Better Behaviour, 2013 Scottish Government Page 5)

So, overall, nurturing approaches build on this evidence base around relationships, and are strongly in tune with the national policy direction.

Additionally, it is argued that nurturing approaches build on an evidence base developed in relation to health-improving schools, which outlined the importance of whole school approaches, social and emotional factors, for instance student–teacher, teacher–teacher, school culture, classroom climate, and peer–group relationships (St Leger et al. 2009). Nurturing approaches in Glasgow draw on evidence about conditions for improved educational attainment (e.g. the positive effect of teacher–student relationships, and the importance of creating classroom and staffroom climates where error is welcomed), much of it summarised by John Hattie (2008) and also draw on the evidence from the Glasgow Study (MacKay, Reynolds, and Kearney 2010), making a clear link between nurturing approaches and attainment.

It is further suggested by these authors that universal nurturing approaches by their nature have the potential to support effective inclusion, which is a priority and challenge within the local context. At a practice level, nurturing principles and approaches aim to promote a climate where each young person should be 'claimed', included in the Glasgow Extended Nurture Principles by March and Kearney (2014), as made to feel they belong, are accepted, liked, safe, and will be supported whatever arises (Randall 2010). Nurturing approaches, in the Glasgow initiative, aimed to support the understanding of practitioners about child development and how best to support children and young people with self-regulation, aspects which are often barriers to inclusion. Barnardo's, in their 'Tough Love, Not Get Tough' report, (Evans 2011), set out an argument for authoritative, rather than authoritarian schools, and cited Pellerin (2005) as saying that schools that were authoritarian could have high pupil disengagement, especially at the secondary stage. The authors would argue that nurturing approaches, where there is a focus on relationships, support, and structure, are 'authoritative' schools. In particular, it is important for those children in the UK who continue to experience a high level of adversity in their childhood (Roffey 2016) to experience a successful educational experience. Living in poverty, experiencing neglect, abuse, family

breakdown, loss, and trauma are clearly identified factors which can detract from a child's resilience and instead create significant barriers to learning.

Some authors have argued for the creation of nurturing environments at the whole community level to ameliorate the effects of early adversity; for instance, Komro, Flay, and Biglan (2011) advocate a nurturing environment as part of their Framework for Promoting Child Health and Development within High-Poverty Neighbourhoods. 'Positive school environments' that show 'evidence of caring and supportive relationships among teachers and students' (p. 12) were seen as a key part of this, as it has very strong influence on health, relationships, and the academic success of students.

Towards the nurturing city

At a time of financial pressure, with public services facing 'their most serious challenges since the inception of the welfare state' (Christie 2011), the commitment by Glasgow to nurture has not only been maintained but further extended and developed. Glasgow's 'Towards the Nurturing City' approach involves the following.

Nurture groups as a key part of the continuum of support. There are 68 nurture groups in Glasgow Primary Schools. For pre-school level, there has been the development of nurture corners with 19 establishments working towards a model of nurture that has been trialled and evaluated within Glasgow. Additionally, there has been the development of three co-located Primary 'Enhanced Nurturing Bases'. These are used to provide more intensive support for children and young people before returning them to their mainstream school after a defined period of time. At secondary level, there has been the creation of eight secondary nurture bases.

To support ongoing quality assurance and consistency of practice of nurture groups, bases, and corners, guidance was developed which outlines indicators for each sector. In addition to this, there is continued access to professional development opportunities for nurture teachers, including in-depth training on attachment and trauma.

At the whole school level, there was the construction of the self-evaluation tool 'How Nurturing is Our School?' (HNIOS), March, Kearney and Burke (2014)), which 50 schools in Glasgow have used to date.

The 'Towards the Nurturing City' approach is Glasgow's Children's Services agreed aspiration across all agencies, and to further support effective multi-agency working Social Work, Health and Education created an Evidence-Based Practice Steering Group which maintains an overview of the approaches, programmes, and interventions used in Glasgow to support the most vulnerable children and young people (Kearney, Williams, and Doherty 2016). This group has supported the development of the vision and given advice on further implementation of initiatives. In addition, this aims to create conditions which allow Glasgow's Children Services to build the nurturing city approach through joint understanding and articulation of approaches.

Universal nurturing approaches

To date, the development of universal nurturing approaches has involved two distinct phases.

In the 'Phase 1' capacity building phase, there was training for all schools in Glasgow, introducing Glasgow's Extended Nurturing Principles (March and Kearney 2014). 'Phase 2' focused on supporting establishments to use the self-evaluation tool which allowed them to reflect on their ethos, their range of nurturing supports and their progression, and development of nurturing practice over time. 'How Nurturing is Our School?' (HNIOS) March, Kearney and Burke (2014)) was developed primarily by the Psychological Service, supported by a wide range of staff from establishments and the directorate.

Due to the extensive work that has been carried out in Glasgow, several Glasgow Psychologists have been asked to contribute to Scottish-wide capacity-building work with the national agency,

Education Scotland. This work has been related to secondary school-aged nurture materials, primary school nurture materials, as well as Education Scotland being keen to receive any research work that has been undertaken at a local level, e.g. nurture research in the secondary sector and longitudinal primary research.

Towards the nurturing city Phase 1: capacity building

Early development of the HNIOS tool informed all subsequent development of capacity-building approaches, and what has emerged is a multi-stranded approach.

An applied 'model' of nurturing principles via Glasgow's Extended Nurturing Principles (March and Kearney 2014a) was developed, for use at a whole establishment level that would be relevant and recognisable for all educational establishments. It was intended that these applied principles could be used to support change, regardless of whether a school completed the more detailed HNIOS or whether the school had a nurture group.

In addition to universally delivered training on nurturing principles, all schools in Glasgow were also asked to consider approaches promoting positive behaviour/relationships approaches and implement these in a planned and systematic way which were embedded at the establishment level by senior managers. This involved joint partnership work between Education Scotland, GPS, and schools. These positive supports for promoting positive relationships included restorative (Cameron and Thorsborne 2001), solution oriented (De Shazer et al. 1986), and nurturing approaches; this final approach was one that was, and is, developing through the use of Glasgow's nurture materials with reference to national research (McLaughlin 2005; Elias et al. 2003). All were considered compatible with nurture as a whole school concept and to focus on building relationships within and across establishments. The input above was supported by working with all the senior managers of educational establishments in Glasgow to develop their knowledge and understanding of effective implementation, planning, and their importance.

Each establishment in Glasgow was asked to complete the initial training and reflection on the extended nurturing principles in the academic year 2013–2014. The integrated approach took into account evidence emerging from Implementation science about key steps, stage, and specific inputs required to support effective delivery of real-world interventions. This topic is reviewed in depth in Kelly and Perkins (2012). Cognisance was taken of core implementation principles (Blasé et al, 2012): which include selection, training and coaching, staff performance/evaluation, decision support data systems, facilitative administration support, and systems support as key implementation principles. Although all staff were required to participate in initial training, staff selection was considered and encouraged in a way that would 'build capacity' by supporting school staff to take as much ownership of delivering the training as possible. In many establishments, a staff member co-presented with an Educational Psychologist or nurture trainer. In-service training was planned by asking management teams to consider establishment readiness; identifying training gaps in staff understanding aspects of attachment theory; a core understanding of child development (Bornstein and Bradley 2014) was provided.

In addition, ongoing coaching and consultation were considered in a range of ways, e.g. directly via the link educational psychologist; through local support and development groups; and via the encouragement of within establishment working groups.

Staff performance and evaluation was tackled through school staff groups being asked to reflect on current practices and plan next steps, and also formally record the school's current level of nurturing practice via the Glasgow online nurture questionnaire (Currie 2014). This questionnaire could be used by establishments as a measure of progress by recording staff views on practice at regular intervals

Towards the nurturing city – Phase 2: How Nurturing is Our School? (HNIOS)

As noted earlier, HNIOS was initially used to develop a whole school framework for nurture. Later, HNIOS informed the development of the local authority approach to quality assurance and improvement and helped to broaden practitioner views of school effectiveness that were often narrow and focused on achievement or attainment (Evans and Cowell 2013; Seligman, Ernst, Gilham, Reivich and Linkins, 2009).

A first draft of the HNIOS self-evaluation document had been piloted with a large sample of primary school staff in 2008. The feedback was that this was likely to be very sought after and useful, and there was considerable interest, but it needed to be more compatible with quality assurance frameworks that schools were dealing with, in Scotland, such as the key national school improvement framework of 'How Good is Our School?' (HMIE 2009a). To this end, the writing team needed to give more robust exemplars of what would constitute effective practice for each quality indicator. Nurture was new to most at the whole school level, and, as in reported research evidence, even when the school had a nurture group, there was a lack of clarity and confidence about nurture at the whole school level that needed defining. Work with key education leadership staff helped identify appropriate quality indicators from How Good is Our School?

The authors took forward this next stage by developing these exemplars, with an approach that aimed to synthesise evidence-based practice with good-practice-based evidence under an umbrella framework of nurture. The practice-based element was provided by linking in with staff from education establishments that had developed nurturing approaches at the wider level, and noting consistent features, in addition to referencing practice-based articles that focused on putting attachment-based practice into the classroom (Randall 2010). At this stage, contributors were largely schools which had nurture groups and had 'scaled up' from there. The evidence-based aspect was provided by linking with the whole school effectiveness literature relating to attainment and health, e.g. St Leger et al. (2009), Hattie (2008), and McGrath and Noble (2010), and work on building resilience., e.g. Newman (2004). Through this process, HNIOS developed clear and detailed exemplars.

Additionally, as mentioned earlier, GPS included elements of the emerging discipline of Implementation science in HNIOS. These references were partly due to the work within the city, led by Dr Barbara Kelly, drawing on her wider work (Kelly and Perkins 2012). GPS was advocating that effective implementation was the key to success for an intervention for children and young people across education and social care sectors, and that this was underpinned by core implementation principles. Both editions of HNIOS include a strong reference to core implementation components and also provided a simple 'readiness scale' for senior managers to evaluate whether their establishment could engage in the process rigorously.

Evidence of impact: Glasgow as the nurturing city

Evidencing the impact of universal nurture in Glasgow is a significant challenge. As mentioned, the local authority is large and the focus is on continual self-improvement in educational establishments and at local authority level through multi-level, multi-modal approaches to school and community improvement. What is clear is that the vast majority of schools have engaged in capacity-building work on nurturing principles and that 50 schools in the city have used the How Nurturing is Our School (HNIOS)? tool.

> The local authority recently reported that
> Attainment and achievement is at an all-time high in the city, school attendance is up and exclusions are down. (Glasgow City Council Standards and Quality Report Published March 2016)

More specifically, it should be noted that since 2006, there has been a 71% reduction in exclusion, and many other improvements, such as the staying on at school rate, higher attendance, teacher absence, attainment overall, and specifically for looked after young people.

The city has seen some positive social trends beyond the school gates, with a reduction in violence being partly attributed to the pursuit of approaches that reduce exclusion (McCluskey, K., 2016 as cited in Duffy 2016), of which nurture would be a central approach for any Scottish Education Authority.

GPS recently underwent a Validated Self-Evaluation (VSE) led by HMIE. GPS had to focus on two themes within their work, one of which related to learning and teaching. GPS chose to focus on nurture and asked the high-level question, 'How does Nurture impact on learning and teaching?'

'The service's improvement plan articulates very well with the educational authority's priorities …. For example, the development of nurturing interventions to support the city's vision of being a nurturing city.' This acknowledged that GPS was at the heart of Glasgow's progress in nurture. In addition, Education Scotland found the following in relation to GPS:

> The service was clear about the need to build resilience and to create a learning environment which promotes and maintains good mental health and wellbeing. The service focused on the preventative and environmental factors, rather than the medicalisation of children and young people.

The VSE oral feedback also included comments on Glasgow education staff and their understanding of the core concepts of nurture and attachment. These were concepts that the staff used appropriately and in way that widened out the traditional concept of SEBN to a more thoughtful and sensitive understanding of the trauma and loss that many young people have experienced.

In the view of the inspectorate, the evidence seems clear that the nurturing work has had a positive impact on practice. A sample of 10 learning communities (groups of schools which include nurseries, primaries and a secondary) in Glasgow indicated that 1737 staff members had completed the Glasgow online nurture questionnaire. The range of staff included class teachers, head teachers, support for learning staff, child development officers (nursery staff), and other promoted staff members and staff from the city's Additional Learning Needs sectors.

Of this group, 96% reported that they 'understood fully or partly how the principles applied in their classrooms'; 89% judged that they 'understood fully or partly how they applied in the whole establishment'. Ninety-five percent 'fully or mostly agreed that they were supporting children's social and emotional needs effectively'; 96.5% of staff 'fully or mostly agreed that pupils feel welcomed and included at the start of the day and at points of transition'; and 95% 'fully or mostly agreed that there is a welcoming and safe environment for all, including parents and carers, in all areas of the school both inside and out. Ninety-one percent 'fully or mostly agreed that they had a clear and shared understanding of child development, which informs their understanding of the progress and well-being of children'. Ninety-seven percent 'fully or mostly agreed that young people know who they can talk to when they need to talk', while 93% 'fully or mostly agreed that staff consistently model good communication including verbal and non-verbal'. However, from this response, the number that report 'mostly agreed' is higher than that for 'fully agree', reflecting room for improvement. Similarly, 88% 'fully or mostly agreed that staff consistently used effective de-escalation', but staff were more likely to answer 'mostly agree' than 'fully agree' by a ratio of over 2:1, suggesting further development needed.

Further work is required to triangulate the above data trends with children and parents, although 41% of staff related that children 'understood the principles very or fairly well'; 35% related the same about parents. Getting pupil's views on this scale is a necessary, albeit challenging, next step. The data have weaknesses on reflecting the service user sector but are derived from a substantial sample with trends indicative of good progress with understanding and practice.

Conclusions and future directions

In the last five years, there has been a pattern of sustained improvement in outcomes for children within the local authority. These have been part of Glasgow's 'improvement journey' which has

been driven by the Executive Director of Education in tandem with the vision of 'Towards the Nurturing City'. The most notable measurable outcomes are increases in attainment, exclusions, attendance, positive school leaver destinations, and increased 'very good' and 'excellent' evaluations from inspections (see Glasgow's Standards and Qualities Report, 2014–15).

The reasons for these improvements are complex and multi-stranded, within an era of transformational change in Scottish Education. Effective strategic leadership has been at its heart, and the authors would argue that nurture initiatives have already contributed significantly to changes within the city. The pace of transformational change over the next few years will remain relentless, as indicated by Scottish Government initiatives including the National Improvement Framework for Scottish Education (2016), the Scottish Attainment Challenge which was launched in 2015, and the recent Delivering Excellence and Equity in Scottish Education: A Delivery Plan for Scotland (Scottish Government 2016a). What is clear, however, from the promising evidence so far is that to support the ongoing needs of young people in Scotland, the well-established link between positive relationships in schools and outcomes needs to continue. Moreover, to support both well-being and attainment, nurturing approaches need to be a key part of our future provision, both locally and nationally.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Bennathan, M. 1998. *The Boxall Profile: A Guide to Effective Intervention in the Education of Pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*. Handbook for Teachers. The Nurture Group Network.

Binnie, L. M., and K. Allen. 2008. "Whole School Support for Vulnerable Children: The Evaluation of a Part-Time Nurture Group." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 13 (3): 201–216. doi:10.1080/13632750802253202.

Blase, K. A., M. Van Dyke, D. L. Fixsen, F. W. Bailey, B. Kelly, and D. F. Perkins. 2012. "Implementation Science: Key Concepts, Themes and Evidence for Practitioners in Educational Psychology." In *Handbook of Implementation Science for Psychology in Education*, edited by Kelly, B and D. F. Perkins, 13–34. Cambridge University Press.

Bornstein, M. H., and R. H. Bradley, eds. 2014. *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*. London: Routledge.

Cameron, L., and M. Thorsborne. 2001. "Restorative Justice and School Discipline: Mutually Exclusive?." In *Implementing Restorative Practices in Schools*, edited by M. Thorsborne and P. Blood, p.181. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Children and Young People (Scotland) Act. 2014. *Getting It Right for Every Child*. Edinburgh.

Christie, C. 2011. "Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services." *Edinburgh: Scottish Government*.

Colwell, J., and T. O'Connor. 2003. "Understanding Nurturing Practices—A Comparison of the Use of Strategies Likely to Enhance Self-Esteem in Nurture Groups and Normal Classrooms." *British Journal of Special Education* 30 (3): 119–124. doi:10.1111/1467-8527.00296.

Cooper, P., R. Arnold, and E. Boyd. 2001. "The Effectiveness of Nurture Groups: Preliminary Research Findings." *British Journal of Special Education* 28 (4): 160–166. doi:10.1111/1467-8527.t01-1-00219.

Cooper, P., and D. Whitebread. 2007. "The Effectiveness of Nurture Groups on Student Progress: Evidence from a National Research Study." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 12 (3): 171–190. doi:10.1080/13632750701489915.

Curriculum for Excellence: Building the Curriculum 4.. 2009. *Skills for Learning, Skills for Life and Skills for Work*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.

Curriculum for Excellence: Overview. 2004. *The Scottish Executive*. Edinburgh.

Currie, D. (2014) Glasgow Working Towards a Nurturing City. https://www.pulsion.co.uk/resources/blog/glasgow-working-towards-a-nurturing-city/

De Shazer, S., I. K. Berg, E. Lipchik, E. Nunnally, A. Molnar, W. Gingerich, and M. Weiner-Davis. 1986. "Brief Therapy: Focused Solution Development." *Family Process* 25 (2): 207–221. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.1986.00207.x.

Doyle, R. 2003. "Developing the Nurturing School: Spreading Nurture Group Principles and Practices into Mainstream Classrooms." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 8 (4): 252–266.

Doyle, R. 2004. "A Social Development Curriculum: Applying Nurture Group Principles and Practices to Support Socially and Emotionally Vulnerable Children within Mainstream Classrooms." *British Journal of Special Education* 31 (1): 24–30. doi:10.1111/j.0952-3383.2004.00322.x.

Duffy, J. 2016. *No More Mean City… the Truth about Glasgow's Street Gangs in 2016*. The Sunday Herald. 7 February 2016. Glasgow.

Elias, M. J., J. E. Zins, P. A. Graczyk, and R. P. Weissberg. 2003. "Implementation, Sustainability, and Scaling up of Social-Emotional and Academic Innovations in Public Schools." *School Psychology Review* 32 (3): 303–319.

Elliott, I. 2016. *Poverty and Mental Health: A Review to Inform the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Anti-Poverty Strategy*. London: Mental Health Foundation.

Evans, J. 2011. *Tough Love, Not Get Tough. Responsive Approaches to Improving Behaviour in Schools*. Barnardo's. Ilford.

Evans, M. J., and N. Cowell. 2013. "Real School Improvement: Is It in the Eye of the Beholder?." *Educational Psychology in Practice* 29 (3): 219–242. doi:10.1080/02667363.2013.798720.

Fontana, D. 1984. *Behaviourism and Learning Theory in Education (No. 1)*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Pr.

Gerrard, B. 2006. "City of Glasgow Nurture Group Pilot Scheme Evaluation." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 10 (4): 245–253. doi:10.1177/1363275205058997.

Gray, L., J. Merlo, J. Mindell, J. Hallqvist, J. Tafforeau, D. O'Reilly, E. Regidor, et al. 2012. "International Differences in Self-Reported Health Measures in 33 Major Metropolitan Areas in Europe." *The European Journal of Public Health* 22 (1): 40–47. doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckq170.

Hattie, J. 2008. *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. London: Routledge.

HM Inspectorate of Education (Scotland). 2009a. *How Good Is Our School? Document*. HM Inspectorate of Education (Scotland).

HM Inspectorate of Education (Scotland). 2009b. *Developing Successful Learners in Nurturing Schools: The Impact of Nurture Groups in Primary Schools*. HM Inspectorate of Education (Scotland).

Kearney, M. 2005. "Nurturing Confidence: The Impact of Nurture Groups on Self-Esteem." *Educational Psychology in Scotland* 7 (1): 2–5.

Kearney, M., F. Williams, and F. Doherty. 2016. "Towards a Nurturing City: Promoting Positive Relations across Agencies." *Education & Child Psychology* 33: 2.

Kelly, B., and D. F. Perkins, eds. 2012. *Handbook of Implementation Science for Psychology in Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Komro, K., B. Flay, and A. Biglan. 2011. "Creating Nurturing Environments: A Science-Based Framework for Promoting Child Health and Development within High-Poverty Neighbourhoods." *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 14 (2): 111–134. doi:10.1007/s10567-011-0095-2.

Lucas, S. 1999. "The Nurturing School: The Impact of Nurture Group Principles and Practice on the Whole School." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 4 (3): 14–19. doi:10.1080/1363275990040304.

MacKay, T. 2006. *The West Dunbartonshire Literacy Initiative: The Design, Implementation and Evaluation of an Intervention Strategy to Raise Achievement and Eradicate Illiteracy: Phase 1 Research Report*. West Dunbartonshire Council. Dumbarton.

MacKay, T., S. Reynolds, and M. Kearney. 2010. "From Attachment to Attainment: The Impact of Nurture Groups on Academic Achievement." *Educational and Child Psychology* 27 (3): 100.

March, S., and N. Healy. 2007. "What Is the Parental Perception of Progress Made by Nurture Group Children?." *Educational Psychology in Scotland* 9 (1): 2–7.

March, S., and M. Kearney. 2014. *Glasgow's Extended Nurturing Principles*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.

March, S., M. Kearney, and J. Burke. 2014. *How Nurturing Is Our School?*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.

McGrath, H., and T. Noble. 2010. "Supporting Positive Pupil Relationships: Research to Practice." *Educational and Child Psychology* 27 (1): 79.

McLaughlin, C., and B. Clarke. 2010. "Relational Matters: A Review of the Impact of School Experience on Mental Health in Early Adolescence." *Educational and Child Psychology* 27 (1): 91.

McLaughlin, T. 2005. "The Educative Importance of Ethos." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 53 (3): 306–325. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8527.2005.00297.x.

Newman, T. 2004. *What Works in Building Resilience?*. London: Barnardo's.

Pellerin, L. A. 2005. "Applying Baumrind's Parenting Typology to High Schools: Toward a Middle-Range Theory of Authoritative Socialization." *Social Science Research* 34 (2): 283–303. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.02.003.

Randall, L. 2010. "Secure Attachment in the Future: The Role of Educational Psychology in Making It Happen." *Educational and Child Psychology* 27 (3): 87.

Reynolds, S., T. MacKay, and M. Kearney. 2009. "Nurture Groups: A Large-Scale, Controlled Study of Effects on Development and Academic Attainment." *British Journal of Special Education* 36 (4): 204–212. doi:10.1111/bjsp.2009.36.issue-4.

Roffey, S. 2016. "Building a Case for Whole-Child, Whole-School Wellbeing in Challenging Contexts." *Educational & Child Psychology* 33 (2): 31.

Sanders, T. 2007. "Helping Children Thrive at School: The Effectiveness of Nurture Groups." *Educational Psychology in Practice* 23 (1): 45–61. doi:10.1080/02667360601154600.

Scottish Executive. 2005. *Happy, Safe and Achieving Their Potential, A Standard of Support for Children and Young People in Scottish Schools*. Scotti200.

Scottish Government. 2008. *The Early Years Framework*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. 2013. *Better Relationships, Better Learning, Better Behaviour*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. 2016a. *Delivering Excellence and Equity in Scottish Education: A Delivery Plan for Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. 2016b. *National Improvement Framework for Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

St Leger, L., I. Young, C. Blanchard, and M. Perry. 2009. "Promoting Health in Schools from Evidence to Action." In *International Union for Health Promotion and Education*.Saint Denis Cedix.

Stone, K. 2013. *The Role of Schools in Supporting Vulnerable Children and Families*. Stirling.

Weare, K. 2006. *Taking a Positive, Holistic Approach to the Mental and Emotional Health and Well-Being of Children and Young People*. In *Making and Breaking Children's Lives*, edited by Newnes, Craig and Radcliffe. Ross On Wye, 115-122