



*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission and the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education.*

*This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein*

# JUMP@SCHOOL PROJECT

## WP5 - Deliverable 26

# Reports from National Researchers

Written by: Fabiana Barca and Roberta Manca (Italian researchers)

Sara Gabarda and María Escriche (Spanish researchers)

Edited by: Juliet Tschank, Centre for Social Innovation (P4)



[www.jumpatschool.eu](http://www.jumpatschool.eu)

## Introduction

This report summarises the researchers' reports from each of the intervention site. The researchers' reports were intended to be completed by the local researchers, who were the connecting link between Jump@Operators, responsible for implementing the Jump@School intervention, and the evaluation team. Each researcher was requested to fill out a short survey, the 'experiment monitoring template' every month of the intervention for each school.

As the intervention in Spain was run in two cohorts, there are reports from the researchers from both intervention periods. In the first round of intervention, reports from the researcher are available per school whereas for the second round of implementation, the incidents for each school are compiled to give a country report.

This was a monitoring tool that aimed at providing a short overview of whether the whole experiment was running smoothly in all schools and countries or whether any problems were encountered which might harm the effectiveness of the Jump@School intervention and which should therefore be reflected upon when interpreting the statistical results or which should be solved immediately. This tool asked for the following information from the researchers:

1. Current state of implementation
2. Challenges or concerns and concerns encountered during the implementation
3. Solutions found to overcome these challenges
4. Other comments

It is worth noting that the reports from the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort in Spain varied slightly from the rest of the reports as they focussed on the researcher's tasks rather than the activities of the intervention. This was due to the change of researchers and this inaccuracy not being noticed on time.

Besides these monthly reports, the researchers were in constant email and skype contact with the evaluation team at ZSI so that timely solutions could be found to the challenges faced and also to provide the evaluation team with information that would need to be considered when carrying out the data analysis for example with regard to delays and attrition.

Below, the reports for each school are summarised in individual tables.

## 1st Cohort Spain

### ES01: IES Juan de Garay

Month	State of implementation	Challenges	Solutions	Other comments
January 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parental consent</li> </ul>	Problems with parental consent: the director needed consent from all the parents whose children had been chosen for both the control and intervention groups.	We had a meeting with the families, spoke with all the main teachers and called all the families by phone to try to get their consent. Although we tried very hard, we couldn't get all the parental consents. We obtained 39 from the intervention group and 37 from the control group.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We changed the information strategy but we didn't change the information on the website so the families were still able check it if they wanted to. We agreed to update the website as well.</li> </ul>
		In the meeting in Valencia (December 2015) we decided to change the information strategy: speaking about 'motivational project' instead of 'early school leaving project'. However, we had already spoken about 'early school leaving' with the schools, this situation created some confusion with the schools.	We explained the reasons for this change to the school.	
February 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pretest</li> <li>Inauguration meeting</li> </ul>	We couldn't administer the questionnaire online because we didn't have the resources in the schools to do so.	We administered all the questionnaires on paper and afterwards transferred the answers to the online survey platform (LimeSurvey).	
		We spent more time than we expected administering the questionnaires, because we couldn't find all the students when we tried, due to: illness,	We tried again and again.	

		exams and their teacher had other important things to do with them.		
		<b>Inauguration day:</b> The Jump@Operators celebrated one inauguration day (after school time). <u>Most but not all</u> of the students participated – 31 out of 39 intervention group participants. Nevertheless all the activities during this day were very good and the students enjoyed them too.	The Jump@Operators explained about the project to the students who didn't attend the inauguration day during the individual meetings.	
March 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pretest</li> <li>▪ First individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Signing IDPA</li> <li>▪ First session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> </ul>	<b>Individual meetings:</b> Although Jump@Operators have already had the first individual meeting with most of the students, they couldn't get all the students to sign the IDPAs yet, due to: illnesses, exams, their teachers had other important thing to with them.	The Jump@Operators are trying to schedule other times for the first meeting with these students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The activities of the intervention are going very well. Our biggest problem is the lack of time for doing all the actions proposed. We propose extending the period of the intervention.</li> </ul>
		<b>Workshops:</b> Due to the delayed start of the intervention and other problems with the schedule of the students, it is going to be extremely difficult to do all the workshops proposed in the logic model.	We have decided to extend the intervention period until 8th of June.	
		<b>Evaluation:</b> The Jump@Operators found it complicated to classify the goals in the IDPAs in the 8 topics proposed (school motivation; valuing learning; engagement with learning; self-confidence with learning, commitment to complete secondary school; anxiety; self-regulation and control and withdrawal). Sometimes	We added the option 'others' and the specification of item.	

		these topics did not properly cover the goals defined for and with the student. The Jump@Operators had the same problem with the workshop reflection form.		
April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual meetings (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> depending)</li> <li>Second session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> </ul>	<b>Individual meetings:</b> Although the Jump@Operators have already had three individual meetings with most of the students, there are three students who have not had more than one session because they have stopped attending classes.	The Jump@Operators are trying to contact these students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activities of the intervention are going on very well. Our biggest problem is the lack of time for doing all the actions proposed. We propose extending the period of the intervention.</li> <li>The student ES_01_0233 doesn't want to participate in the project. For this reason we don't have his IDPA.</li> </ul>
		<b>Workshops:</b> There are seven students who have not participated in any workshop because of different reasons: time, family and interest.	The Jump@Operators are trying to contact them and to speak with their teachers.	
		<b>Evaluation:</b> Students found it complicated to fill in the workshop feedback form for the 'support action on self-esteem and motivation'.	We explained to them the answer options.	
May 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual meetings (2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> depending)</li> <li>Third session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> <li>Workshop on 'learning to learn'</li> </ul>	<b>Individual meetings:</b> The Jump@Operators have already had three or four individual meetings with <u>almost all</u> of the students.	Prioritising individual sessions with students who need it most.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jump@Operators had meetings with some parents to strengthen the social network of the students.</li> <li>We are delaying the posttest a little bit because we need more time for the intervention.</li> <li>We weren't able to get the posttest of</li> </ul>
		<b>Workshops:</b> During this month the Jump@Operators have done one workshop on 'learning to learn' divided into two sessions as well as a new session of the self-esteem and motivation support action divided into several groups. There are students who have not come to any of the self-esteem workshops. The	Propose some workshops after school period.	

		Jump@Operators need more time to carry out all the workshops.		ES_01_0233 because he no longer wanted to participate
		<b>Evaluation:</b> Students found it complicated to fill in the workshop feedback form for the ‘support action on self-esteem and motivation’.	We explained to them the answer options.	
June 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 4<sup>th</sup> individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Extra individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Third session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> <li>▪ Final party</li> <li>▪ Posttest</li> </ul>	<b>Individual meetings:</b> The Jump@Operators had at least four individual meetings with <u>almost all</u> of the students. Moreover, in June some students had some extra sessions.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Jump@Operators had some meetings with teachers and the students’ families.</li> </ul>
		<b>Workshops:</b> The Jump@Operators in IES Juan de Garay had one workshop on ‘learning to learn’ and three activities on self-esteem and motivation because they didn’t have time to carry out more workshops. In June the students began their end of year exams and they could no longer attend the workshops.	The Jump@Operators decided to close the cycle of group workshops.	
		<b>Final party:</b> The Jump@Operators organised the party with the intervention group, teachers, and school management.		
		<b>Evaluation:</b> Students were tired and they put resistance in filling out the questionnaire (posttest).		

*ES01 - Gantt chart of implementation*

Activities	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE
Parental consent	■	■	■			
Pretest		■	■			
IDPA signature			■	■		
1 <sup>st</sup> individual interview			■	■		
2 <sup>nd</sup> individual interview				■	■	
3 <sup>rd</sup> individual interview				■	■	
4 <sup>th</sup> individual interview						■
Other individual interviews						■
Inauguration meeting			■			
Workshop 1					■	■
Self-esteem and motivation (s1)			■	■		
Self-esteem and motivation (s2)				■	■	
Self-esteem and motivation (s3)					■	■
The final party						■
Posttest						■

## ES02: IES Malilla

Month	State of implementation	Challenges and exact activities of implementation	Solutions	Other comments
January 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parental consent</li> </ul>	<p>Problems with parental consent: some families are at risk of social exclusion and participation is complicated.</p>	<p>We held a meeting with the families spoke with all the main teachers and called all the families by phone to try to get their consent. Although we tried very hard, we couldn't get all the parental consents. We obtained 42 from the intervention group and 51 from the control group.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We changed the information strategy but we didn't change the information on the website so the families were still able check it if they wanted to. We agreed to update the website as well.</li> </ul>
		<p>In the meeting in Valencia (December) we decided to change the information strategy: speaking about 'motivational project' instead of 'early school leaving project'. However, we had already spoken about 'early school leaving' with the schools, this situation created some confusion with the schools.</p>	<p>We explained the reasons for this change to the school.</p>	
February 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pretest</li> <li>Inauguration meeting</li> </ul>	<p>We couldn't administer the questionnaire online because we didn't have the resources in the schools to do so.</p>	<p>We administered all the questionnaires on paper and afterwards transferred the answers to the online survey platform (LimeSurvey).</p>	
		<p>We spent more time than we expected administering the questionnaires, because we couldn't find all the students when we tried, due to: illness, exams and their</p>	<p>We tried again and again.</p>	

		teacher had other important things to do with them.		
		<b>Inauguration day:</b> The Jump@Operators organised two inauguration days (during school time) because it was complicated to assemble all the students at the same time. <u>Only about half of the students</u> attended this meeting because of different reasons: exams, illness, and problems with their school schedule.	The Jump@Operators explained about the project to the students who didn't attend the inauguration day during the individual meetings.	
March 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pretest</li> <li>▪ 1<sup>st</sup> individual meeting</li> <li>▪ Signing IDPA</li> </ul>	<b>Individual meetings:</b> The Jump@Operators have already started with the first individual meetings with the students but they have had some problems with two groups of the students. Different events have coincided with the intervention period for these groups: education strikes, trips and exams.	The Jump@Operators are trying to schedule other times for the first meeting with these students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The activities of the intervention are going on well. Our biggest problem is the lack of time for doing all the actions proposed. We propose extending the period of the intervention.</li> </ul>
		<b>Workshops:</b> Due to the delayed start of the intervention and other problems with the schedule of the students, it is going to be extremely difficult to do all the workshops proposed in the logic model.	We have decided to extend the intervention period until the 8th of June.	
		<b>Evaluation:</b> The Jump@Operators found it complicated to classify the goals in the IDPAs in the 8 topics proposed (school motivation; valuing learning; engagement with	We added the option 'others' and the specification of them.	

		learning; self-confidence with learning, commitment to complete secondary school; anxiety; self-regulation and control and withdrawal). Sometimes these topics didn't properly cover the goals defined for and with the students. The Jump@Operators had the same problem with the workshop reflection form.		
April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual meetings (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> depending)</li> <li>First session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Individual meetings:</b> The Jump@Operators have already had two individual meetings with most of the students. There are some students with which the Jump@Operators couldn't have more than one session because they no longer attend classes.</p>	We are trying to contact these students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activities of the intervention are going on well. Our biggest problem is the lack of time for doing all the actions proposed. We propose extending the period of the intervention.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Workshops:</b> There are a few students who have not participated in any workshop because of: time, family and interest.</p>	The Jump@Operators are trying to contact them and speak with their teachers.	
		<p><b>Evaluation:</b> Students found it complicated to fill in the workshop feedback form for the 'support action on self-esteem and motivation'.</p>	We explained to them the answer options.	
May 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual meetings (3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> depending)</li> <li>Second session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Individual meetings:</b> The Jump@Operators have had three or four individual meetings with <u>almost all</u> of the students.</p>	Prioritising individual sessions with students who need it most.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jump@Operators had some meetings with teachers and the student's families.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Workshops:</b> During this month the Jump@Operators implemented</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshop on 'learning to learn'</li> </ul>	<p>the second session of the support action on self-esteem and motivation and a workshop on 'learning to learn'.</p> <p><b>Evaluation:</b> Students found it complicated to fill in the workshop feedback form for the 'support action on self-esteem and motivation'.</p>	<p>We explained to them the answer options.</p>	
<p>June 2016</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final party</li> <li>Posttest</li> </ul>	<p><b>Individual meetings:</b> Only 80% of the students had the 4<sup>th</sup> individual meeting with the Jump@Operator because many of them had missed classes, had exams, lectures or excursions. However some students had more than four sessions.</p> <p><b>Workshops:</b> The Jump@Operators in Malilla did only one workshop (on 'learning to learn') and two sessions of the self-esteem and motivation support action because they didn't have time for doing more workshops.</p> <p><b>Final party:</b> The Jump@Operators organised the party with the intervention group, teachers, and school management.</p> <p><b>Evaluation:</b> Students were tired and they put resistance in filling out the questionnaire.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jump@Operators had some meetings with teachers and the students' families.</li> <li>We were not able to get the posttests for the following students:: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES_02_0031, ES_02_0097, ES_02_0143 (They left the school)</li> <li>ES_02_0129 and ES_02_0120 (We couldn't find them)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

*ES02 - Gantt chart of implementation*

Activities	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE
Parental consent	■	■	■			
Pretest		■	■			
IDPA signature			■	■		
1 <sup>st</sup> individual interview			■	■	■	
2 <sup>nd</sup> individual interview				■	■	
3 <sup>rd</sup> individual interview					■	■
4 <sup>th</sup> individual interview					■	■
Inauguration meeting			■			
Workshop 1					■	■
Self-esteem and motivation (s1)				■	■	
Self-esteem and motivation (s2)					■	■
The final party						■
Posttest						■

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort Spain

Month	State of implementation	Challenges	Solutions	Other comments
October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incorporation of the new researcher. Meeting with Raul (Implementation coordinator in Spain). First contact with Silvia and the qualitative investigation.</li> <li>▪ First meeting between Jump@Operators and new researcher.</li> <li>▪ First meeting for the second part of intervention with the schools, IES Malilla and IES Juan de Garay. We talked with the school principal and the secretary (at IES Malilla both were new this year) and IES Juan de Garay asked for the results of the first part of intervention.</li> <li>▪ The Jump@Operators began to collect information about the students that were on the first list of the second cohort.</li> <li>▪ Jump@Operators have got an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were a lot of students from the first list of the second cohort that were no longer in school or were in the last year of high school. The final number of students in the list was so low, all this, taking into account we still hadn't requested for parental consent.</li> <li>▪ <b>IES Malilla:</b> From the 18 participants selected to be in the intervention group, 8 didn't start the academic year and 1 was in the last year of secondary education, leaving only 9 potential participants.</li> <li>▪ <b>IES Juan de Garay:</b> 15 in control and 15 in intervention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Camila (Jump@Operator from IES Juan de Garay) and the local researcher had a skype meeting with Juliet from ZSI resolve the situation of low number of potential students for the second intervention. We all decided to include all the remaining eligible students in both schools.</li> <li>▪ In the case of Malilla these were 76 and 15 had to be eliminated due to being in the final year or not being enrolled in that academic year. Remaining potential participants were then 61.</li> <li>▪ In the case of Juan de Garay, the remaining eligible population was 92. 16 had to be eliminated for similar reasons as stated above. The remaining number of potential participants for the intervention was then 76.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The team of Jump@Operatora and Raul were always favourably disposed to help and to solve anything that was needed.</li> <li>▪ Jump@Operators were very interested in beginning with the intervention as soon as possible because they wanted the students to reap maximum benefits.</li> </ul>

	<p>appointment with the agents who are going to be involved in the investigation (teachers, school principal, secretary).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal meetings between Jump@Operators, Raul and local researcher to talk about status quo</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Spanish team checked which if these potential participants were still enrolled in the school. The remaining participants were then randomly allocated to either the control or the intervention group in each of the schools. Participants with parental consent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IES Malilla 11 in the intervention group and 20 in the control group;</li> <li>IES Juan de Garay 9 participants in each group.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
		<p>Some information was missing from the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort, the local researcher who wasn't involved then, had to organise this information, which was quite challenging as she was new to the project.</p>	<p>Meetings with the Jump@Operators, Raul and local researcher.</p>	
<p><b>November 2016</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11.04.2016 was the deadline for parental consent.</li> <li>Meeting with the Jump@Operators to coordinate the administration of the pretest (schedule, participant codes, classes etc.).</li> <li>Administration of the pretest</li> </ul>	<p>Some students handed in their parental consent after the deadline and were therefore not planned in the administration of the posttest.</p>	<p>The researcher asked the Jump@Operators to include these students in the administration of the pretest last minute. The local researcher had to then rearrange the schedule for administering the pretest and at the same time ensure that the start of the intervention was not delayed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The collaboration of the Jump@Operators in administering the pretest was essential in successfully completing the process as quickly as possible.</li> </ul>

	<p>in IES Juan de Garay and IES Malilla.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Begin of the intervention week in the week of 14<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> of November.</li> <li>▪ Internal meetings between Jump@Operators, Raul and local researcher to talk about status quo</li> </ul>		further.	
<b>December 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Internal meetings between Jump@Operators, Raul and local researcher to talk about status quo including administration of the posttest.</li> </ul>			
<b>January 2017</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Posttest</li> <li>▪ Filming some interviews with Jump@School participants</li> <li>▪ End of the intervention 23.01.2017</li> </ul>	Difficulties taking students out of classes to complete the posttest due to colliding schedules of the local researcher and that of the students.	Go to the school to administer the posttest more often than planned.	
		Find the students at the moment of the posttest.	Coordinate with Jump@Operators and have a schedule of the available hours to go to the school.	

## Italy

### IT01: IPSAR-Tortoli

Month	State of implementation	Challenges	Solutions	Other comments
January 2016	<p><b>Research activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection of hard facts to select the 120 students (eliminating those who had already dropped-out of school or those who were no longer enrolled in the school from the list of eligible students).</li> <li>Organisation of the administration of the pretest.</li> <li>Administration of the pretest.</li> <li>Currently all the pretests have been entered onto LimeSurvey.</li> </ul> <p><b>Intervention activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial party / inauguration meeting</li> <li>First individual</li> </ul>	<p>There was too little time between data collection in January, the selection of the sample and the date of the administration. The headmaster wanted the names of the pupils involved in advance in order to organise everything, and the local researcher provided the list at the last moment and this created slight tension.</p>	<p>The question of timing was resolved with the headmaster by explaining to him why data had to be gathered so close to the administration of the pretest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>necessity to know if some students had already dropped out of school to exclude them from the sample</li> <li>necessity to avoid any delays with the administration so as not to disadvantage the students by missing the activities of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The local researcher thinks that starting the project in the middle of the academic year meant that we automatically lost those pupils that had already dropped out of the school in January. As a result, the intervention did not work as preventatively as it was aimed to.</li> </ul>
		<p>During the administration of the pretest, which took place over two days, not all the students were present.</p>	<p>The local researcher had to go to the school several times to 'catch' the missing students.</p>	

	sessions			
<b>February 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ First individual meetings</li> <li>▪ First session of the photo-food workshop</li> </ul>	In this month, some students were denied permission by some teachers to leave classes to attend Jump@School activities. This occurred because not all teachers were familiar with the project.	The Jump@Operators asked the headmaster for support of which he promptly adhered to by explaining to the teachers the importance of the pupils' participation in the project.	
<b>March 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Second individual meetings</li> </ul>	In this month, the school closed for several days for some festivities which created some chaos and collision between the activities of Jump@School and of the school. Some activities in fact overlapped, because it was not possible to postpone them due to the limited time available to complete all the activities set out in the logic model of intervention.	The Jump@Operators had to review the entire agenda, and with the collaboration of the school, managed to reorganise it accordingly; to frame all Jump@School activities within the school activities. In fact the headmaster requires a list of students who have to participate in some activities at least one week before to be able to send a document to the teachers so as to authorise the students to go out of the classes. Therefore as can clearly be seen, behind each task (both individual meetings and workshops) there's a huge organisational effort behind it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Both the Jump@Operators and the local researcher agree that, the time available for the Jump@School intervention, from January to May, was not enough to effectively and successfully deliver the Jump@School activities as set out in the logic model of intervention.</li> <li>▪ The school is a closed system and very complex, and to get in there and be accepted, you must have some time, both to gain acceptance from teachers and especially with regard to creating alliances and confidence with students.</li> <li>▪ Starting at the beginning of the school year would have been better. The short time available resulted in a defensive attitude from and obstruction by the teachers resulting from the large</li> </ul>

				<p>number of absences of students from classes to attend the Jump@School activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The inadequate time also made bonding and confidence building between the students and the Jump@Operators difficult.</li> </ul>
April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Second and third individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> </ul>	<p>In this month, the Jump@Operators have experienced stonewalling by the teachers who were not informed on the project setup. Some teachers even criticised the project in front of the students ending up demotivating the students to taking part in the Jump@School activities.</p>	<p>This problem was solved by Annalisa, one of the Jump@Operators, who explained to the teacher in question about the project and its structure.</p>	
		<p>Also in this month the school was closed for many days and as a result, some of the activities overlapped and the students missed many lessons. Furthermore, after the second workshop the third workshop immediately took place which overlapped with the individual meetings.</p>		
May 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The third workshop</li> <li>▪ Third and fourth individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Final party</li> <li>▪ Posttest</li> </ul>	<p>A student from the intervention group wanted to withdraw from the project and from school.</p>	<p>The Jump@Operators mediated between the student's family and the school and together, they convinced her to stay in school. She was placed in the project: 'school-work alternation' which allowed her</p>	

			to take her of year examinations despite her high absenteeism.	
		Two students from the intervention group withdrew from school. The Jump@Operators were not promptly alerted by the school thus they were not able to intervene.		
June 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Posttest: Administered late May to mid-June. School closed on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June.</li> <li>▪ The activities of Jump@Operators are already finished.</li> <li>▪ In late June the researcher collected some of the materials from the Jump@Operators (IDPA, individual monitoring process journal etc). In July she will have to continue to collect material from Jump@Operators and the school (hard facts).</li> </ul>	Being the end of the school year many students were absent during the administration of the posttest. Many had started missing school from May, as they probably knew that they would not pass the school year. Others had left for an internship. This resulted in the loss of a large part of the sample of intervention in the posttest.	The researcher repeatedly went to the school to track down the students that were absent during the administration. Nevertheless, it was not possible to administer the posttest to all students that took part in the intervention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Jump@Operators found the interviews to have been a very important tool for approaching the pupils because some of them don't open-up in group situations and felt more free to express themselves in individual settings. There was no monitoring of individual interviews - the Jump@Operators requested feedback from the students.</li> <li>▪ According to the researcher and the Jump@Operators, a tool to follow each individual student's path was missing. Both Jump@Operators documented their activities and discussions with the students, but, non-homogenous way. This would have an important tool to monitor the progress of each student. There are many monitoring and evaluation tools but fragmented.</li> </ul>
		Jump@Operators activities: a teacher stopped a Jump@Operator in the middle of the street and criticised the project. The teacher was of the opinion that there should be a consultation with teachers on the pupils.	Manuela, the Jump@Operator involved in this altercation explained to the teacher the importance that the Jump@Operators should not be viewed by the students as allies of the teachers - it was important to maintain the image of professionals outside the school system.	

## IT02: Iglesias

Month	State of implementation	Challenges	Solutions	Other comments
January 2016	<b>Research activities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection of hard facts to select the 120 students</li> <li>Planning the administration of the pretest</li> <li>Administration of the pretest</li> </ul> <b>Intervention activities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial party / inauguration meeting</li> <li>First individual sessions</li> </ul>	There was too little time between data collection in January, the selection of the sample and the date of the administration of the pretest.	The problem of time has been resolved going to school several times.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would have been more practical to start the project in September.</li> </ul>
		The structure of the school (logistically-speaking) was not very favourable for administering the pretest as selected participants were spread over many classes all of which were spread over 4 floors.	It was not possible to change the structure of the school.	
		During the pretest, which was filled by the students directly online, not all students were present and had to be tracked down during the following weeks.	The researcher went to the school more often than planned to allow all control group and intervention group students to fill in the pretest.	
		As the pretest took place during regular school time, some teachers were not pleased about releasing the students for the project activities.	The teachers were explained more about the project.	
February 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First individual meetings</li> <li>First session of the photography workshop</li> </ul>	Some teachers did not allow the intervention group students to leave classes to attend the Jump@School activities	The Jump@Operators asked the school director to intervene which he promptly did explaining the importance of the students' participation in the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The workshop went well and was very successful.</li> <li>Many students of Iglesias school come from poor families with</li> </ul>

		Some of the participants of the project faced problems with for example the law, had problems in their families and as a result dropped-out of the project or of school altogether.		complicated situations. This should be taken into consideration.
<b>March 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> </ul>	During this period there have been many strikes from students resulting in the school being closed for some periods.	<p>The Jump@Operators have tried to motivate the students to continue going to school and have been successful in some cases.</p> <p>The activities of Jump@School are still going forward despite these challenges.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It's important to consider the student's school and apprenticeship schedule when planning the Jump@School activities to avoid any clashing of the activities leading the students to miss straightforward academic activities or the Jump@School activities.</li> </ul>
<b>April 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Second individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Completed support action on self-esteem and motivation</li> <li>▪ Started workshop on comic and creative writing</li> </ul>	Some difficulty with teachers	The Jump@Operators have worked hard to make the project run smoothly especially by explaining the project to the teachers.	
<b>May 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Third individual meetings</li> <li>▪ Completed workshop on comic and creative writing</li> <li>▪ Final party on 28th of May 2016</li> </ul>	Some difficulty with the teachers with respect to the participants missing some classes.	The Jump@Operators continued with their attempt to explain the project to the teachers. Also, during the third individual meetings, they focussed on supporting the students with their school work to ensure that they passed their end of year examinations.	

<b>June 2016</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administration of the posttest</li> </ul>	<p>It was impossible to administer the posttest online as the informatics room was not available.</p>	<p>All posttest were filled out on paper and the results entered by the researcher onto LimeSurvey.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would have been better to start the interviews in September because the students would have given better feedback.</li> </ul>
		<p>Many students were absent during the administration of the posttest because it was the end of the school year and those who already knew that they would not pass the end of year examinations or those who knew that they had to repeat the school year started missing school from May.</p>	<p>The researcher went to the school several times over a period of two weeks to chase the students down. Unfortunately not all students could be tracked down and fewer posttest were completed than expected.</p>	