

GONGS BEHIND BARS:

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE GOOD VIBRATIONS GAMELAN IN PRISONS PILOT PROJECT 2003

by Cathy Eastburn, Good Vibrations Project Co-ordinator

November 2003

Firebird Trust
The Stables
Wellingore Hall
Wellingore
Lincoln LN5 0HX
Tel and fax: 01522 811229
www.firebirdtrust.org.uk
sibyl.firebird@pop3.poptel.org.uk



Contents

Page	Chapter/section
4	Acknowledgements
5	What people said
6	Chapter 1: Executive Summary
6	1.1 Background to the project and project outline
6	1.2 Running the project
7	1.3 Monitoring the workshops
7	1.4 Results of the project
8	1.5 The future of Good Vibrations
9	Chapter 2: Background to the project
9	2.1 Breaking the cycle
9	2.2 Arts in prison education
10	2.3 Music in prisons
10	2.4 What is gamelan?
10	2.5 The benefits of playing gamelan
12	2.6 The idea for the pilot project
13	2.7 Sources of advice and information
13	2.8 Key success factors
14	2.9 Taking the project forward: planning and fundraising
15	2.10 Problems and difficulties at the project planning stage
15	2.11 What went particularly well at this stage
15	2.12 Establishment of project outcomes
16	Chapter 3: What happened
16	3.1 Monitoring and evaluation
16	3.2 Security
17	3.3 Promotion
17	3.4 Logistics
18	3.5 Media and recording the workshops
18	3.6 Project administration and accounts
19	3.7 Workshops
20	3.8 Numbers participating
20	3.9 Lessons learnt from the process
24	3.10 Conclusions
25	Chapter 4: Results of the workshops
25	4.1 Methodology
26	4.2 Gathering the data
27	4.3 Presenting the results
27	4.4 Results of the taster sessions
30	4.5 Results of the in-depth workshops
37	4.6 Conclusions
38	Chapter 5: Future of gamelan in UK prisons
38	5.1 Returning to participating prisons
39	5.2 Working in other prisons
40	5.3 Funding Good Vibrations Phase 2
40	5.4 Costs of Good Vibrations Phase 2
40	5.5 Good Vibrations Phase 3
41	5.6 Structure and constitution of Good Vibrations
41	5.7 Summary of recommended way forward
43	Appendix 1: What is gamelan?
47	Appendix 2: Breakdown of basic and key skills into observable behaviours
49	Appendix 3: Full details of workshop results
58	Appendix 4: Media coverage of the project
58	Selected bibliography

Good Vibrations CD

The Good Vibrations 2003 compilation CD, including tracks recorded at all the prisons participating in the Good Vibrations pilot project, is available free on request. Please contact the Firebird Trust on 01522 811229 or email sibyl.firebird@pop3.poptel.org.uk if you would like a copy.

Separate supplementary report

The following are available in a supplementary report:

- Notations for the traditional pieces used in the workshops
- Monitoring questionnaires for participants, prison staff and workshop leaders
- Examples of promotional materials
- Examples of hand-outs and certificates

If you would like a copy of the supplementary report, please contact the Firebird Trust on 01522 811229 or email sibyl.firebird@pop3.poptel.org.uk.



Good Vibrations at HMP Wolds

Acknowledgements

Good Vibrations' grateful thanks to: our funders (Arts Council England, the Tudor Trust, the Allen Lane Foundation and the Pilgrim Trust), our project partners (Hull Music Service and the South Bank Centre's Education Programme), Liz Peat at HMP Wakefield, Gordon Todd at HMP Nottingham, Pat Malpass at HMYOI Glen Parva, Rev. Jean Griffiths at HMP Brixton, Pat Wilcox at HMP Wolds, Sara Lee and Kate Lewis at the Irene Taylor Trust, Pauline Gladstone at the Unit for Arts and Offenders, Christine Fisher and Anthony Harris at the Department for Education and Skills, Pauline Adams at the Institute for Education, Sally Adams, the governors and staff of the participating prisons and, most of all, the men who took part for their enormous efforts and achievements.

My personal thanks to the four brilliant workshop leaders: Nikki Kemp, John Pawson, Kathy Berg and Laurence Rugg, and my particular thanks to Sibyl Burgess, Director of the Firebird Trust, who took on this project at its very beginning with enthusiasm and trust, and who has been so supportive and positive throughout.

**Cathy Eastburn, Good Vibrations Project Co-ordinator
(cathy@good-vibrations.org.uk)**

This evaluation report is the work of Cathy Eastburn. Cathy was also the inspiration behind the project and its main driving force. She designed the project, raised the funding and monitored the work, working with the Firebird Trust on the day to day management of the programme.

Cathy is a keen amateur gamelan player, a member of the South Bank Gamelan Players and has been a participant in the South Bank Centre's gamelan education programme for the past seven years. She has 12 years' experience in the voluntary sector, including fundraising, marketing, strategic planning and project management. Cathy has worked as Head of Fundraising and Marketing at the Refugee Council, Head of Fundraising at the Council for the Protection of England and worked on the capital fundraising appeal to rebuild Shakespeare's Globe Theatre. For the past three years Cathy has worked as a freelance consultant for a variety of voluntary sector organisations, developing a particular interest and expertise in difficult causes and marginalised groups, such as refugees/asylum seekers, offenders and vulnerable parents.

The Firebird Trust was formed in 1984. It is a pioneering music organisation committed to artistic excellence, founded on the principle of inspiring and empowering people through a creative involvement in making music.

The artistic team for Good Vibrations was: Nikki Kemp, Co-ordinator of the Lincoln Firebird Gamelan; John Pawson, one of the UK's leading gamelan teachers and musicians; Laurence Rugg, Co-ordinator of the Hull Gamelan; and Kathy Berg, freelance musician and teacher. Cathy Eastburn and this strong team of superb musicians worked tirelessly with tact and good humour to produce the significant results that are described in this report. It has been an important experience for all of us.

**Sibyl Burgess, Director
Firebird Trust**

What people said

"It is quite incredible how these guys have worked and what they have achieved this week. I am very pleased that [Good Vibrations] came in and provided this opportunity" - David McDonnell, Director of Wolds Prison

"It was evident, even from my own two or three brief visits to the sessions in progress, that the prisoners were participating to very good effect and that useful skills and attitudes were being picked up as a result of their mutual co-operation and your enthusiastic presentation. An inspiring and enjoyable initiative" - Steve Orchard, Head of Regimes, Nottingham Prison

"The project produced an effect and result beyond my wildest dreams" - Pat Wilcox, Education Manager, HMP Wolds

"Improved their self-esteem and working with others" - Pat Malpass, Education Manager, HMYOI Glen Parva

"Good that anyone could take part. Far more inclusive than eg creative writing" - Liz Peat, Prison Librarian, HMP Wakefield

"I've only talked to 4 or 5 people since I've been here [more than a year] – I've talked to far more this week, because we're all the same, we're all here with a clean slate, and I feel much better" - participant

"Pleasure, relaxation, inspiration – and I've never said those words about anything before" - participant

"A state of mind you can't describe – touched me inside" - participant

"[With regular gamelan sessions] we could sack the psychology department because gamelan automatically builds into how you think and act" - participant

"Gamelan has opened a new door, it could change how I think" - participant

"I learnt to trust others, appreciate what others can do, that sometimes I need help and can't do everything on my own – will help me in other group situations" - participant

"I realise now just how many basic and key skills are covered in a gamelan workshop and how much impact it has" - Nikki Kemp, workshop leader

"Exceeded all my expectations in terms of the inmates' achievement" - John Pawson, workshop leader

"It was great to see the positive and committed response of the participants. To reach such a standard of performance in the time available is an achievement in itself, and it was apparent that the project is likely to be conducive to developing greater co-operation and understanding" - Andrew Herbert, Music Officer, Arts Council England (Yorkshire)

Executive Summary

1.1 Background to the project and project outline

It is now generally accepted – including by prison policy makers and many prisons themselves - that the arts have a vital role to play in prisons' education and rehabilitation efforts. Gamelan (Indonesian percussion music) has particular attributes that make it appropriate for using in a community or prison setting, including:

- unlike western musical forms (eg opera, pop music), gamelan does not have any particular connotations that might alienate people;
- most of the instruments are easy to learn to play and no previous musical experience is necessary;
- a group can quickly and easily learn a piece, without using any notation, and can learn to play music of high quality in one two-hour session; and
- gamelan music is communal and egalitarian: there is no leader or conductor; players are encouraged to swap instruments; every player is of equal importance; co-operation is emphasised rather than competition; and many musical changes (in dynamics, tempo etc) are negotiated as a group during the course of a piece.

Good Vibrations was set up with the aim of piloting gamelan workshops in prisons to assess their effectiveness in enhancing prisoners' self-esteem and developing certain basic and key skills including communication, listening, team working, numeracy, problem-solving, concentration and motor skills.

During Summer 2003, gamelan workshops were run in five prisons: Wakefield, Nottingham, HMYOI Glen Parva, Brixton and The Wolds. The usual format was to run a couple of short "taster" sessions, following which participants could choose to sign up for a longer, in-depth workshop lasting several days. The workshops were monitored and evaluated in detail, focusing particularly on their impact on participants' self-esteem and basic and key skills.

1.2 Running the project

The successful running of the project was possible only because of meticulous planning plus the commitment and enthusiasm of the project's contacts in the participating prisons. The format and structure of the workshops were tailored to each prison's regime and requirements but, even so, workshop leaders had to be extremely flexible and respond to last-minute changes and cancellations.

Security and other staff in the participating prisons were usually co-operative and interested in the project. However, it was sometimes difficult to get governors and other relevant senior staff involved and engaged. There was no difficulty

getting enough men to sign up for workshops and participants were mainly extremely enthusiastic, positive and engaged with the project.

1.3 Monitoring the workshops

Monitoring data, focusing particularly on the impact on participants' self-esteem and on their basic and key skills, were gathered in a number of ways:

- Questionnaires for participants, before and after the project
- Participant focus groups, before and after the project
- Questionnaires for prison contacts, before, during and after the project
- Questionnaires for workshop leaders, after each session, including observation logs
- *Ad hoc* monitoring, including short questionnaires for prison staff attending sessions and funders attending play-throughs

Two or three participants were selected in each in-depth group to be the focus of more detailed observation by workshop leaders and prison contacts. These case studies were chosen to be broadly representative of the group as a whole in terms of educational level and abilities.

1.4 Results of the project

124 prisoners took part in taster sessions and 64 completed in-depth workshops. Analysis of the data gathered suggests that overall the project was extremely successful in helping participants develop basic and key skills and in building self-esteem:

- Around a quarter of participants were assessed at below Level 1 numeracy and a similar figure for below Level 1 literacy, a slightly higher proportion than in the prisons' populations as a whole. Half of participants had never done anything musical before. Nearly 40% had never participated in any kind of prison education programme. The project therefore successfully engaged people with low levels of educational attainment and who had not previously been reached by prison education.
- Prison education staff rated the taster sessions as very good or excellent opportunities for people to develop basic and key skills including team working, communication, listening, concentrating, numeracy and motor skills. Most of them felt the sessions were more effective in this than other short arts projects.
- The content and structure of the in-depth workshops were rated 5 out of 5¹ by prison education staff. They also rated the workshop leaders 5 out of 5. They rated the sessions an average of 4.8 out of 5 for giving participants of all abilities an equal chance to participate.

¹ Prison education staff and workshop leaders were asked to score the workshops from 1-5 according to various criteria.

- Prison education staff rated in-depth workshops as very good or excellent in their effectiveness in developing participants' self-confidence and basic and key skills. They rated the in-depth sessions an average 4.9 out of 5 for their effect on participants' self-confidence, with 100% rating them as more effective in this than other similar-length arts projects.
- Prison education staff rated the in-depth workshops 5 out of 5 for their effectiveness in helping people develop their team working skills, and they all rated them more effective at this than other similar-length arts projects.
- Development of communication skills and listening skills also scored highly. The in-depth workshops got an average 4.6 out of 5 on both counts from prison education staff. Prison education staff consistently rated the sessions as more effective in helping people develop these and other basic and key skills (concentration, numeracy and motor skills) than other similar-length arts projects.
- 89% of participant questionnaire respondents spontaneously reported feeling better about themselves, feeling a sense of achievement or pride, or increased self-confidence. 57% of questionnaire respondents (71% of the young offenders) spontaneously mentioned enjoying and learning from the experience of team working.
- Even in the short timeframe of the monitoring, two prison education managers reported improved behaviour or performance in education and one reported participants signing up for further prison education activities.

1.5 The future of Good Vibrations

The clear success of the pilot stage makes a strong case for continuing the Good Vibrations project, along the following lines:

- Return to participating prisons and go to some new prisons (focusing on those in the same geographic areas, young offenders institutions and women's prisons), delivering gamelan workshops as part of the prisons' education programmes. The workshops will be offered to prison education providers as an effective tool to meet targets for engaging previously disengaged prisoners in education and for improving inmates' basic and key skills, including helping prisoners to get appropriate qualifications. The expectation is that prisons will part-fund the workshops themselves.
- Piloting gamelan workshops in secure hospitals to assess their therapeutic, rather than educational, benefits.

Chapter 2: Background to the project

2.1 Breaking the cycle

Over 60% of prisoners re-offend within two years of their release. Government research has found that 65% of prisoners lack basic skills and are essentially unemployable. Yet prisoners that manage to find and hold down a job on their release are only half as likely to re-offend. These stark facts have led to a focus in prison rehabilitation and education programmes on equipping prisoners with basic and key skills² to boost their employability. A key challenge for all those working in the prison system is therefore how to maximise the number of prisoners who acquire those skills and hence increase their chances of finding a job.

Since 2001 prison education has been the responsibility of the Offenders Learning and Skills Unit (OLSU), managed jointly by the Department of Education and Skills and the Prison Service. As well as developing and standardising more formal education programmes, the OLSU is increasingly looking at new ways to reach the high proportion of prisoners that are resistant to traditional forms of education. There is a growing interest in the arts as one possible way of providing more accessible learning opportunities.

It was in this context that the Good Vibrations pilot project was set up, to see whether a new form of music in prisons project could improve basic and key skills.

2.2 Arts in prison education

It is now generally accepted – including by prison policy makers and many prisons themselves - that the arts have a vital role to play in prisons' education and rehabilitation efforts. The OLSU's website states, "We recognise the value of the arts in prisons" and, "to engage in learning the majority of the prison population which is reluctant to get involved in formal education ... we are increasing opportunities for adult prisoners to learn through a range of activities such as the arts". However, despite the many different prisons arts projects taking place every year, such activities are still often marginalized. This is partly owing to a lack of rigorous monitoring of the outcomes of prison arts activities in terms of prison education targets and priorities and, in particular, their effectiveness in developing basic and key skills. Such monitoring is difficult, time-consuming and requires resources which cash-strapped arts projects often do not have. The Unit for the Arts and Offenders (a national umbrella organisation that supports the development of the arts within criminal justice

² The concept of basic and key skills has been developed by the education establishment and it is generally understood that basic skills cover literacy and numeracy, and key skills cover communication, application of number, IT, working with others, improving one's learning performance and problem-solving.

settings) plays a valuable role providing prison arts projects with assistance and advice on monitoring and evaluation.

2.3 Music in prisons

There are many examples of successful music in prisons projects, encompassing all kinds of music. Percussion music in particular has benefited prisoners.³ The success of percussion-based music projects suggested that workshops based on teaching gamelan had great potential in a prison setting.

2.4 What is gamelan?

Gamelan music is the music of the bronze percussion orchestras of Central Java. The sound is enchanting, mellifluous and joyful. The music is full of interlocking rhythms, layers of melodies and rippling textures. In Java, gamelan music is a vital component of celebrations as well as part of everyday life. Gamelan music is an integral part of all cultural activities in Java such as *wayang kulit* (shadow puppets) performance and dance. For more information on gamelan, please see Appendix 1.

Gamelan is becoming increasingly popular outside Indonesia. This is because of its beautiful sound and because it is easy to learn the basics of playing the instruments without any previous musical experience. There are currently over 60 sets of gamelan instruments in the UK. Many are used in the community, for example with school groups, young people with learning difficulties, adults with mental health problems and substance abusers.

2.5 The benefits of playing gamelan

Gamelan has particular attributes that make it appropriate for using in a community or prison setting:

- Unlike western musical forms (eg opera, pop music), gamelan does not have any particular connotations that might alienate people
- Most of the instruments are easy to learn to play and no previous musical experience is necessary
- A group can quickly and easily learn a piece, without using any notation, and can learn to play music of high quality in one two-hour session

³ A project in Wakefield Prison (a high security prison) taught samba drumming to 15 Category A prisoners through weekly sessions for 16 weeks culminating in a performance. Around two thirds of the participants had never taken part in a musical activity before. As mainly life sex offenders, participants were clearly a particularly difficult group. However, the accessible and sociable nature of samba drumming meant they were able to develop their musical and social skills. Another example of a successful prison percussion project was a five-week African drumming project in Aylesbury young offenders institution run by Live Music Now in 2002. The use of percussion was felt to have been particularly effective in developing team-working skills, in relieving aggression, and in offering meaningful opportunities for participation for everyone.

- Gamelan music is communal and egalitarian: there is no leader or conductor; players are encouraged to swap instruments; every player is of equal importance; co-operation is emphasised rather than competition; and many musical changes (in dynamics, tempo etc) are negotiated as a group during the course of a piece
- The music has a clear structure which is easily understood
- The instrumental parts interlock with each other, with numerous musical connections between players
- Playing the instruments encourages careful listening (to hear and follow cues), numeracy (through counting) and physical co-ordination (striking instruments in time, damping correctly)
- With more in-depth workshops, there are opportunities for players to learn to give each other cues, to develop skills (eg drumming and more advanced instrumental techniques), to improvise within clear limits and to create group compositions
- The sounds of the instruments (particularly the gong tones) are resonant and full of complex harmonics; people find the sounds particularly satisfying and there is some evidence that the sounds may have therapeutic benefits⁴
- Instruments are played by striking with mallets or padded sticks, in some pieces quite hard: the context and musical goal help focus this small act of controlled violence so it is harmless but therapeutic
- There are specific rules required by the gamelan (eg taking shoes off, not stepping over instruments, using beaters and mallets correctly) which impose a clear discipline on a group

The only gamelan workshop to have taken place in a UK prison prior to the Good Vibrations project was a two-day workshop in Hull Prison in 2002. This was funded by the Single Regeneration Budget SRB6 as part of a larger project involving a consortium of Hull-based organisations working with disadvantaged groups. The workshop consisted of several one-off “taster” sessions. Most participants had never taken part in any music-making. Participants’ feedback was all positive: they enjoyed the opportunity to make music together and the sense of achievement. The sessions were observed to be a good opportunity for prisoners to work co-operatively and to utilise their listening and social skills in a supportive environment, in contrast to the rest of their prison (and outside) lives. The prison chaplain and education staff welcomed the workshops as a positive contribution to their ongoing efforts to rehabilitate prisoners.

A week-long gamelan residency was run by Gamelan Amadindas at the Clark County Juvenile Detention Center in the US in 1998. This involved 15 boys and girls, who worked co-operatively, fought less, developed group problem-solving skills, encouraged each other, and assisted people who joined the group during the course of the week. One boy, released from the centre half-way through the project, asked to be kept inside until the end. The week ended with a

⁴ for example: “Music Therapy with Archaic Instruments”, Peter Hess, Musiktherapeutische Umschau 20, 77-92 (1999); also Sunday Times article on “gong therapy” 10 August 1997

performance in front of fellow-detainees and (at the participants' request) parole officers.

A week-long residency was run by the South Bank Gamelan in 1996 with substance abusers at Kaleidoscope, the only one-stop drug treatment agency in the UK. This was successful in encouraging people to participate and to commit to attend daily sessions, culminating in a performance to other Kaleidoscope clients and friends. Participants reported feeling a sense of achievement and improved self-esteem.

Work by the South Bank Gamelan with children with challenging behaviour often results in improved behaviour being observed. For example, teachers have reported disruptive children behaving more calmly and considerately in school after participating in gamelan workshops.

Teachers of 11 year-olds participating in gamelan workshops in Edinburgh commented on pupils' attentiveness during workshops, their listening acuity developing as they began to hear the interaction of parts with each other, and the level of maturity demonstrated in performances.

These examples suggested that there would be great value in a pilot project to assess systematically the benefits of gamelan in a prison context.

2.6 The idea for the pilot project

The Good Vibrations gamelan in prisons pilot project was devised in late 2002, with the aim of piloting gamelan workshops in five prisons. The prisons would encompass a range of prison regimes and types of prisoner, including high security (Category A) offenders, Category B prisoners, remand prisoners and young offenders. A key part of the project would be the careful monitoring and evaluation of the workshops, to see how effective they are in helping prisoners develop basic and key skills such as team-working, communication, listening, concentration and numeracy. Working with the prisons' education managers, an assessment would then be made, of how gamelan might best be used as a tool in prisons' education and rehabilitation work.

Three prisons were approached at this initial project planning stage: Wakefield (Category A), Nottingham (Category B) and Brixton (Category B). In consultation with them, the project was designed as a series of intense, short-term projects. This was because the size and quantity of instruments involved and the space required meant that once-weekly sessions over a longer period were impracticable. The workshops would range from short, one-off "taster" sessions to week-long residencies. The longer residencies would end with an informal run-through in front of interested fellow-prisoners and prison staff. Although short, these workshops would give an indication of gamelan's effectiveness. The workshops were planned for July and August 2003. At this time of year there

would be less going on inside prisons, allowing these intensive sessions to be run over several days.

The Firebird Trust, a long-established community music organisation and a strategic music client of Arts Council England (East Midlands), agreed to take on the Good Vibrations project, as long as sufficient funding could be secured. The Firebird Trust has a strong track record of running successful music projects with all kinds of disadvantaged groups, including in prisons. It also manages the Lincoln-based Firebird Gamelan on behalf of Lincoln City Council, running a year-round programme of workshops and classes for schools and other groups. The Firebird Gamelan would be made available to the project for use in prison workshops and its co-ordinator, Nikki Kemp, would play a key role in the delivery of the project.

2.7 Sources of advice and information

Securing reliable advice and information was crucial to designing a feasible project. Apart from the prisons themselves, advice and guidance came from a number of sources:

- the Unit for the Arts and Offenders (particularly on monitoring and evaluating prison arts projects, but also their very useful “Handbook for Artists – Working with the arts in criminal justice settings”);
- the Irene Taylor Trust (a leading music in prisons charity); and
- the Institute of Education.

2.8 Key success factors

A number of key success factors were identified at the project design stage which helped focus subsequent project development and planning work. These were:

- Funding – obtaining sufficient funding to run a high-quality project, including the necessary monitoring and evaluation work, without diverting existing funding for the Firebird Trust or for other gamelan projects. It was also important to ensure that all project partners and workshop leaders would, as professionals, be properly remunerated.
- Prison co-operation – ensuring that all participating prisons were genuinely supportive of the workshops and able to facilitate the project inside the prison.
- Workshop leaders – ensuring that all workshop leaders were exceptionally able and experienced, could deliver high artistic quality, and that some had prior experience of working inside prisons.
- Monitoring and evaluation – ensuring that robust and practicable monitoring mechanisms were set up, enabling the project to evaluate in detail the effectiveness of the project, particularly focusing on basic and key skills. It

was clearly articulated by the project co-ordinator from the start that good monitoring and evaluation were a key success factor for the project, regardless of how well the workshops went.

2.9 Taking the project forward: planning and fundraising

In addition to the three prisons contacted at the project design stage, two others - Glen Parva (young offenders) and The Wolds (Category C, and a Group 4-run prison) - were approached and agreed to participate. All five prisons were male prisons, though this was not deliberate policy. Three of the project's prison contacts were Education Managers, one was the Prison Librarian and one the Chaplain. The understanding with all five prisons was that they would not have to contribute financially to the pilot, other than bearing the costs of extra security, staff time etc. Provisional dates were agreed with the five, running from late July until mid-September 2003.

The Hull Music Service and the Education Programme at the South Bank both agreed to become project partners. Hull Music Service agreed to deliver the Wolds prison workshops, using the Hull Gamelan and their Music Officer, Laurence Rugg, who ran the 2002 Hull Prison workshops. The South Bank agreed to allow the South Bank Gamelan to be used in Brixton Prison.

A team of four workshop leaders was set up, to work mainly in pairs, although sometimes (for taster sessions) individually. The four – Nikki Kemp, John Pawson, Laurence Rugg and Kathleen Berg - all had extensive experience of running gamelan workshops in the community. Like Laurence, Nikki had experience of working in prisons.

The precise format of each prison project was agreed in consultation with the workshop leaders and the prisons. The basic model was a couple of two-hour taster sessions, following which interested prisoners could choose to go on to take part in a few days of intensive workshops, finishing with a performance in front of an audience. The final performance would be recorded and a CD produced for all participants.

Detailed project plans and budgets were drawn up, and potential funders approached. The total cost of the project was budgeted at £25,000. Contingency plans were drawn up for the possibility of raising only part-funding, which would involve running the project at three prisons at a cost of £17,900. Some potentially interested funders could not be approached, either because they were already supporting other similar projects or because of the relatively short time between submitting funding applications and the summer, when the project needed to happen. Out of the nine funders approached, four agreed to fund the project. These were the Tudor Trust, Arts Council England, The Allen Lane Foundation and The Pilgrim Trust.

2.10 Problems and difficulties at the project planning stage

There were three main difficulties at this stage:

1. Trying to access and understand information about basic and key skills, in particular what they actually “look like” in practice. Getting this information was time-consuming and, once obtained, it was often very jargon-laden.
2. Because of the tight and immovable project timescale, the time taken for some funders to make decisions created problems, mainly in terms of prisons and workshop leaders keeping dates free.
3. In order to keep the project going, a decision was made in early May 2003 to go ahead on the basis of part-funding already received. This part-funding was sufficient to enable the pilot to run in three of the five prisons, as per the contingency plan, and still allowing proper evaluation. However, one funder was not happy with the project going ahead on this basis and threatened to reduce their grant to below the level needed for the contingency plan. The future of the whole project was in jeopardy at this point. Luckily the remaining funding was secured shortly afterwards.

2.11 What went particularly well at this stage

Other than securing the funding, there were two key successes at this stage:

1. Establishing contact with prisons, getting their agreement to participate, and liaising with them about the format and timing of the project.
2. Embedding the project within the Firebird Trust and agreeing with the Director roles and responsibilities, budgets, financial controls and funding applications.

2.12 Establishment of project outcomes

The following project outcomes were agreed with the project team and funders:

Overall project outcomes

- *OPO1* Hold taster sessions and in-depth workshops in five UK prisons, involving between 70 and 140 participants in all, which help participants’ develop basic and key skills and build their self-esteem.
- *OPO2* Make a detailed assessment, grounded in the experience of the pilot workshops, of the benefits of gamelan for prisoners and how gamelan might best be used as a tool in prisons’ education and rehabilitation efforts.
- *OPO3* Formulate concrete recommendations for developing a UK gamelan-in-prisons programme.
- *OPO4* Generate an understanding of and interest in gamelan as an educational and rehabilitation tool, among prison staff (including governors and education managers) and prison policy-makers (eg Offenders Learning and Skills Unit).

Chapter 3: What happened

As soon as full project funding had been secured, in late June, the detailed implementation work began. An emphasis on planning and organisation paid off in terms of good working relationships with the project's prison contacts:

"The providers [Good Vibrations] understand the problems and joys of working in a prison"

"The information on and confirmation of activities was very good and general preparations were excellent"

3.1 Monitoring and evaluation

The following monitoring tools were designed and produced:

- Questionnaires for participants, before and after the project (both those who participated in tasters only and those who did the whole project)
- Focus group topics for participants, before and after the project (for logistical reasons, after-project groups consisted of those who had done the whole project)⁵
- Questionnaires for the project's prison contacts, before, during and after the project
- Questionnaires for workshop leaders, after each session, including observation logs

The supplementary report⁶ includes examples of all of these.

Workshop leaders and the project's prison contacts were briefed on how to complete the questionnaires.

Additional *ad hoc* monitoring tools were produced as the project proceeded, including short questionnaires for prison staff attending sessions (eg prison officers on duty) and informal email requests for feedback from the funders and Offenders Learning and Skills Unit officials who attended play-throughs.

3.2 Security

Security checks on workshops leaders and the project co-ordinator had to be carried out by the prisons. Depending on the prison, this took between two days and four weeks. A detailed inventory was taken of each gamelan and associated

⁵ All five prison contacts managed to set up pre- and post-project focus groups, which were an invaluable source of qualitative data about participants' expectations and feedback. The groups, usually 10-15 in size, were facilitated by the project co-ordinator.

⁶ The supplementary report, including examples of questionnaires, notations of pieces used, and examples of promotional materials, hand-outs and certificates is available on request from the Firebird Trust (01522 811229 or email sibyl.firebird@pop3.poptel.org.uk).

equipment being used for each prison. Unsurprisingly, security arrangements were more thorough at Wakefield, the Category A prison. Here, every instrument and piece of equipment was subjected to detailed security checks going in and out of the prison. In each prison, after every session, instruments, beaters and other equipment had to be checked and the inventory signed off.

At some prisons, funders and other contacts attending play-throughs had to be security cleared, whereas at others simply passing names to the gate was sufficient.

3.3 Promotion

All participants in the project volunteered to take part, by signing up for an initial taster session. Leaflets and posters promoting the workshops were produced for each prison (see the supplementary report for examples). In addition, a workshop leader or the project co-ordinator visited each prison, with the exception of Nottingham⁷, approximately two weeks in advance of the workshops to promote the project to the men and to staff, and to encourage men to sign up. Liaison with the project's prison contacts ensured that each prison had a clear process for people to sign up (eg asking people to sign their names on posters, or to give their names to education staff) and for managing if demand outstripped the number of workshop places available.

Hand-outs and certificates were produced for all participants: see the supplementary report for examples of these. Neither was originally envisaged as part of the project but they were produced for Wakefield participants in response to enthusiastic demand, and were replicated in the other prisons.

3.4 Logistics

Transporting gamelans to and from prisons was generally done using a professional removal company. They were security cleared to drive into each prison and unload the instruments in the workshop venue (or, in the case of Wakefield, in the security store). Workshop leaders were usually present to oversee unloading and packing up of instruments, and were responsible for setting them up *in situ*. When workshop leaders were unable to be present, there tended to be problems (eg equipment being left behind at one prison). The project's prison contacts assisted with moving instruments around and in most cases were also able to organise additional manpower. This was very helpful.

At Wakefield, complaints from the neighbouring psychology department part-way through the project about the "noise" meant the gamelan had to be unexpectedly moved to a different venue. No assistance was provided to do this, meaning that the workshop leader and the project's prison contact had to move the entire gamelan unaided across the prison, an exhausting exercise.

⁷ HMP Nottingham was confident that they could sign up sufficient numbers without this help.

Other logistical issues, usually dealt with by the project's prison contacts, included organising security staff to be in attendance at all sessions; sending out notes to participants reminding them to attend; bringing men off the wings; drawing up lists of participants for security staff; and chasing up non-attendees or late-comers. At the Wolds, the prison education manager arranged for all workshop security staff to be newly-appointed, which helped their understanding of the prison and formed a useful part of their induction.

3.5 Media and recording the workshops

Each prison was asked for guidelines about how the media could be involved, eg whether journalists could attend workshops, interview participants, or make recordings. Generally, prisons were happy for the project co-ordinator to liaise directly with local media and with the Prison Service national press office regarding national media. In the case of the Wolds, media work was done in liaison with the Group 4 press office.

Initial media contact was usually through emailing press releases, followed up by phone calls a few days before the prison workshops. Interested journalists were able to attend play-throughs, interview participants and record sessions. The one exception was Glen Parva, which was unable to clear local radio journalists to come in at short notice. In addition, a number of radio interviews were carried out (by the project co-ordinator and by the Director of the Wolds). See Appendix 4 for details of media coverage of the project.

Each play-through was recorded onto minidisk, tracks edited and CDs produced. The CDs were both of individual prisons' efforts (as a memento for the participants) and an overall compilation CD.

Prison contacts were asked to try and organise photographs of sessions for use on the CDs and in project reports, but in some cases this was not possible.

3.6 Project administration and accounts

At the very start of the implementation phase, written and detailed agreement was secured with each prison about dates and times, their responsibilities and what they could expect from the project. Workshop leaders were briefed in detail about their roles and responsibilities and contracts agreed. Contracts were drawn up with Hull Music Service and the South Bank Centre, the project partners. Detailed budgets, financial control mechanisms were set up and project expenditure monitored. Funders were kept informed of key events, invited to play-throughs etc.

3.7 Workshops

The optimum size for a gamelan workshop is around 10-15 participants, with a maximum size of 20.

For this project, the usual format was to run a couple of taster sessions so men could try gamelan without committing a great deal of time. At the end of these sessions those keen to do more were asked to sign up to do the in-depth sessions. These culminated in a play-through in front of a small audience. However, the exact format varied from prison to prison in order to fit best with the prisons' individual regimes and requirements.

The workshop leaders had to complete detailed questionnaires after each session, requiring two or three additional hours' work each day.

3.7.1 HMP Wakefield

Three taster sessions were run. Numbers wanting to carry on were so high that a decision was made to split the in-depth week into a morning group and an afternoon group with both groups coming together for the final play-through on the Friday morning. A lunchtime session for prison staff was organised by the workshop leaders but, despite some interest expressed beforehand, no-one attended.

3.7.2 HMP Nottingham

The project was only in the prison for two full days, so was run as two one-day workshops. Rather than have a play-through in front of an audience, the workshop leader simply recorded what each group had achieved at the end of the day.

3.7.3 HMYOI Glen Parva

The second of the two planned tasters was cancelled, because of a security problem on the wings. In any case numbers signing up for tasters were low, mainly owing to the fact that only three classes of inmates were offered the chance to participate (prison education staff had worries about potential discipline and commitment problems particularly as a previous music project there had had to be abandoned). Furthermore, the prison education manager reported some inmates saying they didn't want to sign up because it was not "their sort of music". The in-depth workshops lasted a full week with the play-through on the Friday morning. The final Friday afternoon was cancelled shortly before the project started as the venue, the chapel, had been double-booked. Workshop leaders organised a lunchtime taster session for education staff that was well-attended and popular.

3.7.4 HMP Brixton

The project ran for 2.5 days in all. Two taster sessions were followed by a 1.5 day intensive workshop (including final performance). In order that all who

wanted to carry on could do so, the intensive group was larger than ideal (20 participants).

3.7.5 HMP Wolds

The project ran for a week in total, with two taster sessions on the Monday, followed by three full days of in-depth workshops and the final play-through on the Friday morning. The final Friday afternoon was cancelled at short notice as there was another summer school activity occurring that many of the men wished to participate in.

3.8 Numbers participating

Numbers signing up for and participating in workshops were as follows:

Name of prison	Number signing up for taster sessions	Number participating in taster sessions	Number signing up for in-depth sessions	Number participating in in-depth sessions
Wakefield	36	38	29	24
Nottingham (one-day workshops)	30	22	N/A	N/A
Glen Parva	10	10	10	9
Brixton	32	28	20	20
The Wolds	27	26	13	11
Total	135	124	72	64

Generally, numbers participating were slightly fewer than numbers signing up.

3.9 Lessons learnt from the process

Many lessons were learnt from the process of running the pilot project, the main lessons being:

- Numbers signing up: there were no problems getting plenty of people to sign up for tasters, with the exception of HMYOI Glen Parva, where the low number was partly owing to comparatively few inmates being offered the chance to take part.
- Numbers wishing to continue with in-depth projects: the expectation that around 50% of participants would wish to continue was vastly exceeded. At Wakefield, Glen Parva and Brixton the proportion exceeded 70% (and many of those choosing not to continue made this decision reluctantly, for example because they found sitting on the floor uncomfortable).
- Gratitude and enthusiasm of the participants: participants were mainly extremely positive and enthusiastic about the project, and many expressed

gratitude to the project. Workshop leaders found the groups more demanding than non-prisoners but also more rewarding. They rated the in-depth groups an average of 4.7 out of 5⁸ for their positive attitude (taster groups were rated an average of 4.3 out of 5). They rated the in-depth groups an average of 4.6 out of 5 for their level of interest in the music, and taster groups 4.0.

- Cynicism of some prisoners towards the prison establishment: at Wakefield and Brixton prisoners expressed some cynicism about the prison's attitude towards them, which at times coloured their perception of the project. For example, when complaints from the psychology department threatened to close down the project at Wakefield after the taster sessions, a number of men decided not to sign up for the in-depth sessions. They said they saw the situation as being a typical example of "prison games - offering us things and then taking them away". They did not want to be part of such "games" and preferred not to sign up so they would not be let down.
- Communication within the prison: internal communication could be very poor, resulting in problems for the project. For example, getting the instruments into Wakefield was hampered by the senior security staff member in charge being unexpectedly absent and failing to notify staff on the gate and the project's prison contact about what security procedures he had authorised. This resulted in unnecessary moving of instruments and some damage to them.
- Operations planning: because of security and fairly rigid prison procedures, it was necessary to think of absolutely everything in advance. Meticulous and time-consuming planning was essential, and there was also a great deal of sorting out of practicalities while prison projects were in progress. It proved vital to have a project co-ordinator undertake this work, rather than leave it to the workshop leaders.
- Demands on the project's prison contacts: the amount of work the project created for its prison contacts was enormous, as they had to bear the brunt of getting things done internally, internal communications, ensuring participants were fetched from the wings etc. At Wakefield, this job was made even harder by a lack of interest and support from senior staff and colleagues. The project's prison contacts were given little or no extra help to cope with the large workload the project created for them. Ideally, a senior member of prison staff should have overall responsibility for the project to ensure that the workload is shared and any problems can be resolved.
- Importance of the project's prison contact's role: the smooth running of the project was largely down to the sustained efforts and determination of the

⁸ Prison education staff and workshop leaders were asked to score the workshops from 1-5 according to various criteria.

project's contact in the prison. When, on a very few occasions, these were not sustained, problems tended to arise.

- Attitude of prison staff: prison staff were mainly very co-operative, interested in and positive about the project. Occasionally individual members of gate staff could be obstructive and create delays in bringing in instruments, equipment and project staff. In contrast to the other prisons, staff at Wakefield were, on the whole, neither interested in the project nor helpful. An *ad hoc* taster session organised for prison staff at Glen Parva proved successful and popular.
- Involvement of senior and education staff: At Wakefield and Brixton, the project failed to get any governors to attend any sessions. More effort in advance might have corrected this. In the two prisons (Wakefield and Brixton) where the project's prison contacts were not themselves education managers, the project failed to engage education staff properly. Again, greater advance thinking and effort might have corrected this. In the future, particular efforts should be made in good time to ensure governors and other senior staff are engaged with the project and attend play-throughs.
- Demands on workshop leaders: on top of the challenge of running the sessions, workshop leaders had to deal with logistical issues if they suddenly arose. Also the daily monitoring questionnaires were long and arduous (though valued by the workshops leaders as a way of forcing them to reflect on what they were doing). Running the workshops was emotionally draining for the workshop leaders and leaving each prison at the end of the final session was hard. Feedback from workshop leaders included:

"I am overwhelmed by the experience. The men have produced fabulous results – leaving an emotional void now it's over"

"I have never experienced anything quite the same as this before and feel a sense of loss now it is over"

Ideally, when running week-long workshops or longer, workshop leaders should be given a few days' break between prisons.

- Workshop leaders working together: the workshop leaders worked together very effectively, even when they had not worked together before. This was especially impressive given that, owing to the nature of the groups, often plans had to be revised mid-session and workshop leaders' roles and task-sharing worked out 'on the hoof'.
- Access to equipment: once in the workshop venue, because of prison security procedures, workshop leaders sometimes found it difficult to access paper,

pens, toilets etc, requiring more thinking in advance than is necessary in other settings.

- Attendance at sessions: workshop leaders had to cope with late arrivals, people being taken away without warning mid-session and non-appearances (eg due to court appearances). For example, the Glen Parva taster session started late because of an incident on the wings, and then had to finish early because of staff shortages. A taster session was cancelled altogether because of a security alert.
- Workshop disruption by prison staff: on occasions, prison staff unexpectedly interrupted sessions for various reasons which created difficulties for the workshop leaders. For example, the start of the play-through at Brixton was delayed considerably while a security officer took photographs of the group. The play-through itself featured security staff unlocking doors noisily and rattling keys (noisy key-rattling during sessions occurred at several of the prisons). Also at Brixton, and to a lesser extent elsewhere, time-consuming discussions about prison issues (eg meals) were occasionally sprung on the workshops by the project's prison contacts, without warning workshop leaders beforehand.
- Questionnaire completion and return: getting completed monitoring questionnaires back from the project's prison contacts was difficult in some cases. These questionnaires were long, but essential, and their importance had been explained and agreed with the contacts beforehand. In the two cases where prison contacts were not education managers, there was a significant delay in returning the questionnaires and crucial information was missing. In one of the other three cases, despite the contact being an education manager, crucial information was not supplied. In future, more explanation should be given to the prison contacts about the importance of their feedback and what exactly is involved, and an explicit agreement made about when questionnaires will be returned.
- Workshop photos: getting photographs of the sessions was problematic in nearly every case. Getting permission was difficult (and at Wakefield photos were only allowed of the instruments, and had to be taken when all prisoners were out of the room). Too often pictures taken were of poor quality, typically Polaroid snaps taken by a member of security staff. More advance thinking and planning would have helped here.
- Press liaison: liaising with the Prison Service national press office was problematic. Any contact with national media is supposed to be co-ordinated by them but in practice they seem primarily geared up to deal reactively with negative media stories rather than proactively attracting media coverage of a positive story. They were unable to undertake any of the agreed tasks until

too late. Several promising opportunities for securing national media coverage of the project were lost as a result.

3.10 Conclusions

The successful running of the project was possible only because of meticulous planning plus the commitment and enthusiasm of the project's prison contacts. The format and structure of the workshops were tailored to each prison's regime and requirements but, even so, workshop leaders had to be extremely flexible and respond to last-minute changes and cancellations.

Security and other staff in the participating prisons were usually co-operative and interested in the project. However, it did on occasion prove difficult to get governors and other relevant senior staff involved and engaged. There was no difficulty getting men to sign up for workshops and participants were mainly extremely enthusiastic, positive and engaged with the project.

Chapter 4: Results of the workshops

Rigorous monitoring and evaluation were crucial to the project's overall success, in order to assess the impact of the workshops on people's basic and key skills⁹ and on their self-esteem. Obtaining and analysing the right data during the project was therefore essential.

4.1 Methodology

As mentioned in Chapter 2, four overall project outcomes were defined. The first of these, OPO1, was "hold taster sessions and in-depth workshops in five UK prisons, involving between 70 and 140 participants in all, which help participants' develop basic and key skills and build their self-esteem". In order to allow a detailed assessment of the impact of the project on the participants, OPO1 was broken down into workshop outputs and outcomes. The outputs related to what took place in the workshops, and were relatively easy to measure, for example:

Taster output 1: 120 people take part in taster sessions

Taster output 4: taster participants teach each other different instrumental parts

In-depth output 1: 60 people take part in in-depth sessions

In-depth output 2: groups learn and perform to an audience several pieces to a high standard

The outcomes related to the impact of the project on participants, in particular their self-esteem and basic and key skills. Three broad outcomes were set for both taster sessions and in-depth workshops:

Outcome 1: to create an inclusive experience for participants

Outcome 2: to improve participants' self-realisation¹⁰

Outcome 3: to achieve a positive appraisal by prison education staff and workshop leaders in relation to participants' basic and key skills (and also self-esteem, in the case of in-depth sessions)

Each workshop outcome was broken down, for both taster sessions and in-depth workshops, into more detailed sub-outcomes, for example:

Taster outcome 1: to create an inclusive experience for participants:

Sub-outcomes to Taster outcome 1:

⁹ The concept of basic and key skills is explained in Footnote 2, page 9. Those basic and key skills relevant to the workshops – communication, listening, team-working, numeracy, problem-solving - were made the focus of this project's monitoring and evaluation, along with two additional (arguably also basic/key) skills: motor skills and ability to concentrate.

¹⁰ Self-realisation is taken in this context to cover a range of high-level psychological and emotional experiences such as developing self-esteem, self-confidence and sense of achievement.

- 1a The proportion of the group with below Level 1¹¹ basic skills is the same or greater than in the prison as a whole
- 1b 30% or more of participants have never taken part in a musical activity before
- 1c 30% or more of participants have never taken part in prison education before
- 1d 50% or more of participants volunteer to go on to in-depth workshops

In-depth session outcome 3: to achieve a positive appraisal by prison education staff and workshop leaders in relation to participants' self-esteem and basic and key skills:

Sub-outcomes to in-depth session outcome 3:

- 3a sessions have a calming effect on participants
- 3b participants' self-confidence increases
- 3c 70% or more of participants improve their basic and key skills to some extent:¹²
 - i. teamworking
 - ii. communication
 - iii. listening
 - iv. concentration
 - v. problem-solving
 - vi. numeracy
 - vii. motor skills
- 3d the sessions' effectiveness in terms of improving basic and key skills favourably compare with other, similar-length arts projects

All the outputs and outcomes/sub-outcomes are listed in Appendix 3.

4.2 Gathering the data

As mentioned in section 3.1, data were gathered in a number of ways:

- Questionnaires for participants, before and after the project
- Participant focus groups, before and after the project
- Questionnaires for the project's prison contacts, before, during and after the project

¹¹ Level 1 = the level expected of an average 11 year-old.

¹² Some of the sub-outcomes related to the impact on participants' levels of various basic and key skills. This required the definition of particular behaviours that would illustrate the deployment of each skill. For example: using vocabulary and expressions suitable for the purpose; and making clear and relevant contributions to group discussions, are both particular types of behaviour that illustrate the deployment of communication skills. These behaviours could be tracked and observed by monitoring tools such as the workshop leaders' observation logs and the prison education staff's questionnaires. Please see Appendix 2 for this break down of basic and key skills into observable behaviours.

- Questionnaires for workshop leaders, after each session, including observation logs
- Additional *ad hoc* monitoring

Rather than attempting to track the progress of every participant in the in-depth workshops, two or three participants were selected in each in-depth group to be the focus of more detailed observation by workshop leaders and the project's prison contacts. These "case studies" were chosen by the project's prison contact to be broadly representative of the group as a whole in terms of educational level and abilities. They did not receive any special treatment, nor were they informed that they were being observed in more detail. (See section 4.5.5 below for examples of these case studies).

There were some significant gaps in data collected. For example, feedback questionnaires from participants were mostly completed by men who had done the in-depth workshops, so there was very limited feedback from men after only participating in a taster. The project's prison contacts' questionnaires were not always fully completed.

It was decided not to prompt¹³ participants in their post-project feedback questionnaires as it was more valuable to get spontaneous feedback rather than steering men towards certain types of responses. This meant that it was sometimes difficult to measure precisely the workshops' success against certain sub-outcomes.

4.3 Presenting the results

Analysis of the data gathered suggests that overall the project was extremely successful in helping people develop basic and key skills and in building self-esteem. OPO1, the first overall project outcome, was therefore fully achieved.

The following two sections highlight the main findings of the analysis, according to the methodology outlined above. Key results are given firstly for the taster sessions and then for the in-depth sessions, relating to the outputs and outcomes of each. Full details relating to each specific output and outcome are given in Appendix 3.

4.4 Results of the taster sessions

The content and structure of the taster sessions were rated an average of 4 out of 5¹⁴ by prison education staff. Workshop leaders were rated 5 out of 5.

¹³ An example of prompting in a questionnaire would be the question "Did the project make you feel more self-confident?", whereas asking the question "How do you feel about yourself, having taken part in the project?" seeks people's spontaneous responses.

¹⁴ Prison education staff and workshop leaders were asked to score the workshops from 1-5 according to various criteria.

4.4.1 Outputs

Three of the five outputs were fully met. The other two – participants learn and play a whole piece, and participants swap roles and instruments - were not met in every taster session, usually because a session started late, but also because some groups were slow to learn. Participants particularly struggled with damping techniques, and with listening and keeping in time. There was a great deal of interest in Indonesian culture and values. 124 people took part in taster sessions.

4.4.2 Outcome 1: to create an inclusive experience for participants

Around a quarter of participants were assessed at below Level 1 numeracy and a similar figure for below Level 1 literacy, a slightly higher proportion than in the prisons' populations as a whole. Half of participants had never done anything musical before. Nearly 40% had never participated in any kind of prison education programme. The project therefore successfully engaged people with low levels of educational attainment and who had not previously been reached by prison education.

Prison education staff rated the taster sessions an average of 4.3 out of 5 for giving participants of all abilities an equal chance to participate.

4.4.3 Outcome 2: to improve participants' self-realisation

57% of taster-only questionnaire respondents spontaneously mentioned feeling better about themselves, feeling a sense of achievement or pride, or feeling more content. 67% of taster-only respondents spontaneously mentioned enjoying themselves, enjoying the sound of the music, or enjoying playing the music.

70% of taster participants volunteered to carry on (at Glen Parva the figure was 90%).

Feedback from participants after taster sessions included:

"Wasn't going to participate, but I was drawn into it"

"Great sense of well-being"

"Good to be respected enough to play expensive instruments"

"[There was] no judgement in the room, we were treated like normal people"

"I got a sense of freedom ... and felt very happy"

"Gamelan is different from other things here, because it takes effort and the effort is enjoyable"

"We worked well as a group"

4.4.4 Outcome 3: to achieve a positive appraisal by prison education staff and workshop leaders in relation to participants' basic and key skills

Prison education staff rated the taster sessions as very good or excellent opportunities for people to deploy basic and key skills including team working, communication, listening, concentrating, numeracy and motor skills. Most of them felt the sessions were more effective in this than other short arts projects. In particular, the taster sessions were rated an average of 4.1 out of 5 in terms of their effectiveness in giving people an opportunity to deploy co-operative behaviour and team working skills.

Feedback from prison education staff included:

"They began to learn about listening to each other and to discover about being in and working together as a group. [They learnt] a lot about respect"

"Some found the discipline required to wait or be quiet difficult to cope with"

"Teamwork for all – the more confident, musical people still needed to consider less able members of the group. Everyone's contribution mattered"

"Participants all seemed to take something positive from the session.

Considering how much they varied in ability, this was an excellent achievement"

"The men seemed genuinely surprised by the quality and good look of the instruments, which made them feel valued"

"The men were taken seriously and so they entered into the sessions seriously, so the learning became higher"

Workshop leaders found that groups were on the whole attentive and concentrated well, although some groups and some individual participants were disruptive and lacked concentration. Workshop leaders' feedback reflected the difficulties they experienced with some groups. Their feedback included:

"A couple of people almost didn't want to be part of the group eg playing the spare drum at the side"

"Improvisation not good, very little listening"

"I wasn't sure if I was being ignored deliberately or whether the men were just excited and talking too much. This did improve"

"People were buzzing after the session – definitely had a 'feel good' factor"

"A few characters tried to dominate at first"

"One person stepped over an instrument and when he realised what he had done, apologised and stepped back over it as if to undo it"

"Generally a very positive attitude, although a few complained about not sitting comfortably"

"They became more involved and interested"

"Initially quite hard to get them to listen to me and to each other"

"Some appeared to be disinterested.... These refuseniks gradually left. The remaining men all signed up for the rest of the week"

"Responded with a great deal of interest in the music and the culture"

4.5 Results of the in-depth workshops

The content and structure of the in-depth workshops were rated 5 out of 5 by prison education staff. Workshop leaders were also rated 5 out of 5. Feedback from the prison education staff included:

“[The content and structure] worked wonderfully as they allowed self-expression within a framework. The content allowed students to be themselves, yet an essential part of the group. Moving between instruments allowed fair and creative opportunity”

“X proved a sensitive, positive and excellent workshop leader. His gentle but purposeful leadership was an inspiration to the men, especially in a prison setting”

“I was especially impressed with Y’s patience with less able members of the group. She gave so much positive feedback to the men that by the end of the week they felt capable of anything.”

“Both workshop leaders were inspirational and practical. Their delivery, security awareness and patience with both staff and students were appreciated”

4.5.1 Outputs

Workshop leaders fully achieved all but two of the 12 outputs, including developing group compositions, improvisation, engaging in group problem-solving and decision-making, listening to and following cues, and discussing and understanding of the values and discipline of gamelan. All groups were very interested in the music and also in Indonesian culture and values, particularly keen to learn about Indonesian values and associated artforms like shadow puppets and masked dance.

Of the two outputs that were not fully achieved:

- one - groups learn and perform to an audience several pieces to a high standard – was not achieved at Brixton Prison, as the in-depth workshop lasted only 1.5 days in total.
- it is unclear whether the other – participants overcome personal differences to work successfully as a team – was met at The Wolds, as no personal differences were evident. In the other prisons this output was clearly met.

4.5.2 Outcome 1: to create an inclusive experience for participants

Interestingly, a significantly higher proportion of participants signing up for in-depth workshops were rated as being below Level 1 literacy and numeracy than

had signed up for taster sessions. 45% of participants signing up for in-depth workshops said they had never done any music before, a little lower than the proportion of taster participants.

Prison education staff rated the sessions an average of 4.8 out of 5 for giving participants of all abilities an equal chance to participate.

“Far more inclusive than eg creative writing, where education levels make a huge difference to the work produced”

4.5.3 Outcome 2: to improve participants’ self-realisation

89% of questionnaire respondents spontaneously reported feeling better about themselves, feeling a sense of achievement or pride, or increased self-confidence.

Feedback from participants included:

“I’ve only talked to 4 or 5 people since I’ve been here [more than a year] – I’ve talked to far more this week, because we’re all the same, we’re all here with a clean slate, and I feel much better”.

“I liked being treated like a normal human being...so much of prison is to make you feel abnormal.”

“My mates took the piss to begin with, knowing I was doing a music thing. When I went back to the cells after the performance [in front of fellow inmates], I got a round of applause from the other lads and they said ‘that was fantastic’”

“Pleasure, relaxation, inspiration – and I’ve never said those words about anything before”

“It gave me courage to deal with other people”

“I’ve never been comfortable in group sessions, but this helped me express myself more confidently”

“Before I thought I couldn’t do music, but now I know I can”

“[Now I feel I] can do whatever I put my mind to”

“Gave me a lot of satisfaction, not letting down team mates and participating – brought me alive”

“A state of mind I can’t describe, touched me inside”

60% of respondents spontaneously mentioned feeling calm, relaxed or peaceful in the workshops, for example:

“Very chilled out”

“The music was so good for the soul”

“Gamelan music has a meditative, stress-busting atmosphere. Result: I felt de-stressed and happy”

Given that team working was one of the key skills the project was looking to enhance, it is encouraging that 57% of questionnaire respondents (71% of the young offenders) spontaneously mentioned enjoying and learning from the experience of team working, for example:

"I will miss working as a group: we were strangers but this project brought us together"

"I learnt to trust others, appreciate what others can do, that sometimes I need help and can't do everything on my own – will help me in other group situations"

"I'm not usually a group participant but given the chance I'd do it straight away again"

"I feel a sense of belonging and part of a structure – more aware of myself and others around me"

"I liked it that no-one was self-centred, we were supportive of each other and I was expecting everyone to be for their own"

"Working with other people was a pleasure. Gamelan involves team work and taking note of other opinions – it was great that we found compromises and it wasn't long before we all bonded"

"Everyone put 100% into it, no one wanted to let anyone down"

The men appreciated the values of the gamelan, in particular that everyone is equal, that all players' contributions are equally important, and the importance of respecting everyone in the group:

"Didn't need explaining, instinctive, just came out of the music"

"It removed barriers between groups, it was equalising"

Other feedback from the men included:

"[With regular gamelan sessions] we could sack the psychology department because gamelan automatically builds into how you think and act."

"Too often we're told how to think, but this was about experiencing it."

"Gamelan has opened a new door, it could change how I think."

"Able to control my Aspergers"

"Helped me with concentration and focus – will help me outside [the group]"

"The tutors gave us the freedom of making our own decisions"

"[I liked] the opportunity to voice our own opinions and they were taken seriously"

4.5.4 Outcome 3: to achieve a positive appraisal by prison education staff and workshop leaders in relation to participants' self-esteem and basic and key skills

Prison education staff rated the in-depth workshops as very good or excellent in their effectiveness in developing people's self-confidence and basic and key skills. On a scale of 1-5, prison education staff rated the in-depth sessions an

average 4.9 for their effect on participants' self-confidence, with 100% rating them as more effective in this than other similar-length arts projects:

"Their self-esteem was boosted – in a place where they are often put down"

"Helped self-confidence and ability to develop"

"The men achieved more than they believed possible in playing together"

A representative from a funder attending the HMP Wolds play-through commented:

"The participants seemed to be very comfortable and confident in their use of the instruments and in singing in front of an audience"

Prison education staff rated the in-depth workshops 5 out of 5 for their effectiveness in helping people develop their team working skills, and they all rated them more effective at this than other similar-length arts projects.

Development of communication skills and listening skills also scored highly. The in-depth workshops got an average 4.6 out of 5 on both counts from prison education staff. Prison education staff consistently rated the sessions as more effective in helping people develop these and other basic and key skills (concentration, numeracy and motor skills) than other similar-length arts projects.

Their feedback included:

"The men grew into managing and achieving more than they or I imagined they could"

"The in-depth project produced an effect and result beyond my wildest dreams"

"Three men with known difficulties overcame them to produce personal and team triumph"

"The composing element helped prisoners learn to concentrate, co-operate and negotiate far more than I had anticipated"

"Improved their self-esteem and working with others"

"An impressive level of concentration in the students"

"They worked together as a group and most of them realised that and knew it improved their performance"

"There was a noticeable occasion when the group recognised that they had something special between them. An improvised piece that waxed and waned with what seemed like only non-verbal communication. I did not want to leave the room when required to. It was a magical moment"

"[Participants benefited by] working through some minor conflicts co-operatively instead of aggressively"

Workshop leaders' feedback included:

"The epitome of how groups should/could work together, very like it would be in Java"

“Each person found their own way of learning – visual, aural, by numbers, patterns”

“Contributions to discussions have improved: language appropriate, relevant comments, and positive comments on other people’s”

“A noticeable improvement in harmony between individuals and merging of cliques”

“In performance people were very focused, looking at each other and relying on each other”

“The group helped two men who missed Day 1 join in the group composition”

“More respect for the gamelan and each other is evident”

“Remarkable change – lots of people contributed ideas about how to help those struggling”

“Motor skills and memory for number sequencing improved during the course”

Prison education staff rated the in-depth workshops a maximum 5 out of 5 for their effectiveness in developing participants’ creative skills, with 100% saying they were more effective in this than other similar-length arts projects. Their feedback included:

“I was surprised that the men were able to compose their own music – this seemed very ambitious but it worked wonderfully”

Workshop leaders found some groups had great difficulty coming up with creative ideas. In some cases this was because of difficulty articulating ideas. In other cases this seemed to be because men were not used to being asked for their ideas. All groups became better at coming up with creative ideas and making creative decisions themselves. Feedback from workshop leaders included:

“They were unable to come up with creative suggestions, and needed a framework/structure to get started”

“Transition from ‘being taught’ to putting their own ideas together through experiment and discussion”

“Many men came up with valid creative ideas and were surprised at how good the ideas sounded”

An Arts Council England observer at the Wakefield play-through commented:

“It was good to see the participants beginning to employ individual creativity, and it was interesting that some were already introducing elements from other musical cultures, thus using the gamelan as a source of inspiration and making the music their own, whilst retaining respect for Javanese culture”

The Glen Parva young offenders were found by the workshop leaders to be a particularly challenging group at the start of their week:

“Some very unco-operative challenging and threatening behaviour – felt like I was being tested”

“Not listening to instructions properly”

However, dramatic improvements were observed over the course of the week in this group’s concentration levels, co-operative behaviour and engagement with the project and workshop leaders.

In the other prisons, participants were found to be mainly focused and enthusiastic from the start, and this improved further during the project.

Finally, even in the short timeframe of the monitoring, two prison education managers reported improved behaviour or performance in education and one reported participants signing up for further prison education activities.

4.5.5 Case studies

More detailed observations of a sample of participants throughout the in-depth workshops enabled prison education staff and workshop leaders to assess improvements in levels of self-esteem and basic and key skills.

13 individuals were tracked in this way. These case studies spanned a range of educational levels, with three being below Level 1 in literacy and numeracy, one at Level 1, two at Level 2, and three at Level 3 or above (four unknown).

Prison education staff saw significant improvements in self-confidence in 100% of the rated case-studies¹⁵. Furthermore, the level of improvement in self-confidence was seen to be high, with an average improvement rating of 2.7 out of 3.

Prison education staff and workshop leaders saw significant improvements in 70% or more of rated case studies in all of the following basic and key skills: communication, listening, team working, numeracy, motor skills and concentration/application. Only problem-solving failed to improve significantly in more than 70% of case studies. The greatest improvements in the case studies noted by prison education staff were in communication and listening skills.

Below are summaries of four of the case studies, all typical examples of the improvements observed over the course of the in-depth workshops.

¹⁵ For each case study, the level of improvement seen in each basic and key skill was scored as 0 (no improvement), 1 (tiny improvement), 2 (moderate improvement), 3 (impressive improvement) or X (not observed). A score of 2 or 3 is counted as a significant improvement.

Case study 1

M had literacy/numeracy levels assessed at Level 1. Over the course of the week, his self-esteem and his communication, team working, listening, concentration and motor skills were all judged by the prison contact to have improved significantly.

At the beginning of the week he was sometimes disruptive, and made insensitive and inappropriate comments. He often talked when the workshop leader was explaining things, and his concentration tended to be in short bursts. He seemed to calm down a little when the group was asked to focus on Javanese traditions (calm, gentle, low voices etc). Over the course of the week, he became more controlled and made more relevant contributions to group discussions. In particular, he was able to move forward the group's compositional ideas and came up with a workable idea of how the group could ensure a chord was played together. Towards the end of the week, he volunteered to learn a part which required listening to and focusing on a melody within a complex structure. He struggled with this task at first but persevered and succeeded. His performance in the play-through was "very sincere – a total contrast from early sessions".

Case study 2

S, a young offender, was disruptive, chatting a lot to fellow participants and tending to jump in with questions before the workshop leader had fully explained a task. He had a definite "on/off switch", frequently lying down. Over the course of the week, he became more focused and became a more constructive group member, for example coming up with ideas for the group composition. He tried hard, but was still easily distracted. Towards the end of the week, he further improved in his ability to concentrate, to follow instructions and to articulate his views in a group. He also worked out a way of writing down his part with dots and arrows which helped him remember it.

Case study 3

The workshop leader found D to be "on a different planet" at the start of the project. Over the three days, his body language improved and he became an active group member. He became better at identifying when he had a problem, communicating this and then persevering until he succeeded. He volunteered to play a melody on his own in the play-through, and managed to do this very well. He achieved this by practicing, even during break times, succeeding in developing an effective damping technique.

Case study 4

S had literacy/numeracy levels of below Level 1. His verbal communication was good, but he was not always focused on the task. His concentration came in bursts. During the course of the week, he became much better at listening to the other players. He contributed relevant and sensible ideas to group discussions, particularly on organisational matters, where he became proficient at identifying possible problems and offering solutions. By the end of the week, his

contributions were never off-subject. He also overcame a counting problem to enable him to perform his part well. He offered to introduce one of the pieces at the play-through, having previously avoided responsibilities. He clearly took great pride in his performance at the play-through. The prison education manager judged his self-confidence, team working skills, verbal communication, listening, problem-solving skills and numeracy all to have improved significantly.

Dealing with personal differences

Participant A criticised B's drumming. B took it personally and an intense argument ensued. The rest of the group offered support to both and effectively defused the situation, by explicitly drawing on Indonesian values such as respect and co-operation. Both A and B acknowledged these values and calmed down.

The following day there was no evidence of bad feelings between the two. In fact, a situation arose when B had to help A, who was having problems with his part. The two worked together well and supported each other.

4.6 Conclusions

The results of the workshops show clearly that they were a huge success. They engaged previously disengaged prisoners, groups achieved a great deal both musically and in working together co-operatively, and significant improvements in levels of self-esteem and basic and key skills were observed over the course of the in-depth sessions.

Chapter 5: The future of gamelan in UK prisons

The clear success of the pilot workshops makes a strong case for continuing the Good Vibrations project. This chapter outlines a recommended way forward for the project over the next two to three years. The recommendations are based on findings from the pilot project (including feedback from the project's prison contacts, the workshop leaders and the participants themselves) as well as conversations with other arts-based prison education providers and with officials in the Offenders Learning and Skills Unit (OLSU).

5.1 Returning to participating prisons

All five participating prisons are keen to do more gamelan workshops. 91% of participants expressed a wish to do more gamelan, and mentioned fellow-prisoners' interest:

*"Some people who didn't come wish they did now they've heard about it"
"People on the wings are interested – the audiences liked it and gave positive feedback"*

The project's prison contacts mostly want workshops in a similar format to the pilot, ie a week-long residency, or in some cases, a two-week project. Those contacts who are education managers are keen to build gamelan workshops into their education programmes to help achieve targets. For example, the project's contacts at Glen Parva and The Wolds are definitely interested in running gamelan projects for people working on Key Skills and Social and Life Skills qualifications to help them attain relevant units. In addition, one of the two contacts who were not education managers saw the workshops becoming a valuable part of the prison's education programme. The other was doubtful whether her education colleagues could be persuaded, despite the project's educational benefits.

Ideally, future gamelan workshops at the five prisons should be part of their education programmes. Good Vibrations should be sub-contracted by the prisons' education providers and the workshops used by them as a tool to engage otherwise hard-to-reach prisoners and to help prisoners obtain key skills qualifications. These might be Group and Teamwork or Communications units from the Social and Life Skills programme, or Key Skills qualifications such as Working with Others.

Being part of the education programme in this way is desirable for a number of reasons:

- it should enable the workshops to be at least part-funded by the prisons themselves (see Section 5.3 below);

- it should help bring previously disengaged prisoners into other kinds of education provision;
- monitoring and evaluation of the workshops could be carried out jointly with prison education staff, enhancing both its quality and its credibility with prisons; and
- it will also help Good Vibrations in developing a model of service provision that fits with prisons' education and resettlement priorities and programmes.

There are some possible disadvantages to being part of a prison's education programme:

- the workshops might be seen as part of the "establishment" rather than separate, which might deter some participants;
- being tied into the education department's ongoing programme might exclude those participants unwilling to engage with formal education; and
- prisons might impose restrictions on the workshops' content which could jeopardise their effectiveness.

In most cases, returning to the participating prisons should be along the lines of the pilot workshops, ie one week (or so) residencies. It would also be useful to try out running once-weekly sessions over a longer timeframe to assess gamelan's longer-term impact on participants' behaviour and skills levels.

5.2 Working in other prisons

Given the results of the pilot, there should be no problem attracting the interest of other prisons. The following kinds of prisons would be the most appropriate to target:

- prisons in the same geographic area as the pilot prisons (eg Hull Prison, other London prisons) enabling Good Vibrations to tap into the Prison Service Area structure and also possible make cost-savings;
- other young offenders institutions, as they have more access to education funding (see Section 5.3 below); and
- women's prisons, to assess the workshops' effectiveness with female prisoners.

In addition, it would be interesting to run workshops in a secure hospital (eg Rampton) to assess their effectiveness with particularly challenged and vulnerable prisoners. This assessment would focus on the more therapeutic aspects of learning gamelan, rather than on strictly educational benefits.

As with the pilot participants (with the exception of secure hospitals), the intention would be to offer the workshops as part of prisons' education programme.

5.3 Funding Good Vibrations Phase 2

Being a pilot project, it was appropriate that this first phase was funded by Arts Council England and three charitable trusts rather than the prisons themselves. The expectation in the next phase will be that prisons will provide part-funding.

From conversations with prisons arts organisations who have successfully secured contracts with prisons, it seems unlikely that prisons will cover the whole cost of providing workshops. The OLSU's preferred model for funding of prisons arts projects is that prisons should at least part-fund projects, with the remaining funding coming from other sources (eg Arts Council England, charitable trusts).

Some prisons do make provision in their budgets for "buying in" arts workshops to help deliver educational programmes and meet targets. In particular, Young Offenders Institutions already have "curriculum enhancement" budgets as well as other budgets, such as Youth Justice Board education funding, which can be used for buying in arts projects. However, most prisons do not expect to pay for arts projects - but then these projects are not usually explicitly coupled to the prisons' delivery of basic and key skills. The expectation is that this situation will change over the next 12-18 months. Every prison has or shortly will have in post a new Head of Learning and Skills. Their responsibilities will include looking at new ways of engaging prisoners in learning, and involving the voluntary sector in delivering education. The OLSU's draft strategy on voluntary and community sector involvement, due to be approved in early 2004, recommends that grant making is devolved to Heads of Learning and Skills so they have budgets specifically for "curriculum enhancement". This would include buying in arts projects.

5.4 Costs of Good Vibrations Phase 2

Based on the pilot project costs, the cost of providing a week-long project is likely to be approximately £5000 - £6000. Assuming that the project returns to all five pilot prisons, plus a further three prisons, the total cost of Good Vibrations Phase 2 will be of the order of £40,000 - £48,000 during 2004/5.

5.5 Good Vibrations Phase 3

Assuming the Phase 2 is successful, Phase 3 should focus on expanding the workshops programme into other prisons, using the model of service provision developed during Phase 2. The possibility of buying a "portable gamelan" (a set of such instruments is currently being commissioned by the South Bank Centre) should be considered, as this will reduce the project's reliance on the availability of other organisations' gamelans. A portable gamelan would also enable the project to be much more flexible in terms of workshop formats, timings and venues.

The option of becoming accredited to deliver part of the Social and Life Skills programme (eg Group and Teamwork units) should be considered. This would certainly be attractive to prisons, as Good Vibrations would be able to assess participants for the purposes of obtaining qualifications, freeing up prison education staff from this task. However, this would be a major step for the project. Workshop leaders would need particular qualifications, the significant costs of assessment would have to be borne, and all the additional paperwork dealt with. Very few prison arts organisations have embarked down this road and the OLSU recognises the difficulties involved for arts organisations.

5.6 Structure and constitution of Good Vibrations

For the next phase at least, it seems most appropriate to keep Good Vibrations as a subsidiary project of the Firebird Trust. However, should the project become significantly larger, it may be worth considering floating off Good Vibrations as a separate charity.

Even during the pilot phase, Good Vibrations has inspired a separate initiative. Following the successful workshops at The Wolds, Hull Music Service returned to Hull Prison during October 2003 to run workshops with vulnerable offenders. Good Vibrations offered advice and support. This is a positive sign, and Good Vibrations should encourage other such off-shoots in the future, where quality control can be maintained. The idea of a Good Vibrations “franchise” should be considered, whereby other, interested organisations can deliver gamelan workshops in prisons themselves but are advised, co-ordinated and quality-controlled by the Good Vibrations project.

5.7 Summary of recommended way forward

The clear success of the pilot stage makes a strong case for continuing the Good Vibrations project, along the following lines:

Phase 2 (2004/05)

- Return to participating prisons and go to some new prisons (focusing on those in the same geographic areas, young offenders institutions and women’s prisons), delivering gamelan workshops as part of the prisons’ education programmes. The workshops will be offered to the prison education providers as an effective tool to meet targets for engaging previously disengaged prisoners in education and for improving inmates’ basic and key skills, including helping prisoners to get appropriate qualifications. The expectation is that prisons will part-fund the workshops themselves.
- Piloting gamelan workshops in secure hospitals to assess their therapeutic, rather than educational, benefits.

Phase 3 (2005/06)

- Using the model of service delivery developed during Phase 2, to deliver gamelan workshops in more prisons.
- Explore the possibility of the following: buying a “portable gamelan”; becoming accredited to deliver eg Group and Teamwork units in the Social and Life Skills Programme; becoming a stand-alone charity; and “franchising” Good Vibrations workshops to other suitable workshop providers.

Appendix 2: Break-down of basic/key skills into observable behaviours

Notes

1. This is mainly compiled from Qualifications and Curriculum Authority and Open College Network information, as their analysis of basic and key skills underpins prison education policy.
2. In addition, specific behaviours relevant to learning and playing gamelan are included.
3. The listed behaviours formed the basis of an important aspect of the project's monitoring. Prison education staff and workshop leaders were asked to observe and track these behaviours in the in-depth groups, focusing on a representative sample of the participants. Their observations were captured in the form of questionnaires and observation logs.
4. Some of the behaviours (eg "showing an understanding of the group's objectives if asked") were not relevant to the pilot workshops, but are listed anyway to give a full picture of the associated basic/key skill.
5. Inevitably, there is some overlap between basic/key skills, eg between listening ("respond appropriately") and teamworking ("follow instructions").

Basic/key skill and its main components	What kind of behaviour looking for?
<p>1. Communication and influencing skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use appropriate verbal communication with others • accept and respond to praise and constructive criticism • contribute effectively and confidently to group discussion • able to change one or more person's perspective as a result of using influencing skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use vocab and expressions suitable for the purpose (eg presenting an argument, exchanging info) • Adapt contributions to suit the situation (the amount said, tone of voice etc) • Make clear and relevant contributions to group discussion • Respond appropriately to others' views and ideas • Make openings: eg encourage others, support points made, ask follow-up questions • Move the discussion forward (eg summarising what has been said, developing points made by others, refocusing on the group's purpose) • Respond appropriately to constructive criticism • Offer constructive criticism to others • Use logical argument and presentation of supporting information to support own case/point of view • Anticipates needs of others and adapts influencing techniques to person/people dealing with
<p>2. Listening skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen carefully • Accurately comprehend • Respond appropriately to others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen without interrupting • Use appropriate body language to show listening • Make appropriate comments to encourage speaker • Seek clarification • Give relevant answers to speaker's questions • Respond appropriately, showing information has been understood (eg following instructions) • Adapt own behaviour to reflect revised understanding of situation • Playing in time together with others • Following drum cues (eg start, speed up, finish) • Playing correct notes

<p>3. Co-operative behaviour and team-working</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan work with others, identify objectives, clarify responsibilities and confirm working arrangements Work co-operatively with others towards achievement of objectives, organising tasks to meet one's responsibilities Exchange information on progress and agree improvements to help achieve objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show understanding of group objectives if asked Show understanding of own role and responsibilities if asked Show understanding of working arrangements if asked Ask questions to clarify objectives, own role/responsibilities, or working arrangements Make suggestions for how can help Carry out the tasks given Work safely and follows working methods given Ask for help from appropriate person when needed Offer support to others when appropriate (when asked to, or on own initiative) Report difficulties or problems Show willingness to help sort out a disagreement Show tolerance when others experience difficulties Show consideration of others' rights and feelings by adapting own behaviour Articulate what has gone well and what not so well Articulate what has been good/not so good about own contribution Listen and responds appropriately to progress reports from others Suggest ways of improving the way the group works Move around gamelan carefully Perform piece/s successfully as a group
<p>4. Problem-solving</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the problem and identify possible solutions Plan to try out an option to solve the problem Check if problem solved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ask appropriate questions to clarify problem and what will constitute success (success criteria) Offer possible solutions to problems Participate in discussion about possible solutions and which to try Participate in discussion about how to carry out the chosen option Draw on own previous relevant experience to inform discussion about possible solutions, tasks to carry out to solve problem etc Use agreed success criteria to work out if problem has been solved
<p>5. Concentration and application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to concentrate on task for significant period Able to sustain interest and effort over time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concentrate on the task at hand throughout session Attend all sessions Continue to make an effort even after disappointment or set-back Perform piece/s successfully
<p>6. Numeracy/counting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand numbers used in different ways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deal effectively with numbers presented in different ways Play at right time (punctuating instruments) Play correct notes
<p>7. Motor skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to perform controlled and co-ordinated movements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learns technique for particular physical activity Performs controlled and co-ordinated movements as required to undertake task Play and damp accurately

Appendix 3: Full details of workshop results

Results of taster sessions¹⁶

Outputs

Output 1: 120 people take part in taster sessions

Achieved – 124 took part.

Output 2: Participants learnt and played a piece

Partly achieved. In some cases groups managed only to learn, say, the first half of a piece, because of time limitations and/or groups being slow to learn.

Output 3: Participants swapped roles and instruments

Achieved, except at Glen Parva where the session was drastically shortened.

Output 4: Participants showed an understanding and acceptance of the “rules” and discipline of gamelan (eg not stepping over instruments, using the beaters and mallets appropriately)

Achieved by all groups.

Output 5: Participants experienced music of another culture

Achieved by all groups.

Outcomes

Outcome 1: to create an inclusive experience for participants

1a The proportion of the group with below Level 1 basic skills is the same or greater than in the prison as a whole

Achieved. Out of 124 inmates taking part in taster sessions, 29 of these (23%) were rated by prison education staff as being below Level 1 literacy and 33 (27%) below Level 1 numeracy. Only 3 of the 5 prisons could supply information about basic skills levels in the whole of their prison population, and in those three, 21% of prisoners were assessed at below Level 1 literacy and 23% at below Level 1 numeracy.

1b 30% or more of participants have never taken part in a musical activity before

¹⁶ Where applicable, monitoring data from HMP Nottingham are included as these workshops only lasted one day and so were essentially taster sessions.

Achieved. Out of 124 inmates taking part in taster sessions, pre-project questionnaires were collected from 90 of them. Of these, 45 (50%) said they had never taken part in any kind of music activity before.

1c 30% or more of participants have never taken part in prison education before

Achieved. 34 (38%) of those completing pre-project questionnaires said they had never taken part in prison education before.

1d 50% or more of participants volunteer to go on to in-depth workshops

Achieved. Out of 102 inmates taking part in tasters (excluding Nottingham), 72 (70%) volunteered to go on to do in-depth workshops.

Other evidence for Outcome 1

Prison education staff rated the taster sessions an average of 4.3 out of 5¹⁷ for giving participants of all abilities an equal chance to participate.

Outcome 2: to improve participants' self-realisation

2a If 70%+ participants feel a sense of achievement

Unclear if achieved or not. The decision was made not to prompt participants in their post-project feedback as it was felt it was important to get their spontaneous feedback rather than to steer them towards certain areas and risk encouraging certain responses. Therefore it is not possible to measure precisely against this sub-outcome. In addition, it proved very difficult to get post-project feedback questionnaires from inmates who had only done tasters, rather than from those who had gone on to do in-depth workshops. Only 21 feedback questionnaires were received from participants in tasters only, 17 of these from Nottingham. Feedback from participants about tasters, rather than in-depth workshops, is therefore very limited. 12 of the 21 taster-only feedback questionnaires (57%) spontaneously mentioned feeling better about themselves, feeling a sense of achievement or pride, or feeling more confident.

2b If 70%+ participants enjoy the session

2c If 70%+ participants respond positively to the music/sound

2d If 70%+ participants respond positively to the experience of learning a piece

All achieved. The low number of feedback questionnaires obtained from participants in tasters only, makes it difficult to measure these. However, the fact that 70% of taster participants volunteered to carry on, means these sub-

¹⁷ Prison education staff and workshop leaders were asked to score the workshops from 1-5 according to various criteria, with 1 = not at all effective and 5 = extremely effective.

outcomes should be assumed to be achieved. Furthermore, 14 of the 21 taster-only feedback questionnaires (67%) spontaneously mentioned enjoying themselves, enjoying the sound of the music, or enjoying playing the music.

Outcome 3: to achieve a positive appraisal by prison education staff and workshop leaders in relation to participants' basic and key skills

3a If prison education staff rate it a very good opportunity to deploy basic/key skills

Achieved. Prison education staff were asked to rate the tasters (1 – 5) according to how good an opportunity they were to deploy various basic skills, and to rate them as more, less or as effective as other short, one-off arts projects:

Basic/key skill	Average score	More/same/less effective than other short arts projects
Co-operative behaviour and teamworking	4.1	75% - more 25% - same
Communication skills	3.7	50% - more 25% - same 25% - less
Listening skills	3.6	75% - more 25% - same
Concentration	3.5	100% - same
Numeracy/counting	3.7	75% - more 25% - same
Motor skills	3.7	50% - more 50% - less

Other evidence for achievement of outcome 3

Prison education staff were also asked to rate the tasters according to other important criteria:

Other criteria	Average score	More/same/less effective than other short arts projects
How well the group worked together	3.7	Not asked
The general level of interest	3.8	25% - more 75% - same
Calming effect	3.5	50% - more 50% - same
Opportunity to exercise creative skills	3.8	25% - more 75% - same

Workshop leaders were asked to rate the taster sessions according to the following criteria:

	Average rating (1-5)
Group's positive attitude	4.3
Group working together	4.2
Sharing and helping each other	4.1
Interest in the music	4.0
Level of achievement	3.8
Calming effect	3.5
Quick to learn	2.9
Creative input	1.9

Results of in-depth sessions¹⁸

Outputs

Output 1: 60 people take part in in-depth sessions

Achieved - 64 people completed the in-depth workshops.

Output 2: Groups learn and perform to an audience several pieces to a high standard

Partly achieved. All groups managed this, except at Brixton. The Brixton group only learnt and performed one traditional piece, owing to the in-depth workshop lasting only 1.5 days in all.

Output 3: Participants learn in more details about eg drumming, singing parts (longer residencies only)

Achieved. All groups managed this, except for Brixton, which was a short residency of 2.5 days in total.

Output 4: Participants successfully listen to and follow more sophisticated cues, and give cues to others

Achieved with all groups.

Output 5: Participants take up opportunities for improvisation and improvise "appropriately" ie within the limits given

Achieved with all groups.

¹⁸ Monitoring data from the Nottingham sessions are not included, as these were one-day workshops and so essentially taster sessions rather than in-depth.

Output 6: Participants engage in group problem-solving and decision-making

Achieved with all groups.

Output 7: Participants have the opportunity to give constructive feedback and to receive constructive criticism

Achieved with all groups.

Output 8: Participants overcome personal differences to work successfully as a team

Unclear if achieved. This output was achieved with all groups except at the Wolds, where it is unclear whether this was achieved or not, as no personal differences were evident.

Output 9: Participants have opportunities to take responsibility for the success of the group (eg offering to help a new member of the group to catch up)

Achieved with all groups.

Output 10: Participants create a group composition, drawing on what they have learnt and their own responses to the gamelan (longer residencies only)

Achieved with all groups, including Brixton.

Output 11: Participants develop their understanding of the discipline and underlying values of gamelan, such as behaving respectfully towards other members of the group

Achieved with all groups.

Output 12: Participants show a sustained commitment to attending sessions (as far as realities of prison life permit)

Achieved with all groups.

Outcomes

Outcome 1: to create an inclusive experience for participants

1a Participants reflect the spread of educational background and musical experience of participants in taster sessions

Achieved. Out of 72 participants signing up for in-depth workshops after having done taster sessions, 26 (36%) were rated by prison education staff as being below Level 1 literacy and 30 (42%) below Level 1 numeracy. This compares with 24% (24 out of the 102, excluding Nottingham) and 29% (30 out of the 102) of taster participants respectively. We obtained feedback questionnaires from 53 in-depth participants, of whom 24 (45%) said they had never taken part in any musical activity before (compared with 49% of non-Nottingham taster participants).

2b No participants drop out (other than for reasons beyond their control eg transfer)

Not achieved. 72 signed up to do in-depth workshops, and 64 completed them (attending all or high proportion of sessions), ie eight dropped out. One dropped out for reasons beyond his control. The others dropped out for a variety of reasons: mental health/drugs problems (1), unable to sustain commitment (1), decided it wasn't for them/lack of interest (4), unknown (1).

Other evidence for Outcome 1

Prison education staff gave the in-depth sessions an average of 4.8 out of 5 for their effectiveness in giving everyone, regardless of abilities, an equal chance to participate. 50% of them rated the sessions as more effective in this than other, similar-length arts projects, and 50% rated them as equally effective. Other prison staff attending sessions (eg custody officers) gave the in-depth sessions 5 out of 5 for this measure.

Outcome 2: to improve participants' self-realisation

2a 80%+ participants experience an increase in self-esteem

2b 80%+ participants feel a sense of achievement

Both achieved. As mentioned before, it was decided not to prompt participants to give specific responses, but to gather their spontaneous reactions. Therefore it is not possible to measure precisely these sub-outcomes. However, of the 53 feedback questionnaires received from in-depth participants, 47 (89%) reported feeling better about themselves, feeling a sense of achievement or pride, or increased self-confidence.

In addition, 32 (60%) of the respondents spontaneously mentioned feeling calm, relaxed or peaceful in the workshops.

2c 80%+ participants are keen to do more gamelan

Achieved. 48 (91%) of the 53 respondents said they were keen to do more gamelan.

Outcome 3: to achieve a positive appraisal by prison education staff and workshop leaders in relation to participants self-esteem and basic and key skills

3a Participants' self-confidence increases

Achieved. On a scale of 1-5 prison education staff rated the in-depth sessions an average of 4.9 for their effect on participants' self-confidence. 100% rated them as more effective in this than other, similar-length arts projects. Other prison staff attending sessions (eg prison custody officers) gave an average of 4.6 out of 5 for their effect on participants' self-confidence. The prison education staff noted an average improvement in case studies' self-confidence of 2.7 out of 3¹⁹.

3b The sessions have a calming effect on participants

Achieved. On a scale of 1-5, prison education staff rated the in-depth sessions an average of 4.4 for their calming effect. 50% of them rated the sessions as more effective in this than other, similar-length arts projects. Other prison staff attending sessions (eg prison custody officers) gave an average of 4.8 out of 5 for their calming effect.

3c 70%+ participants improve their basic/key skills to some extent

3d The sessions' effectiveness in terms of improving basic and key skills are favourably compared with other, similar-length arts projects

Both achieved. Prison education staff were asked to rate the in-depth sessions (1 – 5) according to how effective they were at helping people develop various basic and key skills, and to rate them as more, less or as effective as other similar-length arts projects:

Basic/key skill	Average score	More/same/less effective than other short arts projects
Co-operative behaviour and teamworking	5.0	100% - more
Communication skills	4.6	50% - more 50% - same
Listening skills	4.6	100% - more
Concentration	4.6	100% - same
Numeracy/counting	4.2	100% - more
Motor skills	4.4	50% - more 50% - less

¹⁹ For each case study, the level of improvement seen in each basic and key skill was scored as 0 (no improvement), 1 (tiny improvement), 2 (moderate improvement), 3 (impressive improvement) or X (not observed). A score of 2 or 3 is counted as a significant improvement.

In addition, prison education staff and workshop leaders were asked to rate the improvements they saw in the case studies:

Basic/key skill	Percentage of case studies where significant ²⁰ improvement seen by prison education staff	Percentage of case studies where significant improvement seen by workshop leaders	Average improvement seen by prison education staff (0-3)
Communication	86	92	2.3
Listening	100	83	2.4
Teamworking	71	75	1.9
Problem-solving	40	75	1.4
Numeracy	100	58	2.0
Motor skills	100	58	2.0
Concentration/application	71	80	1.9

There was no significant difference in improvement ratings between those case studies assessed with higher levels of literacy/numeracy and those with assessed at lower levels.

The table shows that there were some significant differences between the proportion of case studies judged by the prison education staff to have improved significantly and the proportion judged by workshop leaders. This is likely to be owing to the workshop leaders having no idea of the background and education levels of the case studies, whereas prison education staff usually knew the case studies and therefore could put their behaviour and performance in context.

3e 70%+ participants develop their understanding of Indonesian culture and society

Achieved. Pre-project focus groups demonstrated almost no knowledge of Indonesian culture or society, aside from some men having an awareness of Indonesia as a predominantly Muslim society. Post-project focus groups all demonstrated some understanding of the different religions in Indonesia, the predominant cultural values, and the role of music in Indonesian society.

The men were clearly interested in learning about Indonesian culture and values: workshop leaders noted the high level of interest shown in the photographs, books, shadow puppets and masks that they brought in and at how keen men were to discuss Indonesian/Javanese values.

²⁰ ie improvement scores of 2 or 3 out of 3.

3f Prison education staff rate it a good opportunity to exercise imaginative/creative skills

Achieved. Prison education staff gave the sessions 5 out of 5 (ie excellent) for their worth in helping prisoners exercise their creative skills, with 100% rating them as more effective in this than other, similar-length arts projects.

3g Some of the participants subsequently improve their performance in prison education and/or behaviour

3h Some of the participants subsequently sign up for prison education

Both achieved. Even in the short timeframe allowed for feedback, two prison education managers reported improved behaviour or performance in education. Examples include being enlivened by the project, setting up discussion groups to discuss and review the project in-depth, and increased use of the library. One prison (The Wolds) reported some participants signing up for education activities.

3i Prison education staff are keen to do more gamelan workshops

3j Prison education staff see gamelan as useful in helping their prison achieve important education targets

Both achieved. All five of the project's prison contacts want to do more gamelan workshops. It is worth noting that all said that the project met all of their expectations. The three contacts who are education managers all believe that gamelan workshops could help their prisons achieve education targets, and one of the other two contacts also believes this.

3k Workshop leaders see the project as a good way of developing their skills and/or increasing their understanding of gamelan in a community setting

Achieved. Workshop leaders rated the project an average of 4.5 out of 5 (very good/excellent) for developing their teaching skills. They gave the project an average of 3.9 out of 5 (good/very good) for increasing their understanding of gamelan in a community setting.

Appendix 4: Media coverage of the project

- Piece on BBC Radio 3 'Music Matters', 21 September 2003, including extracts from HMP Brixton play-through and interviews with participants
- Live interview with Director of HMP Wolds, BBC Radio Humberside, 19 September 2003
- Interview on Ridings FM, 8 July 2003
- Article in Leicester Mercury, 9 July 2003

Selected bibliography

- Home Office Standing Committee for Arts in Prisons: *Including the Arts: the creative arts – the route to basic and key skills in prisons*, Bar None Books (2001)
- Houston, Neil with Ruffer, David: *Teaching and learning gamelan*, Seleh Notes (UK Gamelan Network magazine) (Vol. 8 No. 3, June 2001)
- Prisoners Learning and Skills Unit/National Open College Network: *Performing Arts Programme*, NOCN (2003)
- Prisoners Learning and Skills Unit/National Open College Network: *Social and Life Skills Programme*, NOCN (2003)
- Qualifications & Curriculum Authority: *Key Skills guidance handbook*, QCA (2002)
- Qualifications & Curriculum Authority: *Guidance on the wider key skills*, QCA (2001)
- Qualifications & Curriculum Authority: *National standards for adult literacy and numeracy*, QCA (2000)
- Rugg, Laurence: *Reaching the parts other experiences cannot reach*, Seleh Notes (UK Gamelan Network magazine) (Vol. 9 No. 3, June 2002)
- Sorrell, Neil: *A Guide to the Gamelan*, Society for Asian Music (2nd ed. 2000)
- Unit for the Arts and Offenders: *Handbook for Artists: working with the arts in criminal justice settings*, Unit for the Arts and Offenders Publications