

Annex G

A full account of SPI-B input on the scenarios:

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
What networks or contacts between individuals does the scenario increase / limit vs. keeping the schools shut as is the policy of today?	No change.	Will increase interactions from current baseline: among vulnerable SES students (among whom BAME & low SES individual will be over-represented); among children of keyworkers (who are more likely to be exposed to infection); and between these two groups.	Will increase interactions from current baseline (in order of magnitude): among class members; among year group members; and between year group members. This will be limited to specific year groups.	Will increase interactions from current baseline among all individuals unless barriers to mixing between classes and year-groups is instituted.	Will increase interactions from current baseline (in order of magnitude): among class members; among year group members; and between year group members. Not limited to specific year groups.	Will increase interactions from current baseline (in order of magnitude): among class members; among year group members. <u>Not</u> limited to specific year groups.	It depends how it is done. If each class is split in half this would increase interactions among class members from current baseline but less than would be the case if instead the year group was split in half but with students remaining in their existing class groups. Mixing between classes and year groups would also increase from current baseline and this would be slightly greater if each class were split in half compared to the year group being split in half but classes retained.	It depends how it is done. If each class is split in half this would increase interactions among class members from current baseline but less than would be the case if instead the year group was split in half but with students remaining in their existing class groups. Mixing between classes and year groups would also increase from current baseline and	Will increase interactions from current baseline (in order of magnitude): among class members; among year group members; and between year group members. Not limited to specific year groups.

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
								this would be slightly greater if each class were split in half compared to the year group being split in half but classes retained.	
What role might extending / changing outdoor break time play in limiting transmission?	No change.	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is more likely in secondary than primary or early year settings. Schools caring for vulnerable children and children of key workers may value this as simply reducing total time in school may not be an option because of the need to care for these children for a certain period.	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is more likely in secondary than primary schools. However, schools may simply prefer to reduce total time in school and remove or reduce break times.	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is less likely in early year settings. Early years settings may value this as simply reducing total time in care may not be an option for those settings providing a paid for	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is less likely in primary schools. However, schools may simply prefer to reduce total time in school and remove or reduce break times.	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is more likely in secondary schools. However, schools may simply prefer to reduce total time in school and remove or reduce break times.	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is more likely in secondary schools. However, schools may simply prefer to reduce total time in school and remove or reduce break times. Schools will also need to consider alteration of environments to disrupt routine activities that	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is more likely in secondary schools. However, schools may not have this option if children are only attending for the morning or afternoon and	Increasing the proportion of time outside could reduce transmission assuming it allowed more distancing which is more likely in secondary than primary schools. However, schools may simply prefer to reduce total time in school and remove or reduce break times.

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
				service to parents.			would lead to higher transmission risk, using environmental redesign alongside staff patrols. This includes both interstitial spaces and activity areas ¹ .	therefore need to maximise contact time with teachers. Schools will also need to consider alteration of environment s to disrupt routine activities that would lead to higher transmission risk, using environmental redesign alongside staff patrols. This includes both interstitial spaces and activity areas ² .	Schools will also need to consider alteration of environment s to disrupt routine activities that would lead to higher transmission risk, using environmental redesign alongside staff patrols. This includes both interstitial spaces and activity areas ³ .
What messaging to pupils, parents or teachers should be prioritised in each scenario to reduce transmission – e.g. washing hands (hygiene) vs. reducing contact	No change.	Messaging to teachers could encourage limiting interactions between year groups (which may be being mixed due to low attendance figures).	Messaging to teachers could encourage stopping whole-school gatherings. Younger children	Messaging to staff could encourage limiting interactions between children of	Messaging to teachers could encourage stopping whole-school gatherings and interactions	Messaging to teachers could encourage stopping whole-school gatherings and interactions between students in	Messaging to teachers could encourage minimising interaction between students in different classes	Messaging to teachers could encourage stopping whole-school gatherings.	Messaging to teachers could encourage stopping whole-school gatherings

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		Messaging should not encourage distancing between vulnerable and key-worker children as this would be stigmatising and divisive. Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.	will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.	different ages which would normally be mixing. Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact.	between students in different classes or year groups. Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.	different classes or year groups. Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.	or year groups. Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.	Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.	and interactions between students in different classes or year groups. Younger children will require more supervision to promote hand hygiene and reduce face touching and physical contact. Older children more likely to adhere to advice regarding hand hygiene, face touching and physical contact.
How do pupil age and other characteristics impact the understanding of, and compliance with, social distancing measures?	No change.	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of limited self-regulation. But older children may also not adhere if they are not	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of limited self-regulation. But older children	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of	Older children may also not adhere if they are not sufficiently informed, motivated or enabled to do so. Adherence might be	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of limited self-regulation. But older children may also not adhere if	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of limited self-	Younger children will generally require more support to adhere because of limited self-

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		sufficiently informed, motivated or enabled to do so. Adherence might be lower where student needs and wants are not sufficiently considered or where students feel alienated by top-down school regulations. Children with SEND might find expectation around social distancing very difficult to follow.	may also not adhere if they are not sufficiently informed, motivated or enabled to do so. Adherence might be lower where student needs and wants are not sufficiently considered or where students feel alienated by top-down school regulations.	limited self-regulation. School-based implementation for hygiene and social distancing will need to be commissioned and implemented, drawing on multiple levels and domains ⁴ .	limited self-regulation. School-based implementation for hygiene and social distancing will need to be commissioned and implemented, drawing on multiple levels and domains ⁵ .	lower where student needs and wants are not sufficiently considered or where students feel alienated by top-down school regulations.	they are not sufficiently informed, motivated or enabled to do so. Adherence might be lower where student needs and wants are not sufficiently considered or where students feel alienated by top-down school regulations.	regulation. But older children may also not adhere if they are not sufficiently informed, motivated or enabled to do so. Adherence might be lower where student needs and wants are not sufficiently considered or where students feel alienated by top-down school regulations.	regulation. But older children may also not adhere if they are not sufficiently informed, motivated or enabled to do so. Adherence might be lower where student needs and wants are not sufficiently considered or where students feel alienated by top-down school regulations.
Will parents send their children in if schools open? If not why not? Will children and young people attend? What conditions need to be in place?	No change.	Parents of vulnerable children and those who are key workers have so far largely chosen not to send their children to schools that are open for their children. This may change if the perception is that risk of transmission is	Parents may send their children to school if the perception is that risk is lower and if they believe that their children need to attend school to prepare them for	Parents may take up early years provision to return to work if the perception is that risk is lower. Parents who need to remain home	Parents may send their children to primary school so that they can return to work if the perception is that risk is lower. Parents may be more	Parents may be more likely to be willing to send older children to school because of their perceived lower vulnerability and because of the perceived importance of preparing for	Parents may send their children to school if the perception is that risk is lower. This may be supported if attendance achieves a tipping point of becoming normative. However, parents	Parents may send their children to school if the perception is that risk is lower. This may be supported if attendance achieves a	Many parents and students may decide against school attendance until this is normal and normative. This might be

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		<p>lower. However parents may continue to keep their children at home if sending them to school is perceived as non-normative or if they perceive that children may learn better and be better cared for at home rather than in a partially open school. Older students may themselves choose not to attend schools if this is perceived as non-normative or stigmatising in their peer group.-</p> <p>Messaging around 'vulnerability' is key to avoid stigmatisation and labelling and precluding appropriate access to schools. Perceived vulnerability is a barrier to successful engagement with services especially when this requires adherence to recommendations⁶. As reiterated in prior SPI-B guidance, relying on</p>	<p>the following academic year. This may be supported if attendance achieves a tipping point of becoming normative for these year groups. However, parents may not see preparation for tests or exams as a priority or may believe that their children will be able to prepare adequately at home. Parents who need to remain home to care for their children in different age groups may decide to continue to care for their children in the selected age groups rather than send them to school.</p>	<p>to care for their children in different age groups may decide to continue to care for their children in the selected age groups rather than send them to school.</p>	<p>reluctant to send in younger than older children because of perceived vulnerability. Willingness to send children to school may vary by SES for example according to whether parents can instead work from home.</p>	<p>exams. Willingness to send children to school / for older students to attend may vary by SES for example according to whether parents can instead work from home or according to the importance given to exams.</p>	<p>of younger children may not be able to align their working time with the rota system or may be sceptical of the limited school offer and so may decide to stay at home and keep their children at home. This might be particularly so where parents have different children with different rotas. Older students may themselves decide not to attend if they do not perceive the rota system as being a return to normal requiring their attendance or serving their need.</p>	<p>tipping point of becoming normative. However, particularly with this very limited rota parents may not be able to align their working time with the rota system or may be sceptical of the limited school offer and so may decide to stay at home and keep their children at home. Older students may similarly decide not to attend if they do not perceive the rota system as being a return to normal requiring their</p>	<p>stratified by low SES for example based on attitude to education or conversely by parental ability to work from home and therefore care for their children.</p>

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		broad categories is to be disfavoured in place of specific, directive communication.	Older students may vary in their attitude to returning to prepare for public exams based on their views about how important these are to their futures, which may vary by SES, gender and ethnicity.					attendance or serving their need.	
Is the implementation or likely impact on transmission of this model predicated on or potentially affecting other aspects of policy?	No change.	There have been suggestions that vulnerable children should be compelled to attend schools. This would be unwise firstly because these are a diverse group only some of whom may be at increased risk of harm at home, and secondly because in all but a minority of cases the harms in terms of alienating parents and stigmatising children would outweigh any benefits. SEND children could need intimate/close care from					This option is more likely to be associated with increased attendance if employers give staff flexibility in shift working / home working so that this aids parents in returning to work. If it does not enable more parents to work then this may tip the balance so that they keep their children at home.	This option is more difficult to align with parental work patterns and so may have lower attendance.	

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		teachers/staff which makes social distancing difficult or impossible.							
* How does the status of other household members interplay with a child's susceptibility of the virus?		Households with BAME & adolescent or young adult members may create greater susceptibility among children to the virus for different reasons. BAME because of the greater prevalence of frontline medical and care work. Adolescents because they may not comply to regulations on social distancing and hygiene due to distrust of authority. Young adult family members will be likely to be working in frontline logistics sectors such as warehousing and be exposed more in their workplaces to risky environments.							
* How does a school's structure interplay with levels of mixing? i.e. modern schools vs. older buildings									
* Is there a particular profile of teachers we should be looking to deliver this policy i.e. younger/ single occupancy household	No change.	If not all staff are required to attend school then it would	If not all staff are required to attend school	All staff would be required as the setting	All teachers would be required as	All teachers would be required as the	If not all staff are required to attend school then it	If not all staff are required to attend	All teachers would be required as

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		<p>be possible to prioritise younger teachers' attendance as long as this was negotiated rather than imposed. Other staff could remain at home and facilitate distance learning.</p> <p>If SEND children are to be included here then we have a smaller population of skilled and experienced teachers to draw upon, so it may be difficult to prioritise a certain age profile of staff.</p>	<p>then it would be possible to prioritise younger teachers' attendance as long as this was negotiated rather than imposed. Other staff could remain at home and facilitate distance learning.</p>	would be fully open.	the school would be fully open.	school would be fully open.	would be possible to prioritise younger teachers' attendance as long as this was negotiated rather than imposed. Other staff could remain at home and facilitate distance learning.	school then it would be possible to prioritise younger teachers' attendance as long as this was negotiated rather than imposed. Other staff could remain at home and facilitate distance learning.	the school would be fully open.
* How can testing be maximised each scenario to understand the intervention effectiveness? (assumed to be testing linked with school settings).		For this and for other partial opening strategies—drawing lessons from school-based health programmes, a successful testing programme will require strong intersectoral partnership, local champions and coordinators of testing, and clear school policies', as well as a credible test							

	Stay Shut	More vulnerable children and key worker kids	Transition years 5/6/10/12, this side of summer holiday	Early year settings	All primary	All secondary	Half time A (Full class, 2 weeks on/ 2 off – full attendance)	Half time B – Half classes, alternating two weeks	Fully reopen
		and appropriate beliefs about the severity of coronavirus even in school populations ⁸ .							

**Wider contextual questions to consider around each scenario, please answer where possible*

References:

- Hughes H., Franz J., Willis J., Bland D., Rolfe A. (2019) High School Spaces and Student Transitioning: Designing for Student Wellbeing. In: Hughes H., Franz J., Willis J. (eds) School Spaces for Student Wellbeing and Learning. Springer, Singapore, 91-119. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6092-3_6
- Cabinet Office (2020): Guidance for schools, childcare providers, colleges and local authorities in England on maintaining educational provision. Published 19th March 2020. Downloaded from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision-on-29th-April-2020>.
- Kang, G. J., Culp, R. K., and Abbas, M. K. (2017). Facilitators and barriers of parental attitudes and beliefs toward school-located influenza vaccination in the United States: Systematic review. *Vaccine*, 35(16), 1987-1995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.03.014>.
- Leung, E., Wanner, K.J., Senter, L., Brown, A., and Middleton, D. (2020). What will it take? Using an implementation research framework to identify facilitators and barriers in implementing a school-based referral system for sexual health services. *BMC Health Serv Res* **20**, 292- 303. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05147-z>
- SAGE: Principles for the design of behavioural and social interventions (21st April 2020)
- SAGE Subgroup: The role of children in transmission (SAGE 26: 16th April 2020)
- SPI-B: Theory and evidence base for initial SPI-B recommendations for phased changes in activity restrictions (24th April 2020)
- Staniford, L.J., Schmidtke, K.A. A systematic review of hand-hygiene and environmental-disinfection interventions in settings with children. *BMC Public Health* **20**, 195 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8301-0>
- Tanner, E. and Su, L. (2019). Reducing perceived vulnerability to increase utilization of nonprofit services. *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 344-355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-12-2017-0434>
- Department for Education (2020) , [Coronavirus \(COVID-19\): attendance in education and early years settings](#).