

This is a repository copy of How 'The Daily MileTM' works in practice: A process evaluation in a UK primary school..

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/156711/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Harris, J, Milnes, LJ orcid.org/0000-0002-1110-6527 and Mountain, G (2020) How 'The Daily Mile™' works in practice: A process evaluation in a UK primary school. Journal of Child Health Care, 24 (4). pp. 544-559. ISSN 1367-4935

https://doi.org/10.1177/1367493519880049

© The Author(s) 2019. This is an author produced version of a paper published in Journal of Child Health Care. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Table 1 Eligibility criteria

	Phase one	Phase two
Inclusion	Teaching staff and students from	Maximum variance sample of 4-6 students from phase one selected according to
criteria:	key stage one and one key stage	behaviour characteristics (competition, interaction with peers, interaction with teachers,
	two year groups attending the	isolation, anxious) and physical activity level (lying, sitting, standing, walking, vigorous)
	school during academic year	noted in structured observation.
	2016/2017	• Parents of student sub-sample (8-10 participants)
		• Teaching staff implementing the intervention in phase one, senior leadership within the
		school and current school governors (8-10 participants)
Exclusion	Any person advised against	Teaching staff or students not participating in phase one or parents of said students. School
criteria:	participating by a doctor or	governors not representing in phase one
	qualified health professional. An	
	ongoing consent process was	
	applied to all participants.	

Table 2 Participant characteristics and dose received in phase one

Key	Year	Total	No. of	Boys	Girls	Teachers	TAs	Mean	Mean (SD)	Proportion	Mean (SD)	Proportion
Stage	group	students,	classes					Age	no. of	of class	no. of	of class
		n							students	participating	students	completing
									participating	(%)	completing	15 mins
									each day		15 mins	(%)
											each day	
KS1	Yr 2	42	2	26	16	1 FT	0	6yrs,	20 (0.912)	95.8	20 (0.981)	95.7
			(21 in			2 PT		9mths				
			each)									
1/00	37.4	22	1	177	1.6	1 171	2.575	0	21 (1 575)	04.6	21 (1.010)	02.7
KS2	Yr4	33	1	17	16	1 FT	2 FT	8yrs,	31 (1.575)	94.6	31 (1.910)	92.7
								10mths				

FT = full-time, PT = part-time, TA = Teaching assistants, SD = standard deviation, Means are rounded to nearest whole number

Table 3 Participant characteristics phase two

Focus group /	No. of	Relevant	Duration of
interview	participants,	characteristics	discussion
	n		
Key stage one	5	Boys	28 mins 9 secs
focus group		Mean age 6yrs 11mths	
Key stage two	6	4 girls, 2 boys	18 mins 23 secs
focus group		Mean age 9yrs 1mth	
Teacher focus	4	All female varying	39 mins 54 secs
group		grades and year groups	
Parent focus	2	Mothers of KS1	26mins 14secs
group		participants (1 parent-	
		governor)	
Parent-governor	1	Parent governor and	16 mins 26 secs
interview		mother of KS2	
		participant	