education and skills
creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence

Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative: Final Report

Colleen Cummings * Alan Dyson # , Daniel Muijs # , Ivy Papps ¶ , Diana Pearson # , Carlo Raffo # , Lucy Tiplady * and Liz Todd * with Deanne Crowther

*School of Education, Language and Communication Sciences, University of Newcastle

Education in Urban Contexts Group, School of Education, University of Manchester

¶ Tecis Ltd

Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative: Final Report

*Colleen Cummings[*] Alan Dyson[#], Daniel Muijs[#], Ivy Papps[¶],
Diana Pearson[#], Carlo Raffo[#], Lucy Tiplady[*] and Liz Todd[*]
with Deanne Crowther*

*[*]School of Education, Language and Communication Sciences,
University of Newcastle*

*[#] Education in Urban Contexts Group, School of Education,
University of Manchester*

[¶] Tecis Ltd

Acknowledgements

Contents

Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative: Final Report

Executive summary

1. This report presents the findings from the final year of the three-year evaluation of the national full service extended schools (FSES) initiative. It draws on these and on the work of the previous two years to reach overall conclusions about the initiative. Earlier findings are available on-line at: www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR680.pdf (year 1), and www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR795.pdf (year 2).

2. The FSES initiative was launched by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in 2003. The original aim was to support the development in every local authority (LA) area of one or more schools which provide a comprehensive range of services, including access to health services, adult learning and community activities as well as study support and 8am to 6pm childcare. Local FSES projects received funding from DfES, and came on stream in each of three successive years. Most FSES served areas of disadvantage and in the first year were located in Behaviour Improvement Programme areas. By the end of the initiative, 138 schools were involved, together with a further 10 funded through the London Challenge.

3. The evaluation aimed to identify:
   - the activities undertaken by participating schools;
   - the processes underpinning these activities;
   - the impacts of activities; and
   - the outcomes of activities.

   A multi-strand approach was adopted over the three years of the initiative. The main components of this were: detailed case studies of 17 projects; a statistical analysis of the National Pupil Database (NPD); a cost benefit analysis of FSES provision in a sample of 10 projects; brief case studies of comparator schools not participating in the FSES initiative; a questionnaire survey of pupils, parents and staff in case study FSESs and their comparators, repeated across two years; and a final questionnaire survey of all FSESs.

4. FSESs were characterised by considerable diversity as schools charted their own directions in response to what they understood to be the situations they faced. Beneath this diversity, however, were some common features:
   - a focus on overcoming pupils' 'barriers to learning';

- a recognition that these were related to what were seen as family and community problems;
- the development of additional provision to overcome these barriers;
- the deployment of additional staff and the formation of partnerships to deliver this provision;
- the manipulation of multiple funding streams to support provision; and
- a tendency for schools to go their own way in pursuing their aims.

5. The FSES initiative was broadly welcomed by schools. Issues of sustainability and the difficulties of partnership working, which had figured prominently in earlier stages of the evaluation, remained as potentially problematic in the third year. However, enough FSESs had found ways round these difficulties to suggest that they were far from insuperable. Indeed, there were promising developments in terms of the stable and productive partnership arrangements that were now emerging, the beginnings of genuine pupil and community involvement, and the development of some very interesting strategic initiatives at local level.

6. The FSES approach was impacting positively on pupils' attainments in case study schools. The analysis of NPD and responses to the questionnaire survey indicated that similar impacts were happening in other FSESs. These impacts were clearest in the case of pupils facing difficulties. FSESs were having a range of other impacts on outcomes for pupils, including engagement with learning, family stability and enhanced life chances. In the case of children facing difficulties, these outcomes were often closely related.

7. FSESs were also generating positive outcomes for families and local people particularly where they were facing difficulties. Impacts were less strong in relation to local communities as a whole, but positive outcomes for some groups and individuals could nonetheless be identified. Though large-scale effects were not yet evident, they are not out of the question in the longer term if FSESs have a stable and supportive local context within which to work.

8. The cost benefit analysis suggested that both the costs and benefits of FSES approaches were high. However, since benefits balanced or outweighed costs, and since they accrued particularly to children and families facing the greatest difficulties, FSES approaches represented a good investment.

9. The FSES approach was commonly associated with improved school performance, better relations with local communities and an enhanced standing of the school in its area, though it is likely that other factors were also contributing to these outcomes. Whilst an FSES approach did not 'bomb-proof' schools against other problems, there was no indication that it damaged their performance or reputation. Positive outcomes for pupils, however, did not always translate directly into school performance data, and there was in any case a range of other outcomes that schools were aiming to effect.

10. Many schools that are not designated as FSESs nonetheless offer some aspects of FSES provision, and it seems likely that there are positive outcomes from such provision. However, there were additional outcomes in the case study schools, associated with different aspects of provision coming together into a more holistic FSES 'approach'.

11. Perhaps not surprisingly, the development of FSES approaches tended rely heavily on the dynamism of head teachers and other school leaders, and to be conceptualised in terms of what they saw as priorities. Often, school leaders took a view as to what lay in the best interests of pupils, families and communities, and then energetically sought the funding and partnerships that would enable them to make appropriate provision. However, there were examples which point to a way of leading the FSES approach that relies less on this kind of entrepreneurship at the school level. In these cases, the initiative of individual schools was supplemented by a clearer sense of area strategy, a greater involvement of partners from beyond the school (including local people) in decision-making, and a more stable resourcing regime.

12. The experience of FSESs suggests that attempts to develop similar approaches in future might be helped by:
    • policy coherence and stability, enabling schools to develop over longer periods of time;
    • clear conceptualisations emerging from a debate about the nature and purposes of FSES approaches; and
    • strategic frameworks developed at local level in order to link the efforts of schools with those of other organisations and agencies tackling similar issues.

13. Although FSESs are different in important respects from extended schools, they offer some lessons for the national roll out. In particular, the experience of FSESs:
    • indicates the potential of extended approaches for making a difference to children, families and communities.
    • suggests that this potential might be realised best within the context of local strategic approaches;
    • underlines the importance of identifying coordinators at school level, of building the commitment of school leaders, and – in view of the time taken to establish partnerships and a stable base of provision – of maintaining support over the medium as well as the short term;
    • suggests that leaders of extended approaches at school and local level should be given opportunities to think through some fundamental issues as well as more practical concerns – how extended provision relates to the core business of the school, what the aims and purposes of extended approaches should be, and who should be involved in making decisions about this.

List of acronyms

AD(H)D	Attention Deficit (Hyperactivity) Disorder
ASDAN	Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network
BEST	Behaviour and Education Support Team
BIP	Behaviour Improvement Programme
BSF	Building Schools for the Future
CAMHS	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service
CBA	Cost benefit analysis
CiN	Children in need
CLAIT	Computer Literacy and Information Technology
CLC	Community (or City) Learning Centre
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
EiC	Excellence in Cities
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ESF	European Social Fund
FE	Further Education
FSM	Free school meals
FSES	Full service extended school
IT/ICT	Information (and Communications) Technology
LA	Local Authority
LEA	Local Education Authority
LFS	Labour Force Survey
LLL	Lifelong learning
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
NC	National Curriculum
NCS	New Community Schools
NEET	Not in employment, education or training
NOF	New Opportunities Fund
NPD	National Pupil Database
NPV	Net Present Value
NRF	Neighbourhood Renewal Fund
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education
OoSH	Out of School Hours
PAYP	Positive Activities for Young People
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PV	Present Value
QALY	Quality Adjusted Life Year
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SRB	Single Regeneration Budget

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the national full service extended schools (FSES) initiative. It follows an earlier report dealing with the first year of the initiative (Cummings et al., 2005), and a set of thematic papers produced after the second year of the initiative (Cummings et al., 2006). This is the final report in the series, and draws upon the earlier findings together with new data and analyses to present a summative overview of the initiative as a whole.

The FSES initiative was launched by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in 2003. The original aim was to support the development in every local authority (LA) area of one or more schools which provide a comprehensive range of services, including access to health services, adult learning and community activities as well as study support and 8am to 6pm childcare. Local FSES projects received funding from DfES, and came on stream in each of three successive years.

In the first year, 61 projects were funded at between £93,000 and £162,000 per annum, decreasing annually for a further two years. In addition projects received £26,000 per year to develop and support childcare provision. Most projects comprised individual primary, secondary or special FSESs, though some included more than one school as part of a formal joint project. Many projects involved other schools on a more informal basis. All were located in, or served pupils from, Behaviour Improvement Programme (BIP) areas. Since these areas were selected because of their relatively high street crime levels, the first wave of FSESs overwhelmingly served areas of social and economic disadvantage. In the second year, these were joined by 45 projects – 25 in BIP areas and 20 from non-BIP areas. These projects were funded at a similar level to those in year 1. They were more likely to include clusters of schools than was the case in year 1, and not all of them were located in those most disadvantaged areas in national terms, though they might well be serving areas that were disadvantaged in relative local terms. By the third year of the initiative, 138 schools were involved. A further 10 projects were funded through the London Challenge. Of the participating schools, 99 were secondary phase, 46 were primary, 2 were special schools, and 1 was an all-age school.

As our year 1 report (Cummings et al., 2005) indicated, the FSES initiative builds on a long history of community-oriented schooling in England, and in other parts of the UK. This can be traced back at least to the establishment of the Cambridgeshire Village Colleges in the 1920s, and from there through to the community schools of the 1970s and beyond. Even though these developments depended on local rather than national initiatives, there were, by the end of the 1990s, many schools offering what we would now recognise as extended activities (Ball, 1998, Wilkin et al., 2003). The immediate antecedents of the FSES initiative, however, lie in the Schools Plus report (DfEE, 1999),

produced as part of the development of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000, 2001) and the extended school demonstration and pathfinder projects (Cummings et al., 2004, Dyson et al., 2002) which followed. The former in particular argued that schools could make an important contribution to the renewal of disadvantaged areas, and to the life chances of people living in those areas, by opening their facilities to community use and by offering a range of services to children and young people, and to local residents.

This link to neighbourhood renewal is a useful reminder that the FSES initiative lies at the intersection of a number of recent policy concerns. Because FSESs have the potential to bring together a range of services within and beyond education, and because they can work not only with their own pupils, but also with families and local residents, they offer a rich resource for the delivery of multiple policy agendas. In addition to their potential contribution to neighbourhood renewal, FSESs have much to offer to the Every Child Matters agenda (DfES, 2003a, 2004). In principle, they can make the notion of seamless services for children and their families real by offering a base from which a range of services can operate, and by working towards all of the Every Child Matters 'five outcomes'[1] rather than simply towards the most obviously education-oriented one. Their provision of before and after school childcare makes them potentially important vehicles for the delivery of the national childcare strategy (DfEE & DSS, 1998, DfES, 2002). It is also reasonable to suppose that they might be able to make contributions in terms of adult learning, the development of ICT literacy, health promotion, the 'localisation' of national services, and enhancing the diversity and distinctiveness of schools from which local families can choose. Above all, of course, FSESs retain the core commitment of all schools to teaching their pupils and, more specifically to driving up standards of achievement. Again, it is reasonable to suppose that schools which can offer a variety of enrichment activities and a range of support for pupils are well placed to enhance achievement, even in circumstances which might otherwise prove challenging.

This rich potential of FSESs is something of a double-edged sword. It is certainly clear that they are in principle able to deliver not only in strictly educational terms, but across a wide range of public policy areas. However, this inevitably raises questions about how these potential contributions relate to each other, and how schools are to prioritise amongst them. As we pointed out in our first report (Cummings et al., 2005), national guidance to FSESs outlined a range of activities in which they might engage, and indicated a host of outcomes and benefits that might ensue. However, it did not set out a blueprint of what a FSES should do, nor did it identify one sort of outcome that should take precedence over all others. This gave local FSES projects considerable freedom to work in ways which suited local conditions, but also left them with much work to do to clarify their aims and set their priorities.

This challenge is perhaps even greater as all schools begin to develop extended approaches. Given the potential for delivering on multiple policy agendas, it is perhaps not surprising that, even before the FSES initiative had run its course, DfES announced

---

[1] Being healthy, staying safe, enjoying and achieving, making a positive contribution, and economic well being.

its intention to roll the extended schools approach out nationally, so that by 2010 all children would have access to extended provision in their schools (DfES, 2005). This new commitment is clearly located within the Every Child Matters and national childcare agendas, and is in many respects similar to the FSES initiative. There is, therefore, much that all schools can learn from the experience of FSESs, and this is an issue to which we shall return later in the report. However, there are key differences between FSESs and the expectations of the national roll out. The latter stops short of requiring every school to become a *full service* extended school. Instead, schools are asked to focus on five areas – childcare, out of school hours (OoSH) activities, parenting support, swift and easy referral (to other agencies and providers), and community access to ICT and other facilities. They are also invited to consider working in clusters with other schools and in collaboration with other providers, so that extended provision can be made available to children, families and local people without each school having to provide all of these services and activities individually. This recognises that schools in the national roll out will be of all kinds and in all sorts of circumstances, and will face the challenge of defining aims and priorities that are appropriate to contexts which may be very different from those in which the majority of FSESs found themselves.

1.2 The research context

Although the FSES initiative is too recent for much research evidence to have emerged beyond the current evaluation, there is, in fact, a substantial research base on extended approaches more generally. This comes in part from the international evidence on full service and other community-oriented schools, and in part from evidence on what we might call the 'components' of FSESs – that is, the activities, strategies and services which they bring together within one school, but which have often been widely used in other contexts.

In our first year report (Cummings et al., 2005), we presented a summary of the main findings of the international research literature on full service extended schools and their equivalents. In brief, we suggested that:

- Although there is a substantial literature on full service schools, much of it is descriptive and exhortatory rather than analytic and evidence-based. There is, therefore, relatively little trustworthy evidence on the sorts of impacts and outcomes that can be expected from these schools.
- Full service schools and their equivalents are characterised by diversity. Not only are there different kinds of initiatives in different administrations, but individual schools within the same initiative tend to develop in somewhat different ways. There is, therefore, no single 'model' of what a full service extended school should be like.
- The weakness of the research literature and the diversity of approaches explain to some extent a lack of robust evidence regarding outcomes from full service schools and their equivalents. Such evidence as there is tends to relate to the

impacts of particular activities on particular groups of pupils rather than to the overall impact of such schools. In particular, there is no clear evidence that full service approaches impact on *overall* levels of academic attainment in schools.

- Amongst the specific areas where evidence exists, that relating to parental involvement is perhaps strongest. It seems beyond doubt that certain kinds of parental involvement with their children's learning enhances achievement and other educational outcomes, and there are some indications that involvement of this kind can be promoted by school-level action.
- Evidence that schools can have wider positive impacts on the communities they serve is less easy to find.

We are aware of no more recent evidence that would cause us to change this account. However, it might be worth elaborating some of these points. First, in terms of outcomes for school pupils, there seems to be a good deal of evidence – even if the evidence is of variable quality – for the positive impact of full service approaches on outcomes for particular pupils. There is less evidence for the generalisation of these impacts into outcomes for all pupils and hence for school performance. Sometimes, this is likely to be because full service provision has been explicitly targeted on particular pupils – usually the most disadvantaged – and wider impacts have not, therefore, been anticipated (see, for instance, Szirom et al., 2001). Even where claims are made about whole school impacts – as, for instance, in Blank et al.'s (2003) review of evaluation findings from US community schools – these are difficult to interpret unless comparisons are made with other schools not using full service approaches. School performance can, of course, change for a whole range of reasons that are not directly related to whether or not the school uses a full service approach.

In this context, the evaluation of the Scottish New Community Schools (NCS) pilot programme (Sammons et al., 2003) is particularly significant, since it compares achievement in both NCS and non-NCS settings. Moreover, the NCS (latterly, Integrated Community Schools) initiative has some similarities to the FSES initiative in England. Unfortunately, however, the evaluation was able to find no evidence of differences in achievement at school level between NCSs and others, despite indications of other, more localised, benefits from the approach. There are many possible explanations for this finding – perhaps the effects at individual pupil level were too small to show up at the school level; perhaps the focus of activities was on issues other than achievement per se; perhaps non-NCSs were involved in different initiatives and strategies that were at least as powerful in their impact on achievement as full service approaches; or perhaps the evaluation was concluded before any impacts became apparent. Nonetheless, this lack of unequivocal evidence of positive impacts on achievement at the school level is clearly an issue for the FSES initiative.

More positively, there is evidence from other initiatives that the sorts of activities typically found as components of FSES provision can generate positive outcomes for children and young people. For instance:

- The Big Lottery Fund has carried out a series of evaluations of activities which frequently form components of FSESs – out of school hours learning, other out of school activities, and enhanced child and community access to sport – and reports a range of positive outcomes in terms of enhanced engagement, learning and well being (Big Lottery Fund, 2006).
- Evidence from the Excellence in Cities initiative (Kendall et al.2005,Ofsted, 2005) suggests that the work of learning mentors – frequently described by FSESs as a key element in their approach – enables some pupils to overcome barriers to learning and leads to enhanced achievement
- There is evidence that multi-agency collaborations targeted at children in difficulties can bring a range of benefits including better access to support for children and their families, improved cost-effectiveness of service delivery, improved child behaviour and well-being and even raised attainment (Pettitt, 2003, Webb and Vulliamy, 2004).
- More specifically, there is evidence that Behaviour and Education Support Teams (BESTs) have a positive impact on children's attainment, attendance, behaviour and well-being, that they give parents better access to services and better links with schools, and that they can lead to enhanced parenting skills (Halsey et al., 2005). This is particularly important given that BESTs were developed as part of the Behaviour Improvement Programme (BIP) and that many of the FSESs located in BIP areas regarded BESTs as part of their full service provision.
- Research suggests convincing evidence of the value of childcare (Sylva et al., 2004), and study support activities (MacBeath et al., 2001) – and there is evidence that the nature and quality of provision is likely to be important. Similarly, the literature on breakfast clubs indicates that positive impacts on punctuality, socialisation and self esteem can be anticipated (Roberts & Murphy, 2005).

Such examples could, no doubt, be multiplied. They do, however, add to an intriguing picture of what is known about the likely outcomes from FSESs. We can be reasonably confident that FSESs will generate positive outcomes for at least some pupils and families. It is puzzling, then, that research so far has failed to identify a 'scaling up' of these effects in terms of achievement at the school population level, or wider area effects. There are many reasons why this might be the case. It may be that no such scaling up exists, and that individual gains become invisible when aggregated at the school and area level. It may be that the effects of full service approaches are no greater than those of other approaches typically adopted by schools serving disadvantaged populations, and therefore that they do not appear in comparisons between full service schools and others. Alternatively, it may be that appropriately designed studies able to detect the wider impacts of full service approaches have not yet been undertaken. In any event, it is clearly important to know what it is reasonable to expect from full service approaches, particularly in the context of the national roll of extended schools. This is an issue to which we shall return later in this report.

1.3 The evaluation

1.3.1 Evaluation methods

The FSES initiative as a whole has been subject to a multi-strand evaluation over the three years for which it was funded. The evaluation aimed to:

- identify and characterise the activities undertaken by participating schools;
- identify the processes underpinning these activities;
- identify the impacts of activities; and
- identify the outcomes of activities.

Full details of the evaluation methodology are provided in our earlier reports (Cummings et al., 2006, 2005). In general terms, however, the evaluation has comprised the following components:

- 'Mapping' visits to 22 projects joining the initiative in year one and a further 11 projects joining in year 2. These visits were aimed at characterising activities, process issues and early outcomes through interviews with school, LA and partner organisation personnel.
- Detailed case studies of 12 projects joining the initiative in year one of the initiative and a further 5 projects joining in year 2. These studies aimed to analyse activities and process issues in greater detail, but focused particularly on identifying outcomes.
- Visits to 9 'comparator' schools (see appendix 4). These comparators were nominated by local authority contacts as being schools that were similar in many respects to the case study schools, but that were not participating in the DfES initiative. Visits were structured in a similar way to the mapping visits, but with the aim of clarifying how far the practices and outcomes associated with FSES provision were in fact peculiar to FSESs.
- An evaluation of process issues and outcomes associated with childcare provision in FSESs, conducted through visits to 16 schools in 15 LAs.
- A statistical analysis of the National Pupil Database (NPD) (see appendix 2) and of neighbourhood statistics aimed at identifying quantifiable outcomes from FSESs.
- A cost benefit analysis (CBA) of FSES provision in a sample of 10 projects, aimed at identifying the costs of provision and its benefits in terms of their equivalent financial value (see appendix 3).
- A repeated questionnaire survey of pupils, staff and parents in the case study schools, aimed at identifying their perceptions of FSES provision and likely impacts of that provision (see appendix 5).
- A final questionnaire survey of all FSESs aimed at identifying in comparable form their aims, activities, costs, perceived outcomes and salient process issues (see appendix 1).

1.3.2 Evaluation rationale

The multi-strand character of the evaluation stems in part from the multi-strand nature of FSES provision and the multiple aims of the evaluation. So, for instance, identifying process issues in relation to establishing childcare provision requires different methods from identifying attainment outcomes from FSES projects as a whole. However, it also stems from the inherent difficulties of identifying outcomes from FSESs. These have been discussed at length in our previous reports, but essentially they relate to:

- the multi-strand nature of FSES provision,
- the variability of approach between projects,
- the multiple aims of and possible outcomes from FSES provision,
- the 'rolling start' which some FSESs had because of their prior involvement in extended provision, and
- the location of FSES projects in a context where both FSESs and possible comparator schools were involved in multiple funded initiatives and other improvement measures (including the national roll-out of extended schools).

All of these factors make it extremely difficult to identify (much less to quantify) outcomes from FSESs, or to attribute any outcomes that are identified to FSES provision. In this situation, a simple comparison of, say, performance data from FSESs before and after their participation in the initiative, or from FSESs and similar schools outside the initiative would be unlikely to give us evidence on which we could place much reliance. It is entirely possible, for instance, that FSES provision would have a significant impact on pupil attainment, but that this would be masked by the similar impacts of different initiatives in which other schools were participating, or in which FSESs participated prior to joining the initiative, or by the fact that these impacts had already begun to be generated by extended activities undertaken by FSESs before joining the initiative. Similarly, the impacts on attainment generated by FSESs might be targeted on small groups of pupils, making a significant difference to those pupils' lives, but not showing up clearly in aggregated performance data. Alternatively, FSESs might be generating important outcomes for which there are no good or readily-available measures – for instance, on pupils' engagement with learning, or on family stability.

With this in mind:

- The statistical analysis of performance data looked beyond aggregate levels of attainment (such as the proportion of pupils achieving 5A*-C equivalents at GCSE). It employed a range of more sensitive measures, for instance, focusing on sub-groups of pupils most likely to benefit from FSES provision, and constructing statistical comparisons of the attainments of those groups in FSES and non-FSES contexts.
- The case study component of the evaluation used a 'theory of change' methodology. Essentially, this meant working with FSESs to identify the aims which they believed to be important and to collect evidence of interim changes which seemed likely to lead to long-term outcomes. This made it possible to

identify outcomes for which there are no readily-available measures, to identify outcomes which fall below the radar of aggregate performance data, and to predict the likely emergence of outcomes which have not yet had time to become fully apparent.

- The CBA made it possible to value outcomes in a different way. The education community is accustomed to seeing outcomes in terms of pupil attainment and (to some extent) wider achievement measures. Initiatives then tend to be judged successful insofar as they have large effects on these measures. Useful as this approach is, it masks the importance of other outcomes which impact on the longer-term life chances and well-being of young people, their families and the wider communities in which they live. CBA makes it possible to quantify these outcomes and, moreover, to value them in relation to the costs that are incurred in generating them.

1.3.3 What is being evaluated?

A major issue for the evaluation has been to define what we mean by 'a FSES', or 'FSES provision'. In one sense, this is relatively straightforward. At the start of the national initiative, participating projects were given a list of areas in which they were expected to develop activities (DfES, 2003b, 2003c). These activities define FSES provision, and a school offering these activities is a FSES.

However, as we worked with schools, it became obvious that this simple definition did not match the reality on the ground. The boundaries that schools drew around their full service approaches did not match a simple list of activities. For instance, the first wave of projects were located in Behaviour Improvement Programme areas, and most of the schools we worked with made no distinction between their involvement in BIP and their involvement in the FSES initiative. So, for instance, their access to Behaviour and Education Support Teams was typically seen as part of their FSES provision. Likewise, most schools were developing some sort of mentoring support for pupils, and some sort of curriculum development aimed at pupils who were otherwise likely to become disengaged. Although it was not clear that these developments were funded or catalysed by the FSES initiative, schools often insisted that they were part of their FSES approach. Finally, schools took different stances about whether to include particular activities within their FSES approach. So, for instance, one secondary school saw its on-site Community Learning Centre (CLC) as the basis of its FSES provision, while another explicitly excluded it, seeing it as an activity that was co-located with the school but not 'part' of the school.

This situation is reflected most clearly in the resources which schools deployed to develop their FSES provision. It was not the case that schools received determinate amounts of funding which they then used to develop dedicated forms of provision. First, it was local authority FSES projects that were funded, and whilst these were often synonymous with particular schools, this was not always the case. Funding might be divided between a cluster of schools, and/or be top-sliced by the local authority to maintain central support provision. Indeed, one FSES (2.13) reported that it received no

additional funding at all. More important, schools were typically in receipt of multiple streams of funding (for instance, from BIP, or from acquiring specialist status), combined these to support provision, and drew down other resources in kind (in the form, for instance, of health or social care personnel) to extend that provision. These complexities are most apparent in the large, but hugely variable costs reported as part of the CBA (see appendix 3).

Faced with this situation, the evaluation had two options. One was to draw some boundaries around what would count as FSES provision, in terms of the activities specified originally by DfES, or of activities funded wholly or partly by dedicated FSES funding. It seemed to us, however, that while this might simplify the evaluation process, any such boundaries would be arbitrary, and would fail to capture what it was that schools were actually trying to achieve. The second – and from our point of view, preferable option, therefore, was to be guided by FSESs themselves in terms of what they regarded as their FSES provision.

Taking this option means, of course, that FSES provision is defined differently in each case. Whilst all the schools we worked with saw themselves as developing some or all of the activities in the original DfES specification, they did so in different ways and with different emphases, combined them with other initiatives and developments, and pursued different sets of aims or different priorities within their aims. This combination of resources, activities and aims is what we refer to as a school's (or group of schools') FSES 'approach'. What we have evaluated, therefore, are these approaches rather than, say, the impacts of particular activities, or the outcomes generated directly or indirectly by DfES funding.

This notion of an approach is important for understanding the status of the evidence we have collected. Had we opted to evaluate only clearly-delineated activities with specific and fairly short-term outcomes, we would doubtless have been able to collect more-or-less unequivocal evidence as to whether those outcomes were indeed generated. So, for instance, if a school had set up a breakfast club with the aim of improving attendance, it would have been a relatively simple matter to test whether attendance did indeed rise after the club was started. However, 'approaches' tend to be much more wide-ranging than this in their resourcing, activities, and aims. They might, for instance, seek to create sophisticated support mechanisms in and around school aimed at keeping young people engaged with learning, building their self-esteem and aspirations, and enhancing their life chances. Alternatively, they might try to develop positive relationships between the school and community members aimed at engaging local people with formal learning and ultimately bringing about cultural changes in the community. Had we focused only on the detail of specific activities, we would almost certainly have missed these broader – and potentially more important – outcomes.

By using theory of change methodology, particularly in combination with the analysis of performance data and the CBA, we have been able to get some indication of how far these combinations of actions and resources are moving the FSES towards the realisation of what are often quite broadly-defined and long-term aims. Often, we have been able to

collect more-or-less definitive evidence that this or that specific activity has generated this or that specific, short-term outcome. The more we focus on the approach as a whole, however, the more we need to think in terms of likelihoods rather than certainties – the likelihood that outcomes we have been able to identify have indeed been generated by the FSES approach, or that the changes we can securely attribute to that approach will indeed generate outcomes in the longer term. The purpose of evidence in this context is not to demonstrate unequivocally the outcomes of FSES approaches, but to establish the likelihood of those outcomes' emerging from those approaches.

Another way to think of this is to see evidence as testing the 'theory of change' embedded in the approach. Such theories are not formal propositions so much as sets of assumptions on which action is based. They take the form: *'If we take this set of actions in this context, the situation will change in this way, and we will ultimately generate these outcomes.'* The national FSES initiative and, latterly, the extended schools roll out imply similar theories of change, of course, along the lines of: *'If schools are enabled to develop extended provision, a range of outcomes for children, families and communities will be enhanced.'*

This focus on demonstrating likelihoods and testing local theories means that we have made no attempt to identify every outcome from every FSES, or from the initiative as a whole. Given the resources at our disposal, this would have been a quite impossible task. We are not in a position to say definitively, therefore, how many children passed how many GCSEs, or how many young people avoided drug abuse, or how many adults gained additional qualifications as a result of the FSES initiative – though we can certainly say something about all of these. Our focus has been on the likelihood that FSES provision can generate outcomes of this kind. Much of what follows, therefore, reports positive examples of where outcomes have indeed been generated. However, in dealing with likelihoods, we have also had to address the boundaries of likelihood. These are set by how well particular projects have managed – and been enabled to manage – themselves, and therefore we have something to say about process issues. They are also set by what we have called the 'scope' and the 'additionality' of FSES provision. The former refers in broad terms to the numbers of intended beneficiaries that provision actually reaches; some, for instance, may have powerful effects, but only on very limited numbers of beneficiaries. The latter refers to the extent to which FSES provision is genuinely new, or simply replicates or replaces existing provision. If schools employ their own family support workers, for instance, the other agencies may simply withdraw their own personnel from the area, producing no net benefit to local people.

Our contention is that evidence of this kind is particularly useful in the context of a national initiative that allowed local projects considerable flexibility, and, particularly, in the context of a roll-out of a similar approach to all schools. It is, of course, important to know whether a particular activity has generated a particular outcome, and where possible we have collected evidence to this effect. However, it is, we suggest, even more important to know whether a particular wide-ranging approach is likely to generate fundamental and long-term outcomes. Above all, it is important to know whether the

development of extended schools nationally is indeed likely to produce the enhanced outcomes that such an initiative promises.

1.4 The report

In the next chapter, we describe some of the activities that FSESs undertook, and the rationales for those activities that they offered. In chapter 3, we identify some of the possibilities and challenges that arose for FSESs. Chapter 4, in many ways the heart of this final report, sets out our findings in relation to the outcomes that FSESs generated. In chapter 5, we summarise our findings and try to outline the implications of the evaluation for future policy and, in particular, for the national roll out of extended schools.

Throughout, particular FSES projects are referred to by a code number. The first digit (1 or 2) indicates whether the project joined the initiative in its first or second year. The second part of the code identifies the local authority. In some cases, the code has a third element where the local project involved more than one school. So, project 1.7 involved two secondary schools, known here as 1.7.1 and 1.7.2. The same system is used to designate comparator schools located in the same local authority areas, and the codes are the same as those used in our previous reports. Where names are used, they are pseudonyms. In line with usual DfES practice, we refer to 'pupils' rather than 'students', though we recognise that many school personnel preferred the latter term.

2. Practice and provision in FSESs

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with a discussion of the emerging trends from FSESs. An extensive account has been provided in our previous reports (Cummings et al., 2006, Cummings et al., 2005) of the kinds of activities undertaken by FSESs, and the theories of change providing a rationale for those activities. It is not our intention to duplicate this information here. However, we are now in a position to draw upon findings of the review questionnaire answered by about half of all FSESs (appendix 1) as well as results from the further visits to the 17 wave 1 and wave 2 case study schools. We will, moreover, seek to identify some of the overarching themes that have emerged from this work.

2.2 FSES cameos

As we indicated in our previous reports, FSESs were somewhat diverse in the situations they faced, the activities they undertook, and the rationales they advanced for those activities. In the following sections, therefore, we present 'cameos' of schools to illustrate this diversity and to show the way in which different FSESs began to develop their own, internally-coherent approaches. The cameos that follow illustrate something of the range we encountered both in our case studies and in our mapping and survey work. Each cameo is based closely on an account we agreed with the individual FSES, setting out what they saw as the situation they faced, their aims within that situation, and the ways in which they set about realising their aims through clusters of related activities – what we call here 'strands'.

2.2.1 Bellfield Community College

The situation: 'Bellfield' Community College (FSES 2.3), is located in a market town and serves a wide rural catchment. The area in which the school is located is characterised by socio-economic diversity with some areas of relative affluence and pockets of grave disadvantage. The demography of the area is changing with the building of new homes and an increasing Traveller community. There are high quotas for crime in some parts of the town and community provision, in particular that for young people, is limited. There are disparities in educational performance in the area with one of the FSES's feeder schools being the highest performing in the LA and another being the lowest performing.

College leaders feel that many young people in the school have low self esteem and emotional problems which can manifest as barriers to learning, and the school has made strenuous efforts to address this through the development of an 'inclusion' strategy.

Moreover, significant numbers of families and certain sectors of the community (notably, the Traveller community) are seen as more vulnerable and requiring additional support. Many parents of pupils attending Bellfield also attended the school themselves and did not necessarily have a good experience. The school has suffered from a poor reputation in the past and it is anticipated that FSES developments will assist in addressing this.

Bellfield College has a history of community oriented schooling reaching back over a decade. For instance, the community liaison officer has worked in the school since its first designation as a community college. There have, however, been new appointments of support staff and a greater level of multi-agency collaboration since the College became a designated FSES.

What the school set out to do: One strand of action has multi-agency collaboration at its core. It is about providing swift and effective support to children who are at risk of slipping through the net to support them in overcoming problems affecting their learning and their life outside of school. It is also about extended provision during and outside of school hours to engage pupils in activities aimed at the development of key skills, raised self-esteem, and having something constructive to do after school and during the holidays. A second strand is focused on helping families overcome problems that are affecting children's learning. This is targeted at families where there seems to be particular need, but is also available for parents of year 11 pupils to enable them to support their children with their GCSEs.

How the intentions have been put into action: Full service provision is a key part of the school inclusion strategy. Both are about pupil learning and participation, and both rely on effective multi-agency collaboration. The focus on supporting children and families recognises that, in order to raise academic attainment, it is necessary to meet the wider needs of these children and families. To address these needs, the FSES has multi-agency support structures with representation from statutory, voluntary and community agencies. Social Services and Health, the Police Force, Youth Offending Team, Connexions and the Youth Service, the Adult Education Service and voluntary sector organisations deliver provision from the school site.

The inclusion element of the FSES also involves giving all pupils the opportunity to take part in activities aimed at achievement, skills development and raised self esteem. There is a childcare coordinator who has worked to expand the range of out of hours provision on offer to young people. He has also recruited pupils as assistant leaders as part of a strategy to develop wider skills of pupils and foster in them a sense of responsibility. Another aspect of this same strategy is a pupil council and pupil representation on the FSES steering group. In addition, there are 'issue' days where professionals from different agencies work with pupils on matters of common concern, such as relationships or sexual health.

Bellfield is also working with some of the more vulnerable pupils in feeder primary schools to try and intervene earlier and prevent children from encountering crisis situations when they get to secondary school. One aspect of this is the work of the youth

justice worker and the youth issues officer from the police force who are working collaboratively to support and engage young people at risk of offending.

As the full service approach has become more embedded, the school has latterly begun to explore the potential for becoming a community hub. As yet, most of its community provision is targeted at parents, connected in some way with the well-being of young people, or aimed at raising the profile of the school in the area. However, it is now beginning to consider the possibility of developing a coordinated approach with other schools in the town and to build links with the borough council.

How the FSES has been funded: The College first received DfES FSES funding in 2004/5 and ceased to receive this funding directly in 2005/6. Over the course of the initiative, it has received over 280K including 52K for childcare, and has also drawn on other funding sources from the school's base budget, BIP, Standards Fund, Specialist Schools programme, the Healthy Schools Programme, the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and the New Opportunities Fund (NOF).

2.2.2 Weatherknowle School

The situation: Weatherknowle (FSES 2.5) is a school for pupils aged 11-16 with moderate learning difficulties and associated behaviour problems, and for pupils with severely challenging behaviour. Almost 80% of its pupil population is male, with high levels of free school meals entitlement (over 65%). The school has pupils from a wide range of ethnicities and there is a high level of mobility of pupils at the school.

Pupils come from a very wide catchment area and do not live in the commuter area in which the school is based. This area is becoming increasingly 'yuppified' and the population is somewhat transient. There are few facilities for young people in the area, not least for young people with special educational needs, and crime has been reported by some to be an issue.

What the school set out to do: Pupils come to Weatherknowle by virtue of their evident difficulties. Not surprisingly, therefore, its approach is focused heavily on offering them support to overcome those difficulties. However, it also involves supporting parents in dealing with those difficulties, and promoting pupils' engagement with learning and with constructive leisure activities.

How the intentions have been put into action: The strand focused on pupil support has multi-agency partnership at its core. Professionals from a range of agencies, therefore, work in the school, offering support to pupils and their families as and when the need arises. However, 'support' is also understood to encompass curriculum enhancement and the extension of out of school hours provision. The school has a history of providing extended learning and social opportunities and there is now a wider range of such provision which has recently included clubs for mosaic making, reading and drumming after school, a breakfast club and a maths, homework and IT club. In terms of curriculum enhancement, all pupils are now given the opportunity to take part in competitive sports.

School teaching staff run much of the out of hours provision (and are paid for this and get time off in lieu), but partnership links have been an important element of some of the activities. For instance, through good links with the Football Association, Weatherknowle has recently secured funding to run a football skills course, while the school nurse has run a fit for life health course.

Work around meeting needs of parents has involved establishing a monthly one stop shop for parents with representation from a nurse, CAMHS, educational psychologists, speech and language therapists, and education tutors. This was described by one colleague as a 'clearing house for emotional needs and mental health'. There is also a parent support group, and there have been a series of parents' workshops. The school has also recently forged links with a local nursery, to which it signposts parents. Engagement with the wider community has been more limited, but takes the form of community use of meeting rooms and some use of the school as a base for offering community services (for instance, there is a falls clinic for the elderly people, and the local Family Services Unit use the school for play therapy once a week).

How the FSES has been funded: The school received London Challenge FSES Funding and is part of BIP.

2.2.3 Hornham College

The situation: Hornham (1.7.1) has specialist technology college status and is located in a metropolitan borough. The area served by the school is characterised by high levels of deprivation. The demise of heavy industry in the locality has resulted, in some cases, in third generational unemployment. Other indicators of deprivation include low levels of self-esteem, low levels of adult literacy and poor mental health. There is relatively little provision for young people in the area and an absence of support mechanisms for parents of teenagers. Parts of the area have been subject to 'bricks and mortar' regeneration initiatives in the past, and these have left some parts of the community feeling somewhat disenfranchised, though there is evidence of high levels of community activism and much capacity for change. One part of the area feeding into the school has a high NEET (not in education, employment or training) rate amongst young people of 17%, and has the highest proportion of child accidents and teen pregnancies in the borough. Hornham's pupil population is largely white. The College is also a BIP school with a co-located Behaviour and Education Support Team, and is involved in Excellence in Cities, Healthy Schools and the 14-19 strategy.

What the school set out to do: There are two main strands of action. The first is about a collaborative multi-agency approach to help overcome barriers to learning faced by the most vulnerable pupils. The multi-agency element of the work is necessarily reactive at times to manage crisis situations, but it is also about more early intervention and preventive work. Many extended activities, therefore, are aimed at raising the self-esteem, motivation and aspirations of pupils, and providing opportunities for them to develop skills and make a positive contribution. Another aspect of this strand is offering a

more 'appropriate' curriculum to those requiring it so that the most vulnerable pupils have access to both personalised learning and personalised support.

The second main strand is community focused and involves support for parents and community members. It is also about the efforts of Hornham to generate community outcomes around health improvement, crime reduction and enhanced adult learning.

How the intentions have been put into action: Pupil focused provision, which comes under the umbrella term 'support for learning,' is embedded with the school inclusion strategy and with BIP. A structure has been developed around a weekly multi-agency pupil referral panel meeting, and a learning and support team to deliver intervention and support to the most vulnerable pupils and their families. This composition of this team changes from year to year, but in the past has comprised learning mentors, two family support workers (one of whom is social work trained), a BEST manager (from a health background), members of the senior leadership team and an educational psychologist (EP). They work closely with a range of statutory, voluntary and community services and will signpost to other agencies whenever necessary. A wing in the school has been designated a learning support area, and it is from here (and the learning support unit and offsite provision) that learning mentors and other professionals operate for much of their time.

The level of support for targeted pupils is very high. There are nurture groups for vulnerable year 7 pupils, key fund groups, youth engagement strategy activities, a buddy group, counselling support, sexual health clinics, a nutrition group (run by a learning mentor and a health worker), and crime and drugs prevention work (in partnership with a community police officer). The school also has a Connexions-funded positive activities for young people (PAYP) worker who delivers one-to-one and group work support with targeted pupils, and supports pupils following the 'more appropriate' curriculum. As part of a trial in the local authority, aimed at reducing the number of pupils falling into the NEET category, Hornham has benefited from enhanced Connexions PA input. So, PAYP pupils are offered 'entry to employment' placements at the end of the summer term and engage in work based learning to develop skills for employment.

In addition, the school has a range of out of hours activities for pupils (some targeted, some universal), including a breakfast club, homework club, lunchtime and after school girls group, an environment group, Duke of Edinburgh and Youth Civic Award, holiday provision, a pupil council, a pupil participation appraisal programme (involving pupils undertaking consultation with the school and wider community), and activities aimed at youth enterprise and democracy. There is also BIP first day response provision for pupils at risk of exclusion.

Personalised learning, as an entitlement for all pupils, is regarded by Hornham College as being a key aspect of its FSES provision. There are opportunities for pupils to study GCSE Dance after school, and for some to complete their GCSE Maths or to take a GCSE in PE a year early. In addition there is an entitlement for all Key Stage 4 pupils to take a vocational option. The 'more appropriate curriculum' provision can be accessed by

pupils on a full or part time basis as necessary. Pupils following this are given the opportunity to achieve qualifications in vocational and key skills. An enrichment programme has recently been introduced for all pupils, involving them in a range of activities, including voluntary work or attending a local FE college.

Parent and community oriented provision includes: an outreach parent support group; lifelong and family learning provision; intergenerational work in partnership with Age Concern; environmental projects involving pupils and community members; and a police drop in for community members. Hornham has developed a close partnership with the local community centre and offers residents access to its web portal (which provides information on FSES and other provision in the area) from there. Pupils and staff at the college are also involved in raising funding to build a school and support a community in Eritrea in East Africa. Some pupils have visited Eritrea and delivered workshops to children in village schools on drama, dance, and arts. They have also presented at youth democracy events and FSES conferences.

The connection with wider LA strategy: There is a long history of partnership working in the LA. It now has a Children, Young People and Learning Directorate and the Children and Young People's Plan 2006-10 states that all ECM outcomes are covered via the operationalising of extended services, extended schools and children's centres. The FSES project (which involves a second school alongside Hornham) is linked strategically to wider LA level structures including the LSP, the Children, Young People and Families Partnership Board (and the local implementation team for the work of the board) and locality planning.

How the FSES has been funded: The college first received DfES FSES funding in 2003/4 (and had received some Extended Schools Pathfinder money prior to this) and ceased to receive this funding directly in 2006/7. Over the lifetime of the initiative, it has received between £201,000 and £300,000K DfES FSES funding and has also drawn on other funding sources from the school's base budget, BIP, EiC, European Social Fund, SRB Standards Fund and Specialist Schools funding. It has also accessed funding from the Children's Fund, National Lottery, and the Key Fund, and has received donations and grants from charitable bodies. The college estimates that it has received over half a million pounds from these sources. This has been used for capital and revenue expenditure.

2.2.4 Central Primary School

The situation: Central Primary (FSES 1.5) has 272 children on roll, and is located in a pocket of disadvantage which has suffered in the past from lack of services and funding. The community has felt isolated and neglected resulting in low levels of aspiration and self-esteem. Families encounter health and social care difficulties that sometimes culminate in crisis situations. Indeed, the head teacher reported spending more than 60% of her time attending to social care issues before the school became a FSES and a resident social worker was appointed.

What the school set out to do: The focus for Central's FSES provision is ensuring the social, emotional and health needs of children and their families are met, thus improving their life chances. One strand of action is concerned with tackling barriers to learning. It has multi-agency collaboration at its core and is about engaging in early intervention and preventative work, based on information sharing to enable swift referral and support. Outcomes for children will be generated both by direct interventions and by work with families and community, on the assumption that children's learning and well-being cannot be separated from that of their families and communities.

The school also aims to empower parents and re-engage parents and community members in learning. This is the focus of a second main strand of action. As the FSES further develops, this strand will also be about longer-term and deeper changes in aspirations and culture in the community. Impact will be indicated through the increasing participation by local people in accessing provision and services, articulating their needs and wants, accessing extended opportunities such as adult education, and becoming active in shaping services in the community.

How the intentions have been put into action: Central has created a family support team to offer swift and non-threatening support to families requiring it. This comprises a social worker based full time at the school, the FSES and childcare coordinators, counsellors from a local health trust also based part-time in the school, the head and assistant head, a community support nurse, a parental engagement worker, a clinical psychologist from CAMHS, tenancy support workers (who run a weekly clinic), and a domestic violence worker. Other FSES provision includes out of school hours activities for pupils, childcare, lifelong learning provision, and a community service volunteers group. In addition, a post natal clinic has been established by local health visitors, the social worker, and the community health nurse. Central is to become the base for a Children's Centre in the near future.

The engagement of the FSES in a wider strategy: Whilst the school can see the value of embedding FSES provision within area strategies, no such strategy exists.

How the FSES has been funded: Central is a wave 1 FSES and first received DfES funding in 2002/03. It has secured some additional funding from Children's Fund, and from the children's centre initiative.

2.2.5 Walton School

The situation: Walton High School (FSES 1.10) serves a disadvantaged population, with many refugees and asylum seekers. A major housing estate comprising high-rise flats sits to one side of the school. The other three sides are surrounded by an ethnically-mixed population of middle income families who seem reluctant to engage with the school or send their children to it. The school's population, however, is relatively aspirational. Migrant communities in particular have high expectations for their children that the school feels it cannot realise. Challenging pupils (for instance, the high SEN population, 50% EAL pupils) make considerable demands on the school in terms of specialist help.

The school has specialist status for Arts and Media. This is a multi-ethnic school in a multi-ethnic area of high deprivation.

What the school set out to do: Walton identifies three main strands of action within its FSES approach. The first is geared towards putting structures in place to enhance learning by supporting both teachers and pupils. The second strand is about engaging with the local community in order to build a greater sense of community cohesion and to tackle some of the social problems in the area. This is an extension of the school's efforts to engage pupils in the cultures of its own diverse pupil population, helping to make communities feel less isolated and the school itself feel more supported. The third strand aims to develop relationships with parents, encourage greater engagement with the school and improve the overall perceptions of the school.

How the intentions have been put into action: Walton's specialist media arts status represents the major component of all the strands of action. In terms of supporting pupils' learning, a new media arts-based curriculum has been developed as a means of 'embedding…a different learning experience'. This in turn is supported by a range of other measures including the deployment of learning mentors, the establishment of a school council and student ambassadors, the work of a learning support unit, the development of out of hours activities, liaison with the Youth Service in the development of holiday activities, liaison with an attached police officer, and the promotion of arts-based activities in school.

Parent and community engagement have been promoted through the organisation of arts events in conjunction with local community groups, and through the work of the on-site city learning centre. The school has worked at developing links with local community representatives and organisations, particularly in tackling some of the social problems and ethnic tensions both within and beyond the school. Walton is also working with the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service to develop community outreach provision and a family support worker is proactive in targeting families facing difficulties. A good deal of effort is put into publicising the work of the school, developing links with feeder schools, and offering parents of prospective pupils opportunities to see the school in action as a means of attracting families who might not otherwise consider sending their children to the school.

How the FSES has been funded: The first year that the school received DfES FSES funding was 2002/03. This funding has since been extended to March 2008. The school has received between £301,000 and £400,000 over the lifetime of the initiative. The school's other funding sources include the school's base budget, BIP, EiC, NRF, Standards Fund, Specialist Schools funding, Children's Fund, Healthy Schools funding, the local Primary Care Trust, Creative Partnerships, and NOF.

2.2.6 Neaston School

The situation: Neaston School (FSES 1.22) serves an area of very high deprivation characterised by poor housing, high unemployment, underachievement and low

aspirations. It is located on one of the biggest housing estates in Europe and draws most of its pupils from the area, though other schools also serve the estate. There are low employment rates, in part because young men in particular do not identify with the type of work that is available. Families do not want to live on the estate, but find themselves housed there, stay as long as necessary and then move on. Life expectancy is lower than the national average. The area suffers from domestic violence, debt, prostitution and drug related problems. Some parents in the community have, in the past, had unhappy experiences as young people in the school, have negative perceptions of education and are very reluctant to engage with the school. Neaston is a smaller than average school of just over 500 pupils.

What the school set out to do: Neaston sees its FSES approach is about making the school a hub for change in the area, raising community aspiration and engagement, raising pupil attainment and achievement, and engaging with parents as key factors in the lives of pupils and as key community members. Parents are seen as 'achievers' whose success, will by example, impact directly on pupils and the wider community. In order to deliver this vision, there are three strands of action: community re-engagement in learning and parental involvement in schooling; the development of services for young people; and raised school performance and profile.

How the intentions have been put into action: The school is re-engaging the community in learning through the continued development of its community learning centre (CLC). This centre acts as a hub for the community, is user friendly and responsive to the needs of those who may not have been in a learning environment since school. It has an open door policy and works by encouraging adults onto courses to build confidence and restore self-esteem, then progressively moving learners onto more demanding provision. For some, there is the possibility of working in the school, where they act as role models for pupils. Access is facilitated by the provision of a crèche and the school targets vulnerable groups in the community, such as those working with the Probation Service. The school continues to develop and expand its partnerships with agencies that can assist lifelong learning, training and employment, such as Connexions, SureStart, Job Centre, Workers' Educational Association, College in the Community, and universities in the region. In addition the school has welcomed approaches from any organisation that is keen to involve the school in its activities, hire the school site for its own purposes or network with the schools existing partnerships. The CLC offers extensive ICT resources, which pupils access alongside adult learners so that each acts as a role model of learning for the other.

Pupils are offered extensive support in school from teachers, from learning mentors and from other professionals. There is a multi-agency base on the school site which provides drop-in facilities for pupils. Police, health and youth workers work with the school. On site are EWOs, a BEST and Connexions. Neaston houses a youth club and offers summer school provision for pupils. Older pupils have the opportunity to train as play workers.

Considerable time and energy has been devoted to consultation at all levels, including pupils and the school, children in feeder primaries, parents, community members and groups, and external agencies.

How the FSES has been funded: The school first received DfES FSES funding in 2003/04. It has received between £201,000 - £300,000 over the lifetime of the initiative. Other funding sources include: Standards Fund, European Social Fund, Big Lottery, BIP, SRB, EiC, NRF and donations and grants from charitable bodies. The funding contribution from these sources over the lifetime of the initiative is between £251,000 and £500,000. Resources received in kind from other organisations and services are valued by the school at between £201,000 - £250,000.

2.3 Some themes and issues

2.3.1 Aims and foci

It is immediately obvious from the cameos above that different FSESs have different priorities in terms of the aims they pursue. This is confirmed by responses to the review questionnaire (appendix 1, table 6), in which only one aim – raised achievement for all children – was seen as a priority by more than half of the respondents. However, there are some commonalities beneath this apparent diversity. In particular, it is clear that each of the FSESs described above is concerned with what might broadly described as issues of 'well-being'. This is defined particularly in relation to educational achievement, as reflected in attainment, take-up of learning opportunities, and an underpinning engagement with, and commitment to, learning. However, it also embraces other aspects of well-being, such as health, employment, family functioning, safety, and community cohesion.

FSESs tend to view these issues in relation to three main foci: their own pupils; their pupils' families; and the communities in which their pupils live and/or amongst which the schools themselves are located. In addition, they often have a concern with what we might describe as the well-being of the school – its ability to recruit pupils, the nature and challenges of the population it attracts, the way in which it is perceived locally, and the way in which it appears in standard performance indicators.

Underpinning these concerns appears to be a common rationale for FSES provision. This is based on the reality for most FSESs – including those in the cameos above – that they are serving significantly disadvantaged populations and (except, perhaps in the case of special FSESs) from significantly disadvantaged areas. The achievement amongst pupils, therefore, cannot be divorced from the 'barriers to learning' which those pupils experience, and which arise from their family and community circumstances. Tackling these barriers means offering pupils more engaging learning experiences – such as Hornham College's 'more appropriate curriculum' – offering them support with their personal, social and health difficulties, working with their families to tackle any

difficulties in the family situation, and working with local communities to create an environment in which learning is valued. In such a context, of course, the well-being of the school, as the major site of learning, is crucial to the chances of pupils' being able to learn.

The differences between the aims of FSESs, therefore, tend not to be random. Rather, they arise from different understandings of where it is most effective and appropriate for schools to intervene in this set of school-pupil-family-community interactions. All FSESs focus on the well-being of their pupils and, particularly, on the educational achievements of those pupils. Some, however, adopt a somewhat *holistic focus* in which the well-being of pupils is understood in broad terms, and the well-being of families and communities is seen as important in its own right. Others are more likely to adopt a narrower *pupil focus* in which work with families and communities is justified primarily in terms of its impact on children and their achievements.

While these different foci reflect differences of emphasis rather than sharp distinctions between 'types' of FSES, it is nonetheless possible to detect them in the cameos above. Although, for instance, Weatherknowle School opens its facilities to community use, it is clear that the bulk of its effort goes into offering additional support to its pupils and their parents. On the other hand, although Neaston is, of course, concerned with the achievement and well-being of its pupils, it sees those pupils very much as part of a wider community, and is concerned to improve conditions across that community as a whole.

It is not difficult to see why FSESs develop these different approaches. As a special school, Weatherknowle does not have a clearly-bounded geographical community to which it can relate. Like the other special school in our case study sample (FSES 1.13), it has no option but to focus on pupils and their families, though it has facilities it can offer to people in its immediate area, thus building good will and, perhaps, breaking down some of the misunderstandings that sometimes surround children with special educational needs. On the other hand, Neaston serves a bounded and highly disadvantaged area, where the achievements and well-being of pupils are clearly bound up in the well-being of the area as a whole. Its more holistic approach, therefore, seems like a logical response to the situation in which it finds itself.

In the other schools, too, we can see how the context in which the schools find themselves influences the ways in which different aims are prioritised. Hornham and Central, for instance, serve similar areas to those served by Neaston, and like Neaston they place some emphasis on family and community well-being. Bellfield, on the other hand, serves an area that is not so obviously 'needy'. Its focus, therefore, remains much more on pupils and their families, and only now is the school beginning to develop more substantial community provision. Similarly, although Walton serves an area where many people live in disadvantaged circumstances, its situation is different from Neaston's. The population is multi-ethnic and fragmented; more affluent and less-affluent families live in the same area; the school faces stiff competition in recruiting more affluent families; and tensions within local communities spill over into the school. In this case, community

'well-being' has to include a strong element of cohesion building, and the profile of the school locally becomes a major priority.

The importance of these contextual factors is, perhaps, confirmed by the relative unimportance of school phase, which plays such a major role in determining many other aspects of how schools work. Although secondary FSESs may begin with some advantages in terms of the amount of resource they can deploy and the scale of activities in which they can engage, primary FSESs – as the case of Central demonstrates – can be just as holistically oriented.

Finally, however different FSESs prioritised their aims, it remains true, as our previous reports suggested, that their approaches were heavily influenced by a dominant concern with the difficulties faced and presented by their pupils, by pupils' families, and by the communities in which those families live. Essentially, this led to a deficit view of pupils and local people and what we might call a heroic view of schools. By this we mean that local people are seen primarily in terms of their problems, and the FSES is seen as the key means of creating something better. Given that these schools are often serving highly disadvantaged populations, and that they are indeed offering a range of opportunities, such a view may be no more than a realistic appraisal of the situation. Nonetheless, there are obvious dangers here in terms both of paternalistic approaches to local people, and in terms of prioritising the school's view of the world over that of other community members and agencies. This is an issue to which we shall return. Suffice it to say here that these dangers appear to have been avoided in at least some cases.

2.3.2 Actions and activities

The patterns of activities in which FSESs engage likewise show some broad commonalities, but with important differences of emphasis. As responses to our review questionnaire (see appendix 1, table 4) indicate, there were considerable variations between schools. Despite the fact that FSESs were originally provided with a menu of areas in which they were expected to offer activities, schools accorded different levels of priority to these areas. Indeed, no one area was seen as a priority by more than about one third of responding schools. It is notable, however, that activities clearly focused on pupil learning – such as study support – tended to be identified by more FSESs as priorities, while activities most distant from pupils – community use of ICT and community use of facilities – were identified as priorities by fewest FSESs.

The case studies provide a way to look at the different strategic directions taken by different FSESs in developing their activities. Case study FSESs were asked not only to describe the activities they undertook, but also to organise them into 'strands of action' organised around the school's avowed aims. All of the case study FSESs had activities targeted at pupils, families and the wider community, regardless of whether their aims were expressed in more 'pupil-focused' or more 'holistically-focused' ways. Typically, strands of action focused on the provision of support to children and adults in dealing with difficulties in their lives, and on activities designed to promote and greater engagement with learning and thus higher levels of achievement.

28

All of the case study schools developed activities aimed at providing swift access for pupils to a range of personal support. This might take the form of access to teaching and non-teaching staff directly employed by the school, or to professionals from other agencies and organisations working in or with the school. The mixture of school and non-school personnel on Hornham College's multi-agency panel is typical of the diverse sources of support made available to pupils, while the panel itself is typical of the tendency of FSESs to evolve some sort of co-ordinating mechanism to ensure that this support was coherent. Commonly, swift access did not simply involve more efficient referral. Because support workers were already in the school, they could encounter pupils in the course of their normal work, as in the case of learning mentors, and/or pupils could refer themselves, as in the case of Neaston's multi-agency base with drop-in facilities.

All of the case study schools also developed activities aimed at promoting greater engagement with learning on the part of pupils. These might take the form of relatively large-scale curricular and pedagogical initiatives, as with Walton's media arts-based curriculum, or Hornham's 'more appropriate' curriculum. They might also take the form of additional support within schools hours – for instance, learning mentor support at Neaston – and/or opportunities to engage in learning activities outside normal hours – for instance, the wide range of clubs at Weatherknowle. Often, as at Weatherknowle, the difficulties children faced in their lives and their tendency to struggle with learning were seen as closely related, so little distinction was made between activities aimed at offering support and those aimed at enhancing engagement with learning. The breakfast clubs offered at Weatherknowle and else where, for instance, could easily be seen as fulfilling both purposes. Similarly, all the case study schools were engaged in wider school improvement initiatives aimed at enhancing teaching and learning and so at raising achievement. Typically, they saw these initiatives as supporting and supported by their more targeted extended activities, and in some cases – as with Walton's media arts-based curriculum – it was not useful to distinguish one from another.

The more holistically focused FSESs were, the more likely it was that their efforts to support and engage pupils would be accompanied by extensive efforts to support and engage both families and local people. In these cases, support for pupils and for their families were delivered as part of integrated interventions, and might easily extend into support for other community members. As with pupil support, the key was for the school to work closely with non-education professionals, who could offer families and others easy access to a range of services. Central Primary's family support team is a good example of this approach in action. Its inclusion of tenancy support workers and domestic violence workers indicates a commitment to dealing with a wide range of difficulties that families might face, and not just those which most immediately impact on children's learning. Likewise, it is not surprising that Central was to become the base for a children's centre, given that its holistic approach to support was already close to that embodied in the children's centre initiative.

As in work with pupils, support for families and pupils tended to be accompanied by activities aimed at engaging families and local people with learning. This is most evident in the work of Neaston's CLC. Not only did Neaston offer a range of traditional courses,

but it set out explicitly to build adults' confidence, to develop progression routes, to target vulnerable adults, and to link the provision of learning opportunities with pathways into employment.

Given what we said earlier about the tendency of FSESs to adopt deficit views of pupils, there was some ambiguity about the meaning of activities in some cases, and, therefore, some indications of alternative possibilities. This is clear, for instance, if we look at the curriculum developments at Hornham and Walton. The former's 'more appropriate' curriculum can perhaps be seen as deriving from a view that older pupils were incapable of learning within a traditional, academically-oriented curriculum. As such, it forms part of a long line of 'alternative' curricula targeted at low-attaining pupils in their final years of schooling. However, Walton's curriculum initiative was not targeted at low-attaining pupils and was not predicated on those pupils first having failed in a more traditional curriculum. It seems to represent an exploration of new ways of promoting learning rather than of managing failure. In the same vein, a number of case study schools, like Bellfield, worked hard at developing what they described as 'student leadership', giving children and young people experience of running their own activities and taking part in school-level decision-making. Although this might be taken to imply the view that pupils were weak in this respect, it was not clear that this was always the case. Bellfield's strategy, for instance, was open to all pupils and not targeted on those who were held to have particular problems.

There are similar indications in some schools of more positive views of families and communities. For instance, although much of Neaston's work was clearly targeted at people living in disadvantaged circumstances, the view of parents as 'achievers' suggests something other than a purely deficit view. This was similarly evident in another case study school (primary 1.3) which went out of its way to employ parents and other local people, and which tried to encourage and train them as activists involved in changing their own circumstances. In these cases, the implication was that, although people were disadvantaged by their circumstances, they themselves might have considerable potential.

As a further caveat, it is worth noting that the picture we have given here of schools with stable views and stable portfolios of activities is a little misleading. Both views and activities were more fluid than this implies, and it was not unusual to find new sets of activities in place each time we visited a school. Often, this was because new opportunities had presented themselves, or because earlier activities had run their course or begun to seem inadequate. If there was a trend, however, it was towards the adoption of a more holistic focus, and therefore of more wide-ranging activities. Bellfield's move from a child (and to some extent family) focus towards the exploration of its potential role as a community hub, is typical in this respect. Understandably, perhaps, schools started with the issues and resources that were closest to hand, and only as they gained confidence and developed their networks did they feel able to reach out more widely.

2.3.3 FSESs and other initiatives

It is important to note that, as we indicated in chapter 1, we focused our evaluation on schools' FSES *approaches* rather than simply on any additional activities that were supported exclusively by funding from the DfES initiative. The distinction between the two is clear in a school such as Walton High. Here, we see a range of activities that are 'extended' in the sense that they go beyond the core school business of teaching and learning within the boundaries of the National Curriculum. These include the school's work on community arts groups, for instance, and its development of a range of out of hours activities for pupils. However, school leaders in Walton High were very clear that these extended activities were part of a more wide-ranging yet integrated approach which focused on using the arts as a vehicle for developing the capacities of both pupils and local people, and which was concerned, ultimately, with developing active citizens within a more cohesive community. Crucial to this approach was the development of the media arts-based curriculum which would certainly not be regarded as an 'extended' activity in the usual sense.

For Walton, this meant that other initiatives were as important as the FSES initiative in developing this overall approach. Specifically, this meant the school's successful bid for Arts and Media specialist status, around which many of its activities were co-ordinated. We can see the same phenomenon in different forms in other schools. In Hornham, for instance, BIP, BEST, EiC, Healthy Schools, Technology specialist status, and the 14-19 strategy are important. In Central, the children's centre development was proving particularly important. Neaston acknowledged a debt to SureStart operating in its area, and to BIP, EiC and the 14-19 strategy.

By and large, school leaders did not make hard and fast distinctions between these other initiatives and the FSES initiative. As we shall see in the section on funding below, they tended to bundle together as part of their overall approach activities supported from different sources, and to draw resources from wherever they could find them to support their work.

2.3.4 Leadership and management

The existence of dedicated leadership structures to give time and status to the management of FSES activities emerged as crucial to the development of all FSESs. Nearly all schools indicated in their responses to the review questionnaire (appendix 1, section 8) that they had a member of staff who acted as FSES coordinator. Most schools reported that their coordinator was a member of the Senior Leadership Team, was appointed specifically to carry out this role, and/or spent over half of their time on FSES activities. At Bellfield College, for instance, the FSES coordinator was an assistant head teacher, responsible for the school's overall inclusion policy, and working closely both with the head teacher and with other agencies. Similarly, Central Primary had appointed a full time community project coordinator whose role had broadened to include co-ordination and management of both extended provision and the Children Centre (due to be built on site). Both Bellfield and Central also had childcare coordinators.

These dedicated leadership posts may explain why most FSESs responding to our survey felt that the management of FSES activities did not conflict with the management of teaching and learning and might even enhance it (see appendix 1, section 8). Certainly, the case study schools reported that, in a situation where children's achievements could not be raised without addressing the various 'barriers to learning' which they experienced, the work involved in leading extended activities was part of the school's core commitment to teaching and learning rather than an added burden. This was reflected in the centrality of FSES provision to school planning processes. Responses to the survey (appendix 6, section 8) indicate that all schools included FSES activities in their school improvement plans, and the majority included them in the school's planning cycle.

Interestingly, the importance of integrating leadership of extended provision into leadership of the school as a whole was confirmed in the case of one school, secondary FSES 1.4, where leadership structures did not work well for at least part of the time. Here, the FSES coordinator was initially employed directly by the LA. We were told that this had not been satisfactory because extended activities were not integrated sufficiently well into the core business of the school. As the head teacher suggested, most members of the teaching staff had little idea what these extended activities were or how they related to their work in classrooms. The issue here seemed to be the degree of integration which leadership structures achieved between core and extended activities rather than in the allegiance to the LA as such. For instance, in primary FSES 1.3, the FSES coordinator for the school was also the LA FSES coordinator. However, a lot of her time was spent in the FSES school and others in the same cluster and the model of management was reported to be working.

This also goes some way to explaining why schools retained a high level of responsibility for managing their own extended activities, even when they established partnerships for the delivery of that provision. Like the schools described in the cameos above, FSESs worked closely with a range of organisations in delivering extended provision. A few, like Hornham, were set up as partner schools in a FSES cluster or, like Bellfield, were beginning to move towards cluster working. Responses to the questionnaire (appendix 6, table 12) indicated that, for some, this had led to the establishment of joint leadership structures. The majority of FSESs, however, retained control of their activities themselves, and partners were more likely to be consulted rather than given a full say in decision-making. Indeed, the degree of apparent partnership with other schools might be deceptive. Hornham, for instance, developed its approach in parallel with its partner school rather than as part of a fully-co-ordinated effort, while the cluster working of schools such as Bellfield was often predicated on the FSES involving other schools is its own strategy rather than on any jointly-developed approach.

Moreover, decision-making in this sense typically referred to the decisions made by heads and their FSES coordinators. In only about a third of responding schools were governing bodies seen as being heavily involved in decisions, though most heads saw their governors as supportive (appendix 6, section 8). Likewise, local people were consulted about FSES provision rather than formally involved in decision-making

(appendix 6, table 12). Certainly, on our many visits to FSESs, it was rare for us to meet decision-makers other than the head and coordinator, or to be given any indication that others were playing a prominent role in the formulation of strategy.

2.3.5 Staffing and work with other agencies

As we see from the cameos above, although FSESs offered a wide range of activities, it was by no means the case that these were staffed exclusively by members of the school's teaching staff. By and large, teachers were involved principally in those activities that were directly curriculum-related. Other activities were staffed: by volunteers, particularly parents; by paraprofessionals (such as learning mentors or family liaison officers) recruited by the school, often from the local area; by non-teacher professionals based for some or all of their time in the school; and by non-teacher professionals recruited by the school. The sorts of multi- and para-professional teams assembled by schools such as Bellfield or Central were typical of what we saw.

This inevitably meant that FSESs worked with a wide range of agencies. Responses to the questionnaire (appendix 1, table 9) suggest that the most common partner organisations were the Adult Learning Service, the Primary Care Trust, Sure Start, voluntary and community organisations, and the police service. This variety of partners is reflected in the picture of professionals working with the school (appendix 1, table 10). Many schools worked with health workers, adult learning workers, youth workers and voluntary organisation workers. 'Working with' in this sense meant that these workers might visit the school or, quite commonly, be based in the school. It was rarer for professionals other than teachers and teaching-related staff to be directly employed by the school, though there were exceptions. Central Primary's social worker, for instance, was a school employee, and the school was delighted with their ability to direct a resource of this kind. Crucially, many of the professionals and para-professionals working in FSESs were not simply visiting to take referrals from teachers, but were delivering services to children and adults from the school base.

Although in previous reports (Cummings et al, 2005, 2006) we have drawn attention to some of the difficulties FSESs experienced in establishing partnerships, the overall picture is quite positive, with nearly all schools reporting their attempts at collaboration as having been partially or largely successful (appendix 1, section 7). This may be because collaboration was, for the most part, driven by proactive heads and FSES coordinators, inviting other agencies to work with the school and use it as a base for delivering their services. Since, by and large, other agencies shared the broad aims of the school, and since schools could offer access to children, agencies tended to view this invitation positively (see appendix 1, table 11). This did not mean that problems never occurred, however. Most of the case study schools reported that it took time for relationships to become established, and many identified one or other agency where the agency as a whole or individual professionals within it were reluctant to fall in with the school's plans.

2.3.6 Resourcing FSES provision

It is clear from the cameos that FSESs deployed substantial resources in maintaining their provision, and that they acquired these resources from multiple sources. Typically, they received funding from the DfES FSES initiative, made use of funds from other, related initiatives, called upon their base budgets, and drew down resources in kind from other organisations and from volunteers.

 As can be seen in table 1 in appendix 1, the majority of respondents received between £200,000 and £400,000 from the DfES initiative, though there was considerable variation and at least one school claimed to have received over £500,000. Typically, they combined these funds with those from other initiatives – notably BIP, EiC, specialist schools programme, healthy schools programme, NOF, SRB, Key Fund, the European Social Fund and charitable funding such as the National Lotteries Funds. Some schools also received funds from other statutory agencies such as the PCT, and a range of other sources are mentioned, such as Aim Higher, Awards for All, the Community Networks Fund, Connexions, Sure Start and a variety of local organisations. Just as FSESs saw their extended provision as closely integrated with their core business of teaching and learning, so, it would seem, they tended to view funds from a range of sources as part of an overall resourcing package to be used in support of their work.

The amounts FSESs reported themselves as receiving from these other sources was less than those from the DfES initiative – typically, less than £100,000 (see appendix 1, table 3). However, the amounts of funding received cannot be equated straightforwardly with the value of the resources deployed by FSESs in support of extended provision. This is because FSESs often received resources in kind from other organisations (youth work time in Walton, for instance, or police time in Neaston), and invariably drew on their own existing resources, such as teacher and head teacher time. The cost benefit analysis strand of the evaluation attempted to identify the financial value of the overall package of resources called on by schools, and came up with *annual* figures of between three quarters of a million pounds and two million pounds (see appendix 3, table 3). These figures are very large, certainly in comparison with the amount of additional funding available from the DfES initiative. However, they reflect both the capacity of FSESs to attract additional resources into the school and the broad-ranging way in which schools tended to define their FSES approach.

2.4 Overview of practice and provision

FSESs were characterised by considerable diversity as schools chartered their own directions in response to what they understood to be the situations they faced. Beneath this diversity, however, were some common features – a focus on overcoming pupils' 'barriers to learning', a recognition that these were related to what were seen as family and community problems, the development of additional provision to overcome these barriers, the deployment of additional staff and the formation of partnerships to deliver

this provision, the manipulation of multiple funding streams to support this provision, and a tendency for schools to go their own way in pursuing their aims.

It is not difficult to see how these common features – and some of the variations within them – were related to the contexts in which FSESs found themselves. Most obviously, many FSESs were serving areas of significant disadvantage, which largely explains their focus on 'barriers to learning'. We might add that some features of the national policy and funding regimes that we outlined in chapter 1 – the focus on achievement, the parallel focus on social exclusion, the availability of multiple funding streams, the move towards collaborative planning and inter-agency working – also created a context which seems to have shaped the approaches developed by FSESs. This of course has implications for the transferability of learning from the FSES initiative to the national roll out of extended schools, where contexts may be more varied – an issue that we shall address in chapter 5. It also begs the question of how far FSESs thought through their approaches, and how far they responded to policy and environmental contexts. Again, we shall return to conceptual issues in relation to the FSES approach in chapter 5.

3. Possibilities and challenges for FSESs

In our previous reports (Cummings et al., 2006, Cummings et al., 2005), we identified a series of issues that FSESs had to face, and a series of opportunities that they were beginning to exploit. These included the challenges and possibilities of working in partnership with other agencies and organisations, ensuring the sustainability of provision, working within area strategies, and developing appropriate management and governance structures. Our findings from earlier years have substantially been confirmed by our subsequent work. In what follows, therefore, we do not seek to repeat our earlier findings, but simply add some detail where we have further evidence, or reformulate them where new evidence suggests this is necessary.

3.1 Partnership working

Our earlier work with case study FSESs suggested that partnership work took time, and was vulnerable to changing priorities of the partner, but that over time it could generate some strong and lasting arrangements. As we saw in chapter 2, however, the overall picture by the end of the evaluation was a relatively bright one, with many FSESs reporting that they had been able to develop positive partnerships with other schools, and with voluntary and statutory organisations.

A key additional finding has been that some FSESs seem to have been able to create an additional 'layer' of provision for children and adults. The head of a secondary FSES (1.8) described this as a 'zone in-between', because it was between what schools ordinarily could provide and what services ordinarily provide. This layer commonly meant a range of professionals working on the school site at least for some of the week in order to provide support to both pupils and their families more quickly than would be the case if a referral to an outside agency was required. For example, the head and FSES coordinator in a primary FSES (2.7) told us how the standard model of referral to external agencies was inadequate to the pressing needs of the disadvantaged population served by the school. Social workers, in particular, she argued, were inundated with work, which meant there were delays of up to six months between referral and action, and that action tended to take the form of strictly time-limited interventions. The school, therefore, had begun to develop its own forms of support, drawing on learning mentors, family learning provision, a family liaison officer, a breakfast club and nursery provision. This put the school in the position of being able to respond rapidly to problems, to offer support on a continuing basis, to target children and families where there was evidence of difficulties, and to bring to bear a range of different types of provision to match the complex difficulties with which children and adults were often faced.

Central Primary (FSES 1.5), described in the chapter 2 cameos, had developed a similar layer of school-based rapid response to the support needs of pupils and families has emerged over the 3 years of the FSES initiative. In this school, the layer has grown from the employment of a social worker, to an understanding that professionals were now resourced from their own agencies to work on the site of the school. It had taken time, we were told, to evolve a way of working both within the group of professionals based on-site, and between that team and school staff. A model of organic growth had been crucial, building up what was needed, and building on what was working, rather than trying to import any model of perceived 'good practice'. The area that had been most problematic had been where the culture of a professional group had not been able to adapt to such organic growth and vary practice with the needs of the school's situation, but had had external professional protocols to follow.

Our internal report on primary FSES 1.3, agreed, like all such reports, by the school itself, listed some of the key factors which supported developments of this kind. It is worth reproducing here:

1. There is a ***culture of collaboration*** and trust within school, of talking about children (whether to pass on information, share concern, or express appreciation), and taking action in the present. Trust is central to the way all staff work. Working together – and no one working in isolation is also central to this culture. Everyone knows what their contribution is. Staff are valued and this is demonstrated in all interactions. Staff are seen as real people with personal and professional lives and this is part and parcel of the way the head teacher works with them. Children and parents are listened to and their voices have influence far beyond tokenism. The FSES identifies the importance of taking small steps that everyone can take rather than looking for grand structural changes. For example, consultation is not the 'big' solution – it is not a public meeting or a series of focus groups it is starting small and now – it is months and years of listening to people. It is about thinking about 'who needs to become involved before this becomes a crisis?' A premium is placed on the value of conversations: that it is only in these small conversations that actions happen for people.
2. The culture of collaboration is crucial, so much can be achieved in an FSES without many ***additional resources***. However, having additional staff who work on school premises, who build up relationships with other staff, parents and children, has enabled the delivery of support to vulnerable children and families when this support was needed as well as the provision of sessional services…A key issue in the provision of such staff is attention to their training needs.
3. Some more ***formal structures in school*** - meetings - to focus discussion on individual children and families and their needs and to reflect on ways school staff are working both with each other and with other professionals outside the school. These structures make an important contribution to making sure the needs of the vulnerable are being met, to sharing ideas about ways to work and to continuing to develop the culture of collaboration and to make sure the answer is 'yes' to the question of 'are people communicating at the right time?' Key to how

the formal and informal structures work is asking who needs to become involved before something becomes a crisis? These processes mean, according to the school, that most people who need help receive it. The head offers 52 weeks availability and other staff give out their mobile telephone numbers in case families need to speak with them at any time. Time has been given to develop these processes and structures and this has been crucial.

4. ***Shifts in multi-agency delivery***. Shifts are starting to happen in the ways children's services are being delivered because the LA FSES manager is starting to negotiate with each service (speech and language therapy, CAMHS, social services) a more flexible delivery of provision. This means that instead of simply continuing with existing models of working of skilled professionals who are based outside school, FSESs (this case study school but also other FSES schools in the LA) are involving such professionals in discussions with school-based inclusion teams in order to look at more effective working practices. This is important as there is not a universal model. It is recognised that relocating a team of social workers to a school might not work best whereas placing one social worker in a school might leave them isolated. Ensuring the right action for a particular situation at the right time is crucial. In the case of the child psycho-therapist, (a member of the CAMHS), this has led to a decision that she will be based one morning a week in school in a mentoring capacity. In other services this way of working has involved a small payment to the service to contribute (i.e. a proportion of a new salary) to the employment of a new member of staff for the service to train (but who does not work in the school), and the release for a few hours on a regular basis of an experienced worker from that service to negotiate an appropriate way of working with the school.

What seemed to be important was that problems could be dealt with immediately and in a way that fits with how the school operates. For example, in Central Primary (FSES 1.5) a mother who was suffering from a panic attack recently rang the head to inform her that she could not get her children to school. The head first offered that someone could collect the children, but the mother refused as there would be no way for her to collect them again at the end of the day. After more discussion, the head, with a range of resources immediately at her disposal, arranged for a counsellor (working on site but employed by a local voluntary organisation) to collect the children and for another worker from the same organisation to work with the mother. By the end of the day there was a plan of action and the mother had received prompt support.

Such organic, co-ordinated, well-resourced, on-site layers of support for pupils and families were emerging in a number of the case study FSESs. However, as our earlier reports made clear, the change in resource allocation and working practices was not always problem-free. In particular, the development of such provision demanded in effect that support be shaped to the school's priorities and working practices. This was straightforward where the FSES employed workers direct and was therefore not answerable to other agencies. Bellfield Community College (FSES 2. 3) told us that it could also work where trust had been built up over time (this FSES had been a

community school for many years), and where 'external' agencies believed that they could achieve some of their own aims and targets by working closely with the school.

However, it inevitably created tensions where FSESs' desire to enhance their own provision came into conflict with the responsibility of external agencies and the local authority to develop area-wide provision. So, for instance, primary FSES 2.7 had had disagreements with its local authority over its wish to expand its nursery provision, and had been unable to persuade health and social care to co-locate on the school site. This was despite the Every Child Matters agenda which, it believed, they saw as essentially a matter for education. Likewise, some secondary FSESs reported that workers from Behaviour and Education Support Teams were being relocated out of the school as local authorities moved towards the development of integrated services across the whole of their area.

It is not clear that such conflicts could be explained simply in terms of the reluctance of external agencies to adapt their practices in order to support the work of the school. Rather, this seems to indicate a tension between the idea of an FSES as the hub of child, family and community provision and the idea of an FSES as a contributor to wider area strategies. This is one of the conceptual issues in the FSES approach to which we shall return later.

3.2 Sustainability

In the early stages of the evaluation, many FSESs were concerned about whether they would be able to sustain their provision beyond the lifetime of the initiative for which they received funding. At the very least, they found the business of constantly having to search for funds to be burdensome. As the responses to our review questionnaire indicate (appendix 1, table 8), the situation by the end of the initiative was that very few FSESs thought either that their provision would now cease, or that sustainability was no longer an issue. The large majority felt that their provision would continue, but that it might have to be scaled back, or that finding ways to sustain it would remain a burdensome task.

This issue deserves to be unpacked in a little more detail. Whilst there is clearly an issue of sustainability, it appears not to be closely tied to the funding of the DfES initiative. As we pointed out in the previous chapter, although most FSESs appear to have received fairly large sums of funding from the initiative, these funds made up only a small proportion of the resources which many of them devoted to the initiative. So, amongst our case study FSESs, although one school (2.11) effectively withdrew from its local project when it lost its additional funding, another (2.7) was maintaining its full range of provision after funding had ceased, while a third (1.13) claimed that it had developed all its extended provision without additional financial support funding since it was not a Behaviour Improvement Programme school and the funding had been retained by BIP for other purposes. It is also clear, as we saw in the previous chapter, that FSESs tended to

support their provision by combining funds and resources in kind from a wide range of sources. The implication is that the sustainability issue is less about the impact of the end of FSES initiative funding, than about the expectation that FSES approaches will be sustained from highly fluid and unpredictable streams of funding and other resources.

Where sustainability was seen as less of a problem, this was often because FSESs, their partners and LAs, had found some relatively stable structures within which to guarantee resources. This might mean (as in FSESs 1.3, 1.5 – Central Primary – and 2.3, for instance) that the FSES approach was sufficiently well-embedded for a consensus to have developed amongst all partners that this was an effective way for them to deliver their services. Alternatively, it might mean that more formal structures had developed, as our field notes indicate had happened in Hornham College (FSES 1.7.1):

> Sustainability is not seen to be an issue. The four localities for the delivery of children's services have been modelled on the experience of the FSES case studies [this FSES project was based on Hornham and a neighbouring secondary school]. The two head teachers have partial secondment as locality leaders. In this [school], all temporary FSES staff have become permanent – this primarily means the learning mentors. BIP staff are now part of integrated teams. The model being evolved LA-wide is synonymous with that of the FSES case study schools, enabling their work to be continued. The outcomes of the FSES are accepted by the school governors and by external agencies, and sustainability is therefore not seen to be a problem. An indication of this is that the sexual health counsellor was initially paid for by the school but is now provided by Health. A youth club, not paid for by the school (but by the youth service) has been set up at the community centre and the PCT are doing health checks at the community centre – both things have been facilitated by the Assistant Head/FSES manager. Three family workers on site are paid for by BIP. Over a number of years the LEA and other services have been involved in several multi-agency events at management and delivery level to gradually develop a shared understanding of purpose and strategy. This is underpinned theoretically by a model which has drawn upon thinking from earlier evaluations of this research project.

What seems to be key here is the patient build-up of consensus over time, making it possible for school's partners and local authorities to commit resource to a stable form of provision with known outcomes. This contrasts with what we saw in some other projects, where activities seemed to come and go with a good deal of rapidity, with the result that new resourcing streams constantly had to be found.

One way in which FSESs could support their provision was to charge for parts of it. FSESs varied in their policies on this, but in general terms, they made a distinction between activities that were part of their educational and community 'mission', and those that were quasi-commercial offerings. So, for instance, FSESs tended not to charge, or to charge very little, for out of school hours activities for children. However, they were more likely to charge for holiday activities and, especially, for childcare – though in these cases they might subsidise poorer families.

This would appear to indicate that FSESs were engaging with another conceptual issue in the FSES approach – that is, whether they saw themselves as offering optional forms of enhancement to local families and communities on a quasi-commercial basis, or as providing an essential public service. More generally, the sustainability issue raises the question of whether FSES provision is seen as part of schools' 'core business', or as some sort of optional add-on. The model of funding (and, more broadly, resourcing) within which FSESs operated seemed to imply the latter view. This is not simply because FSESs were dependent on time-limited initiative funding, but because their provision drew upon a wide range of inherently unpredictable funding and resourcing streams. Whilst schools could manage these streams with more or less skill to ensure some degree of stability, this is very different from a 'core business' model, in which schools – or, perhaps, schools and their partners – would have access to stable levels of dedicated resource over time.

3.3 The role of strategy

FSESs were clearly operating within the strategic frameworks provided by the DfES initiative, and amplified by the Every Child Matters agenda and, latterly, the national roll out of extended schools. In each case, these national initiatives were implemented through local support mechanisms. Our review questionnaire (appendix 1, section 9) shows that the large majority of FSESs were aware of the support on offer, that most of these felt themselves to be well supported, and that many felt that their work was part of a wider local strategy.

The meaning of strategy here, however, merits some exploration. The FSES initiative originally envisaged that one FSES would be established in each local authority area. Not surprisingly, therefore, participating schools were encouraged to pioneer the development of the FSES approach and tended not to work in the context of any wider local authority strategy. So, in responding to the questionnaire, over half of FSESs felt that they were 'going it alone', or that their work might support, but was not aligned with, wider strategies (appendix 1, table 13). In some FSESs (1.11 and 1.21, for instance) there was minimal local authority involvement. In others, there were tensions between the local authority and the FSES, as authority strategy cut across what the FSES itself wished to do.

Primary FSES 1.6, for example, had, like many FSESs, been a pioneer of extended provision in its area, and had developed its own partnerships and ways of working with, we were told, minimal involvement from the LA. In particular, it had developed a strong partnership with a community organisation, but this had led to tensions with the local authority as the latter sought to exercise its responsibilities in respect of the strategic direction and probity of local arrangements. With the advent of the national roll out of extended schools, moreover, the local authority had set up a cluster structure which compromised the school's ability to act autonomously in relation to extended provision.

Primary FSES 2.7 had somewhat similar experiences. Whilst its local authority was supportive, the FSES reported that it worked largely in isolation. It was aware that there was an area plan at local authority level, but the school had not been involved in it. Likewise, although the head had been asked to represent schools on an extended schools forum set up by the local authority, she had never actually been invited to any meetings. Moreover, the FSES had set up a steering group with its partners which had been taken over by the local authority so that they could run it on behalf of all extended schools. Finally, although the FSES drew many pupils from an area of significant disadvantage, it was located outside the area and therefore felt itself excluded from funding opportunities and opportunities to contribute to strategy. There was, for instance, a neighbourhood management initiative in the area, and while the school was not formally excluded from this, its notional participation did not lead to its being involved in any strategic initiatives. This is, of course, the FSES whose difficulties with external agencies were reported in the previous section.

On the other hand, a few FSESs were locked into strategies which seemed to offer some prospect of sustaining their work over the longer term and enhancing their effects. Hornham College and its partner school (FSES 1.7), cited above, is a case in point where the local authority had long been developing a community role for schools and saw both the FSES initiative and the national roll out of extended schools as a means of developing this approach further. In this case, it seems to have been helpful that FSES provision emerged within the context of a pre-existing LA strategy, and that the further development of that strategy went with the grain of what individual FSESs were seeking to do. The clearest cases, however, were in secondary FSESs 1.4 and 1.19. Here, there were authority-wide regeneration strategies, aimed at enhancing the educational and skill levels of the local population as a means of increasing employment opportunities. Although the details of these strategies differed, both involved the development of a network of schools with an FSES approach, linking pupil support with vocational education, family support and adult learning.

Again, it seems that the experience of these FSESs raises a conceptual issue in relation to the FSES approach. One way to understand that approach is as something that is driven by schools to meet the needs of themselves, their pupils, and local communities as they (the schools) interpret them. This implies that FSESs can formulate their own strategies and then enlist the support of others in delivery. The alternative is to see FSESs as contributors to a strategy – at area or local authority level – that is formulated elsewhere (though, of course, FSESs may well be involved in this formulation). In such a strategy, the needs of children, adults and communities are not interpreted by schools alone, but the work of schools is, in principle at least, enhanced by the coordinated efforts of other agencies and organisations working towards a common goal.

3.4 Consultation and governance

The question of who formulates strategy is inevitably linked to the question of who it is that FSESs consult in deciding on the nature of provision and how that provision is governed. As we saw in the previous chapter, the large majority of FSESs took decisions for themselves, consulting partners as they saw fit, and, even where formal structures for collaborative decision-making existed, these tended to have been established by the FSES. In only 5 cases were such management structures not established by the FSES (appendix 1, table 12). Likewise, although FSES leaders were likely to attend the meetings of a range of partnership bodies, set up around Excellence in Cities or the Children and Young People's agenda, for instance, there was no sense that these bodies had any controlling stake in what the FSES did, other than in authorities with the more strategic approaches outlined above. This was equally true of community involvement in governance. As we saw in chapter 2, governing bodies seem not to have been heavily involved in the strategic leadership of many FSESs. Moreover, in only 8 FSESs responding to the questionnaire were local people formally involved in governance other than through the governing body (appendix 1, table 14). Again, this did not mean that FSESs were operating in total isolation from their intended beneficiaries. As the questionnaire returns show, many FSESs had engaged in some sort of community consultation (appendix 1, table 14), and activities were commonly changed in response to what were seen as local needs and demands. However, consultation on a menu of provision is quite different from involvement in decisions about strategic direction.

There were exceptions to this. For instance, a number of FSESs (such as secondary FSESs 1.8 and 1.21) saw it as part of their role to develop 'student leadership' by involving pupils in decision-making in their schools. They saw this as a way of preparing young people to become active citizens and so play a part in improving the disadvantaged conditions under which they lived. In Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3), for instance, pupil representation on FSES steering groups was regarded as an essential means whereby they could contribute to decision making and feel a sense of ownership. One of the young people described the experience in positive terms:

> All the ideas they [the school staff] come up with they look to us for approval. They said they wanted to set up a homework club and we said yes but don't call it that as it won't get used. We take issues back to the council and we give members of the steering group lots to think about…At first it was odd as there were lots of acronyms and we weren't sure, so we said you need to tell us what you are talking about. People seem to look at us all the time now when they are talking, and so much has been done because of the issues we raised. We know our voices are being heard.

Elsewhere, this principle was extended to local people, who were encouraged to have their say in how the FSES operated as a step towards becoming activists in improving local conditions. For instance, in Central Primary (FSES 1.5), a counselling group was supporting parents in taking greater control of their lives. In an area where housing conditions were poor, parents made up over a third of those attending a community

meeting chaired by councillors. The counselling group went on to ask what it needed to do to make the council listen, contacted the health authority for information and was planning to make a campaigning video.

Primary FSES 1.6 found itself in a different situation, since it was located in a community which already had strong structures and leadership, and where provision on offer from a community organisation based in the community centre already offered a focal point. The FSES therefore entered a partnership with the community organisation to develop provision jointly. Although this raised complex issues over governance and ownership, it also ensured that provision had a firm basis of acceptability in local communities.

Interesting as these examples were, however, they did not disturb the overall pattern of FSESs (which in practice tended to mean senior leaders) largely making their own decisions about the direction they wished to take, and involving potential partners and beneficiaries very much on the school's terms. This is not, of course, necessarily a problem, but it does beg the question of who 'owns' FSESs. The answer during the course of the initiative was very much that they were owned by their own (senior) staff, working, of course, within local and national guidelines, and often consulting widely, but nonetheless ultimately remaining in charge.

3.5 Challenges and possibilities: an overview

The picture that emerges from our work is, broadly speaking, a positive one. Issues of sustainability and the difficulties of partnership working, which had figured prominently in earlier stages of the evaluation, remained as potentially problematic. However, enough FSESs had found ways round these difficulties to suggest that they were far from insuperable. Indeed, there were promising developments in terms of the stable and productive partnership arrangements that were now emerging, the beginnings of genuine pupil and community involvement, and the development of some very interesting strategic initiatives at local level.

It is clear, however, that the experience of FSESs in the national initiative raises some fundamental conceptual issues about the nature of the FSES approach, and, specifically, about how it should be formulated, managed and governed – in short, how it should be led. Put simply, that approach emerges, in the majority of cases, as a manifestation of social entrepreneurship. FSES leaders, acting in the best interests of pupils, families and communities as they see them, find ways of accessing funding and other resources to enable them to make extended provision. In so doing, they may well consult widely, develop stable partnerships with other organisations, contribute to local strategies, and even encourage the involvement of local people. However, in the final analysis, it is the FSES itself which decides what shall be done.

This style of leadership, of course, has many advantages. School leaders are close to the ground, have ready access to children and families, and are likely to have a good grasp of local conditions. Moreover, what appears from one perspective to be an unstable resourcing regime is also one which allows considerable flexibility of action. We see in the development of provision in the 'zone in-between' how FSESs can be light on their feet and achieve a flexibility and responsiveness of provision that has eluded other forms of organisation.

On the other hand, there are also examples in this chapter which point to a different way of leading the FSES approach. This is one in which entrepreneurship at the school level is replaced – or supplemented – by a clearer sense of area strategy, a greater involvement of partners from beyond the school (including local people) in decision-making, and a more stable resourcing regime. Here again, there are clear advantages in terms of stability, the opportunities for the development of better coordinated – and hence more powerful – approaches, and a more broadly-based means of identifying local needs and wishes.

It is not necessarily the case, of course, that these two styles of formulating, managing and governing the FSES approach are mutually exclusive, or that straightforward choices have to be made between them. Indeed, it is not difficult to see how they might complement each other. However, it is, we suggest, important to recognise that they are indeed different, and that their differences are not trivial. This is an issue to which we shall return in the final chapter.

4. Outcomes from FSESs

4.1 Pupil achievement outcomes

Although FSESs typically aim at a wide range of outcomes, those relating to pupil achievement figure prominently in most cases. As we reported in chapter 2, raised achievement for all pupils was the most commonly-professed aim amongst respondents, with related aims – raised achievement for low attainers and enhanced school performance – also prominent. Moreover, many FSESs responding to the questionnaire survey reported positive impacts on the achievements of all pupils, and on low attainers (see appendix 1, table 7).

This positive view is broadly supported by the other evidence we collected, though in somewhat complex ways. The statistical analysis of NPD, for instance, shows that pupils in FSESs achieve less highly on the whole than pupils in the majority of schools (see appendix 2). This seems to be explained by the disadvantaged nature of the intakes of FSESs rather than by any negative effect of FSES status. On the other hand, the analyses show no positive effect of FSES status on pupil attainment overall. Put simply, there is no evidence that being educated in an FSES enables the majority of pupils to attain more highly than they would do if they were educated in schools that did not have this status.

However, the NPD analysis does suggest that there may be more subtle and targeted effects of FSES status. The attainment gaps between pupils entitled to free school meals (FSM) and with special educational needs (SEN) on the one hand, and all other pupils on the other hand are smaller in FSESs than in other schools. It is possible that this finding has little to do with FSES status as such. Schools with highly disadvantaged intakes might be expected to put in place strategies for supporting their lowest-attaining pupils, and produce some improvement in attainment. Acquiring FSES status might have little effect on this improvement in itself – though, of course, such strategies might be regarded as part of an FSES approach regardless of the school's formal status. Equally, it is possible that the attainment gaps are smaller because in schools with highly disadvantaged intakes, higher-attaining pupils do not reach the levels of which they are capable.

However, it is also possible that the narrower attainment gaps represent a real FSES effect, and that they are due to enhanced performance on the part of lower-attaining and more vulnerable pupils. They may even partially be disguised by the tendency of schools without formal FSES status nonetheless to develop something very much like FSES approaches (we shall deal with the question of comparing FSESs and other schools shortly). Our other evidence would tend to support this explanation. As we have seen, FSESs took the business of raising the achievements of their pupils seriously and took

steps to do this through curriculum development, mentoring support, study support and so on. Although only 7 of the 68 schools responding to the survey (appendix 1, table 7) stated that raising achievement amongst lower attaining pupils was a priority, the reality in schools with disadvantaged intakes seems to have been that raising attainment for all necessarily meant support and intervention for the large numbers of children in difficulties. Not surprisingly, therefore, larger numbers of schools said that they focused on engaging children in learning (17), supporting children in difficulties or at risk (14), supporting parents and families in difficulties (28), or promoting parental involvement in their children's learning (28). It seems reasonable to suppose that all of these activities might have impacts on attainments, even if that was not stated as their primary aim.

Moreover, there is considerable evidence from our case study work that FSESs targeted children in difficulties and did so in ways which had impacts on their attainments. Although the patterns of targeted support and the outcomes from that support were different in every case, the following example is typical of what we found. It comes from school 1.8, a comprehensive school, and is taken from an interview with the parent of 'Alison' (all names are pseudonyms) who had begun to experience difficulties in her primary school. When she transferred to the secondary school, received intensive support from the school's pupils support facility which offered a 'safe haven' out of ordinary lessons:

> Alison got a problem with anxiety and she had it from the previous school. It was that bad we couldn't get her out of house. That's how serious it got. It was school based. [When she transferred to the secondary school,] the school knew about Alison's previous anxieties…calmed her down. Looked at the environment….They did it at Alison's pace - weekly task every week. Like, 'We'll probably take you into Maths this week. Just go in. Sit down for 5 minutes. Come out.'…Then week after they'll say, 'Right, we'll see if you can stay in Maths all week this time.' Every time she did a target they put a progress on her sheet where she could see herself as well so they were watching her targets all the way down and she could see what she was doing. Improvement all the time…

> [Now she attends] virtually every class…I think she's an able person. I think she's a bit – she's got a bit of knowledge and that. She's very quick. But when the anxiety took over she couldn't concentrate. If they thought she was being naughty, teachers – but she weren't it's just that she couldn't concentrate. Her grades – she got a 6 in Science last year. I think there were 4s and 5s in Maths, English, German. But before I think she got two or three no marks before, and that was the year she had anxiety.

Quite apart from the impact of this support on Alison's social and emotional well-being, it is clear that there is also an impact on her attainment. By the end of primary school, she is a girl who does not attend school at all and who fails to score (probably because of non-attendance) in national assessments. As a result of the school's support, she becomes someone who attends school and lessons regularly, and who achieves at measurable levels.

Significantly, Alison's case is not an isolated one. The school was able to demonstrate that significant numbers of its pupils were receiving intensive support of this kind (for instance, 44 in the period September 2005-February 2006). When pushed to estimate (in the course of fieldwork for the CBA) the impact of this kind of support on attainment, it claimed that some 21 additional pupils in each year's examination cohort gained 5A*-C GCSE equivalents. The only way to substantiate such a claim, of course, is through the sort of detailed case analysis set out above – and other cases were indeed made available by the school. Even then, as one interviewee pointed out, this is a matter of predicting what *might* have happened had the school not developed its FSES provision. Nonetheless, the evidence seems clear that FSES provision can impact on attainment. The implication is that, in schools that target children in difficulties, the impacts on these children may help explain the smaller gap in attainments between vulnerable children in FSESs and elsewhere.

A second example may be useful to support this argument. The following is an extract from an interview with the head teacher of primary school 1.3:

> You can walk the school and see it as the kids are soaking up learning. To have got attainment up at KS2 so much, we have had clearer communication with parents and told them ways of supporting their child's learning. This is raising parents' and children's aspirations…Exclusions are down. One boy is currently excluded as he had a weapon on him so we had to permanently exclude him. He is very high risk and his Dad is in prison. We have a re-integration package for him…If we didn't support him no-one else will. He's been brilliant and has been given an opportunity nobody else would have given…[Name of pupil] has said it has helped and he came in to school to sit his SATs and he is still here, through re-integration and is receiving ongoing support…There is also [name of another pupil] who was violent in school. His Mum was only 13 when she had him and he has been cautioned twice by the police for assault…We have re-integrated him and he's done his SATs.

The head's claims are supported by other evidence. KS2 aggregate scores across the three core subjects have risen from 183 in 2001 to 258 in 2006, while the proportion of pupils achieving level 4 or above in English and Maths has risen from 50% and 52% respectively in 2001, to 84% in both subjects in 2006. As in most FSESs, there are doubtless many factors involved in these improvements. However, the accounts of the two boys (and there were others supplied by this school) show children achieving who might well not have done so without the support of FSES provision.

These positive outcomes, of course, beg the question as to why gains in pupils' attainments are not reflected in attainment data for the pupil population in schools as a whole. If, as the head quoted above claims, 'the kids are soaking up learning', why do pupils in FSESs not outperform pupils in other schools, at least once other variables impacting on attainment (such as FSM entitlement and SEN) have been controlled?

Our evidence suggests a possible explanation for this. As we have seen, many FSESs put in place intensive support mechanisms for pupils in the greatest difficulties, and these

seem to have created the conditions in which such pupils might achieve. Most FSESs also developed strategies for enhancing the learning of all their pupils and saw this as one of their priorities (see appendix 1, table 6). These strategies seemed to fall into two groups. One was of what we might call generic school improvement strategies – improvements in assessment, target-setting, lesson-planning, staff development and so on. Such strategies were not the focus of our attention precisely because there seemed to be nothing in them that was specific either to the FSES initiative or to the broader FSES 'approaches' adopted by schools. It seems entirely likely that they were bringing about improvements in attainment, but that many schools outside the FSES initiative would be deploying similar strategies. The initiatives that supported these strategies in FSESs - schools mentioned Excellence in Cities, workforce remodelling, specialist schools status, raising boys' achievement initiatives, various aspects of the national strategies, in addition to local authority, cluster and individual school initiatives – were by no means confined to FSESs. Such programmes and initiatives, in various combinations, were available to many other schools, at a time when all schools were working strenuously to raise their pupils' attainments. As a deputy head in secondary FSES 2.6 suggested:

> Our results have gone up two years running but is it just about extended schooling? It is also about greater emphasis on mentoring and being more sophisticated in targeting students for targeted support.

Even where FSESs themselves regarded such strategies as part of their approach, it seems likely that other schools were taking similar action. The most obvious example here is Walton High's (FSES1.10) media arts-based curriculum which was closely associated with its specialist status and may well have been paralleled in other specialist schools. Since our analyses were aimed at identifying whether FSES status as such was associated with higher levels of attainment, they would not detect improvements occurring equally in schools within and outside the initiative.

The second group of universal strategies were more specific to FSESs, but they tended to lie on the periphery of the curriculum. For instance, school 1.11 differentiated between targeted work for vulnerable pupils, and universal provision open to all. This universal provision took the form of a well-attended breakfast club, a pupil-run local radio station, and 'learning for life' days which focused on a range of broader issues affecting children's live, such as sexual health. The aim of these activities was not raised measured attainment as such, but greater levels of engagement in learning, happier and more settled pupils, raised levels of self-esteem and motivation, higher aspirations, and the development of transferable skills. Moreover, although the school's performance in terms of overall pupil attainment improved during the course of the FSES initiative, senior staff attributed this improvement not just to FSES status, but to their participation in an Education Action Zone and the Excellence in Cities initiative, together with a range of curriculum and attendance strategies that they did not regard as being part of FSES provision.

Similarly, FSES 1.21 had a range of activities that were either open to all or were not targeted on the most vulnerable. Study support featured prominently amongst these, and

was well-used by pupils in examination years. However, other activities lay on the periphery of the curriculum, and included establishing a pupil leadership team, offering extended work experience opportunities, developing enterprise initiatives, and opening up social activities out of school hours. There is a good deal of evidence from this school of the engagement of large numbers of pupils in activities, and some evidence that these activities offered important opportunities for curriculum enrichment. It is also the case that overall levels of attainment in the school rose during the course of the FSES initiative. However, with the exception of study support, the purpose of these activities was understood by school staff in terms of developing democratic participation, leadership and a spirit of enterprise amongst pupils, rather than impacting directly on attainment. Although, therefore, overall levels of attainment in the school rose during the course of the FSES initiative, there is little evidence to suggest that, study support apart, this was directly because of FSES provision.

This pattern is fairly typical of the FSESs we worked with in the study. By and large, their targeted provision, though often aimed at resolving a range of personal and family difficulties, created conditions under which pupils could begin to learn, and hence had sometimes dramatic effects on their attainment. Non-targeted provision, by contrast, had what might be called *cultural* effects. This is not to say that it ignored pupil attainment. On the contrary, some aspects of it, such as the provision of study support, mentoring or ICT opportunities seem likely to have had direct impacts on the attainments of those who participated. However, non-targeted provision tended to focus principally on changing attitudes to learning, on increasing learning opportunities, or on curriculum enrichment, rather than more narrowly on ensuring that pupils passed tests and examinations. Its direct effects on attainment, at least in the short term were, therefore, likely to be limited.

4.2 Engagement with learning and other pupil outcomes

As the examples cited above indicate, there is a close relationship between direct impacts on attainment and impacts on other aspects of children's well-being that create the conditions for attainment. Most obviously, if children can be helped with social, emotional and behavioural problems to the point where they attend school and classes regularly, they are in a position to learn and to achieve in assessments. Many FSESs saw the provision of these kinds of help as amongst the priorities for their provision. Twenty nine of the 68 schools responding to the questionnaire survey saw enhanced personal, social and health outcomes as amongst their three main aims, and 14 saw the provision of better support for children in difficulties or at risk as a priority (appendix 1, table 6). Regardless of the extent of prioritisation, however, 61 FSESs reported that they had generated positive personal, social and health outcomes, and 57 reported that they had developed enhanced forms of support (appendix 1, table 7).

4.2.1 Personal and social outcomes

In our previous reports (Cummings et al., 2006, 2005), we suggested that these were not idle claims, and showed how FSES provision could have major impacts on individual children in difficulties. The following three examples are chosen from many that could have been cited. Although they are lengthy, they illustrate well the range of provision that was available in FSESs and the way this provision was used to impact on children and young people. First, there is a testimonial from a 15 year old pupil at secondary FSES 1.11. The school had a multi-agency support team on site and had established an off-site alternative education centre in collaboration with the local authority youth and community learning service:

> From an early age school was very problematic "I didn't like it". I couldn't get on with the teachers; I was always fighting and could not control my anger. I eventually got kicked out and was sent to a naughty boys' school. At this school a teacher helped me to stay calm but I was still not allowed to go to mainstream senior school because of my behaviour. I was put on an alternative education programme at [name of two alternative education providers]. Neither of these two placements worked and the police were called because I was fighting and then I was asked to leave. At home I also started to get into trouble with the police. I had to attend court and had to attend Youth Offending Team sessions. I also started to use "tack" [a drug] on a regular basis. Eventually I was allowed to go to [FSES 1.11] however, within a short time I could not cope and started to fight, [be] aggressive to teachers and finally took drugs during school and ended up in hospital. During this time I was angry with everyone, teachers, pupils and people in general. After a while I returned to [FSES 1.11] where I had to stay in the learning centre. This made [me] feel frustrated and I just left.

> Here and now:

> Last year I was asked if I would like to join the Alternative Curriculum programme at [name of community centre]. I had never heard of it but I thought I would give it a go. When I first went there everyone made me feel so welcome. It's a small group, they seemed to like me and I was able to make friends. And the workers are mint, if you have a problem you can go to them and they'll help.

> [His first challenge came when he was asked to do some written work.] I wrote something but I tossed it in the bin – I just panicked. But rather than being shouted at, the workers calmed me down. I thought everyone would laugh at me but instead they all helped me. This experience helped my confidence and I am now able to try new things without feeling afraid. Over the months my confidence has increased, I have achieved my bronze and silver ASDAN [Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network] Award and am working on my gold (which I didn't think I would get). I have learnt how to cook, budget and run a lunch club for old people. I do writing and number work without getting aggressive and I am much calmer – that's not to say I don't still get angry I am

just learning how to cope with it better. I am also learning how to cope with people in authority better and I do outdoor education activities, which I really enjoy. I have made some good friends, learnt to trust adults and work together as a team to achieve goals. The list could go on and on in terms of what I am achieving 'cause I haven't finished yet!! My home life is much better. My relationship with my Mum has improved greatly (she is so proud of me now) and I have not been in trouble with the police in six months. If you were to ask me what's the best thing about [name of centre] I would have to say everything it's sweet as a nut!!!

A second example comes from primary FSES 1.6. Here, the school had established a range of out of school hours activities, including involvement in a 'playing for success' initiative with the local rugby league club. A parent talks here about the effect on his son:

He was able to see things in a different environment. He was so eager to go and came back saying, 'I can do this, I can do that.' It raised his team building and interpersonal skills…As parents we didn't worry about picking him up or dropping him off as he went on the minibus. He was always very eager to go. It was seen as a bit of a reward for good behaviour and it was definitely a good motivational tool. At the end of the 13 weeks he had a presentation. He was so excited and he got to bring a ball home for Mum and Dad and Aunty and the nephews to see. He did really well and I pointed out to him that this was the kid of reward he will get if he does well at school…He also got to meet rugby players. He got such a lot out of it when you talk with him.

A third example comes from Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3), where the school had established a multi-disciplinary 'inclusion team' to work with young people in difficulties. Here a Connexions personal adviser who was part of the team describes her work with one girl:

[Name of pupil] was referred in year 9. Her behaviour in school was aggressive towards teachers and staff. She wasn't staying in lessons. She was a substance misuser and had outside issues with boyfriends and relationships with other young people. There was no family liaison. She was disaffected with school and at risk of exclusion. When I spoke to her I found she had very little self-esteem and she was involved in substance misuse. So the work I did involved home visits so parents were involved and I did self esteem and anger management sessions [with the pupil] and linked in with the inclusion team so she could do 4 GCSEs in the unit [the inclusion unit in school where students get 1:1 support to complete GCSEs] and I supported her to and from her work placement. I also referred her to the substance misuse worker who comes into school…The inclusion team and I got her a taster course at a FE college in hairdressing and beauty so her timetable was a flexible package so she did this and had sessions to do her GCSEs. We picked her up in Year 9 and did preventative work to try and get her back in class but it wasn't working, so in Year 10 I arranged with the school the work placement. I also showed her around different FE colleges to remove any

prejudgements. When she left Year 11 she came here [the school] to apply to do an NVQ in early years. Her attendance has been brilliant and now she is looking to work in social care and I've linked her with the social worker [in the FSES] to get a grounding in the job…Before this she was being less abusive with staff and said she wanted to come back to school and attend regularly…[Without support] I don't think she would have finished school. She had no aspirations and wanted to work in the local caf[é]. It's really boosted her self-esteem and she is now thinking of helping other young people that she says 'were like me'. It's so great when it goes like this. It's the multi-agency staff that's given this input.

These three examples are very different in terms both of the severity of difficulties faced by the pupils and the strategies used to address those difficulties. In the primary school, the issue is one of motivation and reward across the school population as a whole rather than serious personal and family difficulties on the part of the boy in question. The two secondary examples are more complex and serious (though it is important to note that children in primary FSESs often experienced similar levels of difficulty). Here, the young people have already found school difficult, have begun to disengage from education, and have begun to engage in risky behaviour. In each case, however, we can see how FSES provision produces positive outcomes. As FSESs' theories of change usually predicted, children and young people worked with supportive adults, began to feel better about themselves, and as a result became more pro-social, and more engaged with learning. In the two secondary cases, it is also possible to say that this re-engagement led on to accredited achievement and to what were likely to be enhanced opportunities in the labour market.

There are two other features of these cases that are typical of what we found in FSESs. First, the immediate cause of change in these young people is contact with supportive adults who view them positively. Although there were examples of school teachers playing this role, there were also many examples, as here, where the adults in question were not teachers. The reaction of the first young man to the challenge of writing illustrates how difficult it might be for teachers to play this role in the context of ordinary classrooms, where the demands of curriculum and assessment inevitably constrain responses. What FSESs were able to offer, therefore, was access to a range of adults who were not constrained by the demands of teaching and were therefore able to relate to children and young people in different ways. This, of course, begs the question about the transferability of outcomes to ordinary classroom situations (which clearly did not happen in the case of the secondary-aged young people here).

Second, it is important to note that the two examples from secondary FSESs are not unproblematic success stories. The problems experienced by these young people were long-standing and included significant periods of time where the schools themselves were unable to engage with the young person. This implies that perseverance on the part of the FSES is an important factor for positive outcomes in such cases; as a number of head teachers told us, an important guiding principle for them was never to give up on a child or young person. However, it leaves open the possibility that further difficulties might arise in future, requiring further interventions. In other words, the difficulties of children

and young people were not so much resolved permanently by FSES provision as stabilised temporarily. Given that the evaluation was not able to track young people over time to any significant extent, it is only possible to offer indicative evidence as to whether this might indeed be the case. For instance, both of the secondary FSESs above had established forms of extended provision before the formal start of the DfES initiative, from which the young people in question might in principle have benefited. The fact that they experienced difficulties despite this provision lends weight to the hypothesis that continual intervention rather than one-off resolution is likely to be the norm in some cases.

Indeed, FSESs often reported a small number of cases where their interventions had not – or had not yet – been successful. The following example comes from primary FSES 1.12:

> [We had a] child who was permanently excluded before Christmas last year, and that's the first one we've ever done at this school. It was a child who had such a lot of agency support – in terms of in-school had learning mentor time, we went to get a [voluntary organisation] mentor out of school, social workers were involved…we had lunchtime buddies in to help, clubs for him to go to, we tried to exclude him just at lunchtime...As it is there is a lot of other things happening in his life, his mum was not dealing with that, therefore he was coming seeing that she wasn't really bothered. His behaviour deteriorated and in the end we just had no choice, actually the best thing for him as well as all the other people in the class that he was disrupting constantly, he had to be excluded.

What we see here is a familiar picture in many schools, in which the school deploys all its available resources but finally concludes it can do no more. It is clear that the same issue arises in FSESs, though in these cases the schools have far more resources to deploy before they exhaust their capacity. Significantly, the FSES in this case has far more resources to deploy than do most schools, but these are not unlimited. The head's final calculus of costs and benefits is also familiar from other FSESs. As the head of secondary FSES 1.8 told us:

> The further out on the margins these youngsters are, the more costly they are in terms of provision to keep them here and so therefore the capacity that we build is a real danger that each individual child that we include, absorbs a greater and greater proportion of the resources we've got and therefore the logical question we've got to ask of ourselves, and we must provide an answer, are we, by being inclusive with these children, depriving these children of things that they should have.

Finally, few FSESs were able to guarantee that their former pupils would move into situations where equivalent levels of support were available, and at this same head reported that there was a high level of drop out amongst its young people post-16 because of the lack of support in receiving institutions.

4.2.2 Health outcomes

It is significant that the two young people cited above were engaging in risky behaviour from a health perspective, and that the FSESs' interventions seem to have brought this behaviour under control. In fact, personal, social and health outcomes were often closely interrelated and were treated as such by schools. Schools tended to set up two kinds of health-related provision – though there was considerable overlap between them. First, a number of FSESs set up open-access forms of provision, such as drop-in health clinics or curriculum sessions, which enabled children and young people to get advice on health matters as they needed it. The evidence we collected suggested that these facilities were extensively used and that they resulted in changes in young people's behaviour and health-related outcomes. The following case study is typical, and is taken from a report produced for us by secondary FSES 2.6:

> Student Z was seen by our school nurse at the student's request. Student Z was concerned that she was overweight. Following discussion with the student about her eating habits and analysis of her weight/height it was apparent that student Z was in fact significantly underweight. A food diary was kept for a period of time, regular support was given by the school nurse who liaised with a consultant paediatrician. Support was coupled with referral to the [name of Behavioural Support Unit] due to a significant number of absences from school, and CAMHS who offered emotional support. Following regular mentoring, advice, dietician advice and a planned exercise regime Student Z was successfully re-integrated within school and progressed to take GCSE examinations obtaining 5 grade A* - C.

The second form of provision took the form of more proactive interventions without relying on self-referral. The following field notes come from an interview with the nurse based in secondary FSES 1.11, but also offering extended services in its feeder primary schools and is typical of many such cases:

> A year 6 student was referred to the nurse for displaying aggressive behaviour to teachers and to boys in class. The nurse did some self-esteem work initially and after working with her for a while the student disclosed that she was expected to care for her younger sibling aged 4. The needs of her sibling (e.g. picking her up and dropping her off from school, general care etc) were completely her responsibility. The pupil was also being hit by her Mother and looked neglected. Her Mother had a string of boyfriends who, according to the girl, were 'not nice'. The school had never been able to engage the Mother in the past but the nurse contacted her and began to work with her.
>
> *Outcomes*: The pupil and family are receiving ongoing support from the nurse. The nurse explained: 'Initially Mam gave me abuse and put the phone down but I persevered and rang back and she told me that one of her daughters was bed wetting and it turned out she was being sexually abused. At the time the oldest one [child] was at the [FSES] and she disclosed sexual abuse. Mam didn't have

any idea but it all came out. Mam is now engaged and is trying to make changes and the grandparents now help out. They are looking after the little one'. She also discussed other outcomes: 'The ten year old had strong absences when she was going into a stare, and I said to her Mam to take her to the GP, and it turns out she is epileptic. She would never have gone for advice but now she and the girls go to the doctors regularly and know the importance of health appointments. She also now goes to parents' evenings. Life still isn't brilliant but Mam knows she can't hit the kids and the kids are now on the child protection register… The oldest one said to a Police Officer 'I'm so happy [name of nurse] got involved' and she thinks life will be better for the four year old sister. She said she wished she'd had someone to go to when she was younger'.

In both these cases, we see evidence which tends to substantiate the theories of change articulated by many FSESs. The accessibility to children of professionals other than teachers makes it more likely that difficulties in their lives will be identified. The professionals are then able to work together and work with the child and family to remove or ameliorate these difficulties. This then creates a situation where the child has better health outcomes, but where these are associated with better personal, social and (it seems very likely) educational outcomes. Indeed, in this case, we can see how FSES provision, particularly in the context of cluster working, extends these outcomes to other members of the child's family and results in a closer involvement of the mother with the school. It is also worth pointing out, however, in relation to the issue of one-off resolution versus constant intervention, that the family in the latter case was requiring ongoing support and that, in the nurse's words, 'life still isn't brilliant'.

As part of the cost benefit analysis strand of the evaluation, we asked schools to attempt to quantify some of the specific health outcomes that their FSES provision was generating (see appendix 3). This was a difficult task. Comparators are difficult to find where outcomes (for instance from smoking reduction) might be very long term, or risky behaviours (for instance in relation to drug misuse) might be hidden, or effects (as in the case of teenage pregnancy) might be dramatic at the individual level, but too small-scale to register at the whole population level. Respondents therefore had to consider 'what would have happened if' their FSES provision had not been in place, and to substantiate their claims with case evidence. On this basis, FSESs were confident in identifying positive health-related outcomes. So, for instance, secondary FSES 1.8 reported that its provision had been instrumental in reducing teenage births by 5, reducing the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases by 14, reducing alcohol and drug abuse in 25 cases each, and reducing smoking in 10 cases (see appendix 3, table 4). These numbers are small in absolute terms, but highly significant, of course, for the individuals involved.

4.3 Impacts on families and communities

As the examples cited in previous sections show, impacts on children and young people were frequently dependent on, and related to, impacts on families as a whole. In our final

survey of FSESs, a significant proportion – over a third - of responding FSESs prioritised aims in relation to families and communities (appendix 1, table 6). As was often the case, FSESs reported positive outcomes in relation to aims even where they did not see them as priorities. So, over three quarters of responding FSESs believed that they had indeed established better support for families and over two thirds believed that they had created enhanced community learning opportunities (appendix 1, table 7). However, both aims and outcomes in relation to families and communities were complex. For the sake of simplicity, the following section breaks them down into separate areas, though in practice they were often related.

4.3.1 Impacts on family stability and functioning

As in their work with children and young people, FSESs' impacts on families could either come from relatively low-level interactions, often initiated by families themselves, or from more proactive and intensive interventions. Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3), for instance, ran parenting courses and drop-in sessions for parents that fell into the former category. Field notes from this school illustrate the sort of outcomes that might be generated:

> The social worker [based in school]…discussed outcomes relating to the positive parenting course: 'They [parents] have learnt techniques of how to deal with the children. One woman has said that she changed her language and instead of saying 'you do this', 'you do that' she now says 'this is how it might be done' and she's avoided confrontation. It has built their [the parents'] confidence.' And: 'A couple of women were shy and they've really come out of themselves and shared advice. You make suggestions and they come back and say it works. One particular woman came in every week and said she'd tried things and that they've worked every time'…There were also reports from the school nurse of positive outcomes for parents who attended sessions at the FSES aimed at helping them to help their children during exam periods. She explained: 'Year 11 parents, through [name of assistant head and FSES coordinator] gave very positive feedback…they got a chance to raise concerns and found they were not alone. They knew where to access support for parents. Quite a few parents said, 'I do this, and that and the other' and so they were learning from each other. It's helped them see what they can do to equip their child [in preparation for GCSE examinations]'.

In the latter category were intensive interventions with families in crisis. A social worker in Central Primary (FSES 1.5), for instance, reported the following case:

> There was one family where Mum was suicidal. We put in support from [name of registered charity committed to helping young people deal with the effects of breakdown in family life], we got the children assessed at a children's hospital, and I went out with the counsellor at 10pm at night…Our work has been very, very positive. Mum was upset when she found out about an affair and she was suffering from domestic violence. Her son has Tourettes [Syndrome] and cerebral palsy and AD(H)D [attention deficit (hyperactivity) disorder] and she needed

support. We went out and talked to her and advised her what to do. We got the domestic violence police involved and a solicitor and we've given one to one support to enable her to be so much stronger…She's now got an injunction and is getting on with life with her children. We put in the support straight away. We could do that as we are a multi-agency team and this cuts down on the referral process and on money. The whole process is so much quicker.

These examples lie at opposite ends of a continuum in terms of the severity of problems faced by families and the scale of intervention undertaken by the FSES. However, in both of these cases we see a pattern that was typical of FSESs' work with families. Because families have contact with the FSES through their children, it becomes relatively easy for the school to become aware their problems or for them to self-refer to the various support workers based in school. The FSES is then able to put in place some sort of support mechanism, which may involve providing support directly (as in both of these examples) or linking the family to other agencies and sources of support (as in the second example), or setting up some sort of support network (as in the first example). As a result, families that have previously been overwhelmed by problems begin to find ways to manage them. The adults become more confident and more outward looking, and often there is some positive impact on the children both from changes in their parents' behaviour and from access to their own forms of support.

Although it is difficult to generalise across a large number of cases, the key to this pattern seemed to lie in using support to enable families to manage their problems rather than to solve problems on their behalf. What mattered was that families got support in a timely manner, perhaps seeing them through a crisis, and that they then had means of dealing with those problems subsequently. In the thematic papers we wrote at the end of the second year of the evaluation (Cummings et al., 2006), we suggested that it might be more helpful to think in terms of developing the 'capability' (Sen, 1980, 1992) of families rather than of simply offering support. As one young mother, participating in a parents' support group in primary FSES 1.3 told us.

> You are normally stuck in a flat. This gets you out and you can get advice here on benefits and how to find work. You are also with people the same age who might say, 'have you tried this'. We give support to one another and you get support from [the staff] also.

As in support to children and young people, however, the implication of this model was that problems were not necessarily solved on a once-for-all basis. Schools were in the position of helping, enabling and sustaining, but not necessarily of finding permanent solutions to every problem. As the FSES coordinator in Central Primary (FSES 1.5), where the school had established a multi-disciplinary family support team:

> We thought if only we got this team together, we could cut out all problems. We aren't the answer to all of life's problems…We have seen very definite and very positive impact on families. We've seen transformation and empowerment with

many families but there are a couple of families where the problems are so ingrained and progress is slower…

4.3.2 Impacts on adult learning and life chances

Just under half of the responding FSESs saw impacts on adult learning as one of their priorities, and a few hoped to have a direct impact on employment for local people (appendix 1, table 6). In the event, over two thirds of FSESs claimed that they had actually had an impact on learning, and over a third that they had impacted on employment opportunities (appendix 1, table 7).

In our previous reports (Cummings et al., 2006, 2005), we presented evidence that these impacts had actually materialised. Although FSESs tended to offer a range of learning provision that adults found enjoyable, the most significant effects were in enabling people to move from a position where they had no qualifications and very limited prospects, to one where doors were beginning to open for them. The following account from an adult education officer working with primary 1.3 is typical:

> There was a guy who started a CLAIT (Computer Literacy and Information Technology) computer class and afterwards did his CLAIT diploma and succeeded. He was actually nominated for an adult learning award with the college and he was delighted and actually was selected as winner. What has been really good is that he and his son can help one another with their work. He used to be a bus driver and had been on long term sick and then had to think about a career change. He's now got the highest qualification we offer…We always try and provide progression routes and not necessarily at the same centre. They do tend to move for next level accreditation as they've gained confidence, been supported and been nurtured.

The point about confidence is well made here. Very frequently, people participating in adult learning provision told us that they had been reluctant to become engaged in learning, but that the FSES staff had encouraged them, that they had taken some first tentative steps, and that eventually they had gained the confidence to take more challenging, accredited courses. As parents in Central Primary (FSES 1.5) told us:

> It wakes your brain up, especially if you have been a stay at home Mum for so long and I've grown in confidence.

> I left school with no certificates or qualifications so to get these [shows a file of certificates] it is great.

> I passed English and Maths [at the FSES] and now I've moved on to do my GSES in English at [name of the college].

> I'm the only man here and the helpful thing is I can always get help here. I'm not afraid to ask here. I've been made to feel that I can ask. I never listened at school

and to think I've come here 6 years after I finished school and I've learnt more here.

In this context, the first step might not be towards formal learning at all. For instance, a parent in secondary FSES 1.22 told us about the difference attending a confidence-building course had made to her:

> A hell of a lot! Big difference, especially at home. It made me think about so much. How my family were with me, because they weren't there saying, 'You've got to go get a job. Go on, go try...How you gonna try if you don't get out.' None of that…[As a result of the course] I know my way around a computer…But I've got one piece of paper to say what I can do…Well most jobs involve computers. I said it's something I want to have. Something I can put on my CV which I know will be of some use to me. So I finished on the course and signed on Learn Direct. And I was here every day, for about 5 hours a day… I felt comfortable because I could speak to Sue. I got on with Stephen and Andrew and Alys [pseudonyms of FSES staff].

This was one of many cases where adults began by taking courses aimed at building their confidence as learners, and then moved on to more skills and vocationally-oriented provision. In this case, in fact, the mother in question had ended up as a full time employee in the school. Throughout, a key factor is the support she receives from the FSES staff who are able to help her to overcome the more negative messages she is receiving from her family.

There are clear parallels here with the impact of family support. The role of the FSES in both cases was not to transform people's lives so much as to enable them to take better control of those lives and take them in directions they valued. In this context, simply offering learning facilities is not enough. The key factor is that these facilities are offered in the context of outreach to and support for adults who do not see themselves as learners and who have previously had restricted opportunities to learn.

4.3.3 Impacts on communities

A minority of FSESs saw themselves as prioritising their role not simply in relation to children and families, nor even in relation to local people as learners, but in relation to the well-being of local communities as a whole. So, some of the FSESs responding to our survey saw impacts on community cohesion and safety or improved quality of life for local people as priority aims (appendix 1, table 6). As always, the actual impacts they believed they had were greater than these, with over half reporting positive impacts in these areas (appendix 1, table 7).

Although the well-being of a community is a nebulous concept, it can be operationalised to some extent through sets of statistical indicators relating to local conditions such as crime statistics, employment rates, health outcomes and so on. An analysis of Super Output Area statistics was undertaken using the National Neighbourhood Statistics.

School postcodes were used as the basis for these analyses. Data were examined on variables relating to health (e.g. long-term illness, general health), economic deprivation (e.g. child benefit claimants), training and skills (e.g. qualifications), and access to services. However, no significant findings emerged, largely due to the fact that data were aggregated for the whole population (most of whom attended education a long while prior to FSES) and/or were only collected at one time point, in many cases the 2001 census, which again was prior to FSES. More regularly-collected and fine-tuned data would be needed to find any correlation with FSES. It is not possible to conclude, therefore, that FSESs were having the large-scale effects on local communities that some of them were anticipating – though it is also fair to point out that they typically expected these impacts to take many years to materialise.

Nonetheless, there were some indications that community impacts were not entirely out of the question. For instance, it is reasonable to suppose that, where the learning opportunities offered by FSESs led on to employment, there would be some sort of feed back into the local economy and, possibly, into local cultural attitudes regarding the possibilities of work. Moreover, some FSESs played a direct role in enhancing employment opportunities by employing local people who might have found it difficult to secure employment elsewhere. For instance, in primary 1.3, over 80% of non-teaching staff were people from the local area.

Likewise, although adult learning provision had its most direct effects on the individuals involved, there were a number of examples where there were impacts on group as well as individual confidence and where, as a result, groups of local people felt able to take action to help themselves. The following account comes from a family support worker who had organised a parenting group in secondary FSES 1.11:

> One Mum [in the past] wouldn't even come and pick her children up at school…through the group her confidence has grown and now she's practically running the group as she feels so valued and she's looking into funding for the group…she's also starting another community group at a community centre in [name of LA] where she was on a course I got her on to…She came along and took part and got a qualification and now she's passing skills on to others and I think she'd like to become a tutor.

It is important not to exaggerate effects such as these, but they do indicate that benefits for individuals were able at times to be transformed into benefits for wider groups in local communities. In this respect, it is worth noting that some FSESs (notably secondary 1.8) saw their development of pupil leadership activities as a first step towards developing community leadership by local people – though, of course, the impacts of this strategy would take some years to materialise.

We also found evidence of other effects that might ultimately show in neighbourhood statistics but had not yet done so. For instance, a police officer working with Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3) reported that:

The work here [in the FSES] has had an effect on the number of reports of assaults made to the police. We've not had an official assault reported relating to this school in the last 18 months. This is great when you compare it to figures from my other schools where there are more assaults. The school deals with things before things get out of order. Parents and kids know I'll get involved and get things sorted if anything happens. I do get to the bottom of things and nip them in the bud. It's all about resolution…I can't recall having had a parent say to me, 'Why are you ringing me?' They just assume I will work with the school to address incidents. That's phenomenal. And kids don't bat an eyelid when they see me around college. Some pop into my office to see me.

Similarly, secondary FSES 1.7 .2 reported a halving in youth disorder incidents over the period of a year in which it had participated in a targeted strategy around youth issues. This, a youth worker told us, was:

> …the only [local] area where the rate has dropped and we hope it is, well it is so obvious it is to do with the targeted work.

Likewise, secondary FSES 1.4 offered a range of sports and fitness provision, and, the organiser told us, there were the beginnings of impacts on the health of local people:

> …there's two ladies that come to the keep fit class...They are not friends, just ladies from the community who come to the keep fit and come and talk to me, and one lady lost 4 stone…in about 18 months…I think the keep fit session and fitness suite has given her the incentive to keep going….So just in terms of making people healthier and aware of what they can do to make life better for themselves.

There were some hints of the role FSESs could play in building community cohesion. Walton High (FSES 1.10), for instance, was located in a multi-ethnic area where there had been significant tensions between ethnic groups. Although the school did not feel able to tackle cohesion issues in the community as such, it did feel that it had to tackle these issues in its own population, that it needed to involve community leaders in doing this, and that there would be some carry-over effect into the community itself. The head told us:

> …a few years ago we had a lot of problems with Afro-Caribbean street culture and middle eastern, Afghani tensions…We had CS-gassing of the Afghani boys as they went home one night because there were a lot of jealousies…Two years after when we had the [place name] Afghani heavies and things started to build up and that was all diffused by [the FSES coordinator] contacting different agencies, we got them in to school…The Afghani mentor was absolutely crucial at the time...and importantly the elders from that community…came into the school and talked to these boys in their own language and just turned the situation around, and having the community in our school, the same values that we were trying to encourage, it just worked like a dream.

In other schools serving minority ethnic communities, there were indications that the school could play a part in bringing about changes in attitudes within those communities. In these situations, the issue was not – or was not simply – that people had disengaged from learning because of their poor experiences or limited life-chances. There were also, we were told, cultural issues around the wariness of some people to access services that were not provided by members of, and in accordance with the cultural norms of, their own communities. So, for instance, primary FSES 1.6 offered its services in collaboration with a community-based organisation, with the result that relatively large numbers of people were accessing these services. The head told us that:

> In terms of a percentage, we have about 270 families at [FSES 1.6] and I would estimate at least two thirds of those will have accessed adult classes, the job centre, the community centre the sports hall or the before and after school provision more than once…It is because of the partnership between the school and [name of the voluntary organisation] that it is working. We have to meet community needs and are doing so. We are offering culturally sensitive provision that is accessible to everyone…Because we have the full service extended school and the community centre and the sports centre, we offer full provision and the community do not differentiate [between provision delivered by different providers], they just see it is community provision.

Likewise, primary FSES 2.7, which served an ethnically mixed population, reported that its adult learning provision, which had initially been dominated by better-resourced White British learners, was now more equally balanced between different ethnic groups.

4.4 Impacts on school performance and stability

Many FSESs, particularly in wave 1, described a position prior to their involvement in the FSES initiative where the school did badly on standard performance measures (of overall attainment, attendance and exclusions), where there was some breakdown of trust between the school and local people, and where some families were opting to send their children to other local schools. FSES status was intended in part, therefore, to bring benefits to the school alongside more immediate benefits to its pupils.

4.4.1 School performance and pupil attainment

Although school performance and the overall levels of pupil attainment we considered above are closely linked, they are not synonymous. This is because school performance is typically measured by reducing the attainments of all pupils to single figures, such as the proportion of pupils reaching a particular attainment threshold, or an average points score, or a single value added score. These figures are then used to compare schools with each other, or to compare the past performance of a school with its current performance. In this process:

- The attainments of individuals and small groups of pupils can be lost. It may be very important for an individual's life chances that s/he remains in school or attains at a higher level. However, such individual gains may make little impression on overall performance figures. Likewise, particular groups of pupils may do relatively badly in a school which has found ways of generating otherwise impressive performance figures.

- Comparisons may prove difficult. This is particularly true for FSESs which tend to have highly disadvantaged populations, and where precise matches with other schools are difficult. Likewise, comparisons with past performance can be misleading if, say, the school's intake changes or it seems to be failing to improve, when actually it is maintaining stability in a challenging situation.

Inevitably, therefore, these figures offer only crude proxies for benefits for pupils. Nonetheless, since they are commonly used to judge schools, they have considerable importance as a means of building the confidence of local people in the school, keeping its intake numbers buoyant, and thus creating a stable environment for its pupils.

In this context, the evidence from our data is encouraging. Although at various points during the lifetime of the FSES initiative, fears were expressed by teachers (usually not themselves in FSESs) that extended provision would distract schools from their core business of raising attainment (see, for instance, Brookes, 2006), there is no evidence that this is the case. In the survey over two thirds of respondents said that involvement in the initiative had had a positive impact on the school's performance on standard measures, with only one reporting a straightforwardly negative impact (appendix 1, table 7). Moreover, most of the case study schools were able to report a rise in performance levels during the course of the FSES initiative. Sometimes, this was dramatic. Secondary FSES 1.8, for instance, saw a rise in the proportion of pupils gaining 5+A*-Cs at GCSE from 34% in 2003 to 46% in 2005. At 1.7.1 (Hornham), there was a rise from 24% to 39% between 2003 and 2006. At primary FSES 1.3, aggregate points in KS2 assessments across the core subjects rose from 196 to 258. Moreover, these individual instances are lent weight by an analysis of the performance of all FSESs produced internally by DfES, but to which the evaluation team had access. This shows that both primary and secondary FSESs improved their performance on average over the lifetime of the initiative, but also that their performance levels rose faster than those of schools nationally and of a group of comparison schools with similar starting levels.

These figures make it possible to say with confidence that the development of FSES provision is entirely compatible with raised standards of performance in schools as measured by the usual attainment indicators. However, some caution needs to be exercised here. As our analysis of NPD data shows (appendix 2) FSESs tend to serve highly disadvantaged populations. Not surprisingly, therefore, the DfES position shows their starting levels of performance as well below those of schools nationally, and below those even of the comparison group. Their faster progress may therefore reflect the 'slack' they had to make up. Moreover, when we look at FSESs one by one, we find that in many cases the rise in performance levels predates their involvement in the FSES

initiative. Primary FSES 1.12, for instance, told us that their largest improvement in performance came in 2002. This was well before the start of their FSES provision, but coincided with a range of achievement-oriented initiatives sponsored by the mini-Education Action Zone in which they participated. Finally, there are some cases where performance levels fell – albeit marginally – during the initiative. Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3) illustrates both these points. In 2000, the proportion of pupils obtaining 5+A*-Cs was 43%. By 2004, when it joined the FSES initiative, the proportion had risen considerably to 54%. However, in 2005 it fell to 46%, and in 2006 still failed to match 2004 levels at 52%.

What we know from our case study work with FSESs, of course, is that many of these were schools facing very significant challenges, and operating a range of strategies to meet those challenges. Very often, they had dynamic leadership teams who saw FSES status as a way of taking forward work in school improvement that they had already begun. In this context, FSES status seems to have contributed in most cases to rising levels of performance. It was not, however, the initiator of that rise nor its sole cause.

Moreover, given the turbulence that is endemic in such situations, FSES status could not entirely insulate the school against cohort variation, changes in leadership and other events external to the FSES initiative itself. To take an example, primary FSES 2.7 saw large rises in the proportion of its pupils attaining level 4 at key stage 2 in the year before it joined the FSES initiative (2003-4), but then fall again during the two years when it received FSES funding. However, the head told us, the school served a rapidly changing population which was becoming increasingly disadvantaged. FSES status, she felt, was able to do nothing about the basic problem, but it did offer some degree of buffering against its worst effects.

4.4.2 Attendance and exclusions

Measuring schools' performance in terms of attendance and exclusions brings the same problem as do measures of attainment. What happens to the individual may be lost in such measures, and comparisons may be misleading. We know that FSESs have significant impacts on individuals and groups in terms of attendance and exclusions. Insofar as we can judge from our case studies, these impacts are reflected in whole-school performance data, though the patterns are far from straightforward. Most FSESs claimed improvements in their performance on these indicators during the lifetime of the initiative. In some cases, the data support these claims. For instance, secondary FSES 1.11 moved from 90 fixed term and 3 permanent exclusions in 2000-2001 to 15 fixed term and no permanent exclusions in 2005-2006. In the same period, absence fell from 11.8% (authorised) and 2.2% (unauthorised) to 8.5% and 1.4% respectively. Likewise, in secondary FSES 1.7.1 (Hornham), exclusions fell from 120 fixed term and 5 permanent in 2002-03 to 14 fixed term and no permanent in 2005-06.

We can therefore say with some confidence that FSES status can be accompanied by raised school performance in terms of attendance and exclusions. However, some caution again needs to be exercised. For instance, where improvements were reported, these

tended to have begun before the school was involved in the FSES initiative. So, the authorised absence figures for secondary FSES 1.7.1 (Hornham) show a fall between 2002-3 and 2005-6 from 7.6% to 6.4%. However, in 2000-01 the same figure had stood at 10.3%. Interestingly, the figure for unauthorised absence actually rose from 1.5% in 2000-01 to 1.9% in 2005-06. Elsewhere (primary FSES 1.3), absence fell during the lifetime of the initiative, but remained higher than it had been in 2000-01. The same school had its first permanent exclusion for 10 years in 2006.

It is not possible to claim, therefore, that FSES status is accompanied by improvements in attendance and exclusions data in every case. In this context, it is important to note that national data show that, in the same period, schools in general were finding it hard to bring about continuous improvements in exclusion and attendance indicators (National Statistics, 2006a, 2006b) There seem to be two reasons, however, that relate specifically to FSESs. First, such improvements had been made, but usually before the formal start of the FSES initiative. In some schools, the FSES initiative seems to have strengthened the strategies that had already been developed and permitted continuous improvement. In other cases, good strategies had already been developed and these were simply incorporated into the school's FSES approach. Second, many FSESs were working with highly disadvantaged populations where attendance and exclusions were major issues. Indeed, a number of head teachers told us that not only did the school have a disadvantaged intake, but that they regarded it as part of the FSES mission that they should be willing to accept and reluctant to exclude, pupils with significant problems. It is possible that the schools had come close to the limit of what they could reasonably achieve, and that continuous improvement was an unrealistic aim.

4.4.3 School ethos

What we have called the 'cultural' approach to teaching and learning was often part of a more widespread attempt to establish a positive ethos in FSESs. Only a few of the schools responding to our survey stated this as a priority aim, but over three quarters thought that FSES status had had a positive impact in this respect (appendix 1, tables 6 and 7).

The evidence we have available would seem to support these claims. For instance, we invited pupils and parents in both FSESs and comparator schools in the same areas to complete questionnaires seeking to elicit their views of their schools (appendix 5). In most cases, responses from both kinds of school were similar; parents and pupils felt positively towards schools. However, there were areas where FSESs seemed to be outperforming their comparators. Pupils in FSESs, for instance, were more likely than their peers elsewhere to agree that their school tried to help them, their parents and local people with their problems, and that parents and teachers talked to each other often. Likewise, parents of children in FSESs were more likely than other parents to feel that the school made them welcome, and that it offered help to parents and local people. It is important not to exaggerate what were small differences in a largely positive picture for both types of school, but these responses tend to support FSES staff's claims rather than otherwise.

More conclusive is the evidence we have from interviews in case study schools. A number of factors seemed to be involved in improving the ethos of schools. First, individual pupils who might otherwise be troublesome received support, developed new sets of relationships with teachers and other adults, and became more pro-school. This is clear in this testimony from an ex-pupil in Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3) who, despite a troubled school career, was now helping out in the school:

> The [inclusion unit] was very helpful. [Name of assistant head and FSES manager] really helped me and kept me under her wing. I respected them [staff in the FSES] and they respected me and because they are not all like proper teachers I could talk and we became like friends. Now I'm working on the main desk and at homework club. I never thought I'd work here. I never liked school but then, when I was in the Unit, it all changed because I was getting support. You can tell them [staff] anything and they do their best to solve your problems. I cried when I left because I didn't want to.

Second, the change in attitude of individuals such as this could have wider impacts on other pupils, as we were told in secondary FSES 1.7.2:

> They [the pupils involved] have gone from being a destructive influence in school, to having a really positive impact … They're the kind of leaders we want, for children to listen to.

Third, all pupils, whether they experienced difficulties or not, might be caught up in a more positive set of relationships with staff. This was particularly the case where schools gave pupils high levels of responsibility, through school councils or pupil leadership schemes. Secondary FSES 1.8, for instance, had set up a system of 'pupil activity leaders' responsible for organising productive activities out of lesson times. Two of these leaders reported on the way this system had changed relationships and attitudes both for themselves and more widely across the school:

> Pupil 1: We get like satisfaction.
> Pupil 2: …when I'm coaching football now I feel a lot more confident 'cos I've been like refereeing and things, supervising.
> Pupil 1: We enjoy it don't we and it's nice to like help other people out like PE teachers because there's not enough.
> Pupil 2: [Some pupils] think 'Oh we'll have a go and get involved'. They don't seem to be as hyper either…after dinner because they haven't been like down the bottom eating sweets. They've gone like to the caf[é], got a sandwich, come down and they are like active and no trouble, do you know what I mean. There's not as much fighting I think either.
> Pupil 1: They're more chilled.

4.4.4 School standing

Our case studies suggest that some FSESs had a troubled history in terms of relationships with parents and local communities, and that this had been part of a vicious circle in

which poor school performance, a poor local reputation and unhappiness amongst the staff had become mutually reinforcing. This was confirmed by our questionnaire survey of pupils, parents and staff, FSESs came out worse than comparator schools in terms of what each of these three groups thought of their local reputation (appendix 5). It seems likely that this reflects the low base from which FSESs were working rather than any negative consequences of FSES status.

However, FSESs were able to report an enhancement of their local standing as a result of their involvement in the initiative. Over half of the schools responding to our questionnaire said that they believed FSES status had enhanced the general viability of the school, including community (appendix 1, table 7). More specifically, Walton High (FSES 1.10) served large minority ethnic communities and developed specific strategies to engage with these communities. It reported that the willingness of parents and other community members to come onto the school site and work with the school had increased as a result. As an indicator, attendance at parents evenings had increased from 35% to 65% during the course of the initiative, while it had begun to recruit more pupils from a local primary where parents had previously opted to send their children elsewhere.

Primary 2.7 served a similarly ethnically diverse area, but with a large South Asian population that had been traditionally reluctant to engage with the school. The school reported that, as a result of its participation in the FSES initiative, parents were now more willing to work with the school, and, as an indicator, 160 people had participated in a day trip to the seaside, including many Asian women. In an area with high inter-school mobility, parents from other schools were for the first time beginning to ask to transfer to this school. However, as an indication of the difficulties faced by some FSESs, there was no overall increase in admissions. This was partly because another local primary was particularly popular with the Asian community, partly because the school was not a feeder for any one secondary school, and partly because parents who wished to give their children access to the more prestigious secondary schools in the local authority felt they stood a better chance if they placed them at primary schools outside the area.

The effects of FSES status were particularly clear in Bellfield Community College (FSES 2.3), where pupils told us:

> … that the school is becoming a 'community hub' and how FSES has 'made school a nicer place to go to'. One of the students said, 'It has improved the reputation of the school and it is improving all the time with the full service school, the sports hall [new build] and the healthy school'…Likewise a parent governor from the Traveller community discussed her view of the school and the reputation of the school in her community: 'School is wonderful. It is a marvel…It is the hub of the community and if it wasn't here it would be awful…'

> (Researcher field notes)

The assistant head in this school gave an indication of how the process of reputation-enhancement works:

> One of our subject teachers who works in the community said that he had bumped into a couple of parents whose children had been on the [name of the holiday play scheme] who actually said that they hadn't considered sending their child to [name of FSES] till they did [name of the holiday play scheme] and now they have changed their minds …They're doing some fab stuff but it will take time. There were only 20-25 children [attending], that's all, that's still a mini-school reputation, but from little acorns…

4.5 Scale and additionality

As we explained in chapter 1, our primary focus in this evaluation was to identify what sorts of outcomes could be generated by FSESs and, particularly, to establish whether the pattern of impacts and outcomes matched the predictions in FSESs' theories of change. Nonetheless, in order to put this sort of evidence in context, it was also important to identify what we might call the *scale* and *additionality* of any outcomes. The former is concerned with how widespread a particular outcome was. So, where we had evidence for positive outcomes in particular cases, we tried to establish how many other, similar cases there might be. The latter is concerned with the extent to which outcomes attributable to FSES provision were over and above outcomes that would have been generated anyway. So, we tried to establish whether there were other forms of provision actually or potentially available that might have generated outcomes similar to those generated by the FSES.

4.5.1 Scale

To some extent, the question about scale can be answered relatively straightforwardly from our analyses of NPD, school performance and neighbourhood statistics. Whatever impacts FSESs had at the level of individuals and groups, it seems that these did not reach a scale to register at the level of neighbourhood statistics. Likewise, whatever effects FSESs might have had on children in difficulties, it is not clear that these generalised across the whole school population. The school performance analysis suggests, with some significant caveats, that they may have done; the NPD analysis suggests that they did not.

However, it is possible to give some more nuanced answers by drawing on our other data. For instance, although many FSESs focused their provision primarily on a minority of children and adults facing difficulties, these minorities were quite large ones, and the claimed success rates in terms of positive outcomes were high. Although circumstances varied, FSESs typically presented the cases where they offered detailed evidence as the tip of the iceberg. It was not uncommon for them to report that they were working

intensively in any school year with some 10% of their population, that in many cases families would be involved, and that it was rare for there to be no positive outcomes from these interventions.

Similarly, FSESs were able in many cases to substantiate claims that relatively large numbers of pupils and adults benefited from FSES provision of one sort or another. For instance, in 2005-6 adult learning provision at Central Primary (FSES 1.5) had attracted 69 parents and 42 other adults, 51 children had attended homework clubs, and 89 families with 124 children had used childcare provision. Similarly, in secondary FSES 1.21 up to 150 pupils attended breakfast club on some mornings in 2005, over 60 extra curricular activities were organised each week, some 200-300 pupils participated in these activities every evening, and about two thirds of all year 11 pupils attended Saturday study support sessions. Although the impacts of these activities on the majority of participants might not be as significant as the sometimes dramatic impacts of FSESs' work with disadvantaged children and adults, it seems clear that participation at least was widespread in some cases.

There are, however, some caveats to enter. Where FSESs did not feel confident about offering a full range of provision, they focused first on what could be done for their own pupils. Outcomes for adults and communities, therefore, were less common than outcomes for pupils. Similarly, where they offered adult provision, this was often targeted at, and most commonly taken up by, parents of children at the school. In at least one case (primary 1.12), a good deal of provision was in fact focused on the non-teaching staff of the school, though many of them were, in fact, parents and local people.

A further issue to consider is the likelihood that impacts on individuals would generate wider impacts at school population or community level. We have already seen that there is evidence that this might having been taking place in some cases. However, some caveats again need to be entered. The first is in relation to which members of school populations and communities took up the opportunities offered by FSESs. For instance, when we followed up the very impressive participation rates in FSES 1.21's provision, we rapidly encountered young people who professed to know little about what was on offer. Likewise, when Walton High (FSES 1.10) surveyed its pupils, it found that the large majority agreed that there were lots of extended activities to take part in, but that only about half of them actually did so. This was even more true in a community context, where the apparently large numbers of participants in some activities were actually just a small proportion of the local population who might have participated. Moreover, as primary FSES 2.7 reported, activities were likely to be taken up by the better-resourced and more highly-motivated members of the population unless specific targeting measures were put in place (as, indeed, they were in some schools).

Finally, the impressive success rates for intensive child and family interventions should be set alongside the probability that in some cases these interventions would need to be sustained or repeated over time. Moreover, the head teacher of Walton High (FSES 1.10) made a telling point when considering the extensive support her school was offering to pupils and their families:

We're very engaged with aspects of the lives of the kids...but we don't feel we can change that. All that we feel we can do is give the kids opportunities to want to change and this is the most supportive thing in their lives, coming to school is where they get their security.

Important as the contributions of FSESs were in helping many children and adults to manage the difficulties in their lives, they were by and large not in a position to change the fundamentals of those lives. In this case, the head was thinking specifically of a drugs and gangs culture in the locality that the school was powerless to overcome. However, she might have been thinking also about housing conditions, the state of the local labour market, levels of poverty, crime and safety, the availability of financial services and a range of other area factors. As we have seen, schools could certainly help children and adults to manage their lives in the light of these factors, and might be able to have some small impacts on the prevalence of these factors themselves. However, it seems unlikely that they were at present in a position to overcome them to any significant degree.

This begs the question as to whether the work done by FSESs now is laying the foundation for more large-scale effects in the future. As we indicated in our previous reports (Cummings et al., 2006, 2005), leaders of FSESs were often clear that they expected their efforts to come to fruition only in the longer term of, perhaps five to ten years. Although, our theory of change evaluation methodology requires some prediction from current evidence to future outcomes, looking so far into the future is fraught with difficulties. What we can say is that our evidence shows schools on an upward trajectory, attainment gains being made by pupils facing difficulties, a range of other gains being made disadvantaged children and adults, and the beginnings of positive community impacts. *If* these gains were to be sustained, one might expect levels of educational achievement, skills, health and pro-social behaviour to rise over time in the areas served by FSESs. It is reasonable to suppose that community cultures might change, that employers might be attracted into or recruit from these areas, and that levels of poverty would decline. This would most probably be a long term process, but over time, some closing of the gap – at least – between these areas and others might be expected.

What this analysis leaves out of count, of course, is the wider context in which FSESs are located. Partly, this is to do with the long-term stability of the FSES approach, given that school staff, head teachers, local authority policies, and national policies are all liable to change over time. Partly, it is to do with those factors in the areas served by FSESs that are not controlled by schools. What happens in terms of neighbouring schools, housing provision, patterns of mobility and migration, the local labour market and many other factors is, as the head of Walton High (FSES 1.10) reminds us, beyond the capacity of the school to manage. This is particularly so, of course, where FSESs are not part of wider local strategies. In the circumstances, therefore, it is probably safest to conclude that FSESs can have some longer-term and larger-scale effects, but that they are dependent on a stable and supportive local context within which those effects can materialise.

4.5.2 Additionality

Throughout this chapter, we have explored the outcomes from FSES provision, and have argued that in some cases these can be substantial. However, a separate question is whether these outcomes are additional to those that could have been generated had the FSES not existed. This is partly about whether FSESs bring higher levels of provision than would otherwise have existed, or simply relocate existing provision from community to school sites. Certainly, there was some evidence of relocation. For instance, some provision might arise from a competitive bidding process (as in the case of externally-funded adult learning provision), or might be offered in the context of a limited market (as in the case of childcare provision). In these cases, the success of school-based provision inevitably meant either that existing providers lost market share (and we had some anecdotal evidence that this was happening in some places in the childcare sector) or that there were fewer opportunities for non-school providers to establish themselves.

Beyond this, the evidence we gathered is more supportive of FSESs. By and large, FSESs were not expansionist in the sense of wanting to take over forms of provision that were well established in the community. So, for instance, FSES 1.8 saw little point in developing extensive childcare provision when this was already well developed in community setting, while Walton High (FSES 1.10) was content to work alongside an established CLC rather than trying either to incorporate it into its own approach or develop its own forms of adult learning provision. Moreover, the evidence we had suggested that markets for provision were not fixed and that, if anything, the establishment of provision by FSESs created demand. An example might be the drop-in guidance and clinic facilities established by some FSESs. The young people using these facilities made it clear that the choice for them was not between community-based and school-based provision, but between school-based provision and nothing – either because community-based provision did not exist or because they would have been reluctant to use it.

This leads on to a related question about additionality – whether the location of provision on school sites is in itself able to generate outcomes over and above those that would have been generated if the same provision had been located in a community setting. This is a difficult question to answer without a detailed study of outcomes in non-FSES contexts. Our statistical analyses of NPD (appendix 2) and the internal DfES analysis of school performance data help to a certain extent. They suggest that FSESs may indeed generate outcomes that are additional to those generated by other schools, particularly in terms of the attainments of 'vulnerable' pupils and, perhaps in terms of overall rates of school 'improvement'. However, as we pointed out earlier, these encouraging findings have to be interpreted with caution. Moreover, in terms of additionality they are compromised by the absence of any detailed information about what other schools were offering, or what was on offer in the areas served by those schools.

Our case study work is therefore important for understanding additionality, particularly since it is strengthened by the work we did in comparator schools. However, work in the two types of school was done at very different levels of detail, so our findings have to be

taken as indicative rather than authoritative. With this caveat in mind, there is nonetheless some evidence that the assemblage of different forms of provision in FSESs (and those comparator schools that effectively adopted an FSES approach) was itself a source of additional outcomes. As the account of comparator schools shows (see appendix 4), although most of them had developed some aspects of extended provision, those aspects were not 'joined up'. In particular, links with partners had not developed into co-location, and the school's work with children, families and communities tended not to be part of any wider area strategy. In this context, accounts from FSESs about how their multi-strand provision operated in practice are illuminating. The following such account, typical of many of those we have cited throughout this chapter, come from a behaviour worker in primary FSES 1.6:

> One particular boy was constantly in trouble. He had low level, ongoing issues of behaviour and was being sent home at lunch times but this was aggravating the situation rather than helping. So we sent him to breakfast club and it transpired that as the youngest in the family he was getting himself up and wasn't always getting in on time or thinking about breakfast. He is attending now and eating. CAHMS are involved through the school nurse and children's forum. Mum has reported that he is better behaved at home and he is definitely better in school and because he is being praised every day and people are showing interest, this is helping his self esteem. I've also got a list of activities that mother is interested in and I'll ask [the FSES coordinator] to accompany her to these clubs so she does not feel intimidated.

What is striking here is that the different forms of provision offered by the FSES – the presence of the behaviour worker, the breakfast club, the nurse, the links with the children's forum, the adult learning provision – make possible a multi-strand approach to the child's difficulties. Indeed, it is precisely because problems are often multi-dimensional, and often involve whole families, that such multi-dimensional responses are called for.

Moreover, although this example involves what appears to be a traditional referral (to CAMHS), it also seems to be the case that workers in and around the school are able to organise joint inputs to cases without the need for formal referral. At secondary FSES 1.8, for instance, we pressed a family support worker (FSW) and family nurse (FN) about the possible benefits of such an approach – in this case, in relation to a girl who had accessed the school's pupil support base because of her significant difficulties both in school and at home:

> *Researcher*: What would have happened to [the girl] if you or the [support base] hadn't been there?
> *FSW*: I don't think she'd have still been here to tell you the truth. I think she'd have been excluded.
> *FN*: It would probably have come to me. Which is probably not always the most appropriate person. But I've not got the capacity to deal with it and give it as much time as [the FSW] has. So I might have had to refer her onto other agencies.

Which again is not always the right answer. But she's had quite a lot of input hasn't she and there would be no way I could offer that same level of intervention.
Researcher: She might have got that level of support [the FSW] gives her through say social services?
FN: It might not have been the same level of support really. If it went through [the] Mental Health Service for Young People, it might have been an appointment once a month.
FSW: It's one-to-one. She has formal appointments once a week. But she's always dropping in as and when she wants.
FN: There's just no way really there's the capacity to support young people as much as [the FSW] can.

What is clear here is that the flexible team approach in the FSES made it possible for the school to offer higher levels of service to greater numbers of children and adults, and to do so more speedily. The point is not simply that the co-location of different forms of provision overcomes some of the delays that are endemic in referral processes, but that some of the rationing of services through referral and assessment was also overcome. In effect, it was possible to work with children and adults in difficulties before – or, at worst, or immediately after – crises had developed. It is tempting to describe this as 'early intervention' or 'preventive' work, and there were certainly elements of this. However, some of our informants resisted this description. Informants in secondary FSES 1.8 and primary 2.7, for instance, were clear that this was not about intervening earlier in cases that would eventually have reached the attention of other agencies. Rather, it was about making provision for children and adults who would either never have reached the point of referral, or would have been filtered out by the referral and assessment process, despite the evident difficulties they faced.

Similar sorts of arguments for additionality can be made in relation to other aspects of FSES provision, though the evidence here is not quite so clear cut. For instance, where schools operated drop-in advice services for pupils, they tended to be well-used and to win pupils' confidence. It seems likely, therefore, that young people were accessing these services who might not have done so had they been located beyond the school and required a special effort to reach. Likewise, it is arguable that, while the preponderance of parents in adult learning activities begs questions about wider community impact, it also substantiates what we were told in case accounts about the ability of FSESs to use their initial contact with parents to involve them in activities. The implication is, of course, that they might not have embarked on adult learning had it been located somewhere else.

4.6 Costs and benefits

The cost benefit analysis (CBA) component of the evaluation sought to quantify the outcomes from FSES provision and the inputs that were used to generate those outcomes, and to attach a financial value to them. It did not in itself identify any new outcomes and, indeed, CBA cannot easily deal with outcomes for which no financial equivalent value

can be found. However, it was useful for encouraging informants to move from providing indicative evidence of outcomes to an estimate of the scale of those outcomes – for instance, to move from showing how a particular young person had gained qualifications to estimating how many young people had benefited in a similar way. It also offers a different way of establishing the worth of outcomes than either the case study or statistical analyses that comprised the other strands of the evaluation.

The CBA is presented in detail in appendix 3 and deserves careful scrutiny. Some points are worth underlining here, however. First, the value attached to benefits from FSESs tends to be very high. By and large, this is because FSESs were working with disadvantaged populations, where provision can make significant differences to people's life chances. It follows that impacts on a relatively small number of young people or adults soon generates impressive benefit values. This confirms the impression from other parts of the evaluation that FSESs were indeed making significant differences to individuals, regardless of whether they were bringing about – or were likely to bring about – more widespread change. It is also a useful corrective to the more usual way of establishing school effects by monitoring performance data. Outcomes which make little impact on the 'headline' performance figures may nonetheless have considerable significance if their value is analysed in different ways.

Second, CBA allows us to ask, in a particular way, whether FSESs represent 'value for money'. Just as school effects tend to be measured in terms of performance data, so value for money is often established on a simple funding versus effects model, where the funding in question is the additional finances allocated to a project, and the effects are direct impacts on school performance measures or educational outcome measures for target pupils. CBA takes a much broader view of both terms of this model, including in costs all resources that are required rather than simply marginal funding, and, as we have seen, including life-course outcomes in benefits, as well as immediate educational outcomes.

Not surprisingly, costs as well as benefits turn out to be higher in this analysis that we might normally expect. This is a useful reminder of the actual investment of resource that FSESs have to make, beyond the value of any project funding they may have received, and confirms the extent to which FSESs tended to see their provision as part of a whole-school effort, rather than as an add-on. It also confirms the scale of the resource leveraged into schools through, for instance, contributions in kind from volunteers and other agencies. Perhaps most important, however, costs tend to be balanced or exceeded by the value of benefits – and, in some cases, to a very significant extent. The implication is that FSES provision constitutes a good investment viewed in this way. Of course, a perspective which viewed investment in schools solely in terms of short-term attainment outcomes might well reach a different conclusion.

Third, the benefits of FSES provision accrue disproportionately to the most disadvantaged children, young people and adults. The costs, on the other hand, are borne predominantly by schools and other agencies, and ultimately, therefore, by the taxpayer. In other words, there is a marked redistributive element in FSES provision. If it looks like

a good investment overall, it looks like a particularly good investment from the point of view of people living in disadvantaged circumstances.

4.7 Outcomes from FSESs: an overview

Assessing the outcomes from FSESs is a complex business, and it is important to bear in mind some of the nuanced findings we have reported throughout this chapter. Nonetheless, it is also important to reach some conclusions about outcomes that are as firm as we can make them, and which can be used to inform future policy and practice. With this in mind, we propose the following:

- There is robust evidence of a range of types, to suggest that FSESs are capable of generating positive outcomes for children and young people, families, communities and schools. These outcomes are not 'transformational' in the sense that they bring about widespread and significant differences to large numbers of people, or to overall levels of educational achievement, or to school performance. Nonetheless, neither are they insignificant, and they reach levels that seem to justify the investment that is required to generate them.
- The impacts of FSESs seem to be greatest on children, young people and adults facing difficulties, which is usually where FSESs focus their efforts. Here, FSESs can have significant, even life-changing effects. Although these beneficiaries of FSES provision may be in a minority in the population as a whole, they nonetheless constitute relatively large groups in the disadvantaged populations served by many FSESs.
- The impacts of FSESs are less strong in relation to other parts of the school population or local communities as a whole, but positive outcomes can nonetheless be identified. Though large-scale effects are not yet evident, they are not out of the question in the longer term – but if, and only if, FSESs have a stable and supportive local context within which to work.
- There is strong evidence that FSESs can impact positively on pupils' attainments. These impacts are clearest in the case of pupils facing difficulties. FSESs can have a range of other impacts on outcomes for pupils, including engagement with learning, family stability and enhanced life chances. In the case of children facing difficulties, these outcomes are often closely related.
- An FSES approach is likely to be associated with improved school performance, better relations with local communities and an enhanced standing of the school in its area, though it is also likely that other factors will contribute to these outcomes. There is no indication that an FSES approach damages schools' performance or reputation, though it does not 'bomb-proof' them against other problems. Positive outcomes for pupils do not always translate directly into school performance data.
- Many schools that are not designated as FSESs nonetheless offer similar sorts of provision. Many others offer some aspects of FSES provision. There is no reason to believe that there are not positive outcomes from extended provision, whether

offered by FSESs or not. However, it seems likely that there are additional outcomes associated with provision coming together into an FSES 'approach'.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Overview of findings

Our evaluation of the FSES initiative, as reported here and in our previous publications (Cummings et al., 2006, 2005) gives rise to cautious optimism in terms of what FSESs have achieved, and what the FSES 'approach' might achieve in future. Specifically:

- The initiative was welcomed by many schools who saw it as a way of bringing together a wide range of efforts to meet the challenges facing themselves, their pupils and the communities they served. Schools displayed considerable energy and ingenuity in developing their provision.
- The FSES approach made significant demands on and posed significant challenges for schools. These are in terms of managing FSES provision alongside all the other demands on leadership teams, establishing productive partnerships with other agencies and providers, and finding ways of making provision sustainable. Although the difficulties facing schools should not be underestimated, many of them have found ways of meeting these challenges.
- Schools were given considerable flexibility to develop approaches to match their own circumstances. In practice, there has been a convergence around a focus on outcomes for pupils, and a more holistic focus on pupils in the context of families and communities. Despite initial uncertainties and some changes of emphasis, many schools were able to articulate coherent theories of change on which to base their work.
- The outcomes from FSESs have been positive in terms of impacts on pupils' attainment, personal, social and health outcomes for young people, family stability, community well-being and school performance. These effects have been strongest for children, young people and adults facing difficulties. Larger-scale effects are not yet evident but it is possible to envisage circumstances in which they might materialise.
- There is considerable overlap between the forms of provision offered by FSESs and those offered in other schools. Indeed, some schools operate an FSES approach without having FSES status. It is likely that many of the positive outcomes from FSESs, therefore, are also generated by other kinds of school. However, there also seem to be additional outcomes associated with bringing different forms of provision together within an FSES approach.

The note of caution in this optimistic picture comes from the nature of this evaluation and the methods we have employed. Our purpose has been to determine what FSESs can and might achieve. It has, therefore, deliberately focused on FSESs operating under the most favourable circumstances. FSESs in the national initiative were voluntary participants,

78

given additional funding, considerable freedom to operate as they wished, and, in many cases, considerable local and national support. Much of our work, moreover, has focused on FSESs where provision was most fully developed and positive outcomes were becoming apparent from an early stage. We might, of course, have had very different findings had we focused instead on more 'typical' FSESs, or on those with greatest problems.

5.2 What have FSESs achieved?

In the previous chapter, we set out evidence for the outcomes generated by FSESs. We now wish to step back from the detail of these findings and consider what sort of achievement the generation of such outcomes might represent, and how those achievements might have been and might still be supported.

5.2.1 The achievements of FSESs

In doing this, it is helpful to bear in mind the sort of picture FSESs tended to paint of the situations in which they found themselves. This emerged when we worked with them towards agreed accounts of their theories of change, each of which contained a brief characterisation of the FSES's starting situation. The following example comes from secondary FSES 1.11:

> The school, serves a large catchment area which has, in the past, been characterised by decline, neglect, low levels of community aspiration and adult residents having had a poor experience of education. One possible explanation for the widespread socio economic disadvantage is that in the past poor, problem families were moved into the area from elsewhere in [the region]. There are some very vulnerable students & families in the FSES that require support with multiple problems …These problems frequently manifest as barriers to learning. Many students suffer from low self-esteem and low aspirations which mirror the wider situation in the community. The school has suffered from a poor reputation and low levels of attainment in the past…

Although each school's account was different, the basic features remained the same. As here, the difficulties facing the school (its poor reputation and performance) cannot be separated entirely from the difficulties facing its pupils (the 'barriers to learning' they experience), which in turn cannot be separated from the difficulties facing their families, the local community, and the wider region. On a daily basis, therefore, FSESs have been brought face to face with the interactions between factors at the level of child, family, community and school. In every case that we examined, they had already taken measures to improve their internal practices relating to teaching and learning (school 1.11 was in fact celebrated as the tenth most improved school in England at the start of the FSES initiative). The challenge they faced, therefore, was to find a way of addressing the other

factors in the lives of the children and young people they served – factors which traditionally have not been within the control of the school.

We would suggest that the most important achievement, both of individual FSESs and of the initiative as a whole, has been to demonstrate the potential for schools to become involved in addressing all of these factors simultaneously, and to indicate the sorts of positive outcomes that are possible when this occurs. Whilst bearing in mind the note of caution we sounded above, this has, it seems to us been a remarkable achievement, particularly in a context where the wider family and community role of schools had not been the focus of attention for some years, and where, therefore, it was inevitable that the accumulation of knowledge in this field would have been disrupted.

5.2.2 Some features of successful FSESs

At this stage of our understanding of the FSES approach, the aim of the evaluation was to identify what could be achieved by the FSES approach rather than to characterise 'best practice' or to compare more and less 'effective' schools. Nonetheless, the schools with which we worked most closely were those which, by the end of the project, had established relatively stable and wide-ranging FSES approaches, had managed to overcome obstacles in the way of the development of those approaches, and were able to produce evidence of positive outcomes for children, families and communities. Although we cannot say for certain that they were working in the most effective ways possible, they have a real claim to being regarded as successful. It may be useful, therefore, to describe their main features:

- Successful FSESs in this sense take seriously the relationship between the personal, family and community backgrounds of their pupils and their educational outcomes. Though they differ in the detail of their aims, they recognise that action to improve educational outcomes has to be accompanied by action to enable them, their families, and possibly their communities to overcome the difficulties they face in their lives. They are also likely, therefore, to understand attainment outcomes for pupils as inevitably intertwined with a broader set of child, family and community outcomes.
- Successful FSESs are therefore likely to see the 'extended' aspects of their work as integral to the school's core business. Typically, the FSES approach will provide a focus for all the work of the school, or will be integrated into some other focus (such as specialist status). Measures to enhance teaching and learning, therefore, are likely to be taken alongside the development of extended provision and to be seen as part of an overall 'approach'.
- Successful FSESs tend to have leadership from heads and others who are able to articulate and pursue this broad agenda. They may well do so in a highly principled way which is informed by a commitment to children facing (and presenting) the greatest difficulties, and may well be informed by a sense of the school's responsibility to the communities it serves as well as to the children it educates.

- Although head teacher leadership is important, successful FSESs are likely to have developed structures which enable them to manage FSES provision without over-burdening existing members of leadership teams or jeopardising other aspects of the school's work. Typically, this will involve designating or appointing a coordinator with time to undertake day by day management of FSES provision.
- Successful FSESs are likely to have developed partnerships with a range of statutory and voluntary organisations providing services to local children, families and communities. These partnerships may well have taken time to develop and be based on relationships of trust.
- Successful FSESs are likely to have developed provision in and around the school which can offer easy access to support for children, families and community members. They will have developed a 'zone in-between' the traditional pastoral work of teachers and the necessarily limited services available from other agencies through (often cumbersome) referral procedures. This zone will be populated by professionals and para-professionals who can be proactive in offering support and can respond rapidly to children's and adults' difficulties.
- Although much of the work of successful FSESs will be targeted on those in greatest difficulties, they are likely also to offer a range of provision open to all, and directed at enrichment and enhancement rather than only at problem solving.
- Successful FSESs tend to be focused as much on enabling as on supporting. In terms of adult provision, this means that they are likely to offer a range of learning opportunities that enable adults to progress from confidence-building activities to skills-acquisition, accreditation, and employment. For both adults and children, this means that they are likely to equip people to tackle their own difficulties and to have confidence in their capacity to do so.
- Although successful FSESs cannot escape the challenges of managing complex funding streams and multiple initiatives, they are likely to bend available resources and opportunities to support their aims and their overarching FSES 'approach'.

5.3 How might FSESs achieve more?

If it is possible to say what FSESs can achieve, and what 'successful' FSESs look like, our evidence also allows us to say something about what might have helped them – and, more particularly – what might help similar efforts in future to achieve more. We believe there are three themes that emerge from our evaluation. They are: policy coherence and stability; clear conceptualisations, and; a strategic approach.

5.3.1 Policy coherence and stability

As our reports have repeatedly shown, schools adopting an FSES approach are engaged in a complex set of tasks which involve significant reorientations of school leadership, the establishment of a range of activities and forms of provision, the development of new

sets of relationships with pupils, families and community members, and the creation of a series of partnerships with external bodies. Moreover, once provision is established, its most wide-ranging effects are likely to take some years to emerge. It follows that FSESs need time and stability if they are to become fully effective.

To a significant extent, FSESs in the DfES initiative have had just that. They have had up to three years' pump-priming funding and access to a national support service. The national roll out of extended schools has validated their work and often moved them to the centre of local policy-making. The Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda has created an overarching and potentially stable policy framework within which they can operate.

Yet they have also had to face instabilities. The short-term nature of both the FSES funding and many other stands of the funding regime to which schools are subject has been a constant source of anxiety for them, even if some now appear to have found ways of ensuring sustainability. The implementation of ECM at local level has left some FSESs at odds with new sets of arrangements. The tension between the short-term, narrowly-focused systems for monitoring school performance and the longer-acting, wider-ranging nature of FSES provision has required careful management by schools. Meanwhile, the flexibility allowed to schools and the lack of any single approved model of FSES provision has given schools considerable freedom of action, but has also left them to find their own way by trial and error. Added to this, of course, are the local instabilities as school staff and heads come and go, as local authorities change their personnel and policies, as other agencies reorganise, and as populations and neighbourhoods change.

Some of these instabilities are unavoidable, and perhaps even desirable. However, looking to the future, it seems that schools developing an FSES approach would benefit significantly from a more stable and coherent external policy environment. This would involve removing some of the tensions in the current policy framework, working towards a stable funding regime (which need not, of course, depend on direct project funding from DfES), developing stable policy frameworks at local level, and making a commitment to the FSES approach – perhaps more fully articulated – over a period of time.

5.3.2 Clear conceptualisations

In each of our reports, we have suggested that conceptual issues are at least as important to the future of FSESs as are more practical issues to do with funding and the management of provision. In particular, it is difficult to see how FSESs can be offered to stable and coherent policy framework we are advocating without clarity in terms of conceptual issues around what FSESs are for, and how they are supposed to achieve their purposes.

These conceptual issues revolve around what we described in chapter 2 as the difference between the 'pupil focus' and the 'holistic focus'. The former sees FSES provision essentially as a means of pursuing schools' core concerns with teaching and learning by other means. Its primary aim is to enhance educational outcomes for children and young

people. It recognises that children and young people experience 'barriers to learning', in terms of personal, social and health-related difficulties. It also recognises that these difficulties may derive from the family and community contexts within which children live. However, any work on 'barriers to learning' and on their origins in family and community is justified in terms of its impacts on educational outcomes for children and young people.

The latter, 'holistic' focus accepts much of this analysis. It is also concerned with enhancing educational outcomes and therefore with overcoming 'barriers to learning'. However, it also sees personal, social and health outcomes for children and young people as legitimate ends in their own right, with which the school should be concerned. Moreover, whilst it recognises the impact of families and communities on children's learning, it also sees their well-being as something with which the school should be concerned because it is an important social end in its own right.

As we made clear in chapter 2, these two foci are just that. They mark emphases in the way FSESs approach their tasks rather than sharply divided alternatives. Nonetheless, they do, potentially, take schools in somewhat different directions. They shape, for instance, the extent to which FSES provision will be targeted predominantly at pupils (and to a lesser extent at their families), or whether it will be more evenly distributed between pupils, families, and other local people. They also influence the extent to which the school sees itself as driving the FSES approach on behalf of its pupils, or as contributing to strategies for the development of local communities that are formulated elsewhere.

Important as these issues are, they seem rarely to be debated. Different FSESs seem to adopt different positions, but it is not clear that this is as a result of an informed debate about alternatives, or simply arises out of the assumptions of head teachers and other leaders. Moreover, there is no unambiguous lead on this issue from national policy texts. The Schools Plus report (DfEE, 1999), to which the development of FSESs and the extended schools roll out can be traced, locates the extended roles of schools within a wider area regeneration context. Every Child Matters (DfES, 2003a) focuses on the wider outcomes for children and on the family context, but has less to say about area regeneration and says little about the relative priority of the different outcomes for children. Most other education policies, of course, make it abundantly clear that the priority for schools has to be the achievements of their pupils.

We suggest that some wider debate on these matters is needed, and that such a debate should lead to a clearer conceptualisation of the role of FSESs – even if that takes the form of a clearer conceptualisation of alternatives. With this in mind, we suggest that there are two lessons from the final phase of this evaluation that might be helpful.

1. The comments of the head teacher of Walton High (FSES 1.10) suggest that what we have described as different conceptualisations of the role of FSESs might actually have a more pragmatic base. It is notable that she does not deny the importance of area-level factors, only the feasibility of intervening in them. This

is not surprising, given the fluid nature of the local population and the dense pattern of competing schools leading many children to travel outside the area for their education. Other schools, however, in more stable situations, clearly feel that they can make a difference. It may be, therefore, that more schools would be willing to adopt a holistic focus if they could be given enhanced capacity to make this focus viable. We shall discuss one method of doing this in the next section.

2. We pointed out in our previous reports (Cummings et al., 2006, 2005) that FSESs were prone to thinking about local children, families and communities in largely deficit terms. This is hardly surprising, perhaps, in view of the very real difficulties people were often facing and the clear sense that education offered them and their children a way out of the situations in which they found themselves. However, it is notable that a number of FSESs were moving beyond the idea of 'supporting' people in difficulties to one of enabling people to find ways to resolve their own problems. This was evident, for instance, in the first signs that local people were setting up their own forms of support in FSESs, in groups that worked by local people sharing ideas amongst themselves, and in the student leadership initiatives which some FSESs saw as a way of developing more proactive and confident citizens of the future. It may be that this development, as well as arguably being highly desirable in its own right, can form the basis of a clear and viable rationale for the role of FSESs, particularly in relation to local communities.

5.3.3 A strategic framework

The FSES initiative in its original form was concerned with establishing one FSES in each local authority area. To a significant extent, therefore, schools were expected to pioneer provision in the context of their own immediate situations, rather than to work within any wider strategic framework. Subsequently, a range of national policy initiatives – notably, Every Child Matters, the national roll out of extended schools, the roll out of children's centres, Building Schools for the Future, and the 14-19 initiative – began to provide a strategic framework to support and multiply the effects of FSES provision. In only one case (FSES 1.4), however, was there a clearly-articulated local strategy bringing all of these initiatives together, and linking them to regeneration strategy. For the most part, FSESs developed their own approaches, often consulting partners and stakeholders, but not working within externally-formulated strategies.

Although there is much to be gained by calling upon the social entrepreneurship of school leaders, our evidence suggests that this needs to be balanced by a clear sense of local strategy. This is for two reasons. First, the concerns which many FSESs have had about establishing partnerships with other agencies and ensuring the sustainability of their provision are likely to be lessened if schools with an FSES approach operate within a strategic framework. Even if such a framework is developed largely through voluntary agreements, it is likely to ease the establishment of partnerships at school level, and ensure some degree of sustainability in the medium to long term as different agencies and providers agree to pool resources for particular purposes.

Second, a local strategic framework is likely to reduce the sense amongst schools with an FSES approach that they are facing challenges that they are unable to meet. Our evidence suggests that schools can make a significant difference to the educational achievements and well-being of their pupils, of the families of those pupils and, in some cases, of local communities. It also suggests that they can make a contribution to issues around crime, employment and health. However, it is unrealistic to expect them to play a lead part in tackling these and other area-level issues. Yet these issues inevitably impact on what schools can achieve in relation to their core agenda of learning. A strategy, therefore, which linked the efforts of schools to those of other local agencies and of local people ought to enable schools to contribute where they are strongest, secure in the knowledge that they are supporting an overarching approach to area development that in turn is creating the most favourable conditions for them to do their work.

5.4 Implications for future development

The FSES initiative came at an exciting time for the future of schools. To the policy initiatives referred to above – the extended schools roll out ECM, BSF, 14-19 and the rest – can be added the personalisation agenda (Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group, 2006) and the programme of academies and trust schools, which open up the possibility that the landscape of schooling might become very different over the next few years.

5.4.1 The national roll out of extended schools

The policy initiative for which the current evaluation has the most obvious implications is the national roll out of extended schools. In some ways, the FSES initiative has acted as a pilot for the roll out along with the earlier demonstration and pathfinder projects (Cummings et al., 2004, Dyson et al., 2002). Clearly, some caution needs to be exercised in generalising from FSESs to extended schools. The latter are likely to have less pump-priming funding, and have somewhat different expectations placed on them in terms of the activities they will support. Crucially, they are being developed within a strategy involving all schools and linked from the first to the ECM agenda. This means that in many cases schools are clustering together to develop provision. However, it also means that they will be developing extended provision because that is what is expected of them rather than because they have put themselves forward so to do, and that the majority of them will not be serving the sorts of highly disadvantaged populations that the first wave of FSESs did.

Nonetheless, there are enough similarities for the national roll out to able to learn from the experience of FSESs. Specifically:

- The broadly positive outcomes from FSESs suggest that there is potentially much to be gained by all schools' becoming involved in offering extended provision. This does not, of course, obviate the need for the thoughtful development of

provision, and, in particular, the careful involvement of partner agencies and organisations. However, it is reasonable to look for outcomes in the areas of pupils' attainments, personal, social and health outcomes for children and young people, family stability, adult learning and community well-being. In particular, the anxieties in some quarters that involvement in extended provision must necessarily damage school performance and distract from schools' core business of teaching and learning finds little support in the experiences of FSESs. There, by and large, FSES status has been supportive of schools rather than otherwise.

- One reason why FSESs have been able to manage the development of extended provision alongside their other responsibilities has been the way in which they have integrated FSES provision into their core business. As we have seen, schools tend to have used FSES status as an organising principle around which to build the school's work, or have integrated FSES provision into some other organising principle. The implication is that extended schools nationally will need to be supported in working out how extended provision 'fits' within their overall mission. It is probably less important that they see it as an organising principle in its own right than that they develop an understanding of how it supports their other aims.

- This in turn links to the role to be played by school leaders, both amongst the teaching staff and the governors. FSESs tend to have developed and sustained their provision rapidly in response to strong commitment from their leaders and, in particular, their head teachers. It is probably unrealistic to expect that all school leaders nationally will be similarly committed. Nonetheless, it seems important that those responsible for the roll out at national and local level should do what they can to build appropriate levels of leadership commitment. Working with school leaders to develop a clear sense of how extended provision 'fits' with the core business of the school may be crucial in this process.

- Whilst it is important for individual schools to develop this sense of fit, we have also suggested earlier that there is a need for some conceptual clarification around the purpose of extended provision. This is a pressing need in the context of the national roll out, and probably needs to take place at national and local level, as well as at the level of the individual school. Whilst much effort in the roll out will have to be devoted to enlisting schools and stimulating activity, it may also be necessary to devote similar effort towards clarifying purposes, developing models and setting out optional directions.

- Similarly, we have suggested that the sense of purpose in extended schools, the sustainability of their activities, and the impacts of their work can be supported through the development of local strategic frameworks. This is particularly the case given that extended provision in the roll out is commonly being developed across clusters of schools with some sort of area basis. It is likely to be important, therefore, to link school clusters to other area structures, and to ensure that they are informed about and involved in both area and local strategy. In order for this to happen, extended schools teams supporting the roll out will themselves need to be working within an overarching strategic framework and to be well linked into the corporate local authority.

- The role of school-based coordinators has been important in ensuring the manageability and sustainability of extended provision in FSESs. It seems unlikely that every school in the roll out will need or wish to designate a full-time coordinator. However, in many cases it may be important for schools to have access to staff who can manage extended provision on a day-to-day basis, but who can also work closely with, or be members of, the school's leadership team. This might be achieved by designating a cluster coordinator, or by creating a coordinating team at cluster level. The experience of secondary FSES 1.4, and indeed of the Scottish Integrated Community Schools (HMIe, 2004) suggests that, although coordinators will be helped by working within a local strategy, it may also be important that they are clearly answerable to schools.
- The experience of FSESs suggests that partnerships with agencies and organisations outside schools is possible, but that it is not straightforward, and that it can take time to build trust and develop working practices. It also suggests that schools may have a number of false starts in developing provision. The implication is that the roll out of extended schools is likely to take much longer than the original start-up phase. Some thought may therefore need to be given as to how extended schools can be monitored and supported in the medium as well as the short term.

5.4.2 Future developments

As we suggested earlier, the current national policy context opens up the possibility of significant changes in the nature of schools and schooling in coming years. In principle, schools could become part of a coherent network of provision, aimed at offering enhanced opportunities and support for children, adults, families and communities. This network could operate within clear local strategies for regeneration and development, and could encourage local schools to work together in meeting the needs and wishes of local populations across areas larger than any individual school's 'catchment'.

Such a development would, of course, raise some fundamental questions. It would, for instance, be necessary to resolve the conceptual issues around the FSES approach that we set out earlier, and, specifically, to determine more clearly the relationship between the narrower pupil-focused role of schools and any wider social role they might be held to have. It would be necessary to develop further the existing structures within which schools collaborate, and to achieve an appropriate balance between collaboration and competition. It would also be necessary to think through the relationship between school autonomy on the one hand, and the demands of partnership and local strategy on the other. Finally, it would be necessary to think through issues around the governance of schools, and of local strategies, and, in particular, the role of local people in that governance.

These are complex issues. However, we suggest that there is enough promise in the FSES initiative to suggest that it may now be worth giving them serious thought.

References

Ball, M. (1998) School inclusion: the school, the family and the community (York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation).

Big Lottery Fund (2006) Programmes for young people: what we have learned (London, Big Lottery Fund).

Blank, M., Melaville, A. & Shah, B. (2003) Making the difference: research and practice in community schools (Washington DC, Coalition for Community Schools, Institute for Educational Leadership).

Brookes, M. (2006) Taking control. Speech by Mick Brookes, General Secretary NAHT, to Annual Conference on Monday 1 May 2006 at 11.30am (Haywards Heath, NAHT).

Cummings, C., Dyson, A., Papps, I., Pearson, D., Raffo, C., Tiplady, L. & Todd, L. (2006) Evaluation of the full service extended schools initiative, second year: thematic papers (London, DfES).

Cummings, C., Dyson, A., Papps, I., Pearson, D., Raffo, C. & Todd, L. (2005) Evaluation of the full service extended schools initiative: end of first year report (London, DfES).

Cummings, C., Dyson, A. & Todd, L. with the Education Policy and Evaluation Unit, University of Brighton (2004) An evaluation of the extended schools pathfinder projects (London, DfES).

DfEE (1999) Schools Plus: Building learning communities. Improving the educational chances of children and young people from disadvantaged areas: a report from the Schools Plus Policy Action Team 11(London, DfEE).

DfEE & DSS (1998) Meeting the childcare challenge: a framework and consultation document. Cm3959 (London, DfEE).

DfES (2002) Childcare in extended schools: providing opportunities and services for all (London, DfES).

DfES (2003a) Every child matters. Cm. 5860 (London, The Stationery Office).

DfES (2003b) Full-service extended schools planning documents (London, DfES).

DfES (2003c) Full service extended schools: requirements and specifications (London, DfES).

DfES (2004) Every child matters: change for children (London, DfES).

DfES (2005) Extended schools: access to opportunities and services for all. A prospectus (London, DfES).

Dyson, A., Millward, A. & Todd, L. (2002) A study of the extended schools demonstration projects (London, DfES).

Halsey, K., Gulliver, C., Johnson, A., Martin, K. & Kinder, K. (2005) Evaluation of Behaviour and Education Support Team*s* (London, DfES).

Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (2004) The sum of its parts? The development of Integrated Community Schools in Scotland (Edinburgh, HMIe).

Kendall, L., O'Donnell, L., Golden, S., Ridley, K., Machin, S., Rutt, S., McNally, S., Schagen, I., Meghir, C., Stoney, S., Morris, M., West, A. & Noden, P. (2005) Excellence in Cities: The national evaluation of a policy to raise standards in urban schools 2000-2003 (London, DfES).

MacBeath, J., Kirwin, T., Myers, K., McCall, J., Smith, I., McKay, E., Sharp, C., Bhabra, S., Weindling, D. & Pocklington, K. (2001) The impact of Study Support (London, DfES).

National Statistics, (2006a) Permanent and fixed period exclusion from schools and exclusion appeals in England, 2004/5. SFR 24/2006 (London, DfES).

National Statistics (2006b) Pupil absence in schools in England 2005/06 (provisional) (London, DfES).

Ofsted (2005) Excellence in Cities: managing associated initiatives to raise standards (London, Ofsted).

Pettitt, B. (2003) Effective joint working between child and adolescent mental health services (CAHMS) and schools (London, DfES).

Roberts, J. and Murphy, S (2005) A study of the preliminary phase of the Welsh Assembly Government 'Primary School Free Breakfast Initiative', (Cardiff, Welsh Assembly), available on line at: www.learning.wales.gov.uk/pdfs/breakfast/preliminary-phase-report-e.pdf, accessed 21 May 2007.

Sammons, P., Power, S., Elliot, K., Robertson, P., Campbell, C. & Whitty, G. (2003) New Community Schools in Scotland. Final report. National evaluation of the pilot phase (London, Institute of Education, University of London).

Sen, A. (1980) Equality of what? in: S. McMurrin (Ed) *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Sen, A. (1992) *Inequality Reexamined* (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

Social Exclusion Unit (2000) National strategy for neighbourhood renewal: a framework for consultation (London, The Stationery Office).

Social Exclusion Unit (2001) A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal: national strategy action plan (London, Social Exclusion Unit).

Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. & Taggart, B. (2004) The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: A longitudinal study funded by the DfES 1997-2004 (London, DfES).

Szirom, T., Jaffe, R. & MacKenzie, D. (Strategic Partners in association with the Centre for Youth Affairs and Development) (2001) National evaluation report. Full service schools program 1999 and 2000 (Canberra, Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs).

Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group (2006) 2020 vision: report of the Teaching and Learning in 2020 Review Group (London, DfES).

Webb, R. and Vulliamy, G. (2004). A multi-agency approach to reducing disaffection and exclusions from school. (London, DfES).

Wilkin, A., Kinder, K., White, R., Atkinson, M. & Doherty, P. (2003) Towards the development of extended schools (London, DfES).

Appendices

Appendix 1: Review questionnaire analysis

Appendix 2: Analysis of NPD data

Appendix 3: Cost Benefit Analysis

Appendix 4: Comparator schools: summary of findings

Appendix 5: Questionnaires to pupils, parents and staff in FSESs and comparator schools

Appendix 1: Review questionnaire analysis

1. Characteristics of respondents

A questionnaire was mailed to head teachers of all 148 FSESs, including 10 schools funded through the London Challenge. The questionnaire is reproduced in the annex to this appendix. The initial mailing took place in November 2006 and non-responders were prompted by email and telephone. In total 68 valid returns (46%) were received in time to be included in the analysis (a further 3 were received later). This is a good response rate for a postal survey, though it is possible that responses were skewed towards schools that had made good progress with their extended provision and were committed to an FSES approach.

Head teachers were asked to complete some sections themselves, but were invited to delegate completion to a nominated respondent, provided that they had oversight of the final responses. In the event, 29 nominated respondents were head teachers or principals, 18 were extended school coordinators or managers, and 9 were deputy or assistant heads. 3 respondents were community education managers. Other respondents included the director of partnerships, business manager, an acting head and a director of resources.

39 schools were secondary, 25 primary. There were also 1 first school, 2 high schools, 1 all age school and 1 special school amongst those responding.11 schools were part of clustering arrangements, but of these only 3 responded for the cluster as a whole rather than for their own school.

2. Funding

Of the 63 schools that responded to this question, 35 received their first FSES funding in 2004/5, 19 in 2003/4 and 9 in 2020/3. Of these, actual activities had started in 2003/4 in 16 schools, 2004/5 in 22 schools, in 2005/6 in 14 schools, and in 2006/7 in 4 schools, suggesting that many had needed some lead-in time before starting activities. Of the thirty schools that responded to the question on when their funding had ceased, 15 had received funding up to 2005/6, 13 up to 2006/7 and the remainder up to earlier years.

Table 1. Amount of DfES FSES funding received

Amount in £s	Frequency
21,000-50,000	4
51,000-100,000	10
101,000-150,000	6
151,000-200,000	7

201,000-300,000	14
301,000-400,000	12
401,000-500,000	9
>500,000	1
Total	63

As can be seen in table 1 above, the majority of respondents had received between 200000 and 400000 from DfES, though all other categories are represented, showing considerable variance in funding.

Most respondents had drawn on other sources of funding to support FSES as well.

Table 2. Additional sources of funding

Source of funding	Number of schools
School's base budget	39
Excellence in Cities	39
Behaviour Improvement Programme	37
Donations and Grants	30
National Lottery	22
Neighbourhood Renewal	21
Healthy Schools	19
Children's Fund	15
European Social Fund	10

As can be seen in table 2 above, all additional sources were used by at least 10 out of 68 schools. More than half respondents had drawn on their base budget, Excellence in Cities funding and BIP funding, making these the most common sources of funds. As well as these, a variety of other sources of funding were mentioned, including Aim Higher, Awards for All, the Community Networks Fund, Connexions, Sure Start and a variety of local organisations. As can be seen in table 3 below, the amounts involved were relatively small compared to DfES funding, with two thirds of schools receiving less than £100,000 through this route. Some schools, however, do appear to have acquired significant funding through these routes.

Table 3. Best estimate of additional funding (in £s)

Amount in £s	Frequency
<20000	15
21000-50000	13
51000-100000	13
101000-150000	3
151000-250000	6
251000-500000	7
501000-1000000	4
1000000-2000000	1
>2000000	1
Total	63

Twenty seven respondents, just over 40%, claimed to have received resources in kind from other sources, the value of which was typically below 50000 (20 out of 27 schools).

3. Activities

Table 4. Activities undertaken

	In which of the following areas does the school provide extended activities?	Which of these areas which have been priorities for the school?	In which of these areas did the school already offer extended activities **before** receiving DfES funding?
Childcare	59	23	15
Health and social care	55	18	12
Lifelong learning & community education	61	19	36
Family learning	58	15	27
Parenting support	60	23	19
Study support	62	25	42
Community use of sports & arts facilities	64	17	43
Community use of ICT	37	4	24
Other (please specify)	13	5	5

Table 4 (above) indicates that most schools made extended provision across a range of areas – childcare, health and social care, lifelong and community learning, family learning, parenting support, study support and community use of sports and arts facilities. Community use of ICT resources was the least commonly reported activity, and community groups' use of facilities was the most commonly reported. It is clear from table 4 that involvement in the FSES initiative led to an increase in activities. While all activities were present pre-FSES in some schools, only study support, community use of sports and arts facilities and lifelong and community learning were present in more than half of all schools. The areas of activity that increased the most compared to the situation pre-FSES were childcare, health and social care and parenting support.

Priorities for the development of extended provision varied, with study support, parenting support and childcare receiving the highest number of choices, but all other activities except for community ICT use also being well represented. Other priorities included school clubs and health facilities.

Table 5. Impact on activities

Impact on activities	No of schools
Initiative had negative impact	0
Initiative had little impact	0
initiative enabled school to sustain existing activities	2
enabled school to expand existing a little	8
enabled school to expand existing greatly	56

This impact of the FSES initiative on schools' engagement in activities is confirmed in table 5 above. 56 respondents agreed with the statement that the initiative had allowed the school to expand their extended activities greatly, while none reported a negative or negligible impact on activities.

4. Aims

Table 6. Principal aims of FSESs (respondents had up to three choices)

	No of schools
Raised achievement for all children	43
Enhanced personal, social and health outcomes for children	29
Better support for parents and families in difficulties or at risk	28
Greater parental involvement in school and in their child's education	28
Increased learning opportunities, educational achievements and skills levels for local people	26
Enhanced leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities for children	25
Improved quality of life (e.g. in terms of health, well-being and leisure opportunities) for local communities	19
Engagement of children in learning	17
Better support for children in difficulties or at risk	14
Increased community cohesion and safety	12
Better school performance on standard measures (performance tables, attendance, exclusions)	10
Improved school ethos (e.g. better staff-student and student-student relationships)	9
Raised achievement for the lowest-attaining children	7
Enhanced stability and viability for the school (e.g. reduced staff turnover, higher intakes, better community relations)	6

Increased employment opportunities for local people	5
Other	2

Table 6 above shows that considerable variance exists in stated project aims, though almost two thirds of respondents mentioned raising achievement for all children as one key aim. Over a third chose enhanced personal social and health opportunities and greater leisure and sports and cultural opportunities for children, and greater parental involvement and skills and learning for local people. Least popular choices were those focusing on school standards and internal conditions, targeting low attainers and increasing employment for local people.

All but three schools reported having been involved in other (non FSES) activities that support these aims. All but seven schools reported involvement in the Healthy Schools programme, two thirds of schools in BIP and Excellence in Cities, and over half in the Specialist Schools programme. Just under half saw their involvement in neighbourhood renewal and the 14-19 strategy as supporting these aims. A number of other, mainly local, initiatives were mentioned as well.

5. Outcomes

Table 7. Outcomes of FSES

Outcomes	Positive *Major* impact	Positive *Limited* impact	Neutral *Little* impact either way	Mixed *Some positive/ negative* impact	Negative *Any negative* impact
Achievements of all children	23	31	12	1	0
Achievements of lowest-attaining children	20	34	11	0	0
Engagement of children in learning	25	37	3	1	0
Personal, social and health outcomes for children	36	25	5	0	0
Support for children in difficulties or at risk	33	24	7	1	0
Leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities for children	47	14	3	2	1
Support for parents and families in difficulties or at risk	30	30	6	1	0
Parental involvement in school and in their child's education	17	40	10	0	0

Learning opportunities, educational achievements and skills levels for local people	15	35	14	1	2
Employment opportunities for local people	4	25	31	4	2
Community cohesion and safety	13	27	23	2	1
Quality of life (e.g. in terms of health, well-being and leisure opportunities) for local communities	15	34	16	2	0
School performance on standard measures (performance tables, attendance, exclusions)	22	28	13	1	1
Stability and viability for the school (e.g. staff turnover, intake numbers, community relations)	22	17	23	2	1
School ethos (e.g. staff-student and student-student relationships)	27	27	10	1	1

As can be seen in table 7 above, involvement in the FSES initiative was overwhelmingly perceived as having had a positive impact, the number of respondents reporting a positive impact being greater than the number reporting a negative impact in all cases. The most positive impacts were perceived to be on leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities for children, followed by personal social and health outcomes of children, support for children at risk and support for parents and families in difficulty. The least positive impact was reported on employment opportunities for local people, with only 4 respondents reporting a major positive impact, and 2 respondents reporting a negative impact. In general, the lowest levels of impact were reported for those items relating to impact on the local community. A number of respondents commented that it was hard to estimate the impact of the FSES initiative, as it was one of many initiatives in the school.

6. Sustainability

Table 8. Sustainability when FSES funding runs out..

	No of schools
Most or all of the activities will cease when there is no DfES funding	2
Some activities will be sustainable without DfES funding, but others will cease or be scaled back	45
Most activities will be sustainable, but finding new funding is a major problem	34

Most activities will be sustainable, and finding new funding is not a major problem	1

Table 8 above shows that the majority of respondents felt that some activities would be sustainable once DfES funding stopped, but that others would cease. Most of the other respondents felt that most activities would be sustainable, but attracting other funding would be a problem. Few respondents took either the most pessimistic view – that most activities would cease – or the most optimistic view – that the cessation of DfES funding would be unproblematic.

7. Working with other agencies

Table 9. Other agencies involved in the school's FSES activities to a significant extent

	No of schools
Adult learning service	49
Primary Care Trust	45
Sure start and children's centres	44
Voluntary & community organisations	43
Police service	40
Connexions	36
Education welfare service	36
Local authority school improvement (or advisory/inspection) service	33
Youth service	31
Social work function of the local authority children and families service	29
Area regeneration/neighbourhood renewal team	28
Local authority SEN services (including educational psychology service)	23
Team working with looked after children	21
Local strategic partnership	21
Youth Offending Team	21
Ethnic minority achievement service	15
Probation service	4
Others	34

FSESs reported working with a wide variety of agencies, as table 9 above indicates. The most common partners were the Adult Learning Service, the Primary Care Trust, Sure Start, voluntary and community organisations, and the police service. Few schools worked with the probation service, and relatively few with the ethnic minority achievement service. Most other partners were local organisations, such as FE colleges, football clubs and community services.

This variety of partners is reflected in the picture of other professionals working with the school, as shown in table 10 below.

Table 10. People working with the school

Type of worker	Worked with school?	Based in school?	Employed by school?
Local authority special educational needs teachers (including educational psychologists)	17	8	8
Education welfare officers	24	14	7
Early years workers	20	11	7
Ethnic minority achievement team	15	6	8
Social workers and family support workers	29	16	4
Police officers	32	20	1
Probation officers	1	2	0
Connexions workers	25	21	2
Health workers	43	22	6
Youth workers	34	10	7
Adult learning workers	37	17	6
Area regeneration / neighbourhood renewal workers	21	1	2
Voluntary organisation workers (please specify)	32	11	1
Other (please specify)	22	13	6

The majority of schools reported working with health workers, though - setting a pattern that was repeated with other professionals – far fewer were based in school, and only in 6 schools were health workers employed by the school. Other professionals working frequently with schools were adult learning workers, youth workers and voluntary organisation workers, who again were mainly connected to local organisations. Schools least frequently worked with probation officers, members of the ethnic minority achievement team and LA SEN teachers. Comparative to the number of schools working with them, Connexions officers were most likely to be based in the school, while ethnic minority team members were most likely to be employed by the school.

Table 11. Experience of working with other agencies

	No of schools
Other agencies approached the school with a view to collaboration	37
The school had to approach other agencies, but they were keen to collaborate	50
The school had to approach other agencies, but they were reluctant to collaborate	18
Other agencies shared common goals with the school	44
Other agencies had different goals from the school	19
Our collaborations were usually successful	46
Our collaborations were usually unsuccessful	1
Our collaborations were variable in their success	20

Table 11 above indicates that schools experience of collaboration with other agencies and organisations tended to be positive. 46 respondents claimed that collaborations were usually successful, while 20 described them as variable and 1 as unsuccessful. In the majority of cases (44) other agencies were seen to share the goals of the school, though in a significant minority (19) this was not the case. Several respondents commented that it had taken substantial time to establish successful collaboration, in part due to different cultures and agendas.

8. Leadership and management

All but two schools had a member of staff who acted as FSES coordinator, and in 42 out of 66 cases this person was a member of the Senior Management Team. In 45 cases this member of staff was appointed specifically to carry out this role. In 48 cases this member of staff spent more than 50% of their time on FSES activities.

The majority of respondents (40) felt that FSES activities had been managed in such a way that they enhanced the management of teaching and learning, with another 20 feeling that FSES activities had been managed in such a way that there had been little or no distraction from managing teaching and learning. The remaining 8 respondents felt that managing FSES activities had been a distraction in this respect.

Table 12. Involvement of other partners in managing FSES

	No of schools
The school collaborates with its partners on specific issues, but the formal management of its FSES activities is the responsibility of the school alone	46
The school is part of a formal cluster of schools which manage their FSES activities jointly	12
The school has established a formal management structure, involving agencies and organisations other than its partner schools, which manages FSES activities	18
The school is party to a formal management structure of this kind, but it was not set up by the school itself	5
Other	7

Table 12 above shows that schools typically retained management of FSES activities, though 18 had established management structures that involve other organisations, and 12 managed FSES activities as part of a cluster.

All schools included FSES activities in their school improvement plans, and in 46 cases they were included in the planning cycle. In 29 cases they were included in the school's plans for specialist status.

A mixed picture emerges with regards the relationship between FSES and other strategies, as indicated in table 13 below. While it was designed as part of a wider strategy in 31 cases, in 10 cases the school's FSES strategy was freestanding and not connected to other initiatives or strategies.

Table 13. Relationships between FSES and other strategies and initiatives

	No of schools
FSES strategy is freestanding and not aligned with others	10
FSES strategy supports other area strategies, but not formally aligned	23
FSES strategy is designed as part of a wider strategy for the area	31
Total	64

The governing body had been heavily involved in the FSES initiative in a minority of schools (24 cases), while being lightly involved in a further 26 cases. In the vast majority of cases (50), the governing body was seen as supportive. Only one respondent reported that the governing body had found the governance of FSES activities difficult.

Table 14 below indicates that few schools involved local people formally in the governance of FSES provision, though in many cases they were consulted.

Table 14. Involvement of local people other than governors in the management of FSES

	Frequency
Local people benefit but not involved in governance of FSES	27
Local people consulted but not involved in governance	28
Local people play a formal role in governance	8
Total	63

9. Support and guidance

The vast majority of respondents (63) reported having received guidance and support from the LA, and this support was seen as adequate and helpful in 46 cases. 53 schools had received support from The Extended Schools Support Service, and this support was also seen as helpful in 46 cases. 30 respondents said they would have liked to have

received some other support. A number of respondents felt that their development as FSES school had been more rapid than that of the LA, which therefore was not fully able to offer support.

10. Other comments

Various benefits of FSES were mentioned, with major clusters emerging around issues of community involvement, coordination of different activities and strands of work, delivering ECM and enhanced health and social outcomes.

Major barriers to be overcome included issues of developing successful collaboration with other agencies, finding time for staff to engage in FSES activities, overcoming cultural barriers in both the school and the community, and issues of long-term funding.

Main disadvantages of FSES status were seen as the time involved for management, and lack of funding for the long-term sustainability of activities.

The key factor that had most helped schools manage FSES provision was the appointment of a dedicated FSES manager. Other factors mentioned less frequently included collaboration with other schools, prior experience of collaborative working and support from the LA.

11. Relationships of perceived outcomes to other variables in the survey

In the following analyses, we will look at the relationship between some of the variables in the analysis.

Table 15 below displays the relationships between funding and perceived outcomes.

Table 15: Relationship between funding and outcomes, Spearman's Rho Correlation coefficient

		Amount of DfES funding	Funding from other sources	Resources in kind
Achievements of all Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.246	-.332	-.245
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.054	.008	.200
	N	62	62	29
Achievements of lowest attaining Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.273	-.332	-.410
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.008	.030
	N	61	62	28

Engagement of Children in Learning	Correlation Coefficient	-.176	-.330	-.227
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.175	.010	.235
	N	61	60	29
Personal, Social and Health	Correlation Coefficient	-.362	-.218	-.331
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.091	.079
	N	61	61	29
Support for Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.306	-.218	-.198
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.091	.303
	N	60	61	29
Leisure, Sporting and Cultural	Correlation Coefficient	-.259	-.188	.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	.150	.802
	N	62	60	29
Support for Parents and families	Correlation Coefficient	-.301	-.058	-.210
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	.653	.274
	N	62	62	29
Parental Involvement	Correlation Coefficient	.096	-.176	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.457	.171	.939
	N	62	62	29
Learning Opportunities	Correlation Coefficient	-.385	-.010	-.107
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.935	.581
	N	62	62	29
Employment Opportunities	Correlation Coefficient	-.038	-.260	-.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.774	.041	.615
	N	61	62	28
Community Cohesion	Correlation Coefficient	-.197	-.258	-.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125	.044	.983
	N	62	61	28
Quality of Life	Correlation Coefficient	-.222	-.086	-.262
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.083	.504	.169

	N	62	62	29
School Performance	Correlation Coefficient	-.276	-.380	-.223
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.002	.254
	N	60	61	28
Stability and Viability	Correlation Coefficient	-.042	-.251	.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.749	.051	.898
	N	60	61	28
School Ethos	Correlation Coefficient	-.175	-.161	-.190
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.178	.214	.332
	N	61	61	28

There were a number of significant correlations between amount of funding and perceived outcomes of the programme. Impact was coded as major impact = 1 to negative impact = 5. The negative correlations mean that larger amounts of funding are related to more positive perceived impacts. Correlations vary from modest to moderate, and are strongest for the relationship with school achievement, and with DfES funding rather than funding from other sources.

Table 16 below displays the relationship between perceived outcomes and the range of areas of provision across which extended activities were offered by schools.

Table 16. Outcomes and activities

		How many extended activities areas
Achievements of all Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.226
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.066
	N	67
Achievements of lowest attaining Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.179
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.154
	N	65
Engagement of Children in Learning	Correlation Coefficient	-.516
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	66
Personal, Social and Health	Correlation Coefficient	-.188
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.130
	N	66
Support for Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.324
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008
	N	65

Leisure, Sporting and Cultural	Correlation Coefficient	-.232
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.059
	N	67
Support for Parents and Families	Correlation Coefficient	-.397
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	67
Parental Involvement	Correlation Coefficient	-.251
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041
	N	67
Learning Opportunities	Correlation Coefficient	-.567
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	67
Employment Opportunities	Correlation Coefficient	-.364
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003
	N	66
Community Cohesion	Correlation Coefficient	-.252
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041
	N	66
Quality of Life	Correlation Coefficient	-.347
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004
	N	67
School Performance	Correlation Coefficient	-.391
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	65
Stability and Viability	Correlation Coefficient	-.463
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	65
School Ethos	Correlation Coefficient	-.421
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	66

The number of areas in which activities were offered is significantly related to perceived impact, with strong relationships found with engagement of children with learning and children's learning opportunities, and moderate relationships with support for children, support for parents and families, the school internal factors (ethos and stability and viability), quality of life and school performance. Engagement with activities in health and social care is most consistently related to perceived outcomes. Engagement in family learning is strongly related to children's learning opportunities.

Some relationships were found with management, in that the more FSES activities were seen as enhancing rather than damaging teaching and learning, the more positive outcomes were perceived in terms of achievement of all children (Rho=-.36, p<.01), achievement of children at risk (Rho=-.42, p<.001), engagement of children in learning (Rho=-.32, p<.001), support for parents and families (Rho=-.28, p<.05), community cohesion (Rho=-.34, p<.01), quality of life (Rho=-.33, p<.01), school performance

(Rho=-.30, p<.05) and school ethos (Rho=-.40, p<.001). While not significant, all other correlations were in the same direction. No relationships were found with other management variables, lead-in time or involvement in other initiatives, and few with aims suggesting the possibility of type I errors.

Table 17 below displays the relationship between perceived outcomes and perceptions of collaboration.

Table 17. Collaboration and outcomes

		School and other agencies shared common goals	School and other agencies had different goals	Collaborations were usually successful	Collaborations were usually unsuccessful	Collaborations were variable in their success
Achievements of all Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.362	-.093	-.316	.034	.213
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.456	.009	.782	.084
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Achievements of lowest attaining Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.335	-.127	-.185	.033	.125
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.312	.140	.794	.320
	N	65	65	65	65	65
Engagement of Children in Learning	Correlation Coefficient	-.381	.009	-.231	.078	.151
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.943	.062	.534	.226
	N	66	66	66	66	66
Personal, Social and Health	Correlation Coefficient	-.242	.009	-.247	.114	.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.050	.943	.045	.362	.758
	N	66	66	66	66	66
Support for Children	Correlation Coefficient	-.378	-.020	-.259	-.118	.094
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.875	.037	.350	.458
	N	65	65	65	65	65
Leisure, Sporting and Cultural	Correlation Coefficient	-.211	.222	-.091	-.079	.113
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.086	.072	.463	.524	.361
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Support for Parents and families	Correlation Coefficient	-.373	-.023	-.164	.081	.088
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.855	.186	.516	.476
	N	67	67	67	67	67

Parental Involvement	Correlation Coefficient	-.070	-.113	-.011	.025	-.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.571	.361	.927	.838	.688
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Learning Opportunities	Correlation Coefficient	-.278	-.131	-.047	.163	-.087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.291	.704	.186	.486
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Employment Opportunities	Correlation Coefficient	-.167	.027	-.175	.082	.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.179	.828	.160	.515	.411
	N	66	66	66	66	66
Community Cohesion	Correlation Coefficient	-.442	-.072	-.270	.128	.203
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.566	.028	.305	.103
	N	66	66	66	66	66
Quality of Life	Correlation Coefficient	-.355	-.003	-.262	.163	.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.982	.032	.188	.488
	N	67	67	67	67	67
School Performance	Correlation Coefficient	-.407	-.022	-.380	.025	.370
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.861	.002	.844	.002
	N	65	65	65	65	65
Stability and Viability	Correlation Coefficient	-.184	-.013	-.221	-.014	.228
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.143	.921	.077	.912	.068
	N	65	65	65	65	65
School Ethos	Correlation Coefficient	-.213	.087	-.134	.053	.196
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.085	.489	.282	.675	.115
	N	66	66	66	66	66

A more positive impact was perceived by respondents where schools and partner organizations were perceived to share common goals, with correlations mainly being moderate. Likewise, where collaboration was seen to have been successful, more positive outcomes were perceived.

12. Relationships between other variables in the survey

No consistent pattern of significant relationships was found between activities engaged in and other variables in the survey, and the same was true of sustainability and strategic coordination.

There was a greater level of activity in health and social care (Rho=.34, p<.01), lifelong learning and community education (Rho=.25, p<.05) and parenting support (Rho=.39, p<.001) where the school shared common goals with partner agencies.

13. Summary

- 68 responses were received to the survey, with most respondents being heads of extended schools coordinators. More secondary than primary schools responded.
- The majority of respondents had received between £200,000 and £400,000 from DfES, but most schools had also accessed funding from other sources.
- Most schools provided activities in the areas of childcare, health and social care, lifelong and community learning, family learning, parenting support, study support and community use of sports and arts facilities. Just over half provided community use of ICT resources. FSES had led to a significant increase in activities engaged in.
- Considerable variance exists in stated project aims, though almost two thirds of respondents mentioned raised achievement for all children as one key aim. Enhanced personal social and health opportunities and greater leisure and sports and cultural opportunities for children, and greater parental involvement and skills and learning for local people were other common project aims.
- FSES was overwhelmingly perceived as having had a positive impact. The most positive impacts were perceived to be on leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities for children, followed by personal social and health outcomes of children, support for children at risk and support for parents and families in difficulty.
- FSES schools worked with a wide variety of agencies, the most common being the Adult Learning Service, the Primary Care Trust, Sure Start, voluntary and community organisations, and the police service. Schools' views of collaboration tended to be positive, with the majority of respondents claiming that collaborations were usually successful, and that other agencies shared the goals of the school.
- All but two schools had a member of staff who acted as FSES coordinator, and in 42 out of 66 cases this person was a member of the Senior Management Team.
- The vast majority of respondents (63) reported having received guidance and support from the LA, and this support was seen as adequate and helpful in 46 cases. 53 schools had received support from the Extended Schools Support Service, and this support was also seen as helpful in 46 cases.
- Perceived positive outcomes were related to higher amount of funding, engagement in more extended activities, and the extent to which FSES activities were seen as enhancing rather than damaging teaching and learning.

Annex: Review questionnaire

(NB this questionnaire has been reformatted for the purposes of this report. The content and response modes remain unchanged)

National evaluation of the DfES full service extended schools initiative

Questionnaire for participating schools

This questionnaire has been produced as part of the national evaluation, funded by DfES. The evaluation team is based at the Universities of Manchester and Newcastle. Questionnaires should be returned, and any queries addressed to: Dr Diana Pearson, School of Education, Humanities Building (Devas Street), University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL.

Instructions for completion

Thank you for taking part in this survey.

Who should answer the questions?

This questionnaire is addressed to headteachers.

Headteachers may wish to delegate some of the questions - particularly those in sections A-H – to other colleagues (eg FSES Co-ordinator or equivalent).

However, **it is important that the completed questionnaire reflects the views of the headteacher.** The questions in sections I-K mainly ask about how the FSES initiative has impacted on the school as a whole and heads will probably wish to answer these questions themselves.

How to answer the questions

Please answer the questions by ticking an answer or writing in a response as appropriate.

In some case you may be invited to tick more than one answer. Please make best estimates where necessary. Fine detail is not required.

What happens next

Your responses are **confidential** and will only be seen by the evaluation team and will be **anonymised** in any report. **Individual schools and respondents will not be identified**. We will send you a report with the results of this survey once our analysis is complete so that you can see how your position compares with that of other full service extended schools (FSESs) nationally.

A. Contact

Please give the details of someone who can be contacted about the school's responses:

1. Name	
2. Position	
3. Phone number	

(NB this information will only be used if there are queries about your responses. It will not be disclosed)

B. About the school

4. Name of school	

5. Phase:

	Primary		Secondary		First		Middle		High		All age

6. Is the school a special school ie exclusively for students with SEN?

	Yes		No

7. Local Authority	

8. Is the school part of a **formal** clustering arrangement for full service extended activities? (A formal arrangement is one where the budget is held at cluster level and FSES activities are managed jointly by participating schools. It does **not** include less formal collaborations where individual schools manage their own budgets and activities, but involve other schools in their work).

	Yes		No

9. **If yes,** do your answers to questions below relate to the whole cluster or only to this school? *Please choose whichever makes most sense to you, but be consistent and answer every question from the same perspective.*

	Whole cluster			This school only

C. Involvement in the initiative

10. What is the first school year in which the school received DfES FSES funding?

	2002/3		2003/4		2004/5

11. When did the school cease to receive DfES funding directly?

	2002/3		2003/4		2004/5		2005/6		2006/7

12. Approximately how much DfES FSES funding has the school received directly **over the lifetime of the initiative?**

	Less than £20,000		£21,000 – 50,000		£51,000 – 100,000
	£101,000 – 150,000		£151,000 – 200,000		£201,000 – 300,000
	£301,000 – 400,000		£401,000 – 500,000		More than £500,000

13. What other funding sources has the school drawn upon to support its FSES activities? *Please tick **all** that apply*:

	The school's base budget
	Behaviour Improvement Programme funding
	Excellence in Cities or Excellence clusters funding
	European Social Fund
	Neighbourhood renewal funding

	Donations and grants from charitable bodies or trusts
	Standards fund
	Specialist schools funding
	National Lottery
	Children's Fund
	Healthy schools funding
	Other (please specify)

111

14. What is your **best estimate** of the amount of funding contributed from these other sources over the lifetime of the initiative?

Less than £20,000	£21,000 – 50,000	£51,000 – 100,000
£101,000 – 150,000	£151,000 – 250,000	£251,000 – 500,000
£501,000 – 1,000,000	£1,000,000-2,000,000	More than £2,000,000

15. Has the FSES initiative received resources in kind from any other sources? (We are interested here in staffing, equipment and materials, training etc. that have been donated to the school **for its own use**, but not in staff from other agencies and organisations that have carried out their **own** work from a base in the school).

Yes	No	

16. What is your **best estimate** of the financial value of these resources over the lifetime of the initiative (ie what would they have cost if you had had to buy them)?

Less than £20,000	£21,000 – 50,000	£51,000 – 100,000
£101,000 – 150,000	£151,000 – 200,000	£201,000 – 250,000
£251,000 – 300,000	More than £300,000	

D. Activities

Questions 17-19. *Please complete the following table*:

	17. In which of the following areas does the school provide extended activities? *Tick all that apply*	18. Which of these areas which have been priorities for the school? *Tick one or two areas*	19. In which of these areas did the school already offer extended activities **before** receiving DfES funding? *Tick all that apply*
Childcare			
Health and social care			
Lifelong learning & community education			
Family learning			

Parenting support			
Study support			
Community use of sports & Arts facilities			
Community use of ICT			
Other (please specify)			

20. You only need to answer this question if you ticked any of the areas in question 19 above ie. if the school was already offering extended activities prior to the DfES initiative. Which statement **best describes** the impact of the FSES initiative? *Please tick* ***one*** *statement below:*

	The initiative had little impact on the school's existing extended activities
	The initiative enabled to school to sustain its existing extended activities at their previous level
	The initiative enabled to school to expand its existing extended activities **a little**
	The initiative enabled to school to expand its existing extended activities **greatly**
	The initiative had a negative impact on the school's existing extended activities

21. Schools decide what pattern of activities they should offer. They may do so on their own, or may consult others. If they consult, they may do so **informally** (eg through casual meetings), or they may do so **formally** (eg through steering groups, community fora, student councils, organised meetings). In the questions below, *please tick the statements that describe this school's decision-making processes. Please tick* ***all*** *that apply*:

	The school (eg head, FSES co-ordinator, governing body) decides what is needed, consulting others informally as necessary
	The school undertakes surveys of potential users
	The school asks for feedback from current users
	The school consults *formally* with other providers and agencies (eg through formal meetings or a management committee)
	The school consults *formally* with community groups and members (eg through formal meetings or a management committee)
	The school has a process of *formal* consultation with its students (eg student council / student surveys)
	Decisions about provision are taken by some sort of partnership body rather than by the school

22. Many schools needed lead-in time before their extended activities were operational. What is the first school year in which this school's extended activities were properly operational? *Please tick* ***one box.***

	Before 2002/3		2002/3		2003/4		2004/5

	2005/6		2006/7		They are not yet properly operational

E. Aims

23. FSES provision can have many aims. Which statement(s) **best describe(s)** the aims which are priorities for your current provision? *Please tick **up to three** statements below:*

	Raised achievement for all children
	Raised achievement for the lowest-attaining children
	Engagement of children in learning
	Enhanced personal, social and health outcomes for children
	Better support for children in difficulties or at risk
	Enhanced leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities for children
	Better support for parents and families in difficulties or at risk
	Greater parental involvement in school and in their child's education
	Increased learning opportunities, educational achievements and skills levels for local people
	Increased employment opportunities for local people
	Increased community cohesion and safety
	Improved quality of life (eg in terms of health, well-being and leisure opportunities) for local communities
	Better school performance on standard measures (performance tables, attendance, exclusions)
	Enhanced stability and viability for the school (eg reduced staff turnover, higher intakes, better community relations)
	Improved school ethos (eg better staff-student and student-student relationships)
	Other (please specify)

24. Has the school been involved in any other initiatives that have supported these aims?

	Yes		No

25. If yes, *please tick **all** that apply:*

	Behaviour Improvement Programme
	Excellence in Cities or Excellence clusters
	Specialist schools
	Neighbourhood renewal
	Healthy schools
	14-19 strategy

	Other (please specify)

F. Outcomes

26. The school's FSES provision may have had impacts on a range of outcomes. These may have been positive/negative. Or there may have been mixed impacts or no impact on outcomes at all. *Please tick the box opposite each of the outcomes in the table below that **best** describes these impacts:*

Outcomes	**Positive** *Major* impact	**Positive** *Limited* impact	**Neutral** *Little* impact either way	**Mixed** *Some positive/ negative* impact	**Negative** *Any negative* impact
Achievements of all children					
Achievements of lowest-attaining children					
Engagement of children in learning					
Personal, social and health outcomes for children					
Support for children in difficulties or at risk					
Leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities for children					
Support for parents and families in difficulties or at risk					
Parental involvement in school and in their child's education					
Learning opportunities, educational achievements and skills levels for local people					
Employment opportunities for local people					
Community cohesion and safety					
Quality of life (eg in terms of health, well-being and leisure opportunities) for local communities					
School performance on standard measures (performance tables, attendance, exclusions)					
Stability and viability for the school (eg staff turnover, intake numbers, community relations)					
School ethos (eg staff-student and student-student relationships)					
Other (please specify)					

27. Please add any further comments you wish to make on outcomes, below:

G. Sustainability

28. Which of the following statements best describe your view of the sustainability of the school's FSES activities? *You may wish to tick more than one.*

	Most or all of the activities will cease when there is no DfES funding
	Some activities will be sustainable without DfES funding, but others will cease or be scaled back
	Most activities will be sustainable, but finding new funding is a major problem
	Most activities will be sustainable, and finding new funding is not a major problem

H. Working with other agencies

29. Which of the following agencies/services have been involved in the school's extended activities to a **significant** degree (please note that these agencies may have slightly different names locally). *Please tick **all** that apply*:

	Local authority school improvement (or advisory/inspection) service
	Local authority SEN services (including educational psychology service)
	Social work function of the local authority children and families
	Team working with looked after children
	Area regeneration/neighbourhood renewal team
	Ethnic minority achievement service
	Local strategic partnership
	SureStart and children's centres
	Education welfare service
	Primary Care Trust
	Probation service
	Youth service
	Youth Offending Team
	Adult learning service
	Police service
	Connexions
	Voluntary & community organisations (please specify)
	Other (please specify)

30. In the table below, please *put a tick in the appropriate column* to indicate whether any of these workers:
- Have worked with the school **as a direct result of the FSES initiative**
- Have been based in the school for significant periods of time
- Have been directly employed by the school.

Please note you may wish to tick more than one column for each group of workers.

Type of worker	Worked with school?	Based in school?	Employed by school?
Local authority special educational needs teachers (including educational psychologists)			
Education welfare officers			
Early years workers			
Ethnic minority achievement team			
Social workers and family support workers			
Police officers			
Probation officers			
Connexions workers			
Health workers			
Youth workers			
Adult learning workers			
Area regeneration / neighbourhood renewal workers			
Voluntary organisation workers (please specify)			
Other (please specify)			
Other (please specify)			
Other (please specify)			

31. Which of the following statements best describes your experience of working with other services and agencies. *Please tick **all** that apply.*

	Other agencies approached the school with a view to collaboration
	The school had to approach other agencies, but they were keen to collaborate

	The school had to approach other agencies, but they were reluctant to collaborate
	Other agencies shared common goals with the school
	Other agencies had different goals from the school
	Our collaborations were usually successful
	Our collaborations were usually unsuccessful
	Our collaborations were variable in their success

32. *Please add any further comments below:*

I. Leadership and Management

The remaining sections should be completed by the headteacher.

33. Does the school have a member of staff who acts as its FSES co-ordinator?

	Yes			No

34. Is this member of staff a member of the school's senior leadership team?

	Yes			No

35. Was this member of staff appointed specifically to carry out this role? (ie as opposed to being an existing member of staff who was designated as co-ordinator).

	Yes			No

36. Does this member of staff spend more than 50% of their time acting as FSES co-ordinator?

	Yes			No

37. *Please tick the **one** statement* that **best describes** how the management demands of FSES activities have impacted on the school leadership team's management of teaching and learning?

	Managing FSES activities has been a distraction from managing teaching and learning
	FSES activities have been managed in such a way that there has been little or no distraction
	FSES activities have been managed in such a way that they have enhanced the management of teaching and learning

38. Which of the following statements **best describes** the involvement of other partners (eg other agencies, voluntary organisations, community groups) in the management of the school's FSES activities. *Please tick **all** that apply:*

	The school collaborates with its partners on specific issues, but the formal management of its FSES activities is the responsibility of the school alone
	The school is part of a formal cluster of schools which manage their FSES activities jointly
	The school has established a formal management structure, involving agencies and organisations other than its partner schools, which manages FSES activities
	The school is party to a formal management structure of this kind, but it was not set up by the school itself
	Other (please specify)

39. In which of the following plans do the FSES services feature? *Please tick **all** that apply:*

The school		The school's		Plans for specialist	

40. This question is about the relationship between the school's FSES initiative and other strategies and initiatives (such as the neighbourhood renewal strategy) designed to enhance the communities served by the school. Which one of the following statements **best describes** this relationship? *Please tick **one** statement only*:

	The school's FSES initiative is largely free-standing and is not closely aligned with other strategies in the area
	The school's FSES initiative supports other strategies in the area where possible, but does not formally contribute to those strategies
	The school's FSES initiative has been designed as part of a wider strategy for the area served by the school.
	Other (please specify)

41. This question is about the role of the school's governing body in FSES activities. *Please tick **any** of the following statements which apply:*

	The governing body is heavily involved in the governance of FSES activities
	The governing body is only lightly involved in the governance of FSES activities
	The governing body has been supportive of FSES activities
	The governing body has found the governance of FSES activities difficult
	Other (please specify)

42. This question is about the involvement of local people **other than school governors** in the governance of the school's FSES initiative. 'Local people' in this sense means local residents, parents and community groups. *Please tick **one** of the following statements which best describes this involvement:*

	Local people benefit from the school's FSES activities but are not involved in their governance (other than through the governing body)
	Local people are consulted about the school's FSES activities but are not involved in their governance (other than through the governing body)
	Local people play a formal role in the governance of the school's FSES activities (other than through the governing body)
	Other (Please specify)

J. Support and guidance

43. Has the local authority offered support and guidance to the school in the development of its FSES activities?

	Yes			No

44. **If yes,** was this support and guidance adequate and helpful?

	Yes			No

45. Did the Extended Schools Support Service offer support and guidance to the school in the development of its FSES activities?

	Yes			No

46. **If yes,** was this support and guidance adequate and helpful?

	Yes			No

47. Would you have liked any other support?

	Yes			No

48. **If yes,** what sort of support would you have liked?

K. Overview

49. What do you regard as the major benefits of the school's involvement in the FSES initiative?

50. What do you regard as the major problems you have had to overcome in managing the school's involvement in the FSES initiative?

51. What do you regard as the major drawbacks and disadvantages of the school's involvement in the FSES initiative?

52. What has helped you most in managing the school's involvement in the FSES initiative?

53. What other comments would you like to make about this school's involvement in the FSES initiative? *You may also wish to use this space to explain or elaborate any of your answers to this questionnaire. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary*:

Thank you very much for your time

Appendix 2: Analysis of NPD data

1. Methodology

This appendix presents analyses of data in the National Pupil Database (NPD). This database holds data at individual pupil level on attainments in national tests, teacher assessments and examinations. It also records a range of other information about each pupil, including school attended, gender, entitlement to free school meals (FSM), ethnicity, and special educational needs (SEN) status (i.e. type of SEN, if any, and level of provision). Because NPD uses standard school identifiers, it is possible to identify FSESs within the database and carry out analyses which introduce attendance at an FSES or non-FSES as a variable.

Our analyses were carried out using pupil attainment data for 2004 and 2005, that is, for the first two years of the national FSES initiative (though, of course, some schools were offering extended provision before this period, while others joined the initiative after its first year and/or took time for their provision to become operational). At a late stage in the evaluation, data for attainments at Key Stages 2 and 4 in 2006 became available, and these were analysed separately to test whether the effects of FSES status were changing over time.

A range of methods was employed in these analyses, including multiple linear regression, multilevel hierarchical regression, Analysis of Variance and the use of matched samples design. The latter proved highly problematic, as it proved impossible to design samples that were truly matched on all the relevant variables, making the exercise largely meaningless as it was designed to partial out differences between FSES and non-FSES schools. In particular, ethnic and gender representation and representation of pupils with SEN proved problematic.

No differences were found in results between the three other methods employed, with both significance levels and effect sizes extremely similar across analyses (unsurprising in view of the common underlying General Linear Model). In this discussion we will present the results of the ANOVA analyses, as these provide a helpful insight into both the sizes of effects and interactions in the models.

We employed similar models across key stages and analyses, allowing for easy comparison. In all cases, FSM eligibility, SEN, ethnicity, gender, language spoken in the home and attending an FSES were used as predictors of outcome measures. These outcome measures obviously differ between key stages and will be discussed in the appropriate section.

While gender and FSM were used in their original format, the other predictors were recoded. Due to small sample sizes in some categories in FSESs, and problems regarding between-school definitions of categories, SEN was recoded into a dummy variable (SEN or not SEN). For similar reasons of sample sizes ethnicity was recoded into five main groups, Asian, Black, Chinese, Mixed, White or Other. Language categories ENG and ENB were combined into 'English', while the categories OTH (Other than English) and OTB (Not known but believed to be other than English) were combined into 'Other than English'.

FSES was another dummy variable (FSES or not).

As well as these main effects, we explored interactions between FSES and FSM, gender, SEN, ethnicity and language in the analyses, this to explore the hypotheses of differential impacts for at-risk groups.

We will discuss the findings for each Key Stage in turn.

2. Key Stage 1

2.1. Differences between FSES and non FSES schools – predictor variables

Table 1: Mean values for predictor variables in FSES and non FSES schools and Chi Square test of difference. * indicates significant difference at the .001 level.

		2004			2005		
		Non FSES	*FSES*	*Chi Square*	*Non FSES*	*FSES*	*Chi Square*
Gender	*Female*	48.9	47.8	1.02	48.7	48.8	0.01
	Male	51.1	52.2		51.3	51.2	
FSM	*Not eligible*	81.3	67.6	265.49*	81.9	69.2	233.27*
	Eligible	18.7	32.4		18.1	30.8	
Ethnicity	*Asian*	7.3	18.6	472.55*	7.8	20.0	460.65*
	Black	4.1	6.5		4.3	5.5	
	Chinese	0.3	0.1		0.3	0.2	
	Mixed	3.5	4.7		3.6	4.3	
	White	83.9	69.0		83.1	69.3	
	Other	0.9	1.1		1.0	0.7	
Language	*Not English*	11.1	23.6	338.79*	88.1	75.0	348.56*
	English	88.9	76.4		11.9	25.0	
SEN	*No SEN*	79.9	72.8	69.94*	79.7	72.1	76.44*
	SEN	20.1	27.2		20.3	27.9	

FSESs and non FSESs differ significantly in intake at KS1 (see table 1). Pupils in FSESs are more likely to be eligible for free school meals, more likely to have been identified as having special educational needs, and twice as likely not to have English as their first

language. Pupils in the FSES sample are also far more likely to be Asian and less likely to be White than the population as a whole.

As these factors tend to be related to achievement outcomes, these differences would lead one would hypothesise that achievement levels would be lower in FSESs than in non-FSESs. This is indeed the case, for all outcome variables. However, these raw differences do not tell us much about the differences between FSESs and non-FSESs if the differential nature of the intake as described above is not taken into account, and have therefore not been presented here. Rather, we will look at the impact of FSES status on achievement in the framework of a model that takes into account the differential intake. Below, we present ANOVA models for each subject to this effect.

2.2. Relationship between predictors and outcomes

As measurements of both cognitive and non-cognitive factors tends to be less stable in the early grades of primary school and are known to have lower levels of reliability for this age group, it is not surprising that explanatory power was very low for these models, being below 10% in most cases, and below 11% in all. For this reason we present in table 2 only the results for the teacher assessments for Literacy, Numeracy and Science, rather than the test scores. Due to the large sample size, the cut off value for statistical significance was set at the .001 level, as at lower levels the power to detect even very trivial effects would be too great.

Table 2: Predictors of outcomes at KS1, ANOVA models.

	2004			2005		
	English	*Maths*	*Science*	*English*	*Maths*	*Science*
	F *(*=p<.001)*	*F* *(*=p<.001)*	*F* *(*=p<.001)*	*F* *(*=p<.001)*	*F* *(*=p<.001)*	*F* *(*=p<.001)*
Total	5381.13	6107.10	5825.06	13782.44	8973.79	5537.00
FSM	175.38*	151.10*	204.65*	318.39*	128.95*	180.65*
Gender	74.32*	61.98*	9.72	70.80*	5.22	21.67*
SEN	1623.98*	1764.45*	1459.61*	3950.77*	2950.04*	1429.88*
Language	5.54	0.28	7.67	45.59*	25.85*	21.45*
Ethnicity	2.58	2.71	2.16	6.44*	2.94	3.62
FSES	1.15	4.91	2.87	0.39	1.27	1.10
FSES*Ethnicity	3.55	1.18	0.90	3.57	2.50	4.30
FSES*Language	1.40	5.65	1.22	5.28	4.56	0.20
FSES*SEN	0.01	4.29	0.11	1.20	4.79	0.23
FSES*Gender	0.25	0.75	5.21	0.13	0.86	0.35
FSES*FSM	7.77	5.85	2.91	1.57	0.12	5.38
Explained variance	21.0%	20.8%	16.7%	23.7%	23.6%	16.3%

Explained variance is modest, at only around 16% to 24%, and is higher for English and Maths than for Science. This limited explanatory power is partly due to the absence of certain key predictors in the model, such as good indicators of parental socio-economic status (FSM eligibility is a poor proxy variable) and ability, but also to measurement error. While present in all measurement, this is likely to be greater at Key Stage 1, as measurement of both cognitive and non-cognitive factors tends to be less stable in the

early grades of primary school. A particular issue with the data is also the lack of variance in the outcome measures.

The strongest predictor in all three subjects is SEN. Pupils identified as having special educational needs perform on average half to one National Curriculum (NC) level lower than pupils not identified as having SEN. Free school meal eligibility is the second major predictor. Pupils eligible for FSM score on average .2 of a level lower than those not eligible. Gender is a significant (though weak) predictor in four cases, with girls doing slightly better in English in 04 and 05, and boys in Maths in 04 and Science in 05. Language spoken is a significant, though weak, predictor of outcomes in 2005, with pupils having English as their first language doing somewhat better in terms of outcomes.

Being in an FSES is not a significant predictor of outcomes in any of the analyses. This suggests that any differences in performance found were due to differences in the intake between FSESs and non FSESs. The interaction terms were likewise insignificant. This suggests that FSES is not related to performance at KS1.

3. Key Stage 2

3.1. Differences between FSES and non FSES schools – predictor variables

Table 3: Mean values for predictor variables in FSES and non FSES schools and Chi Square test of difference. * indicates significant difference at the .001 level.

		2004			2005			2006		
		Non FSES	*FSES*	*Chi Square*	*Non FSES*	*FSES*	*Chi Square*	*Non FSES*	*FSES*	*Chi Square*
Gender	*Female*	48.9	48.9	.00	48.8	49.2	0.11	49.9	50.6	0.54
	Male	51.1	51.1		51.2	50.8		50.1	49.4	
FSM	*Not eligible*	82.1	70.0	222.10*	82.7	71.8	197.88*	84.7	70.4	316.32*
	Eligible	17.9	30.0		17.3	28.2		15.3	29.6	
Ethnicity	*Asian*	6.7	17.8	437.81*	6.9	18.2	445.92*	7.3	17.5	322.18*
	Black	3.8	3.6		4.0	4.4		4.2	5.8	
	Chinese	0.3	0.1		0.3	0.5		0.4	0.2	
	Mixed	2.9	3.5		3.0	4.1		1.4	1.2	
	White	86.2	75.0		84.9	72.0		83.9	73.5	
	Other	0.2	0.0		0.9	1.0		2.8	1.8	
Language	*Not English*	9.1	21.0	303.98*	10.4	22.4	333.12*	80.2	71.0	107.71*
	English	90.1	79.0		89.6	77.6		19.8	29.0	
SEN	*No SEN*	77.6	67.3	136.67*	77.1	69.7	64.42*	80.2	71.0	107.71*
	SEN	22.4	32.7		22.9	30.3		19.8	29.0	

There are significant differences between FSESs and non FSESs in terms of intake (see table 3). Pupils in FSESs are significantly more likely to be eligible for Free School Meals and be identified as having Special Educational Needs. They are over twice as likely to speak a language other than English at home, and are almost three times as likely to be of Asian ethnic heritage.

These differences mean that one would hypothesise that achievement levels would be lower in FSESs than in non-FSESs. This is indeed the case, for all outcome variables. However, these raw differences do not tell us much about the differences between FSESs and non-FSESs if the differential nature of the intake as described above is not taken into account, and have therefore not been presented here. Rather, we will look at the impact of FSES status on achievement in the framework of a model that takes into account the differential intake. Below, we present ANOVA models for each subject to this effect.

3.2. Relationship between predictors and outcomes

ANOVA models are presented for 2004, 2005 and 2006 for the three core subjects of English, Maths and Science. In each we have looked at three outcome measures: teacher assessment, overall level and overall points score. Due to the large sample size, significance is measured at the .001 level. Data are given in table 4-6

Table 4: Predictors of English outcomes at KS2, ANOVA models

	2004			2005			2006		
	English teacher assessment	*English Level*	*English Total points score*	*English teacher assessment*	*English Level*	*English Total points score*	*English teacher assessments*	*English Level*	*English Total points score*
	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*	F *(*=p<.001)*
Total	16312.16	8711.14	12949.15	13569.82	8015.50	12184.85	7524.09	10243.9	12764.9
FSM	249.81*	188.57*	263.10*	201.94*	169.99*	249.76*	179.8*	182.9*	249.6*
Gender	83.13*	120.37*	149.54*	34.04*	38.02*	34.0*	34.0*	70.0*	114.3*
Ethnicity	2.15	5.83	6.02	2.89	1.05	1.36	23.4*	10.4*	14.9*
Language	5.72	0.02	0.49	10.23	10.15*	9.19			
SEN	4162.63*	1858.61*	2764.47*	3292.79*	1787.33*	2658.18*	2210.8*	2110.8*	2507.4*
FSES	0.56	0.86	0.63	0.24	4.22	1.96	0.61	2.9	4.9*
FSES*SEN	0.22	2.25	3.34	5.04	5.87	6.43	1.7	10.3*	21.4*
FSES*Lang	0.65	1.88	1.93	0.47	1.40	0.41			
FSES*Ethnicity	2.42	4.20*	4.54*	4.80*	0.73	0.13	3.6*	3.9*	5.3*
FSES*Gender	1.04	1.43	0.76	3.98	6.98	4.51	1.6	0.9	0.0
FSES*FSM	12.47*	7.37*	9.26*	12.74*	10.12*	10.21*	10.14*	15.0*	21.4*
Explained var	33.7%	21.9%	29.1%	32.0%	22.2%	29.9%	25.2%	24.7%	29.0%

The models explain between 22% and 34% of the variance in outcomes in KS2 English. This shows modest explanatory power, and suggests that powerful explanatory variables are absent from this model. These would be hypothesised to include better measures of parental social background (FSM is a poor proxy measure) and ability. There is also likely to be substantial measurement error due to relatively limited levels of reliability and validity of the tests. The models have the strongest predictive power for the teacher

assessment scores in 04 and 05, and for the total points score in 06, and the weakest for the levels. There are few differences across years.

SEN is the strongest predictor of outcomes. On average, pupils not identified as having SEN score 1 NC level higher than pupils identified as having SEN. FSM eligibility is the other main predictor of outcomes in English. On average, pupils eligible achieve around .3 of a level lower than pupils not eligible. Girls tend to do better than boys, though differences are not particularly large. Ethnicity and language spoken in the home do not consistently predict outcomes.

FSES status is also not a significant predictor in any of these analyses, suggesting that differences in performance between FSESs and non-FSESs can be fully accounted for by the differences in intake we discussed above.

One factor that was consistently significantly related to outcomes was the interaction of FSES and FSM. Though the effect is not strong, this does suggest that the relationship between FSM and outcomes varies depending on FSES status. In practice, it would appear that in FSESs the gap in performance between pupils eligible for FSM and those not eligible is reduced, and in some analyses eliminated, once the impact of differences between the groups on other variables in the model is factored out. In some analyses a weak interaction between FSES and ethnicity is present. This represents a somewhat better performance for Black pupils in FSESs, and a somewhat worse performance for Asian pupils.

Table 5: Predictors of Maths outcomes at KS2, ANOVA models

	2004			2005			2006		
	Maths teacher assessment	*Maths Level*	*Maths Points Score*	*Maths teacher assessment*	*Maths Level*	*Maths Points Score*	*Maths teacher assessment*	*Maths Level*	*Maths Points Score*
	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)	F (*=p<.001)
Total	8711.14	7032.09	10694.68	10706.37	6467.01	9762.55	6048.5	6374.2	8897.8
FSM	188.57*	158.80*	208.93*	152.05*	152.31*	175.98*	118.4*	133.0*	162.6*
Gender	120.37*	78.66*	122.90*	129.50*	137.92*	205.90*	150.0*	133.6*	214.2*
Ethnicity	5.83*	1.96	2.23	6.57*	2.79	5.60*	14.7*	15.2*	22.6*
Language	0.02	0.18	0.43	0.49	0.08	1.27			
SEN	1858.61*	1608.19*	2743.09*	2922.45*	1503.95*	2416.25*	1980.1*	1366.2*	2013.7*
FSES	0.86	2.50	5.48	0.68	4.25	2.26	1.2	0.5	0.5
FSES*SEN	2.25	1.65	0.01	1.14	4.67	4.20	0.5	7.0*	5.7
FSES*Lang	1.88	1.03	1.94	0.94	0.40	0.00			
FSES*Ethnicity	4.20	2.55	3.66	3.05	2.29	3.11	3.9	4.3*	6.8*
FSES*Gender	1.43	0.36	0.00	3.28	0.72	2.96	2.0	0.1	0.3
FSES*FSM	7.37	7.09	9.58	10.66*	5.89	14.11*	8.7*	5.9	8.6*
Explained var	21.9%	18.4%	25.1%	25.6%	18.6%	25.3%	21.3%	17.2%	22.3%

Explained variance in Maths is significantly lower than in English, suggesting these predictors work less well for this subject. Explained variance ranges between 17 and 26%.

This lower predictive strength is reflected in fewer variables being significant predictors. Only SEN, FSM and gender are significant predictors across the board. SEN is again the most significant predictor, with pupils identified as having SEN achieving between half and one level lower than their peers. While FSM and gender (boys here performing better than girls) are also significant.

FSES is not a significant predictor of performance in Maths (as in English) at KS2 once the influence of other predictors has been factored out. There are few significant relationships between outcomes in Maths and interaction terms either, with only the FSES-FSM interaction term being significant in two cases in 2005. While in 2005 some significant differences were found between FSESs and non FSESs, they have disappeared or are smaller in 2006 for Maths. The overall (small) difference found has disappeared, while few interactions remain (between FSES and FSM for teacher assessments and total score, between SEN and FSES for level, and between FSES and ethnicity for level and total score).

Table 6: Predictors of Science outcomes at KS2, ANOVA models

	2004			2005			2006		
	Science teacher assessments	*Science Level*	*Science Total points score*	*Science teacher assessments*	*Science Level*	*Science Total points score*	*Science teacher assessments*	*Science Level*	*Science Total points score*
	F (*=p<.001)	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*	*F (*=p<.001)*
Total	10837.82	7030.43	9579.23	8908.63	6319.95	8568.05	5108.9	5633.95	7272.3
FSM	195.85*	222.91*	291.58*	160.12*	205.57*	241.51*	163.8*	182.2*	241.4*
Gender	40.28*	45.33*	61.96*	65.66*	85.83*	95.54*	55.8*	28.8*	44.0*
Ethnicity	3.20	7.09*	7.22*	3.18	5.89*	7.47*	45.3*	54.2*	74.7*
Language	3.25	1.94	2.27	5.41	6.75	11.68*			
SEN	2970.17*	1839.23*	2526.40*	2204.87*	1626.11*	2102.52*	1528.5*	1226.8*	1567.4*
FSES	1.03	0.26	0.00	2.47	3.88	3.65	0	0.8	0.5
FSES*SEN	3.71	5.39	5.88	2.81	0.83	0.07	1.0	0.4	1.1
FSES*Lang	0.98	0.61	1.26	0.95	0.03	0.07			
FSES*Ethnicity	2.93	6.69*	6.14	2.55	4.04	3.89	7.9*	10.9*	16.0*
FSES*Gender	0.36	0.17	0.32	4.24	2.04	0.83	0.9	0.0	0.4
FSES*FSM	18.15*	5.84	7.64	16.25*	3.54	8.80*	7.5*	6.1	6.6*
Explained var	25.2%	17.9%	22.8%	23.5%	17.9%	22.7%	18.6%	15.3%	18.9%

Levels of explained variance for Science are similar to those for Maths outcomes, and reflect similar patterns. SEN is again by far the strongest predictor, with up to one level difference between SEN and non-SEN pupils occurring. FSM is the second main predictor, while there is a small difference between boys and girls in these analyses, with boys slightly outperforming girls all else being equal, though the difference averages at less than .1 of a level.

FSES is again non-significant, and shows a weak relationship with outcomes in KS2 Science. There is a weak but significant relationship between the interaction term of FSM and FSES when the outcome is measured through teacher assessment, with schools in FSES reducing the gap between eligible and non-eligible pupils. The strongest interactions for Science in 2006 were between FSES and ethnicity, with differences

127

between groups again diminishing. There were also some interactions with FSM, though none with SEN, in contrast to previous years.

4. Key Stage 3

4.1. Differences between FSES and non FSES schools

Table 7: Mean values for predictor variables in FSESs and non FSESs and Chi Square test of difference. * indicates significant difference at the .001 level.

		2004			2005		
		Non FSES	*FSES*	*Chi Square*	*Non FSES*	*FSES*	*Chi Square*
Gender	*Female*	48.9	47.3	19.8*	49.1	47.6	15.9*
	Male	51.1	52.7		50.9	52.4	
FSM	*Not eligible*	84.5	67.4	3801.5*	84.9	67.5	4046.8*
	Eligible	15.5	32.6		15.1	32.5	
Ethnicity	*Asian*	6.0	10.4	3586.5*	6.1	9.7	3319.5*
	Black	3.4	10.2		3.4	9.8	
	Chinese	0.3	0.5		0.3	0.4	
	Mixed	2.2	3.5		2.4	3.5	
	White	87.3	73.6		87.1	74.2	
	Other	0.7	1.9		0.8	2.4	
Language	*Not English*	8.3	19.7	2891.3*	8.4	19.9	2973.1*
	English	91.7	80.3		91.6	80.1	
SEN	*No SEN*	81.5	73.6	722.1*	81.1	73.7	631.2*
	SEN	18.5	26.4		18.9	26.3	

As in the primary years, FSESs serve a significantly more disadvantaged population than non FSESs (table 7). At KS3, FSESs have more than twice the number of pupils eligible for FSM and who do not have English as their home language. Pupils in FSESs are also more likely to belong to ethnic minority groups and to have been identified as having SEN. They are also slightly more likely to be boys, though the difference, while statistically significant, is small. As one would predict from these differences, achievement levels in FSESs at KS3 are significantly lower in FSESs than in non-FSESs on all subjects. However, these raw differences do not tell us much about the differences between FSESs and non-FSESs if the differential nature of the intake as described above is not taken into account, and have therefore not been presented here. Rather, we will look at the impact of FSES status on achievement in the framework of a model that takes into account the differential intake. Below, we present ANOVA models for each subject to this effect.

4.2. Relationships between predictors and outcomes

ANOVA models are presented for 2004 and 2005 for the three core subjects of English, Maths and Science. In each we have looked at three outcome measure: Teacher

assessment, overall level and overall points score. Due to the large sample size, significance is measured at the .001 level. Data are given in tables 8 to 10.

Table 8: Predictors of English outcomes at KS3, ANOVA models

	2004			2005		
	English teacher assessments	English Level	English Total points score	English teacher assessments	English Level	English Total points score
	F(*=p<.001)	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*
Total	11456.37	11456.37	7962.68	11245.66	5655.33	8296.78
Gender	1084.5*	1171.97*	1296.45*	1246.94*	1080.02*	1503.81*
Ethnicity	204.1*	44.11*	19.41*	38.90*	15.11*	23.50*
Language	283.3*	306.19*	44.09*	289.61*	8.07	26.98*
SEN	15642.3*	16903.79*	11468.96*	16432.88*	7483.43*	11591.47*
FSM	2404.8*	2598.79*	2597.82*	2857.87*	2062.77*	2897.55*
FSES	15.1	16.29*	52.12*	0.88	12.88	11.62
FSES*FSM	179.7*	194.22*	187.97*	122.76*	85.94*	84.65*
FSES*SEN	222.9*	240.95*	118.44*	333.59*	145.16*	208.54*
FSES*Language	.22	0.24	8.56*	0.02	19.31*	19.14*
FSES*Ethnicity	35.8*	7.75	10.24*	13.75*	4.79	7.03*
FSES*Gender	5.9	6.37	6.83*	0.25	0.48	0.39
Explained var	27.9%	16.7%	22.1%	27.9%	17.0%	22.6%

As can be seen in table 8, overall the models explain a modest 16%-28% of the variance in achievement, with the largest proportion of variance explained for the teacher assessment models. The lack of variables able to measure social background more accurately than FSM, and the lack of a measure of ability, and limited reliability of the outcome data account for the limited variance explained. The strongest predictor of outcomes in English is SEN, with pupils with special educational needs achieving on average a full NC level lower than pupils without special needs, taking into account any differences between SEN and non-SEN pupils on the other variables in the model. Pupils eligible for FSM achieve on average half an NC level lower, while girls achieve on average a quarter level higher than boys.

Language and ethnicity are also statistically significant (English speakers achieving more highly than non English speakers, and White and Black students achieving worse than Asian, Mixed or Chinese students) though the effect sizes are small, with these variables explaining less than 1% of the variance in outcomes.

Attending an FSES is not a significant predictor of outcomes (at the .001 level) in any of the 2005 models, and though borderline significant in two of the 2004 models, the effect size is very small, and the difference lacks substantive meaning.

There are a number of significant interactions with FSES status in a number of models. In particular, the interactions with SEN and FSM are significant, though not strong predictors of outcomes. In both cases, the interaction terms show that the difference between SEN and non-SEN and FSM and non-FSM students is reduced in FSESs. In the case of students with SEN, this means that the gap in achievement is reduced from more than 1 NC level to under 1 level, in the case of FSM the gap in achievement between

pupils eligible for FSM and those not eligible disappears entirely (holding constant all other variables in the model).

Table 9: Predictors of Maths outcomes at KS3, ANOVA models

	2004			2005		
	Maths teacher assessments	*Maths Level*	*Maths Total points score*	*Maths teacher assessments*	*Maths Level*	*Maths Total points score*
	F(*=p<.001)	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*
Total	9999.37	8287.62	3027.28	9952.13	8333.46	3036.08
Gender	86.80*	249.48*	356.54*	152.32*	374.91*	586.98*
Ethnicity	90.76*	88.48*	102.16*	94.10*	99.34*	96.02*
Language	102.34*	28.64*	75.17*	55.69*	18.29*	25.49*
SEN	16387.67*	14459.14*	4832.97*	17082.69*	13935.50*	4509.82*
FSM	2536.68*	2347.07*	884.71*	2659.81*	2419.13*	987.21*
FSES	25.97*	46.60*	84.60*	11.22	15.63*	54.66*
FSES*FSM	205.15*	169.58*	81.97*	161.30*	138.97*	75.14*
FSES*SEN	269.62*	127.20*	18.69*	248.00*	181.17*	36.45*
FSES*Language	0.12	8.47	1.18	6.82	11.45	2.46
FSES*Ethnicity	6.59	5.76*	2.55	3.49	2.61	2.84
FSES*Gender	0.48	0.60	1.14	0.04	0.10	6.25
Explained var	25.1%	22.2%	9.4%	25.1%	22.1%	9.7%

In general, the picture for Maths outcomes is similar to that for English outcomes. Explained variance is slightly lower, but the key predictors remain SEN and FSM. The impact of FSM (half a level) appears similar to that for English. The impact of SEN is greater. Boys achieve somewhat higher than girls. Weak effects are found for ethnicity and language spoken.

Pupils in FSESs achieved significantly lower in 2004 than pupils in non-FSES schools, though the effect was weak (less than 0.2 of a level), and weakened further in 2005.

Again, significant interaction terms were found with FSM and SEN. These interactions, though not strong effects, were larger than those of ethnicity or language and in most cases gender, and were in most cases far stronger than the effect of FSES membership as such. The interaction again took the form of the performance gap between FSM and non FSM being eliminated in FSES schools (all other factors being equal), and that between SEN and non SEN reduced.

Table 10: Predictors of Science outcomes at KS3, ANOVA models

	2004			2005		
	Science teacher assessments	*Science Level*	*Science Total points score*	*Science teacher assessments*	*Science Level*	*Science Total points score*
	F(*=p<.001)	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*
Total	8923.6	7641.25	3439.09	8827.10	7823.35	2463.24
Gender	62.16*	89.44*	8.37	67.41*	322.39*	217.42*
Ethnicity	61.66*	59.20*	35.69*	69.60*	65.04*	31.73*
Language	196.55*	95.60*	217.42*	214.67*	100.65*	206.31*
SEN	14060.58*	12584.00*	5963.56*	13462.32*	12058.93*	4080.20*
FSM	2701.35*	2569.98*	1085.19*	3000.75*	2729.91*	813.74*

FSES	26.67*	42.02*	28.62*	12.64	22.50	64.31*
FSES*FSM	218.29*	188.36*	84.61*	248.22*	130.43*	10.26
FSES*SEN	152.46*	80.71*	3.72*	1.32	141.95*	12.78
FSES*Language	1.68	8.13	5.34	8.90	8.42	8.41
FSES*Ethnicity	9.90*	7.06	13.45	0.39	8.44	5.44
FSES*Gender	0.00	0.00	3.90	165.79*	1.34	0.08
Explained var	23.1%	21.0%	10.6%	23.0%	21.1%	9.7%

Less variance is explained in outcomes in Science than in English and Maths, though patterns remain similar, with SEN being the strongest predictor, followed by FSM, differences being respectively over one NC level and over half an NC level.

FSES was significant in 2004, less so in 2005. Effect sizes are again small, however, the largest difference being less than .2 of a level, and most .1 or less.

The interactions between FSES and FSM and SEN were again significant, with differences decreasing in terms of SEN and disappearing in terms of FSM in FSESs as compared to non FSESs.

5. Key Stage 4

5.1. Differences between FSESs and non FSESs

Table 11: Mean values for predictor variables in FSESs and non FSESs and Chi Square test of difference. * indicates significant difference at the .001 level.

		2004			*2005*			*2006*		
		Non FSES	*FSES*	*Chi Square*	*Non FSES*	*FSES*	*Chi Square*	*Non FSES*	*FSES*	*Chi Square*
Gender	*Female*	49.3	48.7	2.52	49.2	48.8	1.38	49.1	47.7	13.96*
	Male	50.7	51.3		50.8	51.2		50.9	52.3	
FSM	*Not eligible*	86.5	71.5	3273.38*	86.7	71.6	3262.79*	87.2	72.3	3407.77*
	Eligible	13.5	28.5		13.3	28.4		12.8	27.7	
Ethnicity	*Asian*	6.2	10.6	3913.40*	6.2	9.7	3842.88*	6.3	11.0	3689.87*
	Black	3.3	10.4		3.5	11.0		3.5	11.1	
	Chinese	0.4	0.5		0.4	0.6		0.4	0.5	
	Mixed	2.0	2.9		2.1	3.1		1.0	1.6	
	White	87.4	73.5		87.0	73.1		85.3	71.3	
	Other	0.7	2.1		0.8	2.5		3.5	4.4	
Language	*Not English*	8.4	20.3	3136.58*	8.7	20.5	2912.88*			
	English	91.6	79.7		91.3	79.5				
SEN	*No SEN*	83.6	75.5	834.08*	82.6	76.5	441.29*	81.8	72.6	974.59*
	SEN	16.4	24.5		17.4	23.5		18.2	27.4	

As in the other Key Stages, significant differences in intake were found between FSESs and non FSESs (table 11). Pupils in FSES s are more than twice as likely to be eligible for FSM and/or speak a language other than English at home. They are also far more likely to have been identified as having SEN. As one would predict from these differences, achievement levels in FSES s at KS3 are significantly lower in FSESs than in non-FSESs on all subjects. However, these raw differences do not tell us much about the differences between FSESs and non-FSESs if the differential nature of the intake as described above is not taken into account, and have therefore not been presented here. Rather, we will look at the impact of FSES status on achievement in the framework of a model that takes into account the differential intake. Below, we present ANOVA models for each subject to this effect.

ANOVA models are presented for 2004, 2005 and 2006 for two core outcome measures: Number of A*-C passes, number of A*-G passes. For 2004 and 2005, it is also possible to present models for KS3-4 value added scores Due to the large sample size, significance is measured at the .001 level. Data are given in table 12.

Table 12: Predictors of outcomes at KS4, ANOVA models

	2004			2005			2006	
	Number of A*-C passes	*Number of A*-G passes*	*KS3-4 Value Added*	*Number of A*-C passes*	*Number of A*-G passes*	*KS3-4 Value Added*	*Number of A*-C passes*	*Number of A*-G passes*
	F(*=p<.001)	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*	*F(*=p<.001)*
Total	7265.88	9269.43	1817.07	7525.58	8990.51	1820.31	9024.40	10805.80
FSM	2586.22*	2690.04*	740.11*	2474.64*	2425.49*	602.62*	6190.91*	2565.36*
Gender	474.41*	189.12*	1151.94*	472.03*	155.33*	1222.01*	365.53*	100.36*
Ethnicity	60.84*	79.72*	88.50*	66.03*	65.12*	125.49*	79.05*	119.04*
Language	16.81*	5.92	1133.98*	1.06	2.02	1021.00*		
SEN	10564.38*	18672.76*	759.71*	10020.49*	15427.96*	450.07*	10851.01*	14767.01*
FSES	2.69	6.59	0.04	1.12	2.99	13.40*	1.86	9.33*
FSES*FSM	224.27*	38.82*	9.67*	135.22*	15.35*	11.72*	238.44*	161.39*
FSES*Gender	4.90	2.53	2.93	0.12	0.89	1.76	2.92	1.37
FSES*Ethnicity	8.82*	8.41*	13.79	5.36*	7.39*	13.31*	25.48*	49.44*
FSES*Language	31.73*	2.46	76.10	7.95*	0.51	45.50*		
FSES*SEN	239.13*	109.30*	5.92*	319.87*	240.72*	0.57	397.76*	250.46*
Explained var	19.6%	23.7%	5.9%	20.2%	23.3%	6.0%	20.6%	23.7%

As can be seen in table 12, the explained variance in performance at KS4 is around 20% for number of A*-C grades, and around 23% for number of A*-G grades. Explained variance for the value added measure is only 6%, largely because many of the predictor variables are incorporated into the prior achievement measures.

The main predictor of achievement at KS4 is SEN, which accounts for a difference of around 3 A*-G passes and between 3 and 4 A*-C passes. FSM eligibility is the other main predictor, accounting for a difference of up to 2 A-C passes, and between 1 and 2 A-G passes on average. Gender is another significant predictor, with girls outperforming boys. Ethnicity (Asian and Mixed students outperforming White and Black students) and language (English speakers perform better) have significant but weak relationships to performance at KS4.

FSES was not a significant predictor of performance, suggesting that differences in raw performance between FSESs and non FSESs are caused by intake differences. A significant and modestly strong factor was the interaction between FSES and SEN. This interaction takes the form of a weaker relationship between SEN and performance in FSESs, or, in other words, a smaller gap between pupils with SEN and others in these schools. The FSM FSES interaction term is also significant, and affects the relationship between FSM and performance to the extent that in FSESs (all other variables held constant) pupils eligible for FSM slightly outperform those not eligible. Interactions between FSES and language and ethnicity are, while significant, very weak, though in the same direction of smaller achievement gaps.

The picture for value added is different. Explained variance is very low, with the significant predictors being language spoken in the home, gender, and SEN, with ethnicity and, in 2005, FSES being weak (but significant) predictors as well. In particular, students whose home language is not English, girls, and pupils without SEN had higher value added scores. There was, in 2005, a weak tendency for pupils in FSESs to show higher VA. The value added measure was changed in 2006 to be contextual value added, whereby background factors such as SEN and FSM are taken into account. As such it was not possible to repeat the analysis using this new measure as the variables are controlled for already.

6. Main Findings

The main findings can be summarised as follows:
1. The variables in the model have only modest predictive power in terms of achievement outcomes
2. The main predictors of achievement are identification as having Special Educational Needs and eligibility for Free School Meals
3. FSESs have a significantly more disadvantaged intake than non FSESs
4. There is no evidence that attendance at an FSES affects performance as a whole, either positively or negatively, once differences in intake between FSESs and non FSESs have been taken into account
5. There is some evidence that the achievement gap between pupils eligible and not eligible for FSM and to a lesser extent with and without SEN is smaller in FSESs.
6. The data do not allow us to draw conclusions as to the causality of these relationships.

Appendix 3: Cost Benefit Analysis

Summary

1. This paper reports findings from the cost benefit analysis component of the multi-strand full service extended schools (FSES) national evaluation. Cost benefit analysis provides a methodology of using monetary values to summarise the positive outcomes of a policy and its resource requirements in order to assess the value for money offered by the policy. The analysis in this paper focuses on estimating costs and benefits in 10 FSES projects, forming a sub-sample of the case study schools.
2. The sample was selected to reflect a variety of FSES projects. The basic criteria used were as follows.
    *   There will be a mix of wave 1 and wave 2 schools.
    *   There will be a mix of secondary and primary schools.
    *   At least one school will have a Children's Centre on-site.
    *   They will include at least one cluster, where two or more schools work in partnership on FSES activities by sharing experience and often sharing resources.
    *   They will cover a wide range of different activities.
    *   There will be a mix of urban and rural schools.
    *   Where possible, a range of FSES approaches will be covered in the sample.
3. Four broad sources of inputs have been identified. They are:
    *   funds controlled by the school used to purchase inputs for the activities;
    *   strategic support provided by the local authority (LA);
    *   support provided by partners such as the Primary Care Trust (PCT) or the police; and
    *   inputs of time provided on a voluntary basis by pupils, teachers, parents and other members of the community.
4. Information on these inputs has been collected through a mix of face-to-face interviews and follow-up telephone conversations. With the exception of the funds controlled by the school, most of the other information has been in terms of physical inputs (for example, the number of hours per week provided by a police officer in school). These physical inputs were usually converted into monetary values by using various types of information on salary scales.
5. In general, the average annual costs estimated in this way are very high. They range from £391 to £1,961 per pupil per year. Six schools have costs in excess of £1,000 per pupil per year.
6. Schools vary in the mix of types of inputs used. In most schools, the majority of the costs are financed by funds controlled by the school itself. In only two cases did the proportion controlled by the school fall below 80%. However, inputs from partners appear to be particularly important when the FSES project is operating within a strategic framework coordinated actively by the LA.

7. The costs reported in this report are estimates and tend to be of variable quality. In particular, the information on partner and volunteer inputs depends critically on the memory of the school informant. Careful interpretation of the estimates is also required especially in the case of the distinction between school and partner inputs.

8. Although funding under the FSES initiative is a small proportion of the total cost of FSES activities, the initiative appears to have had a relatively large impact on the case study schools by:
   • legitimising multi-agency working;
   • formalising a more coherent FSES philosophy; and
   • providing strategic support to FSES development.

9. The quantitative outcomes assessed in this study fall into six broad categories:
   • improved pupil attainment;
   • improved health outcomes;
   • reduction in youth crime and disorder;
   • more stable domestic environment;
   • improvements in the qualifications and employability of the local community; and
   • increased self-confidence and social skills.

   Estimates of the scale of these outcomes have used a case study approach to make use of each school's knowledge of its own pupils. Five secondary schools and one primary school were able to provide quantitative estimates in this way.

10. Each outcome was valued using estimates from a variety of sources. Ideally, the value should reflect the full social value of the outcome. However, the estimates used vary a great deal in quality ranging from robust estimates of the social value of attainment, developed internally by DfES using well-tested statistical techniques, to values estimated on an *ad hoc* basis. Many of the values used reflected only public expenditures gains attributed to the outcome and will, therefore, generally understate the true social value.

11. For the schools able to provide robust quantitative estimates of outcomes, the high level of costs appears to be matched by a high value of benefits. Indeed, given that the values used tend to be underestimates, true social benefits could well be even higher.

12. In most cases, the Net Present Value (NPV) of FSES activities is shown to be positive. This indicates that the FSES approach appears to be a reasonable social investment. When we take distributional implications into account, the investments appear even more worthwhile. In most of the cases reported here, the benefits accrue primarily to individuals who are the most deprived and vulnerable people in our society.

13. The results reported here should be seen as indicative rather than definitive and one should avoid placing too great an emphasis on the numerical values themselves in the case of the NPVs. However, the scale of the benefits does suggest that FSES activities can be a worthwhile investment.

1. Background

1.1 The Policy and Practice Context

In 2003, DfES launched an initiative to establish at least one full service extended school (FSES) in each LA area. Local FSES projects were to come on stream in each of three successive years. The initiative as a whole is subject to a multi-strand evaluation and this paper reports on the cost benefit analysis component of that evaluation involving FSESs. Further information on the FSES initiative and on the overall design of the evaluation can be found in main body of this report.

1.2 The cost benefit analysis (CBA) component

The overall objective of the component is to provide some guidance on the extent to which FSESs provide value for money. The specific objectives are to:
- undertake CBAs of 10 case study projects;
- learn lessons from the results about the overall value of FSESs and the impact, if any, on this value of various combinations of activities; and
- learn lessons about the quality and availability of data to undertake more general CBAs of this and similar policy initiatives.

Phase 1 of the evaluation included a small component, which outlined some basic methodology and reviewed the potential for the CBA. Phase 2 of the CBA was commissioned in January 2006.

1.3 The paper

The analysis of outcomes is the main subject of the overall FSES evaluation[2] and these outcomes form the basis of the estimation of benefits from full-service extended activities in the case study schools. The nature of these benefits is discussed in detail in other reports from this evaluation. Therefore, this paper will focus on the identification and valuation of costs and on the valuation of benefits in this sample of 11 schools[3]. Unless otherwise stated, all costs and benefits are stated in 2005/6 prices.

The second section sets out the data collection strategy used to identify, quantify and value the inputs used in the delivery of FSES activities. The third section of the paper reports on the cost estimates resulting from this analysis and the fourth identifies some issues in data collection and interpretation. The fifth section outlines the approach to the collection of data on benefits and discusses the methodologies used to place economic values on each and the sixth section compares the costs and benefits. In the final section, the paper draws some conclusions from this analysis.

---

[2] Cummings *et al* (2006).
[3] One of the ten projects was a cluster of two schools.

Throughout this paper we identify FSES projects through a LA code (LA 1.1; LA 1.2 and so on). A list of acronyms can be found in the appendix.

2. Costs Data Collection Strategy

2.1   Characteristics of the sample

The initial analysis of the case study projects[4] revealed a considerable variation in the set of full-service extended activities and the way they are organised and delivered. Therefore, the sample selected and agreed with DfES was intended to cover a wide range of characteristics in order to allow for the possible identification of indicative differences in the outcomes of the CBA. The criteria used for selection from the case study schools of the sample for cost benefit analysis were as follows.

- There will be a mix of wave 1 and wave 2 schools.
- There will be a mix of secondary and primary schools.
- At least one school will have a Children's Centre on-site.
- They will include at least one cluster, where two or more schools work in partnership on FSES activities by sharing experience and often sharing resources.
- They will cover a wide range of different activities.
- There will be a mix of urban and rural schools.
- Where possible, a range of FSES approaches will be covered in the sample.

Some key characteristics of the 10 projects selected that have proved to be interesting in the analysis of costs are outlined in Table 1.

Most of the secondary schools have specialist school status and this status is often the basis for extended school activities. The schools vary in size. In general, the larger secondary schools have a Sixth Form, but there is considerable variation. There are two primary schools.

All of the schools from Wave 1 are predominantly urban but the two Wave 2 schools have a rural catchment area. In the case of school 2.6, this rural catchment is quite large in area and constitutes a significant barrier for many pupils to participating in out-of-school-hours (OOSH) activities.

One of the primary schools, 1.3, has had a satellite of the Children's Centre on site since September 2005 and this provides a focus for many of its family support activities. The other primary school, 1.12, has a Children's Centre planned to open in September 2006. Two of the eight secondary schools have a City Learning Centre[5] (CLC) on site and in

---

[4] Cummings *et al* (2005).
[5] In the case of 1.8, this is a Community Learning College.

one of the cases the existence of the CLC was a contributory reason for the LA choosing that school to participate in the initiative.

LA 1.7 chose to nominate two schools in different areas as FSESs. These two schools do not work together as a cluster but they have close contacts and share experiences.

Table 1: Key Characteristics of Schools in Sample

School Identification No.	1.3	1.4	1.7		1.8	1.10
			1.7.1	*1.7.2*		
Level	Primary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary
Wave	1	1	1	1	1	1
No of Pupils, 2005	413	907	1049	889	1098	1031
Sixth Form	N/A	No	Yes	No	No	No
Specialist School	N/A	Sports	Sport	Technology	Sport	Media Arts
Children's Centre on site	No[6]	No	No	No	No	No
City Learning Centre on site	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Rural catchment area	No	No	No	No	No	No

School Identification No.	1.11	1.12	1.22	2.3	2.6
Level	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary
Wave	1	1	1	2	2
No of Pupils, 2005	877	602	607	1330	1119
Sixth Form	No	N/A	No	Yes	Yes
Specialist School	Business and Enterprise	N/A	No	Sport Business & Enterprise	Technology Music & English
Children's Centre on site	No	Opened in Sept 06	No	No	No
City Learning Centre on site	No	No	No	No	No
Rural catchment area	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

2.2   Data to be Collected

Phase 1 identified four potential sources of resources to deliver full-service extended activities. In broad outline, the delivery of these activities depends on:

- funds controlled by the school used to purchase inputs for the activities;
- strategic support provided by the LA;
- support provided by partners such as the PCT or the police; and
- inputs of time provided on a voluntary basis by pupils, teachers, parents and other members of the community.

This typology is intended primarily to capture the types of relationships involved in obtaining support from the various sources rather than the institution that is paying the bills. For example, the strategic support provided by the LA is defined to include only

---

[6] However, the on-site neighbourhood nursery is a satellite of the local Children's Centre.

that support connected with the establishment and development of FSES as a concept. Inputs for individual services (for example, a social worker provided by Children's Services) are identified as an input provided by a partner because the school works with Children's Services to determine what is needed in that school. It cannot demand that the LA provide the social worker. Therefore, the following analysis of costs will tend to underestimate somewhat the financial contribution of the LA but overestimate the contribution of partners.

2.3 Data collection

Identification of type and amount of resources used
The analysis of the theory of change[7] included a list of activities identified by the school as its FSES activities. This list was used as the basis of a data collection instrument because schools found it easier to identify the inputs required to deliver specific activities than to identify the set of resources used by the school's FSES activities in general. The instrument was, of course, specially tailored to each school with their own activities listed in the first column.

The objective of the instrument was to:

- identify what inputs were used for each activity (for example, social worker, nurse, police officer and so on);
- how much of each input was used (for example, hours per year);
- how the input was financed. The financing of the input determined its category. For example, if the PCT financed a nurse for a sexual health clinic, then this was defined as a partner input. If the PCT supplied the nurse and then invoiced the school[8], then it was categorised as a school input.

Each school in the sample has been visited to collect information using the data collection instrument. In most cases, the relevant LA official was also interviewed in a face-to-face interview although in one case the primary LA interview took place by telephone. Follow-up telephone interviews have also taken place with school staff and partners. In some cases, an additional visit to the school has been required. In most cases, interviews at schools have been with the FSES coordinator and the Finance Officer. In a few cases, the head teacher has also been involved in the interviews.

This information was used to prepare a short report on the cost structure for each of the case study schools and this report was sent to the case study school and LA for review and comment on the accuracy of the reports. The cost estimations were amended on the basis of these comments where necessary.

Value of school-controlled resources used
It became clear during the interviews that all the schools in the sample had a history of FSES activities (although they might not have used this vocabulary) and some schools

---

[7] Cummings *et al* (2006).
[8] This situation was not uncommon.

had been following a FSES agenda for a considerable period of time – ten years in some cases, even longer in another. However, in most cases the DfES initiative had provided a context within which further development was facilitated and, critically, within which planning of services with key partners was empowered. In any case, each school in the sample expressed the view that FSES was not a separate programme within the school but an overarching philosophy within which the school delivered all services.

Most schools had become skilled at obtaining funding from a variety of sources and at mobilising local resources, although it was clear that the opportunities to do so varied with the circumstances in which the school operated. This fund-raising allowed them to provide much more for their pupils than their "normal" funding would have allowed them to do. Although these various sources of funds had slightly different criteria for the programmes they would finance, the schools tended to take an opportunistic approach to fund-raising and chose sources of funds that provided the best fit with what they wanted to achieve. Schools with this attitude tended to perceive FSES as a good fit with their overall objectives and desired manner of operation and it would be artificial to define FSES activities as only those for which the FSES initiative provided funding. Some of the FSES activities are financed by additional funding obtained by the school but some are financed by the creative use of delegated funds.[9]

The additional funding sources have included[10]:

- other Standards Fund finance;
- Specialist Schools (many schools use their specialism as the focus for some of their FSES activities);
- Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF);
- Single Regeneration Budget (SRB);
- European funding such as European Social Fund (ESF) or European Regional Development Fund (ERDF);
- Big Lottery;
- local sources such as Coalfields Regeneration Fund or London Challenge;
- Arts Council;
- national and local charitable bodies.

---

[9] For example, one school has a very high proportion of staff (both teaching and support) from the local community. A major reason for this is the school's strategic approach to volunteer workers in school. All volunteer workers are required to undergo a training programme and to make a commitment to provide a particular input on a regular basis. These inputs are negotiated between the school and the volunteer. The purpose of this approach is to develop working skills and habits within the local economy and has the additional benefit of better-skilled volunteers for the school. The school takes an active approach to encouraging volunteers and sees this as part of their FSES agenda. The incentives for the volunteers are three-fold: (a) they are contributing to the education services of their community (and often their own children); (b) they are acquiring valuable skills; and (c) the school has demonstrated over time that volunteers who make good progress in their skill development will have a good chance of obtaining employment within the school. Indeed, the school's FSES coordinator came into employment within the school by precisely this route and, after acting as a volunteer, was first employed as a Learning Mentor.
[10] A report from Ofsted (2005) also identified additional funding as important.

One of the features of the various funding sources is that they are themselves subject to evaluation against criteria that are very similar to those being used for the FSES initiative. Improved pupil attainment, increased community cohesion and a reduction in social exclusion are likely to be cited by the schools as the positive outcomes of most of their fund-raising efforts. There is, therefore, a danger of double-counting benefits by allocating the same benefit to more than one funding source. For these reasons, we have taken the view that, for the ten case study schools under review, we will treat the value of all the additional funding as the cost of FSES activities.[11] Schools, themselves, tended to agree with this view[12]. We found in the interviews that the list of FSES activities that had been identified in discussion with the school were being delivered with a mix of funding and that the funding from the FSES initiative – while being very welcome – only covered a small part of the total costs of those activities.[13]

In some cases, it is difficult to identify all these sources because they may not be kept within the same accounting system. Some schools keep their main accounting system to record only the funding arising from "educational" sources while other funding passes through the "Private/School Account". Others have established a separate organisation to undertake some of their FSES activities and the funding from the external sources passes through the accounts of these organisations. Indeed, most of the schools have some arrangement similar to this for their childcare provision and others also take this route for their after-school and/or holiday provision. In most cases, no one member of staff has direct access to all the funding and expenditure information.

An additional difficulty is that all of the schools have changed their accounting system in the last five years or are in the process of changing it. This has made it difficult to access detailed information for earlier years recorded on a different system.

Value of resources provided by local authorities
LAs have varied considerably in their approach to offering support, coordination and advice to FSESs. In some cases, they have used very senior managers to develop a strategic approach for the whole LA of which the case study school is seen as a pilot. At the other extreme, the support has been provided by relatively junior advisers focused on the needs of the particular school. In each case, the adviser most involved in the school

---

[11] That is, the marginal cost of FSES activities financed by the school is the additional value of the funding that the school obtains over and above its "normal" delegated funding based on the number of pupils.

[12] School 1.4 helpfully provided information both on total income and expenditure and the expenditure they were able to allocate directly to FSE activities. However, it was clear that there was some degree of artificiality in this allocation because, for example, a Sports Development Worker was part-allocated to FSE and part to another budget.

[13] The initial amounts on offer in the first year of the FSES initiative ranged from £93,000 to £162,000 per year, decreasing annually for a further two years. The first year's funding varied between schools and between the funding streams through which it was released. An additional £25,000 was also available to each Local Education Authority (LEA)/school project to support the development of childcare provision. Schools nominated by each LEA or local authority (LA) for the FSES funding were to agree to provide a core set of services and activities: childcare; some health and social care services; lifelong learning; family learning; parenting support; study support; sports and arts; and ICT.

has provided estimates[14] of the time inputs of themselves and their colleagues. These inputs have been valued at the hourly salary cost of the individual concerned increased in each case by 25% to account for their on-costs (such as employer's national insurance contributions, pension contributions and so on).[15]

Value of resources provided by partners
The mix of partners for each school varies a great deal. Typical partners include:

- Sure Start;
- PCT;
- Connexions;
- LA departments;
- Police;
- Further Education college;
- local university;
- national and local voluntary organisations.

Although it would have been possible to contact each partner and ask them to estimate the cost of the inputs provided to the school, in most cases we have taken the alternative approach of:

- asking the school to identify the time input of each type of input (for example, a Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP) worker or a police officer); and
- applying an appropriate point on a standard pay scale including London weighting where appropriate (augmented by 25% to reflect the on-cost) to value the input.

Although this procedure does not measure the *actual* cost incurred in the delivery, it provides an indication of the *standard* cost (that is, the cost that might be incurred by any organisation delivering a similar service).

There have been a few cases where the partner has preferred to provide information on the total costs of the service delivered and we have accepted their estimates.

Value of resources provided by volunteers
Schools are able to mobilise their pupils, their parents and other members of the community to provide resources for their FSES activities. In addition, some FSESs rely on unpaid extra work by teachers to deliver their activities although some schools have taken a policy decision that they would not rely on the goodwill of their staff but would pay overtime for such contributions. During the interviews, we asked schools to estimate the time inputs by the various categories. In some cases, this methodology may underestimate the value of volunteer inputs if voluntary organisations are delivering services using some unpaid workers. We have identified some of these inputs but we

---

[14] In a very few cases, these estimates were facilitated by an electronic time recording system whereby LA employees are required to record their time spent on various activities on a database maintained on the LA's network.

[15] 25% is the percentage for non-wage labour costs used by DfES in their internal estimates.

cannot be certain that we have identified them all. Therefore, partner inputs could be somewhat overestimated and volunteer inputs somewhat underestimated.[16]

Volunteers participate for a number of reasons. In addition to a desire to contribute to the community, volunteers often learn useful skills, gain valuable experience and/or find the volunteer activity itself interesting and enjoyable. Schools and volunteers often mention that the skills and experience gained by volunteers improve their future prospects. Indeed, school 1.22 has a strategic approach to volunteering that explicitly builds the work-related skills of adult community volunteers, with many former volunteers subsequently obtaining employment within the school. School 2.3 has a similar approach with respect to their pupils. For such volunteers, volunteering is essentially on-the-job training. The fact that volunteers obtain such a benefit does not imply that their contribution should not be costed. However, it does mean that we should be examining the wider outcomes of the FSES activities so that we can take into account outcomes such as increased self-confidence and/or leadership potential for pupils and increased employability for adults.

In order to estimate the value of this time contributed by volunteers, we have valued the time of pupils at £4 per hour and that of the parents and other community members at the minimum wage of £5.05 per hour. We have costed the teacher at £22,000 per year. Although these values are likely to be underestimates in each case, we have at least attempted to place some value on these important inputs.

3. Cost estimates

3.1   Volunteer inputs

Table 2 provides the estimates of the volunteer time in each of the ten case study schools. The schools vary considerably in the total and mix of volunteer inputs they are able to mobilise. Because larger schools have a greater pool from which they can attract volunteers, Table 2 also shows the estimated number of hours per pupil.

Unsurprisingly, the two primary schools (1.3 and 1.12) use relatively little volunteer inputs from their own pupils. Indeed, the pupil input in school 1.3 is from year 10 pupils in a local secondary school. In the case of school 1.12, although the input is from their own pupils, it is not included in the valuation on the grounds that these pupils would not have a value on the labour market.[17] School 1.4 reported no volunteer input at all and this may be because it is located very close to a well-established community facility that has an active and supportive volunteer programme. The volunteers in the community facility include pupils (and probably parents) from the school.

---

[16] This is essentially a issue in classification. Total costs remain unchanged.
[17] This is not strictly true because, in each area, primary school children do in fact have illegal labour market opportunities.

143

With the exception of this school and the two primary schools, the volunteer inputs from pupils[18] are greater than the sum of the volunteer inputs from other groups.

Table 2: Summary of Annual Volunteer Inputs Collected from Ten Case Study Schools

School Identification No.	1.3	1.4	1.7			1.8
			1.7.1	*1.7.2*	*Total*	
Years	3-11	11-16	11-18	11-16		11-16
No. of Pupils on Roll	413	907	1049	889	1938	1098
Unpaid Inputs from Pupils, hours	228		2463	7819	10282	4481
Unpaid Inputs from Pupils per Pupil, hours	0.55	0.00	2.35	8.80	5.31	4.08
Unpaid Inputs from Parents, hours	88				0	1140
Unpaid Inputs from Parents per Pupil, hours	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.04
Unpaid Inputs from Community, hours	380			570	570	0
Unpaid Inputs from Community per Pupil, hours	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.29	0.00
Unpaid Inputs from Teachers/staff, hours			1000	220.5	1220.5	500.5
Unpaid Inputs from Teachers per Pupil, hours	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.25	0.63	0.46
Unpaid Inputs, £	£7,328	£0	£25,477	£38,968	£64,445	£28,042
Unpaid Inputs per Pupil, £	£17.74	£0.00	£24.29	£43.83	£33.25	£25.54

School Identification No.	1.10	1.11	1.12	1.22	2.3	2.6
Years	11-16	11-16	3-11	11-16	11-18	13-18
No. of Pupils on Roll	1031	877	602	607	1330	1119
Unpaid Inputs from Pupils, hours	760	3382	456	3800	4416	2128
Unpaid Inputs from Pupils per Pupil, hours	0.74	3.86	0.76	6.26	3.32	1.90
Unpaid Inputs from Parents, hours				5320		0
Unpaid Inputs from Parents per Pupil, hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.76	0.00	0.00
Unpaid Inputs from Community, hours	76		95	1824		0
Unpaid Inputs from Community per Pupil, hours	0.07	0.00	0.16	3.00	0.00	0.00
Unpaid Inputs from Teachers/staff, hours	1900		10	760		380
Unpaid Inputs from Teachers per Pupil, hours	1.84	0.00	0.02	1.25	0.00	0.34
Unpaid Inputs, £	£33,111	£13,528	£636	£63,152	£17,664	£14,450
Unpaid Inputs per Pupil, £	£32.12	£15.43	£1.06	£104.04	£13.28	£12.91

In some cases, the value of these inputs can be quite substantial. With the exception of school 1.4, all the secondary schools are obtaining inputs of time from volunteers worth more than £10,000 per year[19]. In more than half of the secondary schools, the volunteer

---

[18] These inputs are those without which the activity would not take place. They include peer mentoring and "buddies" for younger pupils, play/sports leaders and membership of consultative groups.

[19] It is worth noting that these inputs of time are those that are not being paid for by any body. That is, the individual is not being paid for his/her input. Voluntary sector organisations do play a part in FSESs but their inputs are accounted for separately as partners. They may also contribute funding to the school's budget.

inputs are worth more than £20 per pupil enrolled in the school and, in a few cases, much more. In the case of LA 1.7, the two schools shared funding of £90,000 for the FSES initiative but between them are mobilising volunteer inputs of almost £65,500. The school with the highest value of volunteer inputs per pupil enrolled (1.22) is the school mentioned above with the very strategic approach to volunteering.

It is, perhaps, worth mentioning that these costs are often matched by benefits to the volunteers. They learn skills and obtain experience and this often improves their position in the labour market. In some cases, we are able to capture these benefits by recording increased employment.[20]

3.2   Structure of Inputs

Table 3 summarises the estimates of the value of inputs from various sources[21] to deliver FSES activities in the key schools of ten case study LAs. The Table shows the value of inputs financed <u>directly</u> by each stakeholder. For this reason the value of the inputs provided by the school's income far exceeds that of inputs provided by any other stakeholder[22], except in the case of school 1.3 where the school together with the LA has pioneered a highly collaborative model of FSES in the most deprived wards. Very little <u>additional</u> funding has been devolved to the school level and even then it is devolved for the purpose of providing extended services across a group of schools. The funding from partners, therefore, includes inputs funded from other schools' budgets that benefit school 1.3. This approach enables each school in these deprived areas to have access to a range of shared services in a cost-effective manner and this has been facilitated by the coordination provided by the LA. Much of the LA's input has been a result of re-configuring services rather than providing extra resources. Although this is the case for most of the case study areas to some extent, LA 1.3 appears to have gone down this route faster and more radically. This factor, together with the sharing of services[23], could account for expenditure that appears to be lower than average.

In some ways, Table 3 underestimates the importance of the school's partners who provide (often substantial) sums of money for the school to use in delivering its FSES activities. However, we believe that it does reflect more accurately the amount of *working with* partners where each side delivers services within the overall framework. To pursue this point a little further, the lower half of Table 3 shows the proportion of total inputs provided by each type of stakeholder. Schools 1.7.2 and 1.3 stand out as having a very high proportion (greater than 25%) of inputs provided and paid for partners. Schools 1.7.1, 1.8, 1.10 and 1.11 each have a relatively low proportion (lower than 2%). This is not to say that these schools do not attract resources from elsewhere. However,

---

[20] See section 5.2. These benefits are essentially those of the on-the-job training that is provided by the voluntary work and this training is similar to that obtained in paid employment.

[21] Some of the details in Table 3 may differ from the draft reports sent to schools and LAs both in order to ensure consistency across schools and also to take advantage of information arriving late.

[22] The estimates for School 1.4 are derived from the same basis as for the other schools.

[23] Such services include a Play Development Worker, activities provided by PAYP workers and activities aimed at children aged 8-12, who are judged to be at risk of offending.

their current strategy appears to be focused more on obtaining funding than on finding partners to take direct responsibility for the delivery of services[24].

Schools 1.3 and 1.7.2 are also remarkable in terms of their high proportions of unpaid inputs from volunteers. Again, this tends to reflect a different strategic approach.

Table 3: Summary of Annual Costs Collected from Ten Case Study Schools

School Identification No.	1.3	1.4	1.7			1.8
			1.7.1	*1.7.2*	*Total*	
Years	3-11	11-16	11-18	11-16		11-16
No. of Pupils on Roll	413	907	1049	889	1938	1098
Additional Schools Income from all Sources, £	£20,223	£802,326	£1,252,715	£181,025	£1,433,740	£702,493
Additional Schools Income per Pupil, £	£49	£885	£1,194	£204	£740	£640
Inputs from LA, £	£16,858	£27,821	£14,682	£14,682	£29,364	£6,645
Inputs from LA per Pupil, £	£41	£31	£14	£17	£15	£6
Inputs from Partners, £	£184,338	£127,459	£47,227	£112,734	£159,961	£12,864
Inputs from Partners per Pupil, £	£446	£141	£45	£127	£83	£12
Unpaid Inputs, £	£7,328		£25,477	£38,968	£64,445	£28,042
Unpaid Inputs per Pupil, £	£18	£0	£24	£44	£33	£26
Total Cost	**£228,747**	**£957,606**	**£1,340,101**	**£347,408**	**£1,687,510**	**£750,044**
Total Cost per Pupil	**£554**	**£1,056**	**£1,278**	**£391**	**£871**	**£683**
Additional Schools Income from all Sources, %	8.84	83.78	93.48	52.11	84.96	93.66
Inputs from LA, %	7.37	2.91	1.10	4.23	1.74	0.89
Inputs from Partners, %	80.59	13.31	3.52	32.45	9.48	1.72
Unpaid Inputs, %	3.20	0.00	1.90	11.22	3.82	3.74
Total, %	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**

School Identification No.	1.10	1.11	1.12	1.22	2.3	2.6
Years	11-16	11-16	3-11	11-16	11-18	13-18
No. of Pupils on Roll	1031	877	602	607	1330	1119
Additional Schools Income from all Sources, £	£1,945,958	£896,750	£971,379	£683,897	£1,061,653	£659,450
Additional Schools Income per Pupil, £	£1,887	£1,023	£1,614	£1,127	£798	£589
Inputs from LA, £	£18,035	£19,319	£0	£2,176	£6,089	£20,619
Inputs from LA per Pupil, £	£17	£22	£0	£4	£5	£18
Inputs from Partners, £	£24,883	£12,319	£29,198	£72,073	£59,963	£48,421
Inputs from Partners per Pupil, £	£24	£14	£49	£116	£45	£43
Unpaid Inputs, £	£33,111	£13,528	£636	£63,152	£17,664	£14,450
Unpaid Inputs per Pupil, £	£32	£15	£1	£104	£13	£13
Total Cost	**£2,021,987**	**£941,917**	**£1,001,213**	**£821,298**	**£1,145,369**	**£742,939**
Total Cost per Pupil	**£1,961**	**£1,074**	**£1,663**	**£1,353**	**£861**	**£664**

---

[24] This may be changing as more FSESs comment on the need to find partners who will resource provision.

Additional Schools Income from all Sources, %	96.24	95.20	97.02	83.27	92.69	88.76
Inputs from LA, %	0.89	2.05	0.00	0.26	0.53	2.78
Inputs from Partners, %	1.23	1.31	2.92	8.78	5.24	6.52
Unpaid Inputs, %	1.64	1.44	0.06	7.69	1.54	1.94
Total, %	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**

The extent of partnership working inherent in the concept of FSES also makes the definition of "partner input" very difficult. As outlined above, many schools deliver their childcare element within a separate organisation and the closeness of the relationship between the school and that organisation varies a great deal. In most cases, the partner inputs in Table 3 do not include childcare except where the school has explicitly identified them. Similarly, although schools 1.8 and 1.10 benefit from having a City Learning Centre co-located, these costs are not included. Finally, a few of the schools have had large capital projects that were expedited by their FSES status. However, although the timing of this capital expenditure was probably affected by their status, the school's need for the capital project was such that it would almost certainly have been approved. Therefore, we have omitted this capital spending.

3.3 Charging

Schools vary in the extent to which they charge for FSES activities. With the exception of regular childcare for which a school (or, more usually, the provider with which the school works) makes charges to cover costs, levels of charging tend to be *ad hoc* and small scale. Some schools do not charge, on principle; some schools charge for some activities (for example, breakfast clubs) and not others. There is considerable variability in the method of charging. For example, some schools make a fixed charge for their breakfast club while others charge nothing for the breakfast club activities and simply charge for the food consumed on a cafeteria basis. Charges for high-cost activities – for example, trips – are sometimes made but such charges are often reduced by sponsorship or other fund-raising by the group of students concerned.

In some schools, these charges are accounted for in the main school accounts. In others, they are entered into "private" accounts. In the latter, it is often not clear to what activity the income relates.

Because the cost of collecting information on charging is so high, we have focused at this stage on three of the schools in order to obtain an idea of the scale and nature of charging and what information may be relatively easily obtained.

School 1.4 charges for childcare (delivered by an independent provider), adult education classes, and for events such as one-off entertainments. In 2005/6, the income from charges were as follows:

• adult education classes - £464;

- childcare - £18,069;
- events – £1,623.

School 2.3 charges only for its holiday activities. In 2005/6, these charges totalled £7,010 and were very far from covering costs. The income from charges are held in a separate account and would not be evident from an inspection of the schools accounting system.

A third school, 2.6, has a policy of allowing modest charges for OOSH activities but neither the FSES coordinator nor the Bursar had ready access to information on the proceeds.

Even the relatively large amount of income from charging in school 1.4 is small relative to the total value of inputs (approximately 2%) and in school 2.3 it is even lower. By far the largest component is the childcare, which in the case of 1.4 can be obtained only from the accounts of the provider and in 2.3 is in a separate account in the school. Therefore, given the time and resources needed to obtain information on such relatively small amounts of money, it does not appear to be worth pursuing this aspect further.

4. Issues in cost data collection and interpretation

4.1 Data quality

It is important to note that the costs reported in Table 3 are simply estimates and tend to be of variable quality. Although the accounting information is reasonably accurate, we have had to make decisions about what to include but schools and LAs have agreed with the picture presented to them.

The LA, partner and volunteer inputs have been estimates based on the memory of the FSES coordinator or the partner. Even where records need to be kept routinely for administrative purposes – as, for example, with courses provided by a FE College – it has often proved to be very difficult to obtain actual recorded information as opposed to estimates. There are, of course, exceptions to this and we have benefited, for example, from the electronic time recording of a few LAs but the general conclusion is that information on inputs to specific activities is either not recorded or is not easy to retrieve. For this reason, most of the information on the inputs of partners and volunteers refers only to 2005/6 since this recent information was easiest for interviewees to remember.

4.2 Interpretation

Table 3 should be interpreted with care in a number of respects.

Firstly, as indicated before, a number of partners are involved in FSES activities by providing grants for the school to manage. In some of these cases, the activities financed

by these grants have been agreed in detail with the school although usually the partner is not involved in their delivery.

Secondly, some of the broader LA input is included in the Partner input. The "LA Input" includes only inputs of advice, support and coordination. Input in terms of service delivery such as the provision of a social worker is included in "Partner Inputs".

Thirdly, because many of the LA inputs relate to the establishment of the FSES, the average annual cost may be misleading. Most of these are one-off costs and will not be ongoing. Most LAs have made this point explicitly.

Fourthly, although FSESs are often budget-holders for grants from, for example, ESF, NRF, Big Lottery, SRB, those grants are often obtained in partnership with other agencies (for example, LA, PCT, Connexions) which often play an important role in identifying the funding source, developing the application and delivering the services.

Finally, many head teachers/FSES coordinators provide advice and support to other schools who are less advanced in the FSES process and sometimes to their own LA. The school is usually compensated for this input in its budget and the FSES costs for the school may be overestimated slightly in such cases because of this.

4.3 Role of FSES funding

Many of the schools had been undertaking FSES activities before the initiative and, as this analysis has shown, this funding is quite small relative to the total value of inputs involved. However, this does not mean that the funding has had little effect. There appear to be three ways in which the funding – or more precisely the initiative – has had an impact on the schools involved.

Firstly, participation in the initiative has given legitimacy to multi-agency working and has made it easier[25]. Many schools have said that it has made other agencies more prepared to consider working more closely in partnership.

Secondly, the funding has focused the school – and usually also the LA – on the general philosophy of FSES and the role it can play in the school and community.

Thirdly, the funding itself has often been used strategically to support the development of activities. This may be by the appointment of a FSES coordinator in the school, responsible for developing partnerships and accessing external funding. Alternatively, it may have been used for small capital projects – for example, the conversion of unused space into office accommodation for the multi-agency team, which encourages them to spend more time in the school.

---

[25] However, the process has not been easy. It has proved difficult for organisations with different cultures to learn to work together.

5. Value of benefits in FSES

5.1 Outcomes of FSES

We have identified six broad types of outcomes from FSES activities:

- improved pupil attainment;
- improved health outcomes;
- reduction in youth crime and disorder;
- more stable domestic environment;
- improvements in the qualifications and employability of the local community; and
- increased self-confidence and social skills.

Within each of those categories, we have selected some key indicators to quantify as a measure of the size of the benefits arising from them.

Improved pupil attainment
The indicators selected are the number of additional pupils per year in each category:

- 5 GCSE A*-C or equivalent compared with no qualification (Level 2 compared with no qualification);
- 5 GCSE A*-C or equivalent compared with 5 GCSE A*-G (Level 2 compared with Level 1);
- 5 GCSE A*-G or equivalent compared with no qualification (Level 1 compared with no qualification);
- 5 GCSE A*-G or equivalent compared with qualification less than Level 1 (Level 1 compared with less than Level 1);
- Gaining a qualification of some sort;
- Pupils who are not classified as "not in employment, education or training" (NEET).

Improved health outcomes
The indicators selected are the number of additional pupils each year falling into the following categories:

- not giving birth;
- no longer using drugs;
- no longer abusing alcohol;
- no longer smoking.

In addition, pupil interviews in one school resulted in a young person claiming that the FSES activities had prevented her from attempting to commit suicide. Therefore, we included this indicator in case it proved to be relevant in other schools. In fact, no school was able to provide convincing information on prevented suicides but most secondary schools indicated that self-harming was a serious and growing problem and most had strategies to address it. Therefore, reduction in self-harm was included as an indicator.

Although many schools identified food and nutrition as an issue addressed within their FSES activities, we could not identify an indicator that they were able to measure as an outcome[26].

Reduction in youth crime and disorder
The crime and disorder indicators are:

- reduction in complaints of anti-social behaviour;
- reduction in the number of young people re-offending.

More stable domestic environment
A key area in many of the FSES activities is family support and schools have identified the following indicators:

- preventing crisis referrals to social services (now children's services);
- preventing family breakdown;
- preventing children being taken into care.

In many cases, the impact of the activities is difficult to estimate because the close relationship that many FSESs have built with LA social workers has facilitated quick and easy referral, which has encouraged families under stress to seek help more quickly and before the crisis develops.

Improvements in the qualifications and employability of the local community
The community strand included in many schools' activities is aimed at improving the skills and confidence of the local community. In many cases, it is hoped that this will improve employment opportunities, which may be facilitated by improved accessibility to childcare. The indicators are the number of additional people in the community:

- obtaining some accredited qualification; and
- obtaining employment.

Increased self-confidence and social skills
The indicator is the number of pupils each year who show an improvement in self-confidence, self-worth, social skills, leadership and/or empowerment.

Many of these indicators (for example, the number of additional pupils achieving GCSE grades A*-C) correspond to government performance indicators. Such indicators have the advantage that schools are accustomed to providing the information in such a form. In addition, DfES has either commissioned research or undertaken research in-house to estimate the economic value of many of these indicators.

---

[26] There was considerable information about participation in cookery activities and some qualitative information about changed attitudes to food but we could not find general evidence on resulting changes in health outcomes. One school, school 1.11, identified an impact on obesity for 7 pupils but, given the issues involved in valuing this impact, we have not included it in the analysis.

Other indicators (for example, the number of pupils showing improvements in self-confidence and social skills) were included because the schools identified such factors as outcomes of their FSES activities.

These benefits relate to secondary schools, which constituted 9 out of the 11 schools in our sample. We amended this list to take into account the different circumstance of primary schools.

5.2 Quantifying the benefits

There are a number of approaches available for quantifying the benefits of educational investments. One approach is to use statistical methods to estimate outcomes with the investment as compared with outcomes in the absence of investment. This approach is often quite effective in situations where there are relatively few expected outcomes and where the other factors potentially affecting outcomes are easy to identify, relatively few in number and capable of measurement. Another approach is to design the investment so that there are well-defined comparators with which the treatment group can be compared.

The second approach was not available to this evaluation because no such comparators had been defined at the start of the FSES initiative. In addition, the context in which FSESs are operating has been so complex that it was not feasible to identify and measure all the control factors. For these reasons, the evaluation as a whole has taken a qualitative approach by using the Theory of Change methodology to test the plausibility of the case study schools' expectations about the process of change as a result of FSES activities.

In many cases, the activities are not yet far enough advanced to perceive the full fruits of the activities and many schools have told us that they would not expect to see results from some of their activities until next year – or, indeed, sometime later. However, some activities were yielding results and we adopted a "mini case study" approach to quantification of these outcomes. This approach involved examining the participants in each activity and using judgement to assess the additional outcome to be attributed to the activity. For example, estimates of attainment outcomes were obtained by considering only those vulnerable pupils who had received some type of intensive intervention. In many schools (though not all), this group consisted of pupils who would have been permanently excluded if they had not received the intervention and would have obtained no qualification in the absence of the intervention. Therefore, the qualifications they actually obtained could be attributed to the intervention. A similar process was undertaken for the other categories.

Because this methodology relies on detailed knowledge of the participants, we relied very heavily on the judgements of the individual schools. At first sight, this appears a risky strategy, inviting schools to inflate the scale of their outcomes. However, we are reasonably confident that this did not occur for a number of reasons.

- When we first explained our request to schools, they were usually at first unwilling to claim any of the effects as exclusively the result of the school's activities. When pressed to do so, they often told us stories about individual pupils to demonstrate the outcome.
- In all cases, when asked, schools were able to tell us how they had arrived at a particular figure.
- Schools appeared to be frank if they could only provide us with a proxy. For example, one school identified 135 adults obtaining a qualification of some sort but had no idea how many of these were accredited. We took the conservative view that only 20% of these qualifications would have been accredited.

Therefore, although we cannot guarantee that none of the figures is inflated, we think that the figures given to us are generally a fair reflection of the school's true judgement.

As we expected, not all schools were able to provide information on every indicator. This was partly because of data limitations but it also reflected in many cases the focus of the school's FSES activities. The attainment benefits for a primary school were transformed into expected results at GCSE by means of a matrix developed internally within DfES.

Table 4: Outcomes for Six Case Study Schools, 2005/6

	1.7.1	1.8	1.10	1.11	2.3	1.3
5 GCSE A*-C compared with no qualification						0.63
5 GCSE A*-C compared with 5 GCSE A*-G		21	15			2.11
5 GCSE A*-G compared with no qualification	5			5		
5 GCSE A*-G compared with less than Level 1		10	15	4	10	
Gaining a qualification of some sort	16	45			10	
Reduction in NEET	18	2	20		1	
Preventing Teenage Births	2	5		1	2	
Preventing STDs		14				
Reduction in drug use	1	25			1	
Reduction in alcohol use		25			1	
Reduction in smoking		10		15	1	
Preventing complaints of anti-social behaviour	300	80		150	30	
Preventing young people re-offending					10	
Preventing self-harm				2	15	
Preventing crisis referrals to social services				2	30	20
Preventing a child being taken into care				4		
Preventing family breakdown						4
People in the community obtaining some qualification		56		27		4
People obtaining employment		6				
Improvement in confidence/self-worth/improved social skills/ leadership/empowerment etc	40	200	134	36	200	

Five secondary and one primary school were able to provide us with quantitative information on the outcomes that could be considered robust. This information relates to

153

the school year 2005/6 and is summarised in Table 4. The attainment outcomes for the primary school (1.3) are the expected number of pupils achieving those grades given their KS2 attainment.[27] These estimates assume that the progress made by these pupils at KS2 as a result of the intensive intervention in primary school will be sustained through to Year 11[28].

5.3 Valuing the benefits

Where possible, we have followed the Treasury *Green Book* approach to valuing benefits by estimating their social value. Such estimates include the value of the outcome to the wider society whether they accrue to the individual participant in the FSES activities or to the taxpayer. However, given the wide range of benefits expected from FSESs, it was beyond the remit of this research to undertake consistent estimates of the value of each and we have used a wide range of existing estimates where they are available. As a result, the assumptions used to develop them differ and the valuations do not always reflect the full social value of the outcome.

Improved pupil attainment
The values for improvements in attainment are based on DfES internal estimates. The estimates are based on the present value[29] (PV) of the increase in lifetime earnings that can be attributed to the qualification. Information on earnings is obtained from the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and increased by 25% to account for non-wage labour costs, thereby ensuring that the measure approximates more closely to productivity gains. Future earnings are also inflated by 2.5% per year to account for real productivity growth in the economy. Finally, future differentials are discounted at 3.5% as required by the *Green Book*. This methodology is the standard approach used within DfES to obtain the economic value of an academic qualification. The estimates are both robust and consistent with those used in other policy evaluations. The DfES estimates differentiate between male and female returns but the information provided by schools did not usually allow us to make this differentiation. Therefore, in the absence of more detailed information, we have assumed that the group affected has the same proportions of males

---

[27] DfES has developed a transition matrix that uses information on pupils' performance at the various Key Stages to predict the probabilities of achievement at various levels at the next Key Stage.

[28] Unfortunately, we have some reason for doubting this. Heckman and Cunha (2006) show that the impact of early intervention is much more likely to be sustained if the support is continued throughout secondary schooling. Since the DfES transition matrix reflects the experience primarily of students receiving no special interventions, it is likely to overstate the probabilities of successful outcomes for those receiving special support only until KS2.

[29] See Cummings *et al* (2004) for an outline of the principles of CBA and the way in which discounting is used to obtain present values. Briefly, however, discounting is required because most people view an amount of money received next year as worth less than the same amount received this year, either because they prefer to consume now rather than waiting until later (time preference) or because they have alternative investment possibilities that would yield a return (productivity of capital). Therefore, to simply aggregate the values without taking into account when they occur would overstate the social value of amounts in future years. Discounting reduces the amounts occurring in future years to their present value – that is, the value received today that would be equivalent to the amount received in the future. The present value depends on the discount rate so that the higher the discount rate the lower is the present value of a given amount received in the future.

and females as does the English population as a whole[30]. The values used for the FSES are as follows:

- 5 GCSE A*-C or equivalent compared with no qualification (Level 2 compared with no qualification) - £288,151 for a boy and £211,259 for a girl;
- 5 GCSE A*-C or equivalent compared with 5 GCSE A*-G (Level 2 compared with below Level 2) - £161,348 for a boy and £126,847 for a girl.

Comparison with Table 4 reveals that, for the target group, these valuations are largely irrelevant because attaining Level 1 is a significant achievement for pupils subject to intensive intervention. Unfortunately, however, the LFS does not allow us to distinguish between those achieving Level 1 and those achieving less than Level 1 and, not only do we not have an estimate of the value of achieving Level 1, but we do not even know whether that achievement has a positive impact on earnings.

On the other hand, schools can show an impact on the post-16 behaviour of these pupils in a reduction in NEET. For the valuation of this reduction, we have updated the estimates of Godfrey *et al* (2002) for changes in the price level so that its value in 2005/6 prices is £50,858.

Improved health outcomes
<u>Reducing teenage births</u>
DfES prepared some estimates of the costs of teenage pregnancy for the evaluation of the Teenage Pregnancy Strategy. This analysis was prepared some time ago when the *Green Book* was advising the use of 6% as the discount rate and the evaluation focused on public expenditure costs of teenage pregnancy rather than on the lost productivity. Finally, it addressed the wider issue of teenage <u>pregnancy</u> while we have information on the number of teenage <u>births</u> avoided.

Fortunately, we were given access to the spreadsheets used to undertake the original estimates and adjusted them for a discount rate of 3.5%, to bring them into line with current methods. We also adjusted them to provide an estimate of the cost of a teenage birth. Although we did not undertake the wider exercise of estimating productivity losses rather than public expenditure costs, we believe that for this group of mothers the values would not be very different.[31]

The present value of avoiding one teenage birth was estimated at £66,060.

<u>Reducing drug abuse</u>
In a report for the Department of Health, Godfrey *et al* (2002) estimated costs of between £36 to £72 per year for young recreational users of Class A Drugs in 2000 prices. Taking

---

[30] For the secondary school estimates, we used the 2005 population estimates for the age group 15-19 while for the primary school estimates we used those for the age group 10-14.

[31] The estimated public expenditure loss (comprising benefits paid to the teenage mother plus the tax and national insurance lost as a result of their not being employed) is approximately £11,000, which is not very different from what they might have been expected to earn.

the mid-point of these estimates and inflating them to 2005/6 prices yielded a value of £61. Godfrey *et al* distinguish between recreational users and problem users, with radically different costs for each. In most cases, schools indicated that it was recreational use that they were addressing and this has informed our choice of estimate. This is almost certainly an underestimate since some pupils who stop using drugs are likely to continue to abstain for more than one year. However, we have no way of knowing how long that may be.

Reducing alcohol abuse
For the Cabinet Office, Leontaridi (2003) estimated that the total costs of problem drinkers to be £18,517 million per year in 2001 prices. When this estimate is averaged across the estimated 2.8 million people aged 16+ with some alcohol dependence, the estimated cost per problem drinker is £6,613 per year or £7,474 in 2005/6 prices. As with drug abuse, this could be an underestimate because it assumes that the young person only ceases to abuse alcohol for one year, while the reality may be that the impact may be of a longer duration. On the other hand, it may be an overestimate because the costs associated with a problem young drinker may be less than the average[32]. It is worth noting that the estimated value of reducing drinking among young people is much higher than that of reducing Class A drug use. To some extent, this difference is a result of the difference in methodology – Godfrey *et al* distinguish between problem and recreational use while Leontaridi considers only problem use – but it may also reflect some underlying real differences. This would be consistent with the recent finding[33] that alcohol could be considered to be more harmful that many Class A drugs.

Reducing the number of smokers
We were unable to find an existing estimate of the value of one person stopping smoking. Raw *et al* estimate that, on average, each person who stops smoking gains an additional 1.54 years of life but, as many authors note, the non-smoker will also experience a better quality of life. In this case, the concept of the quality adjusted life year (QALY), widely used in health economics, becomes helpful but we could find no clear indication of the relationship between a life year saved and a QALY for ex-smokers. Discussion in Parrott and Godfrey (2004), however, implied that 1.54 life years saved was approximately equal to 2 QALYs. Finally, Mason *et al* (2006) estimate that the present value of a QALY is £45,000, resulting in an estimated value for one person stopping smoking of £90,090. This could be an overestimate of the value for teenage quitters given that recent evidence has suggested that most of the damage to health occurs after the age of 35. In addition, it should be noted that this estimate differs from those for reducing alcohol and rug usage because it assumes that the person who stops smoking has stopped for life while the other estimates assume that usage has ceased for one year. However, given the extent of the physical dependency generated by nicotine as compared to recreational drugs and alcohol, more determination is likely to be needed to quit smoking and the abstinence might be considered more likely to continued.

---

[32] For example, the estimate includes the costs of work absence, which is not applicable to pupils. On the other hand, alcohol abuse may be a contributor to school absence, which is likely to have long-term impacts on attainment.
[33] Nutt *et al* (2007).

156

Reducing self-harm
Recent evidence suggests a relationship between self-harm and an increased probability of suicide. Samaritans (2007) reports that the probability of suicide following an episode of self-harm is 0.5% in the first year rising to a cumulative probability of 5% after nine years and these probabilities are 100 times higher than in the population as a whole. The Department for Transport use a value of almost £1.45 million as the value of a life saved[34], based on individuals' willingness to pay for various safety measures. Therefore, in the first year after the incident of self-harm, the expected value of the loss of life is £7,446 (£1.45 million multiplied by 0.5%, the probability of suicide) and similarly for the next eight years. Discounted at 3.5%, this procedure yields a PV of £64,877 for preventing self-harm by one person.

An important assumption of this estimate is that preventing recurrence of self-harming behaviour indicates that the underlying issues have been addressed and that their risk of suicide has returned to that of the population as a whole. Moreover, it is a very crude estimate and does not take account of differences in suicide and self-harming rates in different populations.

Reduction in youth crime and disorder
Complaints of anti-social behaviour
Home Office (2003) uses Whitehead *et al* (2003) and further work to estimate the agency costs of various types of anti-social behaviour. The cost of one event of nuisance behaviour was estimated at £204 and that of vandalism at £400. Inflating to 2005/6 prices results in estimates of £221 and £434 respectively.

Young people re-offending.
NACRO (1998) estimated that the cost of dealing with each young offender was £52,000 in 1998 prices. These are prosecution, incarceration and supervision costs as well as family intervention and care. Inflated to 2005/6 prices, this is a value of £63,041.

More stable domestic environment
Crisis referrals to social services (now Children's Services)
The Children in Need (CiN) Census, 2005, estimated that the average weekly cost of providing support to a child was £290, taking account of the fact that 81% of children within its own family and 19% are children looked after. This could be an underestimate if a crisis referral was more likely to result in a child being taken into care. However, we have no information on such probabilities. Multiplying the weekly figure by 52 to obtain the annual cost provides an estimated cost of £15,080. We have used this figure as the value of avoiding a crisis referral on the assumption that a crisis referral lasts as long as the average duration of involvement with a child in need. This figure provides a crude measure of the value of avoiding the involvement Children's Services in terms of the LA expenditure avoided. It does not include the value of avoiding the distress within the family nor the long-term adverse impact on the child. It may, therefore, be seen as an underestimate of the true value.

---

[34] See Department of Transport (2007) for details of the methodology.

Family breakdown
Some schools saw their Family Support services as contributing to the prevention of
family breakdown. However, although such an event is likely to have an important
impact on the child's circumstances, this is a complex subject for which we do not have
an existing methodology to provide a reasonably robust valuation.[35]

Children being taken into care.
Curtis and Netten (2006) estimate that the annual cost of a child taken into care is
£36,656. We have used their estimate for a low-cost placement for a case in which the
child has no additional support needs. The estimate refers to LA costs only.

Improvements in the qualifications and employability of the local community
Obtaining an accredited qualification
There are no robust estimates of the value of obtaining an accredited qualification
through lifelong learning (LLL). Indeed, most studies conclude, in general, that there are
no increased wage returns to obtaining such a qualification. However, Jenkins (2004)
shows that for women, LLL increases the probability of finding employment by 50% and
that, once in employment, they tend to continue in employment usually part-time. Since
there was reason to believe that most of the participants in LLL were women (although
most schools were not able to provide detailed information on the breakdown by gender),
we have taken this increased probability of employment as relevant for our measure. We
have assumed that those obtaining a qualification had an employment rate of 49.5%
instead of the 33% expected of women with no qualifications aged 30-34 (that is, a 50%
increase in the employment rate) and that each person would work for 20 hours per week
for 48 weeks per year at the minimum wage of £5.05 per hour. Assuming that this
pattern of employment continued for 20 years, the expected present value of the
qualification for one person can be estimated as £17,470.

Obtaining employment.
The measures of employment provided by schools referred usually to mothers obtaining
part-time employment, although there were cases of full-time employment. Employment
effects are converted to full-time equivalents. We use DfES estimates of the annual pay
of a woman in full-time employment, enhanced by 25%, resulting in an estimate of
£12,500 per year as the value of one person gaining employment assuming that the
impact of the FSES activities lasts for one year.

Most schools were able to provide information on LLL or on employment but not,
usually, on both. However, for the single school that was able to provide both, there is
clearly the risk of double-counting the employment effect. Therefore, in that case, we
omitted the employment effect since the LLL value provided a clearer picture of the long-
term value.

---

[35] There are some estimates, which make use of existing estimates of the costs of single parenthood.
However, these estimates appear to assume that the family would not have been claiming benefits in the
absence of family breakdown. Even if the estimates were robust for the average family, therefore, this is
likely to overstate those costs for the families in our sample.

Increased self-confidence and social skills

We do not currently[36] have a robust methodology for placing a value on this outcome. However, given that this is a key outcome that schools have identified and for which they can usually demonstrate real effects, we thought it worthwhile considering whether it would be possible to place a minimum value on it. An internet search carried out in December 2006, revealed a host of private providers of holiday and leisure activities for children promising to build their self-confidence, develop leadership potential and so on. Given the scale of such provision and the prominence of these claims, it seems likely that parents value and are willing to pay for these outcomes. The usual price of these courses was approximately £450 per child. In the absence of more detailed information, we used this price as the value of the outcome.

Table 5: Valuation of Benefits, 2005/6 prices

Outcome	Unit	Estimated Present Value	Comments
Boy obtaining 5 GCSE A*-C compared with no qualification	Boy	£288,151	Estimate from DfES
Girl obtaining 5 GCSE A*-C compared with no qualification	Girl	£211,259	Estimate from DfES
Boy obtaining 5 GCSE A*-C compared with 5 GCSE A*-G	Boy	£161,348	Estimate from DfES; comparison is really the value of Level 2 as compared with "less than Level 2".
Girl obtaining 5 GCSE A*-C compared with 5 GCSE A*-G	Girl	£126,847	Estimate from DfES; comparison is really the value of Level 2 as compared with "less than Level 2".
5 GCSE A*-G compared with no qualification	Pupil		No valuation for Level 1 attainment because of lack of information from LFS
5 GCSE A*-G compared with less than Level 1	Pupil		
Gaining a qualification of some sort	Pupil		
No qualification but not NEET	Pupil	£50,857	Godfrey *et al* (2002). Measured at 2000/01 prices. Includes some costs of teen pregnancy and crime and they may, therefore, be some double counting with other indicators. Used discount rate of 6%; therefore, could be an underestimate compared to other DfES estimates where 3.5% is used. Inflated to 2005/6 prices using the RPI.
Reduction in NEET	Pupil	£50,857	As above.
Preventing Teenage Births	Avoided birth	£66,059	DfES internal estimate inflated to 2005/6 prices and redone using discount rate of 3.5% and assuming a girl aged 15. Information provided by schools refers to birth. (PV of a saved birth is £58,451 in 200/01 prices). Possibly not a bad under-estimate because foregone NICs/tax + benefits may not be much less than the earnings lost over the five years. (Approx £11k pa) Ermisch (2003) and Ermisch and Pevalin

---

[36] It is possible that the National Evaluation of Sure Start could develop such a methodology but we have been able to find no reports of such estimates so far.

			(2003) find no long-term impact on mother's earnings of a teen pregnancy. Living standards over the lifetime are reduced by about 20% but this is an effect of the marriage market not of own earnings. Some evidence from Iacovou and Berthoud (2006) that teen births are additional not postponed.
Reduction in drug use	Pupil	£61	Department of Health estimate. Godfrey *et al* (2002) Refers to young recreational users of Class A Drugs.
Reduction in alcohol use	Pupil	£7,474	Cabinet Office estimate. Leontaridi (2003). Refers to all problem drinkers. Use low estimate of total cost (£18,517 million pa) divided across estimated 2.8 million people aged 16+ with some alcohol dependence. Inflated to 2005/6 prices.
Reduction in smoking	Pupil	£90,090	Estimate based on information from Raw *et al*, Parrott and Godfrey (2004), and Mason et al (2006).
Preventing obesity	Pupil		Work for NICE by the York Health Economics Consortium at the University of York argues that it is difficult to perceive long-term health effects from short-term weight loss although they find that interventions with children are generally more cost-effect
Preventing complaints of anti-social behaviour	Report of ASB	£221	Home Office (2003). Derived from Whitehead *et al* (2003) and further work. Only agency costs, inflated tp 2005/6 prices. Assume that relevant complaints for FSES is nuisance behaviour. Vandalism would be £433.70.
Preventing young people re-offending	Pupil	£63,040	Response cost for each young offender as estimated in NACRO (1998) and reported in *Crime Reduction Toolkits*. Inflated to 2005/6 prices.
Preventing self-harm	Pupil	£64,877	Based on evidence of the probability of suicide given self-harm. Samaritans (2007) Does not include the direct medical costs of self-harm nor the impact on families. The expected value of the suicide is derived from the Department for Transport valuation of a life inflated to 2005/6 prices.
Preventing crisis referrals to social services	Pupil	£15,080	Based on DfES (2005) and assuming that family would need services for one year on average. CiN 2001 suggests 1 year is average duration of support.
Preventing children going into care	Pupil	£36,656	From Curtis and Netten(2006) cost of a child taken into care; low-cost because the child has no additional support needs. This includes LA costs only.
Preventing family breakdown			

People in the community obtaining some qualification	Person	£17,469	There is some evidence that LLL does not have a consistent positive impact on wage rates (some have significant negative impact) but does increase the probability of employment. Jenkins *et al* (2002) find that for those with no qualifications, LLL gives a 10% wage premium but this is for certified learning. Also for those unemployed, LLL increased probability of employment. Jenkins (2004) shows that for women, LLL increases the probability of finding employment by 50% and that, once in employment, they tend to continue in employment usually part-time.
People obtaining employment	Person	£12,500	Assuming the extra employment is a FTE woman aged 30 and that she works for an additional year as a result of the initiative. Derived from DfES internal estimates of the annual pay of a woman with no qualifications in full-time employment, enhanced by 25%.
Improvement in confidence/self-worth/improved social skills/ leadership/empowerment etc	Pupil	£450	Based on parents' willingness to pay for summer camps, private tuition, etc. Information from web search in December 2006.

Table 5 shows the estimated values for each of the outcomes and comments on the valuation methodology. This table illustrates clearly the point made at the start of this section about the quality of the estimates of value. One of the uses to which one would generally put such valuations would be to set priorities for activities placed on the relative value of the expected outcomes. However, Table 5 shows that one should be careful about setting priorities in this way because of the considerable variation in the quality of the estimates. More generally, Table 5 indicates the importance of developing robust estimates on a consistent basis for a wide range of outcomes to facilitate the economic evaluation of complex initiatives such as FSES.

6. Net Present Value of FSES activities

All of the estimated values are the present value of the outcome for a single individual. To obtain the Net Present Value (NPV) of FSES activities, one would ideally aggregate across all individuals affected and across all outcomes and compare the PV of all outcomes with the PV of costs.

However, the methodology used to estimate the scale of outcomes does not allow us to obtain robust information on all outcomes for years earlier than the last academic year. Moreover, we do not yet have enough information to predict continuing outcomes in the future for expected expenditures.

On the other hand, we do know that most of the costs incurred are current costs[37] and relate to the provision of services for the target group receiving the benefits.

Therefore, we have taken the view that to compare the benefits for the academic year 2005/6 with the costs for that year would provide a reasonable indication of the NPV obtained in the cases study schools. Table 6 shows the result of this comparison for the five secondary and one primary school for which we have been able to obtain quantitative estimates of benefits, in which we have some confidence[38].

Table 6: Present Value of Costs and Benefits in Case Study Schools, 2005/6

	Secondary					Primary
	1.7.1	1.8	1.10	1.11	2.3	1.3
PV of Total Benefits	£1,131,976	£5,718,578	£3,246,221	£2,245,015	£2,436,391	£1,979,972
PV of Total Costs	£1,302,748	£1,151,507	£2,239,542	£1,044,150	£1,644,850	£241,599
Net Present Value	-£170,773	£4,567,071	£1,006,679	£1,200,865	£791,541	£1,738,373

The general conclusion from Table 6 is that the FSES initiative does not appear to be a bad investment and, in some cases, it appears to be spectacularly successful[39]. Even in the case of school 1.7.1, it would only need two additional pupils in the general school population obtaining Level 2 to make this school also have a positive NPV. The school does, in fact, believe that its FSES activities could be having such an impact because of the more positive learning environment available for all pupils as a result of addressing the issues of disruptive pupils at an early stage.

The estimates for the NPV of these schools is all the more impressive when we consider two additional factors.

- Most of the schools report attainment outcomes for which we have no robust estimates of values, even though such outcomes may be reported in the DfES School Performance Tables.
- The valuations used in this analysis do not take into account any considerations of distributional equity – that is, they do not vary according to who receives the benefit. However, in most of the cases reported here, the benefits accrue

---

[37] There have been some capital costs for FSES activities but these have been a very small proportion of total costs.

[38] Only schools 1.8, 1.10 and 1.3 reported attainment benefits that were capable of valuation and, therefore, inclusion in the calculations reported in Table 6. As we saw in Appendix 2, statistical analysis of aggregated data cannot demonstrate any clear net attainment benefit although there is some indication of beneficial distributional impact benefiting the most deprived pupils. If the attainment benefits are removed to reflect the statistical findings, the NPV for schools 1.8 and 1.3 would still be positive but school 1.10's NPV would fall to -£1.16 million.

[39] School 1.8's results are outstanding, mainly because of the effects on attainment of its intensive intervention programme. However, even if these effects have been overstated, the NPV is still positive.

primarily to individuals who are the most deprived and vulnerable people in our society.

Finally, it is disappointing that we have quantitative estimates of benefits for only half of our case study schools. Sadly, the missing schools tend generally to have lower costs than the schools for which we have information and it would have been helpful to assess the extent to which the scale of activities affected the NPV.

7. Conclusions

7.1 Costs

The principal conclusion is that the costs of delivering FSES activities are high. Schools are concerned about the sustainability of their whole programme and most of them have a member of staff whose job description includes fund-raising. While many of the schools have been very successful in accessing additional funding, they note that the process of applying for, monitoring and evaluating different – and sometimes quite small – amounts of money can be costly.

The second conclusion relates to issues around data collection. While it is relatively straightforward to obtain past data on schools' own resources (although this potential is often constrained by changes in the accounting system and the use of multiple accounts), it is less easy to resurrect the inputs of partners, volunteers and, to a lesser extent, the LA. In most cases, the best we have been able to do for partner and volunteer inputs is to obtain estimates for those inputs during the past year and this estimation in itself has involved a good deal of research input. As we have seen, the partner and volunteer input in many cases tend to be small relative to the value of resources controlled directly by the school. However, one of the schools where these inputs are relatively large (1.3) is located within a LA that has taken a highly strategic approach to FSES and actively coordinates partnership working. If this model is pursued – and many of the case study LAs approve of the idea in principle – then data collection on FSES costs is likely to become ever more difficult.

Thirdly, the allocation of costs to a particular school has been quite challenging in some cases where FSES projects are operating in a broad network of interconnecting partnerships. School 1.3 again is the most pointed example of this situation but many of the other case study schools have supportive relationships with other schools in the LA. The more developed such support networks become the more difficult such apportionment is likely to be.

7.2 Benefits

The principal conclusion is that benefits in the case study schools are generally high.
Because FSESs are addressing serious problems of under-achievement, poor health and family difficulties, the economic value of small changes is very large. Therefore, an appropriate impact on a few pupils can have a large social value.

Quantification of the benefits has built on the case study approach of the evaluation and, therefore, is likely to underestimate outcomes.
Because of the complexity of the initiative, it was not possible to quantify outcomes by a statistical process. Therefore, we worked with schools to quantify outcomes based on their knowledge of individual pupils and their judgements about the likely experience of particular vulnerable groups in the absence of specific interventions. Although this methodology seems to provide a robust method of estimating the impact on a particular group, it does not capture effects on the wider school population.

Valuation of the benefits has been based on existing estimates.
There is a considerable variety of benefits and it was beyond the scope of this research to undertake robust estimation. Therefore, this analysis has taken existing estimates from a variety of sources and amended them where possible to provide a suitable estimate for our purposes. In a few cases, we have used a very crude methodology to use existing information to obtain an indicative estimate.

Estimated values of benefits vary in their robustness and are not based on a consistent methodology.
It would be unwise to place an undue emphasis on the PV of benefits estimated in this paper. Where we have derived estimates of values, we have attempted to be conservative by choosing assumptions that are likely to indicate the minimum value for each of the outcomes. Economic evaluation of such complex initiatives will require additional research to obtain more robust and consistent estimates of the values of a wide range of outcomes.[40]

7.3 Net Present Value

For most schools, FSES activities appear to provide reasonable value for money.
For the schools for which we have quantitative estimates of the benefits, the NPV is positive.

When we take distributional implications into account, the investments appear even more worthwhile.

---

[40] DfES economists currently have an internal document providing guidance on the methodology and assumptions to be used to prepare estimates of the value of lifetime productivity gains to be used in CBAs. It might be worth considering the potential for extending the scope of this guidance so that it can be used to obtain more consistent valuation of all benefits.

In most of the cases reported here, the benefits accrue primarily to individuals who are the most deprived and vulnerable people in our society.

The results reported here should be seen as indicative rather than definitive.
One should avoid placing too great an emphasis on the numerical values themselves because further research is needed to establish consistent and robust estimates of the various outcomes. However, the scale of the benefits does suggest that FSES activities can be a worthwhile investment.

References

America's Promise Alliance. Every Child, Every Promise, 2006.
http://www.americaspromise.org/uploadedFiles/AmericasPromise/Our_Work/Strategic_I
nitiatives/Every_Child_Every_Promise/EC-
EP_Documents/MAIN%20REPORT%20DRAFT%2011.1.pdf

Crime Reduction Toolkit
http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/py020304.htm

Cummings, C., Dyson, A., Papps, I., Pearson, D. & Raffo, C. (2006) Outcomes from full
service extended schools: interim findings of the theory of change component of the
national evaluation.

Curtis, L and Netten, A. Unit Costs of Health and Social Care, 2006. PSSRU, University
of Kent, 2006.
http://www.pssru.ac.uk/pdf/uc/uc2006/uc2006.pdf

Department for Education and Skills. Children in Need in England: Preliminary results
of a survey of activity and expenditure as reported by Local Authority Social Services'
Children and Families Teams for a survey week in February 2005. SFR 52/2005. DfES,
2005.
http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/

Department for Transport. 2005 Valuation of the Benefits of Prevention of Road
Accidents and Casualties. Highways Economics Note No. 1. Department for Transport,
January 2007
http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/page/dft_rdsafety_614125.
pdf

Ermisch, JE "Does a 'Teen-birth' have Longer-term Impacts on the Mother? Suggestive
Evidence from the British Household Panel Study", Working Papers of the Institute for
Social and Economic Research, paper 2003-32. Colchester: University of Essex, 2003.

Ermisch, J and Pevalin, DJ. "Does a 'Teen-birth' have Longer-term Impacts on the
Mother? Evidence from the 1970 British Cohort Study". Working Papers of the Institute
for Social and Economic Research, paper 2003-28. Colchester: University of Essex,
2003.
http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/pubs/workpaps/pdf/2003-28.pdf

Home Office. Costing the Response to Anti-Social Behaviour – A Note. One day count
of reported anti-social behaviour. Economics and Resource Analysis Unit, Home Office,
2003.

http://www.together.gov.uk/article.asp?aid=1816

Iacovou, M and Berthoud, R. The economic position of large families. Research Report No 358. Corporate Document Services, Department for Work and Pensions, London, 2006.
http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rports2005-2006/rrep358.pdf

Jenkins, A. Women, Lifelong Learning and Employment. Research Report No 39, Centre for the Economics of Education, London, 2004.
http://cee.lse.ac.uk/cee%20dps/ceedp39.pdf

Jenkins, A, Vignoles, A, Wolf, A and Galindo-Rueda, F. The Determinants and Effects of Lifelong Learning. Research Report No 19, Centre for the Economics of Education, London, 2002.
http://cee.lse.ac.uk/cee%20dps/CEEDP19.pdf

Godfrey, C, Eaton, G, McDougall, C and Culyer, A. The economic and social costs of Class A drug use in England and Wales, 2000. Home Office Research Study 249. Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, July 2002.
http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hors249.pdf

Godfrey, C, Hutton, S, Bradshaw, J, Coles, B, Craig, G and Johnson, J. Estimating the Cost of Being "Not in Education, Employment or Training" at Age 16-18. Research Report No 346. London: Department for Education and Skills, 2002.
http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR346.pdf

Heckman, J and Cunha, F. Investing in our Young People. Paper prepared for Every Child, Every Promise, 2006
http://www.americaspromise.org/uploadedFiles/AmericasPromise/Our_Work/Strategic_Initiatives/Every_Child_Every_Promise/EC-EP_Documents/inv-young-rep_text_2006-11-06_fc.pdf

HM Treasury. The Green Book. Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government. TSO.
http://greenbook.treasury.gov.uk/

Leontaridi R. Alcohol misuse: how much does it cost? London: Cabinet Office, 2003.
http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/downloads/files/econ.pdf

Mason, H, Marshall, A, Jones-Lee, M and Donaldson, C (for the SVQ Project Team), Estimating a monetary value of a QALY from existing UK values of prevented fatalities and serious injuries.
http://pcpoh.bham.ac.uk/publichealth/nccrm/PDFs%20and%20documents/RM03_JH31_Final_Report.pdf

NACRO Wasted Lives: Counting the cost of juvenile offending. NACRO/Prince's Trust, 1998.

Nutt, D, King, LA, Saulsbury, W, and Blakemore, C. Development of a rational scale to assess the harm of drugs of potential misuse. The Lancet, Volume 369, Issue 9566, 24 March 2007-30 March 2007, Pages 1047-1053.

Ofsted (2005) Extended schools: a report on early developments. Document Reference No. HMI 2453. (London, Ofsted).

Parrott, S and Godfrey, C. ABC of smoking cessation. Economics of smoking cessation. British Medical Journal, 328, 17 April 2004.

Platt, S, McLean, J, McCollam, A, Blamey, A, Mackenzie, M, McDaid, D, Maxwell, M, Halliday, E, and Woodhouse, A. Evaluation of the First Phase of **Choose Life**: the national strategy and action plan to prevent suicide in Scotland. Scottish Executive Social Research, 2006.
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/146980/0038521.pdf

Raw M, McNeill A, West R. "Smoking Cessation Guidelines for Health Professionals." Thorax, 998;**53** (Suppl 5, Part 1):S1–19.

Samaritans Organisation. Self harm and Suicide. Samaritans Information Sheet. Samaritans, 2007.
http://www.samaritans.org.uk/know/information/informationsheets/selfharm/Self%20harm%20-%20web.doc

Whitehead, CME, Stockdale, JE and Razzu, G. The Economic and Social Costs of Anti-Social Behaviour: A Review. London School of Economics, 2003.
http://www.together.gov.uk/article.asp?aid=1816

Appendix 4: Comparator schools: summary of findings

1. The research process

In order to clarify the extent to which outcomes and processes identified in wave 1 case study FSESs were the result of participation in the FSES initiative, the evaluation team invited local authority officers in each area to nominate schools that could act as 'comparators'. These were schools that were not themselves participating in the FSES initiative, but which were the same phase as the designated FSES and also served similar pupils populations (in terms of numbers on roll, free school meals entitlement, proportion of pupils with identified special educational needs) and areas served (in terms of demographic and socio-economic characteristics).

Within any single local authority, of course, it is difficult to find anything more than approximate matches between schools, and two local authorities (1.4 and 1.5) were unable to identify any comparator willing to participate. Similarly, no attempt was made to find comparators for the special school in the FSES sample (1.12 and 1.13), on the grounds that different special schools within the same local authority invariably cater for different 'types' or 'levels' of special educational need, making comparisons meaningless. In the event, therefore, comparators were found in nine local authority areas (1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.21 and 1.22). Three of the comparators (1.3, 1.6, 1.12) were primary schools; the remainder were secondaries.

Each comparator school received a field visit similar to the 'mapping' visits to FSESs described in the year 1 report (Cummings et al., 2005). Heads (or other relevant members of senior leadership teams) and staff with responsibility for extended provision were interviewed about the school's area context, the challenges it faced, the nature and extent of any extended provision it made, the aims of that provision, and any issues that were encountered in managing that provision. Interviewees were probed particularly about the implications for such provision of needing to sustain it outside the FSES initiative, and about how, if at all, they were able to generate some of the outcomes that FSESs claimed from their work.

2. What were the comparator schools doing that was similar to FSES provision?

All of the comparator schools were offering some forms of provision that could be regarded as 'extended'.

The secondary comparator schools had all acquired specialist status. These schools all offered some community use of specialist facilities and opportunities for students to use facilities OOSHs. Some were involved in the extended schools (ES) pathfinder project (1.6, 1.11) and had a history of ES on which to build. Some had received finding through the DfES ES roll out and were able to develop provision with this financial support. The 1.11 comparator was involved in other educational initiatives such as Behaviour Improvement Programme (BIP), Excellence in Cities (EiC) and Education Action Zones (EAZs). The 1.21 comparator was a London Challenge school, and the 1.7 school had been rebuilt through PFI (the Private Finance Initiative) and benefited from excellent facilities (though these were used by the PFI company in the evenings). The 1.8 comparator was a recent PFI school and its language specialism was giving it a significant role in the community. The 1.22 comparator with a maths and computing specialist was hoping to improve its services to the community through the Parent Partnership Award which it had applied for. Primary comparator 1.12 accessed a number of agencies and funds to enable it to extend its school services. Additional funding e.g. New Opportunities Fund had been secured by some schools (e.g. 1.11) to enable them deliver some ES provision, and a charging system had been introduced by some.

Like many schools in challenging circumstances, the comparator schools offered a range of enrichment activities which were available to all pupils, e.g. out of schools hours provision with both a leisure and study support element, enterprise building activities, and some activities which were more selective e.g. school councils.

All comparators had developed some links with the wider community e.g. community use of facilities, adult education (1.11, 1.21, 1.3, 1.22, 1.12), crime initiatives (1.21), childcare (1.3, 1.12), intergenerational work (1.11, 1.7, 1.12,) although the strength and nature of the links varied from school to school. Likewise, parental engagement was something all the comparator schools attended to, though reported success was dependent on the nature and extent of their parental engagement strategies. For example some offered parent support classes (1.3, 1.12), family learning (1.6, 1.11), dads and lads' activities (1.6), parents' council (1.6).

Some of the comparator schools were deliberate in their decision not to offer certain provision as it was already being offered in the area, or there was no perceived need for it. For example, the 1.6 comparator school was not looking to develop childcare provision due to the location of a children's centre in close proximity to the school and the 1.11 school opted not to develop a youth club as youth provision as already catered for in the area.

The level of collaborative working with partners in the comparator schools was variable and dependent on factors including history of extended schooling, involvement in other educational and wider initiatives, and access to funding. For example, the 1.12 comparator has a successful history of developing positive partnerships with community groups and businesses offering a range of resources to supplement the school's own internal resources. The 1.10 comparator was heavily involved with social care and health

agencies because of its diverse school population, and also had access to a Behaviour and Education Support Team (BEST).

Comparator schools tended to be different from most of the more fully-developed FSESs in that they had developed *some* working links with partners but were not operating a co-location of services model, and were not (at the time of interview) involved in wider strategies involving the creation of integrated teams and commissioning of services. Comparator schools anticipated that the Every Child Matters agenda would help facilitate a culture of multi-agency collaboration in the future and one of the schools (1.3) expected to get a children's centre which they hoped would stimulate this. However, one of the comparator schools (1.11) could be described as a quasi-FSES in that it had a co-located BEST team offering support to vulnerable pupils. This school also benefited from involvement in EiC and EAZ initiatives, and from local authority funding to operate as a 'community' school. Another of the comparator schools (1.21) had developed some links with statutory and voluntary services which were delivering sessional provision in school, and the Police were based in school part time. Both the 1.11 and 1.21 comparators had well thought-out plans to develop multi-agency provision in the coming year and both had already benefited from ES funding (allocated to them via the LA through the ES roll out).

Management structures for extended activities varied between comparator schools. Whilst the 1.11 comparator had clear management structures (e.g. deputy head taking responsibility along with other members of the senior leadership team), and others had designated coordinators (e.g. 1.21, 1.7), the 1.6 and 1.3 schools had less formal structures and it was the head that was leading on ES developments (with support of a community manager in 1.6). For those comparator schools without the opportunity of funding for a designated FSES coordinator, the delivery of ES appeared to be very much in the hands of the senior leadership team as a part of their core priorities.

None of the comparator schools reported any advantages in not being a designated FSES. One perceived disadvantage that was identified was the lack of adequate space for delivery of ES provision. Like FSESs, comparators were worried about sustainability and generating and/or acquiring funding for new activities. Some were identifying the advantages of working with community partners who themselves could generate funding, and with services who could offer provision without costs to the school. In addition the 1.12 comparator regarded the professional development of its staff as advantageous when working with teams in the community.

3. How did comparator schools respond to issues that FSES take as their priorities?

In addition to any ES provision, comparator schools adopted a range of teaching and learning strategies aimed at improved levels of school performance. For instance, in 2004 the 1.21 school achieved what was then its highest-ever GCSE and SATs scores. The

school attributed this to a range of curriculum and pupil-support strategies and to its Business and Enterprise specialist status. Likewise, standards had risen over recent years in the 1.7 comparator and the school attributed this to intervention strategies to target C/D and A/B border line pupils (an education welfare officer had been employed to work with these pupils for the last 2 years). In addition, the 1.22 comparator hoped to see a further improvement in its 5A*-Cs by focusing on raising attainment in maths and science in years 7 and 9 and on improving the quality of teaching in weak subjects across those year groups.

Without exception the comparator schools saw their ES provision as a way of improving standards, and some identified parental engagement and opportunities to support pupils to learn more effectively as key to this. With the exception of the 1.11 comparator, the schools did not benefit from having a co-located multi-agency team, although, the 1.21 comparator did offer some co-located provision. This restricted the opportunities schools had to offer holistic support to children and families. When more specialist intervention was needed, therefore, schools would have to signpost. What schools tended to do was offer a range of enrichment opportunities for pupils (as discussed above) as a way to motivate and engage pupils in learning. Often it was teaching staff who would take responsibility for delivering enrichment activities and this depended on their good will.

Unlike some of the designated FSESs, comparator schools did not articulate any ambitious plan to change the culture of the community served by the school.

4. Summary

It is clear that was no sharp dividing line between comparator schools and FSESs in that both groups offered extended provision, set up management structures to support this, worked with partner organisations, aimed at overcoming pupils' 'barriers to learning', and set their targeted work alongside more universal strategies designed to raise attainment and extend achievement. In general, comparator schools were able to do less of these things that FSESs, but there was considerable overlap and at least one comparator was an FSES in all but name. This lends support to the proposition that FSESs are a particular case of an approach which could be found in many schools beyond the DfES initiative.

Appendix 5: Questionnaires to pupils, parents and staff in FSESs and comparator schools

1. Background

Questionnaires were administered to pupils, parents and staff in case study FSESs and their comparator schools in two waves, in November 2005 for the school year 2005/6 and in November 2006 for the school year 2006/7. The aim was to explore the perceptions of respondents about aspects of their experience likely to be impacted upon by the FSES or non FSES status of their schools. In this way, it might be possible to support indications of outcomes from FSESs, to detect impacts before outcomes became apparent, and to test whether those impacts were peculiar to FSESs.

Questionnaires were devised so that they contained a series of questions on a limited number of themes. So, for instance, the pupil questionnaires contained sets of questions about the school, support for learning, personal support, activities, the area, and 'me'. The questionnaires used in the 2005/6 administration are presented in an annex. DfES requested minor changes in wording for the 2006/7 administration. One question asking pupils whether they thought the school helped parents with their personal and family problems was removed. Another question asking pupils if the school helped local people 'with their family problems' was reworded to read 'if they have problems at home'.

For practical reasons, administration was undertaken via a nominated intermediary in each school. In FSESs this was usually the FSES coordinator. These intermediaries were asked to administer the questionnaires to all staff (perhaps using a staff meeting for this purpose) and to all pupils in year 5 (for primary schools) and years 8 and 10 for secondary schools. The rationale here was to target pupils who were likely to be able to manage the literacy demands of the questionnaire, who had been in the school for some time, but who were not (and whose teachers were not) under the pressure of national assessments and examinations. Intermediaries were invited to ask their class teacher colleagues to administer the pupil questionnaires at some appropriate time, for instance at registration or tutorial time.

The parent questionnaires were targeted at the parents/carers of pupils completing questionnaires. Intermediaries were invited to use their own judgement as to the best way to secure responses, for instance by mailing the questionnaires to parents, sending them home with pupils, or administering them at parents' events. Parents responding to the survey were offered the opportunity of participating in a prize draw. All questionnaires were completed anonymously, though parents wishing to enter the draw were invited to identify themselves on a separate response slip. Individual schools received feedback on how their responses fitted into the pattern of the school sample as a whole.

The administration of the questionnaires was constrained by practical considerations. It was important throughout to bear in mind the burdens being imposed on, and the good will demanded from, respondents and the intermediaries managing the process. Questionnaires, therefore, were designed to be very brief and easy to complete. Considerable discretion was given to intermediaries about how and when to administer questionnaires and whom to target. As a result, there were no standard conditions. Likewise, schools did not always provide information that was requested on which pupils, parents and staff actually received the questionnaire, so it is not possible to state accurately the proportion of responses nor to say whether there were any systematic biases in sampling in particular schools. Where schools did provide this information, the return rates for pupil questionnaires ranged from 34-100%, for parent questionnaires from 6-56%, and for staff questionnaires from 20-62%. In 2005/6, 14 FSESs (10 secondary and 4 primary) and 8 comparator schools (6 secondary and 2 primary) agreed to participate in the process and returned responses. In 2006/7, 6 FSESs (4 secondary and 2 primary) and 3 comparator schools (2 secondary and 2 primary) agreed to participate and returned responses. However, not all 9 schools in 2006/7 returned responses to all 3 questionnaires. Pupil responses were from pupils in years 5, 8 and 10. Further details of these samples are given in the following sections and in annex A.

The aim of the 2006/7 administration was to test the hypothesis that any effects from FSES status would be stronger one year further into the initiative, and that they could therefore be identified more securely as FSES effects. Perhaps not surprisingly, schools were less willing to participate in this second administration, given that most of what they might learn from the questionnaire (particularly in comparator schools) had already been learned in 2005/6.

The constraints surrounding the administration of the questionnaire mean that findings must be treated with considerable caution. They are a useful indicator of impacts, particularly where they are supported by other evidence. However, they should not be regarded in isolation as providing robust evidence for FSES impacts or for differences between FSESs and other schools. With this in mind, the analyses presented below focus on those findings in which we have greatest confidence. The responses to both the open and closed items on the questionnaires made a wider range of analyses possible. The ones reported here are those where response patterns were clearest and most relevant to the concerns of the evaluation

2. 2005/6 analyses

2.1 Pupil questionnaires

Table 1. Responses to pupil questionnaire

QUESTION	COMPARATOR n=1567		FSES n=2247	
	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
This school is a good school	82%	17%	76%	21%
Most pupils are happy to come to this school	68%	31%	68%	30%
Other people would like to come to this school	78%	19%	74%	23%
The teachers here try hard to help you learn	84%	14%	81%	17%
There are other adults here who help you to learn	80%	19%	84%	14%
You can get help with learning outside lesson time	75%	23%	77%	21%
The teachers here will always try to help you with your personal problems	64%	34%	67%	30%
In this school there are other adults who help you with personal problems	72%	**26%**	79%	**18%**
In this school, adults listen to children and young people	65%	31%	68%	29%
In this school there are extra activities outside lesson time	93%	5%	94%	4%
Many pupils take part in these extra activities	74%	24%	74%	23%
The extra activities are interesting for people like me	58%	39%	58%	38%
In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another	57%	**41%**	65%	**32%**
The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems	**27%**	**68%**	**37%**	**58%**
Parents think this is a good school	**82%**	**14%**	**73%**	**22%**
In this school, some people who live in the area take part in activities	58%	38%	61%	34%
The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their family problems	26%	**70%**	34%	**59%**
People who live in the area think this is a good school	**74%**	20%	**65%**	27%
I think I am good at learning	83%	15%	81%	15%
I expect to get good qualifications when I am older	90%	7%	89%	7%
I expect to stay on at school or college after I am 16	84%	13%	78%	17%

Note: differences of 8% or more between FSESs and comparators are shown in bold

The majority of responses were similar between FSESs and comparator schools. The main differences (i.e. of 8% or more) are highlighted in bold (and in other tables in this appendix). They occur in response to the following statements:

- *3Q2. In this school there are other adults who help you with personal problems.* Some 26% of pupils in comparator schools disagree with this statement compared to just 18% in FSESs.

- *5Q1. In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another.* Once again in comparator schools some 41% disagree with this statement compared to 32% in FSESs.
- *5Q2. The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems.* This question led to the same difference in response with a difference of 10% between FSES and comparator schools in both those agreeing with the statement and those disagreeing. Some 37% of pupils agree that this happens in FSES schools compared to 27% in comparator schools.
- *5Q3 Parents think this is a good school.* Conversely more pupils in comparator schools agree with this statement (82%) than their FSES counterparts (73%).
- *6Q2. The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their family problems.* This question led to the largest difference in response of the whole questionnaire with a difference of 11% between FSES and comparator schools. As with 5Q2 which is a similar question, more pupils in comparator schools disagree with this statement than those in FSES schools, 70% and 59% respectively.
- *6Q3. People who live in the area think this is a good school.* Some 65% of FSES pupils agree with this statement whereas 74% of comparator school pupils agree.

We also explored the extent to which these patterns were different when the responses were analysed by gender and by school phase. Overall, the patterns remained the same, with relatively few differences between FSESs and comparators. Interestingly, though, in a context where the large majority of children were positive about their schools, there were fewer differences in responses between genders in FSESs than in comparator schools, which *may* be an indication of greater engagement by boys in the former. There was greater consistency between the genders' responses in FSESs than in comparator schools.

2.2 Parent questionnaires

Table 2. Responses to parent questionnaires

	COMPARATOR n=263		FSES n=511	
QUESTION	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
This school is a good school	95%	2%	92%	5%
Most pupils are happy to go to the school	93%	4%	90%	7%
Most families would like to send their children to this school	89%	**6%**	82%	**14%**
The teachers try hard to help pupils learn	93%	5%	94%	3%
There are other adults in school who help pupils to learn	85%	10%	86%	8%
The teachers will always help children with their personal problems	81%	13%	83%	12%
In this school there are other adults who help children with their personal problems	77%	14%	82%	11%
In this school, adults listen to children and young people	81%	12%	85%	10%
In this school there are some extra activities for pupils outside lesson time	95%	1%	96%	2%

Many children take part in these extra activities	81%	11%	85%	9%
The extra activities are interesting for children like mine	82%	12%	84%	11%
In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another	75%	19%	81%	15%
The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems	**57%**	29%	**66%**	22%
Parents are made to feel welcome by the school	**86%**	9%	**94%**	3%
The school listens to what parents have to say	81%	13%	88%	8%
In this school, many people who live in the area take part in activities	67%	20%	73%	20%
The activities offered by the school are interesting for people like me	62%	23%	68%	23%
The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications	**68%**	16%	**77%**	12%
The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems	**53%**	26%	**63%**	21%
People who live in the area think this is a good school	84%	5%	81%	12%

Note: differences of 8% or more between FSESs and comparators are shown in bold

The majority of responses by parents are similar regardless of the type of school their child is in. The main differences are as follows:

- *1Q3. Most families would like to send their children to this school.* 14% of parents whose chldren are in FSESs disagree with this statement compared to 6% who have children in comparator schools.
- The following two statements received 8-9% more parents agreeing with them if their children are in FSESs than if they are in comparator schools:
  - *5Q3. Parents are made to feel welcome by the school.*
  - *6Q3. The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications.*
- *5Q2. The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems* and *6Q4 The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems (eg child/family/personal problems).* The majority of parents agreed with these statements. However, once again, more parents (9-10%) agree with these statements if their children are in FSESs than in comparator schools.

The small number of responses from parents in primary schools (n = 25) makes analysis by phase problematic. However, in a context where parents in both types of schools were generally positive about their experiences, responses were likely to vary more between primary and secondary comparators than between primary and secondary FSESs.

2.3 Staff questionnaires

Table 3. Responses to staff questionnaires

QUESTION	COMPARATOR n=344		FSES n=433	
	AGREE	DIS-AGREE	AGREE	DIS-AGREE
This school is a good school	87%	8%	88%	8%
Most pupils are happy to go to the school	90%	3%	91%	6%
Many families would like to send their children to this school	**80%**	**12%**	**64%**	**26%**
The teachers try hard to help pupils learn	98%	1%	98%	1%
There are other adults in school who help pupils to learn	97%	1%	98%	1%
The teachers will always help children with their personal problems	75%	18%	80%	17%
In this school there are other adults who help children with personal problems	95%	2%	99%	0%
In this school, adults listen to children and young people	92%	3%	94%	4%
In this school, it is usually possible to get good support for pupils from other agencies	77%	10%	83%	10%
In this school there are many extra activities outside ordinary lessons	84%	11%	89%	9%
Many children take part in these extra activities	63%	26%	70%	22%
The extra activities are interesting for the full range of pupils	**60%**	30%	**69%**	24%
In this school, parents and teachers often talk to each other	72%	21%	79%	16%
The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems	**60%**	**22%**	**75%**	**13%**
Parents are made to feel welcome by the school	**85%**	8%	**93%**	3%
The school listens to what parents have to say	83%	8%	90%	3%
In this school, many people who live in the area take part in activities offered by the school	46%	34%	49%	36%
The activities offered by the school are interesting for a wide range of people	**50%**	**33%**	**66%**	**20%**
The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications	**49%**	**31%**	**67%**	**20%**
The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems	**47%**	**31%**	**67%**	**17%**
People who live in the area think this is a good school	**72%**	**12%**	**55%**	**26%**
Offering support to pupils' learning outside lessons takes up a lot of my time	59%	34%	51%	39%
Dealing with pupils' personal and family problems takes up a lot of my time	35%	57%	37%	54%
Running activities for pupils outside lessons takes up a lot of my time	38%	55%	31%	59%
Running activities for adults takes up a lot of my time	**3%**	**85%**	**11%**	**77%**
I would like to spend less time on these things	12%	63%)	14%	63%
I would like to spend more time on these things (if time allowed)	45%	32%	49%	30%

Note: differences of 8% or more between FSESs and comparators are shown in bold

The majority of responses are similar between FSES and comparator schools. The main differences occur in response to the following statements:

- *1Q3 Many families would like to send their children to this school*. Some 80% of staff in comparator schools agree with this statement compared to 64% of FSES school staff who responded to this questionnaire.

- *6Q5 People who live in the area think this is a good school*. As with 1Q3 a higher proportion of comparator school staff (72%) agree with this statement than FSES staff (55%).
- *5Q2. The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems*. Conversely more FSES staff agree with this statement than comparator school staff with three quarters of FSES staff and 60% of comparator staff agreeing.
- The following three statements all received similar responses with 16-20% more staff agreeing with the statements if they are in FSESs than their comparator school counterparts.
    - *6Q2 The activities offered by the school are interesting for a wide range of people.*
    - *6Q3 The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications.*
    - *6Q4 The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems (eg child's, family, personal problems).*
- Whilst the difference between the responses is not as great for the following statements it is still a marked difference.
- *4Q3. The extra activities are interesting for the full range of pupils* and *5Q3 Parents are made to feel welcome by the school*. Some 8-9% more staff reported that they agree with this statement in FSES schools than those in comparator schools.
- *7Q4. Running activities for adults takes up a lot of my time*. More staff disagree with this statement in comparator schools (85%) than in FSESs (77%).

There were differences in responses by school phase, with primary staff tending to see their schools as better thought of, more community-oriented and more helpful. Secondary staff, on the other hand, are more likely to see the running of extended activities as burdensome. These differences seem to hold good across both FSESs and comparator schools.

3. 2006/7 responses

Tables 4-7 below present a comparison between responses in 2006/7 and 2005/6 in the pupil, parent and staff questionnaires. These comparisons have to be handled with great caution because of the non-response of some schools in 2006/7 and the smaller number of questionnaires returned from those schools that did respond in 2006/7. Moreover, the cost of sampling the same school years in 2005/6 and 2006/7 was that different pupils and parents were sampled. As a further complicating factor, the changes requested by DfES, though not substantial, inevitably compromise strict comparability (in 2006/7 one question asking pupils whether they thought the school helped parents with their personal and family problems was removed and one question asking pupils if the school helped local people 'with their family problems' was reworded to read 'if they have problems at home').

As might be expected, then, there are differences between responses in the two years. Some of these differences are in the direction that might be expected if the 'FSES effect' were growing stronger over time. For instance, pupils in FSESs were more likely to think that activities on offer were interesting to them in 2006/7 than in 2005/6 (table 4). Likewise, staff in FSESs were more likely to think that parents would like to send their children to the school (table 6). However, responses from FSESs were relatively stable, and it is difficult to conclude that they point to a cumulative FSES effect.

Indeed, most of the larger differences were in comparator schools. Some of these might be explained as a consequence of these schools' developing extended approaches within the national roll out of extended schools. For instance, in the later administration, pupils were more likely to see parents and teachers as talking to one another often (table 4), while parents were more likely to see adults in schools as helping children with their personal difficulties (table 5). In particular, the response from staff in comparator schools was more positive in 2006/7 than in 2005/6 and seems to indicate a sense that the schools were now offering extended provision. Other differences, though, cannot be explained in this way. For instance, pupils in comparator schools were less likely to feel that they were listened to in 2006/7 than in 2005/6 (table 4), while their parents are less convinced by the activities on offer to children and local people (table 5).

Overall, then, the picture of FSESs and comparators which emerges from the 2006/7 administration is similar to that which emerged in 2005/6. If there is a change, it is that comparators begin to look a little more like FSESs – though the differences between them were never great. However, the differences in samples between the two years make these findings difficult to interpret, and it would not be wise to place too much weight upon them.

4. Some conclusions

The questionnaire surveys reported here are relatively crude measures of eliciting perceptions, and were administered in the context of significant practical constraints. The evidence they provide is indicative, at best, and should be treated with caution. Nonetheless, it suggests that:

- Pupils, parents and staff generally report positive perceptions of schools, regardless of whether those schools do or do not have FSES status.
- Overall, there are few differences between responses from different types of school. Where they do exist, however, they tend to be along lines that suggest an FSES effect i.e. respondents in FSESs are marginally more likely to see their schools as supporting and offering activities to pupils, parents and local people.
- On the other hand, FSESs are likely to be perceived to be lower status institutions than comparator schools. This may well reflect the reality that FSESs serve highly disadvantaged populations (see appendix 2), together with the poor historical state of relations between schools and local communities which some heads saw as one

reason for pursuing an FSES approach. It seems more likely, therefore, to be the basis from which FSES status was developed than to be an effect of that status

Table 4. Responses to pupil questionnaires in 2006/7 and 2005/6

	2006/7				2005/6			
	COMPARATOR n=442		FSES n=504		COMPARATOR n=1567		FSES n=2247	
QUESTION	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
This school is a good school	78%	18%	81%	17%	82%	17%	76%	21%
Most pupils are happy to come to this school	65%	33%	66%	32%	68%	31%	68%	30%
Other people would like to come to this school	72%	24%	75%	22%	78%	19%	74%	23%
The teachers here try hard to help you learn	83%	14%	86%	12%	84%	14%	81%	17%
There are other adults here who help you to learn	79%	18%	86%	13%	80%	19%	84%	14%
You can get help with learning outside lesson time	71%	26%	77%	20%	75%	23%	77%	21%
The teachers here will always try to help you with your personal problems	64%	31%	69%	28%	64%	34%	67%	30%
In this school there are other adults who help you with personal problems	65%	31%	81%	17%	72%	26%	79%	18%
In this school, adults listen to children and young people	**56%**	**40%**	69%	26%	**65%**	**31%**	68%	29%
In this school there are extra activities outside lesson time	86%	11%	93%	6%	93%	5%	94%	4%
Many pupils take part in these extra activities	**62%**	**35%**	79%	19%	**74%**	**24%**	74%	23%
The extra activities are interesting for people like me	58%	37%	**68%**	30%	58%	39%	**58%**	38%
In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another	**65%**	**31%**	63%	32%	**57%**	**41%**	65%	32%
Parents think this is a good school	79%	14%	77%	18%	82%	14%	73%	22%
In this school, some people who live in the area take part in activities	55%	37%	**70%**	27%	58%	38%	**61%**	34%
The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their family problems	**45%**	**45%**	**51%**	**44%**	**26%**	**70%**	**34%**	**59%**
People who live in the area think this is a good school	**66%**	23%	69%	25%	**74%**	20%	65%	27%
I think I am good at learning	85%	9%	84%	12%	83%	15%	81%	15%
I expect to get good qualifications when I am older	88%	6%	94%	3%	90%	7%	89%	7%
I expect to stay on at school or college after I am 16	85%	8%	81%	13%	84%	13%	78%	17%

Note: differences of 8% or more between administrations are shown in bold

Table 5. Responses to parent questionnaires in 2006/7 and 2005/6

	2006/7				2005/6			
	COMPARATOR n=43		FSES n=180		COMPARATOR n=263		FSES n=511	
QUESTION	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
This school is a good school	93%	5%	91%	4%	95%	2%	92%	5%
Most pupils are happy to go to the school	93%	5%	89%	6%	93%	4%	90%	7%
Most families would like to send their children to this school	93%	5%	81%	11%	89%	6%	82%	14%
The teachers try hard to help pupils learn	91%	9%	91%	5%	93%	5%	94%	3%
There are other adults in school who help pupils to learn	79%	14%	87%	6%	85%	10%	86%	8%
The teachers will always help children with their personal problems	79%	19%	83%	11%	81%	13%	83%	12%
In this school there are other adults who help children with their personal problems	70%	**28%**	84%	11%	77%	**14%**	82%	11%
In this school, adults listen to children and young people	84%	16%	84%	10%	81%	12%	85%	10%
In this school there are some extra activities for pupils outside lesson time	91%	7%	88%	8%	95%	1%	96%	2%
Many children take part in these extra activities	79%	19%	84%	11%	81%	11%	85%	9%
The extra activities are interesting for children like mine	**72%**	**21%**	81%	12%	**82%**	**12%**	84%	11%
In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another	79%	19%	78%	15%	75%	19%	81%	15%
The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems	60%	30%	66%	17%	57%	29%	66%	22%
Parents are made to feel welcome by the school	91%	9%	91%	6%	86%	9%	94%	3%
The school listens to what parents have to say	84%	16%	80%	12%	81%	13%	88%	8%
In this school, many people who live in the area take part in activities	**56%**	26%	77%	13%	**67%**	20%	73%	20%
The activities offered by the school are interesting for people like me	60%	23%	68%	21%	62%	23%	68%	23%
The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications	65%	14%	81%	12%	68%	16%	77%	12%
The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems	51%	30%	66%	17%	53%	26%	63%	21%
People who live in the area think this is a good school	81%	7%	82%	9%	84%	5%	81%	12%

Note: differences of 8% or more between administrations are shown in bold

Table 6. Responses to staff questionnaires in 2006/7 and 2005/6

	2006/7				2005/6			
	COMPARATOR n=21		*FSES n=137*		*COMPARATOR n=344*		*FSES n=433*	
QUESTION	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
This school is a good school	**100%**	0%	90%	6%	**87%**	8%	88%	8%
Most pupils are happy to go to the school	**100%**	0%	92%	4%	**90%**	3%	91%	6%
Many families would like to send their children to this school	**100%**	0%	**74%**	**16%**	**80%**	12%	**64%**	**26%**
The teachers try hard to help pupils learn	100%	0%	98%	1%	98%	1%	98%	1%
There are other adults in school who help pupils to learn	100%	0%	98%	1%	97%	1%	98%	1%
The teachers will always help children with their personal problems	81%	19%	79%	16%	75%	18%	80%	17%
In this school there are other adults who help children with personal problems	100%	0%	96%	1%	95%	2%	99%	0%
In this school, adults listen to children and young people	86%	5%	95%	1%	92%	3%	94%	4%
In this school, it is usually possible to get good support for pupils from other agencies	86%	10%	78%	%	77%	10%	83%	10%
In this school there are many extra activities outside ordinary lessons	86%	14%	92%	4%	84%	11%	89%	9%
Many children take part in these extra activities	**76%**	24%	77%	15%	**63%**	26%	70%	22%
The extra activities are interesting for the full range of pupils	**71%**	24%	64%	24%	**60%**	30%	69%	24%
In this school, parents and teachers often talk to each other	71%	24%	82%	12%	72%	21%	79%	16%
The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems	**71%**	24%	83%	4%	**60%**	22%	75%	13%
Parents are made to feel welcome by the school	86%	10%	96%	1%	85%	8%	93%	3%
The school listens to what parents have to say	86%	10%	86%	9%	83%	8%	90%	3%
In this school, many people who live in the area take part in activities offered by the school	**81%**	14%	58%	25%	**46%**	34%	49%	36%
The activities offered by the school are interesting for a wide range of people	**86%**	14%	70%	17%	**50%**	33%	66%	20%
The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications	**86%**	14%	74%	12%	**49%**	31%	67%	20%

The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems	52%	38%	69%	14%	47%	31%	67%	17%
People who live in the area think this is a good school	**100%**	0%	61%	20%	**72%**	12%	55%	26%
Offering support to pupils' learning outside lessons takes up a lot of my time	**76%**	24%	49%	36%	**59%**	34%	51%	39%
Dealing with pupils' personal and family problems takes up a lot of my time	43%	57%	36%	50%	35%	57%	37%	54%
Running activities for pupils outside lessons takes up a lot of my time	29%	**71%**	30%	54%	38%	**55%**	31%	59%
Running activities for adults takes up a lot of my time	**24%**	**71%**	8%	74%	**3%**	**85%**	11%	77%
I would like to spend less time on these things	**38%**	57%	16%	55%	**12%**	63%	14%	63%
I would like to spend more time on these things (if time allowed)	**67%**	29%	42%	34%	**45%**	32%	49%	30%

Note: differences of 8% or more between administrations are shown in bold

Annex A: details of questionnaire samples

Table 1. Responses to the 2005/6 questionnaire

	Comparators	FSESs
Pupils: total	1567	2247
primary	81	175
secondary	1484	2072
girls	768	1076
boys	780	1142
Parents: total	263	511
primary	25	81
secondary	238	430
Staff: total	344	433
primary	38	106
secondary	306	327

Note: totals may be different from the sum of component sub-groups where data are missing

Table 2. Responses to the 2006/7 questionnaire

	Comparators	FSESs
Pupils: total	442	504
primary	46	113
secondary	396	391
girls	194	251
boys	244	241
Parents: total	43	180
primary	5	14
secondary	38	166
Staff: total	21	137
primary	2	50
secondary	19	87

Note: totals may be different from the sum of component sub-groups where data are missing

Annex B: pupil, parent and staff questionnaires (2005/6 administration versions)

Note: these questionnaires have been reformatted for use in this report. Content and response mode remain unchanged.

Pupil Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire about your views on your school.
Please fill in the following:

I am   female ☐   male ☐

My YEAR group is:

Year 3 ☐ Year 4 ☐ Year 5 ☐ Year 6 ☐ Year 7 ☐ Year 8 ☐ Year 9 ☐ Year 10 ☐ Year 11 ☐

My road name is ⬜

My postcode is ⬜

What to do now
All of these statements are about your school and how you feel about it.
Please read the following statements. Please put a 'tick' in either the 'Agree' or 'Disagree' box alongside each statement.
Please answer as honestly as you can.

Example:

 Agree   Disagree

√	☐	*I like watching TV*

Section 1: About the school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   This school is a good school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Most pupils are happy to come to this school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Other people would like to come to this school

Section 2: Support for learning

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The teachers here try hard to help you learn

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   There are other adults here who help you to learn

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   You can get help with learning outside lesson time

Section 3: Personal Support

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The teachers here will always try to help you with your personal problems

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school there are other adults who help you with
personal problems

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school, adults listen to children and young people

Section 4: Activities

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school there are extra activities outside lesson time (eg
study support, sports/arts clubs, breakfast/youth clubs, health clubs)

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐ Many pupils take part in these extra activities

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The extra activities are interesting for people like me

Section 5: Parents

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and
family problems

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Parents think this is a good school

Section 6: People who live in the area

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school, some people who live in the area take part in
activities (eg adult education, social and/or health related activities, ICT, sports, arts)

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with
their family problems

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   People who live in the area think this is a good school

Section 7: About me

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   I think I am good at learning

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   I expect to get good qualifications when I am older

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   I expect to stay on at school or college after I am 16

Any other comments

Parent/Carer's Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire about your views on your child's school.
Please fill in the following:

I am   female ☐ male   ☐

My 1st child is a   girl ☐ boy   ☐   My 1st child is in:

Year 3 ☐ Year 4 ☐ Year 5 ☐ Year 6 ☐ Year 7 ☐ Year 8 ☐ Year 9 ☐ Year 10 ☐ Year 11 ☐

My 2nd child is a   girl ☐ boy   ☐   My 2nd child is in:

Year 3 ☐ Year 4 ☐ Year 5 ☐ Year 6 ☐ Year 7 ☐ Year 8 ☐ Year 9 ☐ Year 10 ☐ Year 11 ☐

What to do now

Please read the following statements. Place a 'tick' in either the 'Agree' box or the 'Disagree' box alongside each statement. Please complete both sides of the questionnaire. Please answer as honestly as you can.

Example:

Agree   Disagree

√		*Watching TV is enjoyable*

Section 1: About the school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   This school is a good school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Most pupils are happy to go to the school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Most families would like to send their children to this school

Section 2: Support for Learning

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The teachers try hard to help pupils learn

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   There are other adults in school who help pupils to
learn

Section 3: Personal Support

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The teachers will always help children with their personal problems

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school there are other adults who help children with their personal problems

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school, adults listen to children and young people

Section 4: Activities

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school there are some extra activities for pupils outside lesson time (eg study support, sports/arts clubs, breakfast/youth clubs, health clubs)

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Many children take part in these extra activities

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The extra activities are interesting for children like mine

Section 5: Parents

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school, parents and teachers often talk to one another (formally or informally)

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Parents are made to feel welcome by the school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The school listens to what parents have to say

Section 6: People who live in the area

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school, many people who live in the area take part in activities (eg adult education, social and/or health related activities, ICT, sports, arts)

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The activities offered by the school are interesting for people like me

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems (eg child/family/personal problems)

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   People who live in the area think this is a good school

Any other comments

Staff Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire about your views on your school.
Please fill in the following:

I am   female ☐   male   ☐

My role is: teacher ☐ teaching assistant   ☐   mentor ☐   other   ☐
                                                            please state_____

My management responsibilities:

No formal responsibilities   ☐Middle management (i.e. head of year, lead mentor)   ☐

Senior manager   ☐

What to do now
Please read the following statements. Please put a 'tick' in either the 'Agree' or
'Disagree' box alongside each statement.
Please answer as honestly as you can.

Section 1: About the school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   This school is a good school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Most pupils are happy to go to the school

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   Many families would like to send their children to this school

Section 2: Support for Learning

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The teachers try hard to help pupils learn

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   There are other adults in school who help pupils to learn

Section 3: Personal Support

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   The teachers will always help children with their personal problems

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school there are other adults who help children with personal
                    problems

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school, adults listen to children and young people

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school, it is usually possible to get good support for pupils from
                    other agencies

Section 4: Activities

Agree   Disagree
☐   ☐   In this school there are many extra activities outside ordinary lessons

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Many children take part in these extra activities

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The extra activities are interesting for the full range of pupils

Section 5: Parents

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school, parents and teachers often talk to each other

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The school tries hard to help parents with their personal and family problems

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Parents are made to feel welcome by the school

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The school listens to what parents have to say

Section 6: People who live in the area

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   In this school, many people who live in the area take part in activities offered by the school (eg adult education, social and/or health related activities, ICT, sports, arts)

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The activities offered by the school are interesting for a wide range of people

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The school helps people who live in the area to learn things and gain qualifications

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   The school tries hard to help people who live in the area with their problems (eg child's, family, personal problems)

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   People who live in the area think this is a good school

Section 7: My role

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Offering support to pupils' learning outside lessons takes up a lot of my time

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Dealing with pupils' personal and family problems takes up a lot of my time

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Running activities for pupils outside lessons takes up a lot of my time

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   Running activities for adults takes up a lot of my time

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   I would like to spend less time on these things

Agree   Disagree

☐   ☐   I would like to spend more time on these things (if time allowed)

Any other comments