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Evaluation of the Extended Schools Pathfinder Projects

Executive Summary

Background

Extended schools offer services to pupils, their families and local communities over and above their ‘core business’ of teaching the curriculum during the normal school day. As such, they have a long history in England and elsewhere, though under a range of names (village colleges, community schools, full service schools and so on). Following the Schools Plus report (DfEE 1999), there has been a series of initiatives to promote the development of such schools.

In the 2002-3 school year, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) sponsored twenty five local education authorities (LEAs) to develop extended schools pathfinder projects. Each project was free to determine the focus of its work, though particular encouragement was offered to initiatives that would lead to:

- schools that are open to pupils, families and the wider community during and beyond the school day, before and after school hours, at weekends and during school holidays;
- activities aimed particularly at vulnerable groups, in areas of deprivation and/or where services are limited;
- the promotion of community cohesion by building links between schools and the wider community;
- the provision of services to communities;
- a contribution to neighbourhood renewal; and
- a positive effect on educational standards.

This report is the outcome of an evaluation of the pathfinder initiative carried out by a team from the Universities of Manchester and Newcastle with colleagues from the University of Brighton. In the course of the evaluation, the research team visited all twenty five projects and undertook more detailed case studies of ten projects. Documentary evidence relating to each project were analysed, interviews carried out with key stakeholders (including users) and outcomes data assessed where these were available.

What Pathfinders do

In practice, most projects built upon previous work in this field and continued their work, using other sources of funding, after the formal end date. Many activities were targeted at pupils and were focused directly or indirectly on learning. Overall, the commonest activities included breakfast clubs, after school and holiday activities for pupils, family learning, adult education, childcare and community use of school facilities. The ‘full-service’ school in which community services are located on the school site was less common, though many schools were working towards this.
Some of the principal features of the pathfinders were these:

- **Numbers of schools** involved in each LEA ranged from one to over twenty. The project as a whole involved a total of more than 200 schools, of which three-quarters were primary schools and a quarter secondary schools. Five special schools were also involved. In about half of the LEAs some or all participating schools were working in clusters.

- **Leadership** was located at LEA level in the sense that funding was channelled through the LEA to participating schools. In the majority of cases, the pathfinder project fed into a wider LEA (or wider local authority) strategy to develop extended schools and/or to tackle educational and social issues in their areas. Despite the importance of the LEA role, schools were active partners in steering the majority of projects and in six of them schools took the dominant role.

- Projects tended to set up dedicated management structures. These varied considerably but tended to be based on some mixture of an LEA co-ordinator, school co-ordinator(s), oversight by the school’s senior management team and reporting to a steering group drawn from participating schools and stakeholders. In some cases, teachers and/or community link workers were employed or seconded to work on the project.

- In the majority of the projects, **funding** from the DfES initiative was combined with funding from other sources to support extended schools. The principal use of funding was to employ or release staff to manage the initiative rather than to fund particular activities. In many cases, this meant that there was little delivery of new activities in the (brief) life of the project. However, these staff were often engaged in supporting existing activities or were involved in building some kind of infrastructure to support delivery at a later date.

- **Almost all projects included schools in disadvantaged areas.** However, in some LEAs at least some of the participating schools were in more advantaged areas. Likewise, most participating LEAs were predominantly urban, but at least five included rural schools in the project. In about a quarter of the projects, issues to do with ethnicity and/or community cohesion were significant.

The pathfinders varied in the extent to which they aimed simply to enhance what was on offer to their pupils, families and communities in the short term or bring about long-term transformations in cultures, values and conditions – though many projects aimed to do both. Transformatory goals were by definition ambitious, yet seen as necessary if extended schools were to have sustained and substantial impact. They tended to lead to the adoption of a strategic multi-agency and multi-initiative approach. This was seen as the best way to ensure strategic planning of services, effective delivery, increased resources such as staffing, funding and equipment, long-term sustainability and the regeneration of disadvantaged communities. For some pathfinders, the development of links with other agencies and the formulation of a strategic framework was the key focus of the project. This involved informing other agencies about the extended schools initiative, learning about their agendas and identifying opportunities for collaboration.

There was a high level of both variation and overlap in the activities and approaches of individual projects. As a result, it was not possible to identify distinct ‘models’ of
extended school approaches. However, underpinning these differences was an emerging understanding of the task of extended schools. This task can be defined in the following terms:

An extended school maximises the curricular learning of its pupils by promoting their overall development and by ensuring that the family and community contexts within which they live are as supportive of learning as possible.

Similarly, all extended schools operated within a common ‘territory’, though they did so to different extents and in different ways. That territory can be mapped out in terms of the groups which the school seeks to benefit – children, families and/or communities – and by the domains across which it seeks to act – learning issues, social issues and/or health issues. This simple map may be useful to extended schools in deciding where they should weight their efforts – towards their ‘core business’ of teaching pupils within the curriculum or towards family and community domains which have a more indirect impact on learning. In turn, this may enable them to negotiate with their partners as to how their actions and priorities fit in with those of other agencies and organisations.

Impacts and Outcomes

Extended schools impacted on pupils, families and communities in a range of ways and generated positive outcomes for these groups. It was already possible to identify the following impacts and outcomes amongst others:

- For pupils, there was evidence that activities could have an impact on attainment, behaviour and attendance. In a school where the extended schools funding has been used to sustain a holiday revision scheme, there were reports of positive impacts on motivation and attainment. In another school, arts development work impacted positively on levels of attainment in arts, music and drama.
- For families, there was evidence that activities could have an impact on involvement in children’s learning. In projects which offered adult education, parents reported positive effects on their perceptions of themselves as learners and on their consequent ability to act as role models for their children.
- For communities, there was evidence that activities could have an impact on community pride and involvement. In one area where the local community were involved in planning the extended school, community members reported a growing sense of self-esteem and of control over decisions which affected their lives.

Such impacts and outcomes were clear and immediate, but were necessarily limited in their scope. However, some projects and schools had more ambitious aims to make long term changes in aspirations, expectations and cultural attitudes to learning in families and communities. There were reasons to believe such outcomes might be possible. Activities which were already having immediate impacts often formed part of a sustainable, strategic approach which might well produce more fundamental change in the longer term. These long-term outcomes are likely to be more difficult to identify and may well be attributable to other initiatives as well as to the extended school approach. Nonetheless, in some cases, projects and schools were close to being able to articulate a ‘theory of change’, showing how their actions would interact with
other local initiatives to bring about a series of changes and ultimately generate these ambitious outcomes. Developing such a theory might be an important step for all schools and projects seeking to work on a large scale.

**Emerging Issues and Conclusion**

Many projects experienced the sorts of teething problems that might be expected in a new initiative. However, these were being tackled vigorously by teachers and LEA officers who were ‘enthusiasts’ for the extended schools approach. In terms of subsequent national roll-out, however, two issues emerge from the experience of the pathfinders:

- The development of extended schools is a serious and ambitious venture. As such, it requires dedicated management structures, the deployment of co-ordinators with appropriate levels of time and expertise, a thorough process of community consultation, a willingness to invest in genuine partnerships with other agencies and an embedding of school activities in wider local strategies. It also requires the production of viable long-term plans and co-ordination of funding streams to support a long-term strategy.

- Given the ambitious nature of these developments, there are aspects of current national policies and structures which need consultation. These include the time-limited nature of additional funding, the wider context of initiative-led funding, the different priorities of agencies working with the same communities, and the failure in some cases of extended schools to engage with or be engaged by local strategies.

**The evaluation leads to a number of overall conclusions:**

- There is good reason to believe that extended schools have important positive effects and represent a good return on a relatively low level of additional funding. In order to determine their long-term effects, however, a longitudinal and wider-ranging evaluation strategy than has been possible here is needed.

- Where extended schools are more ambitious in terms of their aims, it is important that they develop dedicated leadership structures. The role of the co-ordinator is important not only in terms of attracting and co-ordinating funding but also to reduce the management burden on existing leadership teams.

- Many projects have found that the development of extended schools is an important catalyst for enhancing collaboration between education and other agencies. The key to developing partnerships seems to be a careful and sustained process of trust-building where partners seek to understand each other’s aims, priorities and working methods. This is difficult given the pressures under which all agencies are working, so it is important that the process is given ample time and develops through a series of progressively more ambitious initiatives.

- Although the point of delivery for activities is the school, local authorities have a key role to play in enabling extended schools to develop. They can give a lead in encouraging schools down this route, help plan local strategies within which the work of schools is embedded, network schools with other schools and agencies, link schools to communities, provide specialist expertise and advice, give a lead on the management of funding and assist schools with the evaluation of their work. Some authorities have appointed co-ordinators to lead this work, others ask existing officers to take a lead, others again see the
development of extended schools as part of wider initiatives such as the development of integrated children’s and families’ departments. There are clear implications for the way the role of the LEA is currently defined.

- It is particularly important that extended schools do not fall into the trap of imposing professional views of what is ‘needed’ on the communities they serve. Genuine community consultation and participation are necessary but as this is difficult to achieve, many schools find it helpful to work with partners who are more experienced in this field.

- The experience of these projects suggests that in some cases it may be sensible to plan for a significant lead-in time before delivery can begin. This is particularly the case if schools have not previously been involved in extended activities or if major new initiatives are planned.

- As extended school approaches become more widespread and ambitious, viewing them as time-limited and additionally-funded ‘projects’ may become less effective. It may be more productive to see extended activities as central to the role of every school (albeit to varying degrees) and a different funding model may need to be found to reflect this new understanding. In this case, there is the possibility of a real development in the way in which schools relate to their communities and set about educating their pupils.
Evaluation of the Extended Schools Pathfinder Projects

1. Background to the evaluation

1.1 The policy background
‘Extended schools’ and their equivalents have a long history in England, stretching back until at least the 1920s. At that time, Cambridgeshire, under the guidance of Henry Morris, established a series of ‘village colleges’ which were intended not only to provide schooling for largely rural communities, but also to house a range of community facilities and act as focal points for their communities. This idea, in different guises was subsequently taken up in a range of other local education authorities (LEAs), such as Devon, Coventry, Leicestershire and Northumberland. By the 1970s, many LEAs had invested in some form of community schooling, commonly by locating adult education services on school sites, sometimes using schools to act as focal points in disadvantaged areas and occasionally by encouraging a high degree of interaction between schooling for children, adult education and community use.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, changes in curriculum, funding and governance throughout the education system meant that schools and their LEAs tended to focus most of their energies on what was happening within schools and, particularly, on how effectively a prescribed curriculum was taught. Although, therefore, all schools were concerned with how they interacted with local communities and some continued to have an explicit community role, community schooling as such became less prominent. This situation changed after 1997 when the new government began a series of initiatives – Education Action Zones, Excellence in Cities, the Beacon Schools scheme, the Healthy Schools programme, the Specialist Schools programme to name but a few. These initiatives encouraged schools to become more outward looking and began to re-focus attention on the relationship between schools and the communities they serve and, in particular, on the ways in which schools could help tackle disadvantage. In the same way, in 1998 the Scottish Office embarked on an experiment to develop ‘New Community Schools’, with 62 pilot projects in the first phase and followed by an extension to all schools in Scotland from 2001 with a funding of £30.6 million.

This revived interest was signalled most clearly in England by the ‘Schools Plus’ report, produced by the then Department for Education and Employment as part of its contribution to the emerging National Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (DFEE 1999). The report argued that schools serving disadvantaged areas had a key role to play in ‘building learning communities’ and that they could do this by extending the range of ways in which they sought to engage both their pupils and local communities in learning. Subsequently, the White Paper, Schools Achieving Success (DFES 2001) made a commitment that the government would initiate legislation removing barriers to schools wishing to develop community links and would “establish pilots to test out such ‘extended schools’ and to generate examples of good practice” (8.16). In the same year, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned four
voluntary agencies to work in partnership in six primary schools to test the effectiveness of a team approach in developing Schools Plus activities for schools in disadvantaged neighbourhoods (Shaw et al. 2003). In the meantime, the Local Government Association, as part of its ‘six commitments’ programme, focused on the development of ‘schools for the community’ in seven pathfinder LEAs.

In the first part of 2002, DfES established Extended Schools Demonstration Projects in three LEA areas to explore the benefits and issues which arose when schools offer a wide range of services to pupils, their families and communities. The current research team undertook a study of these projects which came to the conclusion that extended approaches deserved further exploration, outlined some alternative ways of conceptualising those approaches and identified some issues that schools, LEAs and central government might wish to address (Dyson et al. 2002). Subsequently, DfES issued guidance to schools, LEAs and others involved in the development of extended approaches, building on the new opportunities opened up by the 2002 Education Act (DfES 2002a, 2002b) giving powers to governing bodies to extend school services.

Taking this work forward, DfES funded 25 LEAs – including the seven LGA pathfinders – to undertake ‘Extended Schools Pathfinder Projects’ in 2002/3. A full list of participating LEAs is presented in appendix 1. The pathfinders were to test out a range of extended approaches in order to provide information on the impact on pupils, families and communities, the processes involved in developing extended approaches, the structures through which such approaches can best be managed, the nature of relationships with other initiatives and local partners and the issues in funding extended approaches. Subsequently, DfES has embarked on an initiative to fund one ‘full service extended school’ in each LEA in a rolling programme between 2003/4 and 2005/6. It is, however, the DfES pathfinder projects which are the subject of this report.

The pathfinder initiative aimed to extend the family and community services that are provided on schools’ premises for the benefit of pupils, their families and other members of the community. The specification for the projects was relatively open and offered an opportunity for LEAs and schools to develop in ways consistent with their own needs and policies. However, particular encouragement was offered to initiatives that would lead to:

- schools that are open to pupils, families and the wider community during and beyond the school day, before and after school hours, at weekends and during school holidays;
- activities aimed particularly for vulnerable groups, in areas of deprivation and/or where services are limited;
- the encouragement of on-going work that promotes community cohesion by building links between schools and the wider community;
- the provision of services to communities;
- a contribution to neighbourhood renewal; and
- a positive effect on educational standards.

The following examples of possible initiatives were given: childcare, study support, health and social services (particularly through on-site multi-agency teams), adult education and family learning, sports, leisure and arts activities and police in schools.
Funding of £200,000 was made available to projects with an additional £25,000 to fund childcare activities. The funding was intended to support:

- a co-ordinator at school or LEA level (the DFES communication emphasised the importance that teaching staff would not be burdened with this work);
- time and work to lever funding from other sources;
- capital and revenue costs – refurbishment, equip, security, care-taking, heating, lighting; and
- transport costs to enable children to make use of extended services out of school hours.

The funding was notionally made available to support activities over an 8 month period in the first part of 2003. In practice, however, projects often built on ongoing work, drew on multiple sources of funding and have continued their activities after the formal end date.

1.2 The literature on extended schools

Although the literature on extended schools per se is necessarily limited, there is a substantial literature on other forms of community-oriented schooling such as community schools and full-service schools. This literature was recently reviewed thoroughly in a DfES-sponsored study which also mapped out the current extent of ‘full-service’ schooling in England (Wilkin et al. 2003a, 2003b). All we seek to do here, therefore, is to highlight a small number of themes which relate directly to the concerns of the current evaluation:

1. Defining ‘extended schools’

As we have seen, there is a long history of schools’ offering what are currently called ‘extended’ activities and services, particularly in terms of engaging more fully with the communities they serve. The range of such activities has been impressive, regardless of whether schools have been part of funded initiatives or not (see, for instance, Ball 1998, Wilkin et al 2003a). However, neither in England nor in other countries has a single, definitive model of extended schools emerged. Even where initiatives are badged under a single name – as in the case of New Community Schools in Scotland or ‘full-service’ schools in the USA – the label tends to conceal a considerable degree of diversity. It would seem that initiatives tend to promote broadly common approaches, but that the local contexts of schools and communities inevitably produce variations within those approaches. This was certainly the case, for instance in the Extended School Demonstration Projects (Dyson et al 2002) where the three LEAs involved worked in very different ways and where there were significant differences between the activities undertaken by the schools in each project.

2. Outcomes from extended schools

As Wilkin et al (2003b) point out, much of the literature on extended schools (however labelled) tends to be descriptive, advisory or exhortatory. Such evaluative work as there is tends to focus on process rather than outcome issues. To some extent, this is because of the diversity described above; if every extended school is different from every other one, then there is no model which can be evaluated robustly across a range of contexts. However, it is also because of the inherent difficulty of identifying outcomes from initiatives such as these. This is to do with the typically multi-strand nature of extended school activities, the complex contexts (often characterised by the presence of many other related initiatives) in which they operate and the typically short time-span of educational evaluations. This does not mean that there is not good
evidence of positive outcomes from particular activities undertaken by extended schools. As we shall see, we know a good deal, for instance about the impacts of increasing parental involvement in children’s learning. However, there is very little evidence available about the overall impact on children, families and communities of extended schools (and their equivalents) per se.

3. Parental involvement in schooling
One area where there is reasonably strong evidence is on the value of parental involvement in children’s schooling (Desforges with Abouchaar 2003, Dyson & Robson 1999). Although such involvement is, of course, not dependent on a schools’ being formally designated as ‘extended’, many extended schools do in fact undertake activities designed to involve parents. The general trend of this evidence is to indicate that children whose parents are actively involved in their education tend to do better than those whose parents remain disengaged. Moreover, the evidence seems to suggest that initiatives aimed at increasing parents’ involvement can be effective and can have some direct impacts on children’s attainments.

4. Schools and communities
The evidence for schools’ impacts on their communities is less straightforward. There is some evidence that the attractiveness of schools has an impact on the desirability (or otherwise) of particular neighbourhoods and, that this impact can, in certain cases, be traced in house prices (Gibbons & Machin 2004). It is also clear that schools can offer a range of facilities and services to local communities and that they can have multiple positive impacts on particular children and families. What is less certain, however, is the extent to which schools alone can have more fundamental effects by, for instance, acting as engines for regeneration in disadvantaged communities or making substantial differences to large numbers of residents (Crowther et al. 2003). There are also doubts about the strength of relationship between schools and communities insofar as this is indicated by the involvement of those communities in formal and informal governance (Dyson & Robson 1999).

5. Collaboration with other agencies
Although collaboration with agencies beyond education is not a necessary feature of extended schools (at least in the pathfinder project), it is in fact central to the work of many. The evidence suggests that various forms of partnership and collaboration can be established successfully and have benefits for professionals, children and families. However, these collaborations are fraught with difficulties because of the different professional cultures across agencies, the different priorities, different target and client groups and different management, funding and accountability systems (see, for instance, (Riddell & Tett 2001) for a useful review of recent developments). Successful collaborations, therefore, tend either to be in clearly bounded areas with tight procedures, or to depend on a high level of local initiative and supportive contexts (Easen et al. 2000).

6. An overview
In general, then, the literature on extended schools and related areas is full of intriguing possibilities. There are indications that new ways of working may be possible and that they may well have positive impacts. Certainly, there is enough evidence to suggest that this is a field that is worth further exploration. However, what we do not yet have are robust evaluations of the overall impacts of extended schools.
which allows us to say that they have specific, major impacts, much less that one or other variant of such schools is the most effective or most fitted for given circumstances. In this situation, as Wilkin et al (2003b) point out, there is scope for a good deal of further research, particularly in the form of longitudinal studies tracing the impacts of extended schools over time.

1.3 The evaluation
An evaluation of the pathfinder projects was commissioned from a team at the University of Newcastle (though Alan Dyson moved during the course of the project to the University of Manchester) with support in design and the collection and interpretation of data from the Education Policy and Evaluation Unit at the University of Brighton. In this evaluation DfES wished to assess:

- the impact of the projects on a range of pupil outcomes;
- the impact on teaching and learning;
- the impact on community cohesion and regeneration;
- the attitudes of parents and other community members towards the schools;
- the funding of extended approaches (including capital costs);
- relationships with key local partners;
- relationship/integration with other key initiatives in the area;
- processes involved in setting up the provision of services on the school premises;
- the barriers that are encountered and ways in which these barriers are overcome; and
- the management structures adopted by schools and LEAs, including clustering arrangements.

The evaluation extended over 12 months from the end of November 2002 to December 2003. Fieldwork took place between January and September 2003 to coincide with the eight-month period of funding for LEAs from December 2002.

The research team looked at the research questions in terms of:

- Activities – what was happening in each pathfinder; how extended schools accessed and managed various funding sources to support their work; and the organisational and management structures that were developed at school and LEA level to support extended approaches
- Processes – what facilitated and what inhibited the development of extended schools; what the effect was of different management structures, funding approaches, relationships with partners, focus of activities and other processes on the resulting extended schools;
- Outcomes - questions about how extended approaches impact on different stakeholders, notably on pupils (in terms of achievement, attendance, behaviour and so on), but also on families, communities, schools and other community agencies.

A two phase evaluation was undertaken to enable all projects and their supportive structures to be described and then to allow a smaller group of projects to be looked at in more detail:
Phase 1 was concerned with establishing a good understanding of the nature of each project, its historical background, current activities, structures, processes, aims and evaluation intentions. Plans submitted by LEAs to DfES, Ofsted and other official reports on project schools, LEAs and key partner organisations, and web sites maintained by project schools and LEAs were reviewed. This produced an overview of context, project aims, structures, activities, partners and evaluation plans. Visits took place to all projects to interview:

- relevant LEA officers;
- head teachers and other key staff in project schools;
- relevant staff in partner organisations;
- a sample of key stakeholders (parents, pupils, governors and community members)

The support of the schools and LEAs was sought in arranging access to stakeholders and the evaluation aimed for a good representation of stakeholder groups across projects rather than in each project individually. Although formal local evaluations were not a requirement of funding, all projects reported to DfES and many set up their own internal monitoring and evaluation processes. Where local evaluations were commissioned, the research team negotiated access to their data and findings.

Phase 2 was concerned with studying in greater depth projects identified in phase 1 as particularly important and illuminating. The purposes of these case studies were:

- to explore in greater detail the process issues;
- to identify any emerging outcomes from projects; and
- to ensure that the full range of stakeholders (parents, pupils, governors, partner agencies & community members) is represented in our data - though not necessarily in every project.

The original intention was that case study projects would be selected to represent different ‘types’ of project emerging from phase 1 evidence. In the event, the diversity of and within projects meant that clear-cut types did not emerge (see chapter 2). However, it was possible to select projects which displayed a particular focus on generating outcomes for one or other target group (i.e. pupils, families or communities) and which were illustrative of one or other important process issue. This is not to say, of course, that these projects were not interesting in other aspects of their work, but selecting in this way enabled us to pursue particular issues in our visits.

The following table shows which case studies were selected and the rationale for each in terms of the outcomes focus and salient process issues:

---

1 Here and throughout the report, the names of participating LEAs are anonymised in accordance with usual research practice. However, some named case studies (not generated by this evaluation) and other guidance materials are available at the DfES extended schools web site: http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/extendedschools.
Table 1. Case study project foci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Outcomes focus</th>
<th>Process issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Multi-agency working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Special school included, multi-agency working &amp; strategic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 5</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Special school included, some rural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 11</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Governance issues, some rural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 15</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Consortium of schools, some rural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 16</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Multi-agency working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 19</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Leadership issues, some rural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 20</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Strategic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 24</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Community consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 25</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Producing its own guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These more detailed case studies involved interviews with LEA officers and school leaders to establish a strategic context, interviews with activity leaders to understand processes and interviews with participating children, families and community members. Further review of documentary evidence (e.g. plans) and quantitative data (e.g. participation rates) relating to these activities was carried out. Developments and outcomes were investigated at three levels - the level of the project as a whole, the level of the participating school and the level of the individual activity.

In addition to these detailed case studies, phase 2 was also concerned with reviewing developments and outcomes (including those not represented in quantitative data) in all projects towards the end of their lifetime. Although all projects were reviewed in this way, investigations were weighted to focus on projects most likely to be illuminating in respect of the research questions.

Much of the evaluation was concerned with identifying, describing and analysing the key features of projects and the process issues to which they give rise. However, we also wished to consider what outcomes the projects were generating. This was, however, problematic for a number of reasons:

- The funded projects were of short duration, which limited the possibility for them to produce identifiable outcomes.
- The evaluation extended only slightly beyond the life time of the projects, making it difficult to identify anything other than very short-term outcomes.
- There was no possibility for the evaluation team to collect base line data and no requirements on projects themselves to do so.
Typically, projects were embedded in the context of many other initiatives, so that attributing outcomes to extended schools *per se* was difficult.

Projects often involved a number of schools and an even larger number of separate activities. It was beyond our resources to evaluate all of these and, even had we done so, we would then have been faced with the challenge of aggregating to the level of the extended school or the LEA project.

Our solution was to adopt a ‘theory of change’ approach (Connell & Kubisch 1999) wherever possible, particularly in the evaluation of case study projects. This approach rests on specifying the ‘theory’ which links the actions that are taken to the series of changes that are expected to follow from those actions and thence to the outcomes that are anticipated. Where there has not yet been time for outcomes to emerge, tracking the changes gives a good indication as to whether such outcomes are likely in the future. Likewise, setting out the chain of action and change makes it easier to attribute any outcomes which do emerge to the actions that have generated them.

With this in mind, we approached each project with a set of questions in mind:

*Process issues:*

- What developments have there been, particularly in relation to important process issues?
- What factors have helped and hindered these developments and how have these been managed?
- What views do stakeholders other than school and LEA professionals express of these developments?
- What could other projects learn from this project’s experience?

*Outcomes:*

- What outcomes have there already been from the project and how can these be substantiated (e.g. changes in pupil attainment, anecdotal evidence of benefits to the community)?
- For these outcomes and, particularly, for those which are anticipated but have not yet had time to emerge, what are the intermediate changes that have led or will lead to these outcomes (i.e. what is the theory of change)? Which of these changes have occurred and what evidence is there for these changes?
- What do stakeholders other than school and LEA professionals see as the main outcomes from the project?

In the following chapter, we draw on the answers we elicited in order to characterise the pathfinder projects and work towards a definition of extended schools. In chapters 3 and 4 we report on the process issues which the evaluation identified and on the outcomes that the projects were beginning to generate. In the final chapter, we draw out what we see as the main implications of the pathfinder initiative.
2. The Pathfinder Projects

Both the DfES specification for the pathfinder projects and the DfES guidance on extended schools are intended to be facilitative rather than prescriptive. They therefore make no attempt to set out any one preferred model of an extended school and place the emphasis on local decisions to meet local needs. This is in line with the finding from the literature that initiatives of this kind tend to take on many forms as schools explore what is possible and desirable in their own situations. Not surprisingly, therefore, the 25 extended schools pathfinder projects were extremely varied in a range of ways: the activities they undertook, the numbers of schools involved, the management structures that were put in place, the outcomes at which they aimed, and so on. It is also worth adding that projects commonly developed even over the brief time span for which they were funded.

This situation was complicated by the fact that projects have to be understood at three levels:

- the project level – that is, the overall approach adopted by the LEA;
- the school level – that is, the approach adopted by each school within the LEA project; and
- the activity level – that is the particular services and forms of provision offered by the school to its pupils and communities.

In some cases, there was a good deal of coherence between these levels, with a small number of schools offering a range of activities that were agreed as part of an overall LEA strategy. In other cases, however, a larger number of schools were encouraged to identify whatever activities seemed most appropriate, and might do so to meet the needs arising in a particular situation rather than as part of a long-term strategy.

In order to make sense of this diversity, we carried out two sorts of analysis:

- First, we tried to describe the surface features of projects and activities by analysing the initial plans submitted to DfES. The results of this analysis are set out in the next section.
- Second, we tried to capture major differences of style, aim and emphasis between projects by analysing not only the plans, but also what we were told by key decision-makers during our field visits. The results of this analysis are set out in the third section of this chapter.

One possible outcome of these analyses was that we would see some clear patterns emerging so that we could identify three or four ‘models’ or ‘types’ of extended school. In the event, as we indicated earlier, this turned out not to be the case. Projects did indeed differ in terms of these features and dimensions and these are, therefore, useful ways of discriminating between them. However, these differences did not cohere into distinct ‘types’. This is partly due to the sheer range of practice across the twenty five projects. However, it is also due to the variety within projects: although they all had some sort of coherence at LEA level, most involved a number of schools which justifiably went their own ways to greater or lesser extents. Even within each school there might be a range of activities with different features, aims, target groups and so on. Moreover, some extended school projects interacted
extensively with other funded projects and initiatives which added their own features and approaches to the mix.

This confirms, therefore, the common finding that terms such as ‘extended schools’ (or ‘full-service school’, or ‘community school’) act as umbrellas for a very wide range of practice. Despite this variety, we do think it is possible to identify a common task which all extended schools share. Moreover, although schools do not fall into distinct types, there is, we suspect, a single continuum along which their approaches to this task differ. This does not allow us to offer a set of clearly differentiated models of extended schools, but we do think the characterisation of the task and the differentiation of approaches are important for future development. We therefore set these out in the final section of this chapter.

2.1 Descriptive analysis
Each pathfinder project submitted a detailed initial plan which we analysed in terms of a range of descriptors in order to characterise the projects and any differences between them. This information was amended in the light of visits to each LEA. From this analysis, we produced a descriptive summary of all the projects involved and this is presented in appendix 2.

Some of the principal features of the pathfinders were these:

- **Numbers of schools** involved in each LEA ranged from one to over twenty. Since the funding available from DfES did not increase in proportion to the number of participating schools, this means that LEAs made different decisions about whether to concentrate their funds and energies in the hope of making a large difference in a few schools, or distribute funds and energies in the hope of catalysing a wide range of activities. The project involved a total of more than 200 schools, of which three-quarters were primary schools and a quarter secondary schools. A total of five special schools were also involved. In about half of the LEAs some or all participating schools were working in clusters.

- **Leadership** was located at LEA level in the sense that funding was channelled through the LEA to participating schools. In the majority of cases, the pathfinder project fed into a wider LEA (or wider local authority) strategy to develop extended schools and/or to tackle educational and social issues in their areas. Despite the importance of the LEA role, schools were active partners in steering the majority of projects and in six of them schools took the dominant role.

- Projects tended to set up dedicated *management structures*. These varied considerably but tended to be based on some mixture of an LEA co-ordinator, school co-ordinator(s), oversight by the school’s senior management team and reporting to a steering group drawn from participating schools and stakeholders. In some cases, teachers and/or community link workers were employed or seconded to work on the project.

- In the majority of the projects, *funding* from the DfES initiative was combined with funding from other sources to support extended schools. The principal use of funding was to employ or release staff to manage the initiative rather than to fund particular activities. In many cases, this meant that there was little delivery of new activities in the (brief) life of the project. However, these staff
were often engaged in supporting existing activities or were involved in building some kind of infrastructure to support delivery at a later date.

- Almost all projects had schools in disadvantaged areas. However, in some LEAs at least some of the participating schools were in more favoured areas. Likewise, most participating LEAs were predominantly urban, but at least five included rural schools in the project. In about a quarter of the projects, issues to do with ethnicity and/or community cohesion were significant.

- Although formal evaluations were not a condition of funding, about half of the projects proposed to undertake some reasonably rigorous evaluation process.

The range of activities undertaken by participating schools is indicated in appendix 3 where we list what was done in the most active schools in each project. The principal features which emerge from this list are:

- Activities which focused directly on pupils were the most common. Childcare was a feature of all projects and many offered extended activities to pupils that were directly learning-focused (as in after-school study support) or were likely to have an indirect impact on learning (as in breakfast clubs).

- Family learning activities were also widespread, alongside parenting support and more traditional adult education provision. Schools appeared to see activities involving parents and families as complementary to their efforts to provide additional support for children’s learning.

- Health-related activities were also widespread. Most were designed to benefit children and young people (such as drop-in and counselling services) though some were aimed at whole families (as in family therapy services) or at adults (such as a well women’s clinic).

- Some activities were delivered exclusively or in part by non-education professionals, such as school nurses or youth workers. BEST teams were involved in some schools, though there was less evidence of direct contributions to provision by social workers.

- At the project (i.e. LEA) level, there was considerable similarity in the range of activities being offered. At the school level, however, there was much more diversity, even amongst the most active schools. When other schools are taken into account, some of which were offering only a small number of activities, it is clear that what was on offer in different schools – and therefore in different areas – varied considerably.

### 2.2 Analytic dimensions in extended school projects

In our initial visits to the pathfinder projects, we were able to talk to LEA officers, head teachers and other key informants about what lay behind their plans in terms of rationale, aims, history of the initiative and so on. When we combined this information with that from the plans, it was possible to identify a limited number of underlying dimensions along which projects differed. The dimensions are presented in table 2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Pole 1</th>
<th>Pole 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On what issues does the project focus?</td>
<td>The project focuses on issues in and around the school and its pupils (e.g. attendance, attainment, behaviour, curriculum)</td>
<td>The project focuses on issues in the community (e.g. facilities, crime, employment, adult education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the scope of the project’s action?</td>
<td>The project responds to specific issues of immediate importance</td>
<td>The project forms part of an overarching response to underlying issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What interactions are there with other initiatives?</td>
<td>The project has clear boundaries and works largely in isolation from other initiatives</td>
<td>The project interacts with a range of other strategies and initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What agencies are involved in the project?</td>
<td>The project is largely the responsibility of education</td>
<td>The project involves a range of agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is the project’s agenda set?</td>
<td>The school sets the agenda and then involves others if necessary</td>
<td>The agenda is set outside the school and the school is then involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the nature of anticipated change?</td>
<td>The project seeks to enhance a situation that is already functional</td>
<td>The project seeks to transform a situation that is currently dysfunctional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following sections, we explore these dimensions in greater detail.

Focus of issues addressed
The focus, in terms of intended outcome of extended activity, could be on pupils, family communities, or most frequently, a combination of these. Raising the level of pupils’ attainment was a key concern of most of the pathfinders. However, it was seen as an objective that would take time to materialise. Raising levels of aspirations, motivation and self-esteem amongst pupils were outcomes shared by all pathfinders and tended to be seen as necessary steps along the way to raising attainment. Likewise, many projects also identified the need to engage parents in learning in order that they might be in a better position to assist with their children’s learning, and to help raise their own levels of aspirations. Projects seeking to meet the needs of the wider community developed their focus on the basis of an analysis of levels of need and existing provision within communities. This was seen as a pre-requisite to effective delivery.

There were examples of projects having an unequivocal focus on the wider community. One LEA (16), for example, saw the extended schools approach as a key feature of an area and city wide regeneration strategy. The development of a full service school in a particularly disadvantaged area was seen as fundamental to the survival of both the school and the community. The chair of governors at the school explained:

*Each service is valuable to the estate and valuable to the regeneration efforts and so the full service model will ensure the sustainability of the estate...But it is more than about sustainability we will actually see growth... Without the estate the school will fail and without the school the community will fail.*
LEA 1 offers another example of a project where the work of a number of schools was fully integrated into the community plan for the area. In this case, the focus was on economic regeneration and the intention was that schools would host the delivery of training for adults and would offer crèche facilities to enable parents to take advantage of that training. Schools were also planning to signpost parents and community members to other organisations that could offer support. Projects such as these tended to see extended schooling as, in the words of one informant a “catalyst for community regeneration”.

Other projects had more of a pupil focus but intended to expand their provision to parents and the wider community as it developed, or as resources increased. This was true in LEAs (5, 8 and 20) where a number of the school activities had a pupil focus as well as of LEA 19 where the aim was pupil empowerment and support and the development of employment-related skills for pupils. Moreover, activities which were primarily pupil focused could also impact positively on the community. In LEA 20, for example, a holiday school for disaffected pupils which was set up in conjunction with the community and youth liaison police officers had the effect of reducing crime over the summer period. There was a similar project in LEA 7 in term-time with a similar effect on crime. A safety project involving cycling proficiency was set up by pupils in a school in LEA 19 and benefited the whole community by enhancing safety in the area.

There were many instances where an activity focused on several client groups at the same time – pupils, parents, and the community. For example, there were a number of intergenerational learning projects where older adults, and parents had a key role in learning alongside the pupils, such as a visit to historical village with older community members, parents working with teachers and children to produce and talk about literacy-related activities, or intergenerational learning activities. A number of projects (such as LEAs 1, 5 and 8) also organised family learning days.

Scope of action and interactions with other initiatives
In practice, the scope of a project’s action and its tendency to interact with other initiatives tended to be related. Some projects – and, particularly, many activities – were stand alone, one off schemes which addressed a particular need and/or were seen as valuable in their own right. For instance, a primary school in a rural area (LEA 12) perceived a lack of good childcare facilities in the locality. It therefore decided to take over the existing provision offered privately on the school site, set up its own breakfast to early evening care provision together with daytime playgroups for pre-school children and house this provision in a purpose-built facility. This initiative, of course, was not undertaken without proper consultation but it was substantially free-standing and intended to meet a specific local need. A second, metropolitan authority (LEA 8) managed the project by inviting schools to submit expressions of interest and funding a relatively large number (sixteen) of these of these. The consequence was that much of the funding went to support activities such as joint learning opportunities between pupils and older adults in the community, courses to help parents support their children’s reading development and various visits and trips for pupils. All of these activities were valuable in their own right and related to the overall work of the schools. However, they had little explicit connection to broader strategies and initiatives.
Most of the projects, on the other hand were embedded into wider community or local authority strategies and as a consequence tended to interact extensively with initiatives within and beyond Education. A common rationale for the embedded approach to developing extended schooling was in order to create a strategic framework for planning and delivery and to maximise impact on proposed outcomes:

*The more we can embed initiatives into funding and planning the better...We have created a framework with a range of initiatives and they will make a big difference collectively.*

(Officer, LEA 10)

Projects might be embedded in an LEA-wide strategy for extended schools, in a local authority-wide regeneration strategy, or in community development schemes. There might also be a broader embedding in a range of initiatives undertaken by statutory, voluntary and community agencies. Local authorities, LEAs and schools often regarded the Extended Schools Project as the vehicle through which to engage in and develop effective 'joined up' thinking, planning and delivery:

*We feel that Extended Schools is the best chance the area has had. Social inclusion is a focus through Ofsted and various government initiatives and this [ES] has to work with the. It also has to link with regeneration initiatives - and it is. There is a genuine desire to help people move on from whatever start point they are at. Extended Schools is fully integrated.*

(Head, LEA 25)

There was consensus from projects that extended school approaches linked well with a range of educational initiatives aimed at addressing the difficulties experienced by children and young people in disadvantaged areas, such as Excellence in Cities, Behaviour Improvement Programme, Specialist Schools and Early Excellence Centres. These initiatives tended to be characterised by parental and community engagement, multi-agency working and focus on engaging children and young people in order to raise levels of attainment. One project, for instance, reported the following links between extended schools and other initiatives:

*Excellence Cluster links to extended schools; at last there is some coordination. We see extended schools, not as an isolated pot now and we have money from other initiatives to sustain the work. It’s all so crucial.*

(Head, LEA 25)

*BIP [Behaviour Improvement Programme], Children’s Centres, Gifted and Talented and the rest of EiC [Excellence in Cities] are all part of extended schools thinking*

(Head, LEA 25)

Projects also recognized the role that schools had in linking with local, regional and national neighbourhood renewal agendas:

*In terms of the basic core purpose of the poverty agenda, economic regeneration and extended schooling fit together and link to the council community plan.*

(Officer, LEA 1)

A consequence of these linkages was that projects commonly found it difficult to disaggregate their strategies in terms of the different initiatives out of which they were
built. One LEA (24), for instance, had a ‘Schools for the Community’ strategy of which the Extended Schools Pathfinder Project was a part. The DfES funding contributed to a pot of money drawn, amongst other sources, from Single Regeneration Budget, European Social Fund and New Opportunities Fund. Activities and workers were then financed through a combination of these funds, without the need to differentiate between which funding stream funded what activity. To some degree, all projects adopting an embedded approach depended upon multiple funding streams and the effective co-ordination of them. Likewise, it was not uncommon for individual schools to find it difficult to disaggregate the different initiatives contributing to their overall approaches. One secondary school, for example, discussed the support mechanisms which had been developed for pupils and their families as being the ‘Extended Schools’ project, and yet these developments were the result of a number of initiatives including Excellence in Cities (in particular the learning support unit and learning mentor support), Education Action Zone, and BIP (including the development of a Behaviour and Education Support Team). The deputy head at the school said:

*Extended schools is not seen as a separate initiative. It’s been absorbed into the work of Excellence in Cities and it’s become part of the learning support structure and links with the BEST team. It’s so important to ensure that they all fit together and that it fits in.*

In turn, measuring outcomes and attributing them to one or other of the initiatives was not always easy. Projects were, however, relatively unconcerned about this, seeing the effective generation of outcomes on the ground as more important than attribution for accountability purposes:

*When we get outcomes we will be able to say that it is the result of all initiatives working together. By pulling all of these things together we get good lead as we have capacity. You get much better value by managing strategically a range of funding streams.*

(Officer, LEA 10)

**Interaction with other agencies and agenda setting**

The scope of projects and their interactions with other initiatives tended also to be related to how far a range of agencies was involved in planning and/or delivery. In general terms, the more free-standing, tightly-focused projects and (especially) activities were driven from and delivered by schools themselves, while the more wide-ranging and strategically-oriented projects were planned at LEA or local authority level and involved a range of agencies.

However, this was not invariably the case. The drive and entrepreneurship of individual head teachers could sometimes lead them to plan ambitious projects and enlist the support of other agencies in their delivery. For instance, in LEA 5’s project the driving force was the head of a participating special school who was determined to transform his school by opening it to the local community and by becoming more fully involved with other schools and agencies. This involved a wide range of activities: outreach work in local mainstream schools, joint projects with other schools, setting up a crèche for local parents, holding coffee mornings, setting up a holiday scheme for children, and setting up an inter-agency one-stop shop for local parents. Other agencies were involved in the delivery of many of these activities and
the LEA, which has a long tradition of community schooling, was able to offer a supportive framework. However, the initiative was very much the head teacher’s.

Other projects, however, originated outside the school but involved the school as a very willing partner. LEA 16’s project, for instance, involved the location of a wide range of community services on the site of a school serving a highly disadvantaged social housing estate. The immediate impetus for the project came from the residents of the estate themselves, but this also was consistent with a long-term regeneration strategy devised by the council and coincided with the availability on non-Extended School Project funds from SRB. In all of this, the school was a very active partner but the project overall was described by a local authority representative as:

...led by the community with the support of officers.

The nature of anticipated change

Most of the pathfinders aimed both to bring about long-term transformations in cultures, values and conditions for their pupils and communities and to enhance what was on offer to them in the shorter term. Transformatory goals were by definition ambitious, yet seen as necessary if extended schools were to have sustained and substantial impact. For example, projects saw themselves as tackling a ‘culture of low aspirations’ in communities they served, increasing the value attached to education in disadvantaged areas, developing community cohesion and impacting significantly on levels of unemployment, poor health and high crime:

One of the things that we’ve going to have to look at through this, how we change the culture of the whole community...I want them to have different aspirations than they had when I came here...I think it’ll take another generation for that bulk of people to actually change it for their children. So it is this long-term change that will make this biggest impact...If there are these small pockets that seem to be intractable then it’s going to be long-term policies and long-term changes that’ll change them rather than the short term.

(Head, LEA 24)

Those aiming to address long-term, deep-seated, underlying issues, of course, tended also to adopt a strategic multi-agency and multi-initiative approach.

Without exception, projects regarded the extended schools initiative as an extension of existing provision for their pupils and for families and communities. Some pathfinders, perhaps serving less disadvantaged communities, saw little need for a wholesale transformatory approach but instead identified specific gaps in provision for young people and the wider community that extended schools could fill. For example, the leisure facilities at a school might be opened up for wider community use outside of the school day, not because the local community was seen as dysfunctional in any way, but because the school was in a position to add to the range or quality of facilities that were available. Similarly, some projects limited themselves to short-term enhancement goals which could be achieved within the timescale of the pathfinder project. As one head teacher explained:

It is a little pot of money which supports ongoing work and boosts it and improves resources. There isn’t long term expectation with it. The initiative is part of building the capacity of the school.
For some of these projects, enhancement was seen as an intermediate outcome of project and a precursor to more transformational outcomes which would develop over time.

**Immediate priority**

A final dimension along which projects differed was the extent to which their immediate priority was the delivery of activities as opposed to the development of an infrastructure which could form the basis of activities at some later date. This tended to relate partly to the underlying aims or overarching approach of the project and partly to what was judged feasible in the limited time for which DfES funding was available.

Not surprisingly, projects with a tighter focus were able to move into delivery mode much more quickly, as were projects which built new activities onto an existing infrastructure of extended approaches. However, the more ambitious the project was and the shorter the history on which it could build, the more likely it was that DfES funding would be used in the first instance for infrastructural development. In practice, this could mean a range of things, including:

- developing an LEA structure of personnel with responsibility for extended schools and appointment of staff;
- developing a strategy for planning and delivery at LEA, community and school level;
- engaging in community consultation;
- devising plans for sustainability;
- initiating and/or developing links with other agencies;
- managing and co-ordinating funding;
- developing plans for monitoring;
- developing structures for governance (e.g. attending to issues around health and safety, liability, insurance);
- setting up limited companies (e.g. for childcare);
- ensuring the building is suitable (safe and secure, equipped with adult sized furniture, attractive environment) for delivery; and
- developing referral systems for pupil and family support.

Many projects took the view that the development of infrastructure in this sense had to be their priority:

*If some activities actually start in this nine month period, then all well and good, but for me the priority was to make sure that the groundwork was done, possibly looking at alternative funding, because of the short nature of this funding, but having a clear idea of what we wanted to do once we got the facilities to actually start doing things.*

(Head, LEA 2)

This approach arose particularly where consultation with the community and/or with partners was likely to take time, or new build or adaptations were necessary to create appropriate facilities, or where it was important to secure a reliable funding stream before proceeding with ambitious plans. Given the presence of ‘a clear idea of what
we wanted to do’, however, this use of time and funding seemed to be sensible and productive rather than otherwise.

2.3 Defining extended schools
The broad differences between projects which we have described so far indicate the different ways in which they interpreted their task. They lead us to conclude that there is no single model of an extended school. However, there is a sense in which, although the interpretation differs, the underlying task is essentially the same. Across many – perhaps all – of the projects we found a shared basic understanding of what the role of schools might be in the current educational and social context. It is, we suggest, possible to define what makes a school ‘extended’ in terms of this understanding and to map out, if not a shared model of what an extended school should look like, at least a common view of the territory which such schools cover in somewhat different ways.

A number of informants expressed their thinking on these matters in what seemed to us to be interesting and important terms, and these are worth quoting at length:

_We can’t raise attainment without extended schools...It is all about giving children experiences they might not otherwise have had. It enables them to see that things can be different. They can lead very narrow lives and we are giving them a vision of what they can achieve. We are raising their self-esteem but our ultimate aim is to raise attainment...We have third generational unemployment and we need people to realise that there are some opportunities. We must help them to help themselves...Schools seem like the only focal point of the community._

(Head, LEA 25)

…it’s about helping to get children into classrooms in a better position to succeed and achieve. You may have a child at a non-extended school who goes into a lesson and the teacher does all of the right things, but because of the fact that they haven’t had any breakfast...after school they have not got anywhere to go, or they’re not well but no-one has time to take them to a doctor, or they’re depressed or bullied, whatever it is. If that same child is going to an extended school, some of those needs will be met...It’s about getting children into a condition to learn more effectively by supporting their families. We have so many in poverty. To try and do something about addressing those needs is important.

(Officer, LEA 2)

_Drugs, drink, crime, housing, health all link to children’s attendance and behaviour and attainment. We had to do something about these problems. We can’t do this properly unless we focus on the education of the whole child to meet their different needs. As a head I couldn’t do it all so I needed to make links with other agencies. All I did was write to everyone and hold a meeting for all interested in helping meet the needs of children and their families._

(Head, LEA 11)

_If we get this [the extended school initiative] right then we will achieve the attainment targets. If you just go down the narrow target route, you alienate people._
Running through these explanations is a common thread:

- Extended schools are essentially educational ventures relating directly to the ‘core business’ of all schools in enabling children to learn and to achieve within the context of the curriculum.
- However, schools cannot be effective in enabling children to learn if they interpret their core business too narrowly. They have to think about the social and personal aspects of educational development – the ‘whole child’ - and they also have to think about the wider family and community contexts in which their pupils live.
- Schools may intervene in these other contexts directly. More probably, they will need to work with partners in other organisations and as part of a wide-ranging strategy. In particular, they will need to work with families and community members.

This rationale makes it possible to define the fundamental task of an extended school:

An extended school maximises the curricular learning of its pupils by promoting their overall development and by ensuring that the family and community contexts within which they live are as supportive of learning as possible.

This definition, with its focus on wider contexts for school activity also suggests that we can think of extended schools as operating a cross a territory which is more extensive than that within which schools have traditionally defined their role. The extent to which they work across the whole of this territory, the ways in which they choose to do this and the partnerships they form with others operating in the same territory will differ from school to school. However, as figure 1 below illustrates, we can map out a territory which is common to all extended schools. The map is intended as no more than an outline and extended school leaders can add their own examples and priorities in each of its cells.

It describes that territory in terms of three levels at which schools can operate – individual pupil, family and community – and three domains within which they operate – educational, social and health. The core business of all schools is where the individual pupil and educational intersect, that is in enabling children to learn within the curriculum. However, the way in which individual pupils learn will be affected by opportunities for personal development, social interaction and ‘deep’ learning which cannot be entirely defined by the formal curriculum. Extended schools are therefore about extending these learning opportunities. Moreover, children’s learning depends to a significant extent on how their families view learning and support the learning of their children, so this is likely to be a key area for extended schools. Likewise, how a pupil learns is affected by a range of social and health issues – attendance, illness, disability, peer relations, involvement in criminality (as perpetrator or victim), being in public care and so on. Again, it is likely that extended schools will wish to ensure that these factors are managed as supportively as possible.
Figure 1. The territory of extended schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Learning issues</th>
<th>Social issues</th>
<th>Health issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHILD</td>
<td>Curricular learning</td>
<td>Personal development, aspirations, engagement, social well-being</td>
<td>Well-being, healthy living, Sexual health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended opportunities for learning</td>
<td>Attendance, criminality, abuse, public care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual barriers to learning – behaviour and learning difficulties, truancy, underachievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Substance misuse, physical illness, mental illness, disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>Family support for learning</td>
<td>Family functioning, parenting skills, family support, child protection issues, housing issues</td>
<td>Family functioning, parenting skills, family support, family health practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Community opportunities for learning</td>
<td>Crime rates, community safety, community capacity building, housing, leisure, transport issues, employment opportunities</td>
<td>Community stress and well-being, community safety, cultural health practices, environmental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural attitudes to learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social problems impacting on learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Core concerns of schools
- Factors bearing directly on student learning
- Factors which facilitate and support student learning
- Factors with indirect impact on student learning
Beyond these key factors, there are others which might have a slightly less direct impact on learning, but are important nonetheless. For instance, school pupils are also members of communities and therefore are affected by how communities view learning, how safe they feel in those communities, what leisure and informal learning those communities offer, what employment opportunities are available within them and so on. More immediately, pupils are members of families of one sort or another and are deeply affected by how those families function, by the health or otherwise of family members, by family income and the opportunities it brings (or denies). All of these things may be difficult for schools to affect directly. However, they are areas with which many extended schools in the pathfinder project were concerned, though usually any action they took was in collaboration with other agencies and organisations.

In practice, as we have seen, extended schools do very different things in very different ways. In some cases, being ‘extended’ may mean no more than undertaking a few additional activities to broaden the curriculum and increase learning opportunities for pupils. This may be particularly the case when the remainder of the territory is rich in the resources which families and communities bring to bear on supporting children. In other cases, families and communities may have fewer such resources and therefore intensive intervention may be called for with the extended school ranging well beyond the boundaries of its core business.

We suggest that a map of this kind may be useful for planning purposes. For internal purposes, within extended school projects, it makes it possible to assess how much of the territory needs to be covered and how individual activities build up into a more coherent and wide ranging approach. In terms of external partnerships in which extended schools might be involved, it makes it possible to decide who is already doing what and who could develop what provision and services. Crucially, although the core business of schools – however ‘extended’ they may be – lies in the education of their pupils, there are many other agencies and organisations whose core business lies elsewhere in the territory. A key task for a ‘wide-ranging’ extended school, therefore, is to form strategic alliances with partners who can work in areas that are beyond the capacity and competence of the school itself.

In this chapter we consider the processes the pathfinder projects went through in developing extended schools, the factors which facilitated or inhibited their development and the lessons which can be learned from those processes.

3.1 Funding

Most projects used the majority, if not all, of the available funding, for staffing (notably, to appoint or designate a co-ordinator) or for capital investment with a view to creating an infrastructure for the delivery of extended school services. In the few cases where co-ordinators were not employed out of project funds, there were pre-existing staff to manage extended school activity. Some projects also used the funding to buy in non-teacher expertise to work with pupils, in the form of youth workers, counsellors and other specialist staff. Capital investment included the refurbishment of community rooms and facilities, adaptations to existing facilities to allow for disabled access and baby changing facilities, expansion of car parking spaces and improvements in security.

The ways in which projects developed was shaped to a significant extent by funding issues – notably, the limited size of the funding, the short lead into the use of funds, and the need to spend within a single school year. Some projects were dissatisfied with what they saw as the short termism of the funding in that they felt pressurised to spend the money or risk losing it:

*With the extended schools money, it came in at great speed and the money had to be spent quickly so it is not always spent wisely. The emphasis was on spending money rather than identifying need.*

(Co-ordinator, LEA 1)

LEAs that were already engaged in extended activities, and those with existing strategies, were in a more advantageous position, being able to use the new funding to implement or develop further their existing strategies. For others the need to spend funds in a short time-scale meant there was little opportunity for planning. Some projects were not able to appoint a co-ordinator until several months into the funding period. Some schools did not become part of a project, and others delayed involvement, because they were unable to act in the time-scale available, even though they had well-worked out plans for extended activities in a longer time-scale. Many projects said that they would have preferred a designated period for planning and funding:

*In my humble opinion it should have been a two year project and there should have been one year funding for research into exactly what was needed and also to plan what you were going to do to then implement the following year. But that didn’t happen.*

(Officer, LEA 17)

In contrast, other projects accepted that funding was time-limited and used it to support preparatory thinking and structural change in the expectation that implementation would then be funded from different sources:

*It’s deliberately giving short-term support, and you think previously what a daft idea it is, but it’s not. The project is about trying to find what are the barriers that stop other projects taking place. The specific focus is what are*
the educational issues that the school faces that stops it doing this and lets change the education department so it can make things happen. It’s quite radical stuff but that’s the intention

(Officer, LEA 3)

Other projects again thought investment in the school building or in facilities such as IT equipment was the most efficient way to use the funding so that they could leave something of tangible benefit to the school and community after the end of the project.

Funding – accessing, co-ordinating and accounting

Funding for the pathfinder projects was limited both in scale and duration. As a result, projects commonly felt the need to access funds from elsewhere. However, they were not all equally experienced in bidding for other external funding and those projects which were advanced in terms of extended school approaches were the best placed. These projects were of the view that identifying the bodies to approach for funding, drawing up bids with link partners, and accounting for the funding demanded the full attention for an LEA co-ordinator, or, where this support was not available, constituted an additional burden for head teachers. The pursuit of funding was regarded as an unwelcome distraction from the real business of developing extended schools and some projects felt that they were ‘having to jump through hoops’ in order to sustain good work.

We have to pull together the cocktail of funding. Extended schools money ends in August, LSC [Learning and Skills Council] money ends in July, neighbourhood management money ends in April. Every bit has its own accountability system. It’s a huge challenge

(Co-ordinator, LEA 1)

We are juggling five pots of money at the moment and it’s a nightmare. Yes it encourages us to think in a joined up way but we need to try and match fund and time scales are an issue.

(Officer, LEA 24)

Projects reported stringent and time-consuming reporting requirements for some funding bodies and streams. The pathfinder project requirements were few in comparison and this was much appreciated by schools and LEAs. However, they were concerned to find that different funding streams were not always co-ordinated properly at local or national levels and this meant that a range of organisations serving the same area had obtained funding for the same activities:

There is no co-ordination of the different funding pots from central government. In this area, three organisations have been given the same money for the same thing and something desperately needs to be done.

(School co-ordinator, LEA 19)

Sustainability & exit strategies

The question of funding was closely linked to the sustainability of extended schools projects. Given that the additional funding was time-limited, schools had to consider the long-term future of their activities and LEAs similar had to consider the future of
extended schools in their areas. In some cases, sustainability was not a major issue. This might be because:

- schools accepted that the project was time limited and treated it as an opportunity to engage in activities that were worthwhile in the short term;
- there were already ongoing activities which the pathfinder funding could enhance or support on a temporary basis; or
- funding was used for capital investment in buildings or equipment which would survive the ending of the project. As a head teacher in LEA 18 explained:
  
  *I've gone for capital investment, those things will still be there, and even if they're not used in the same way, they will still be used. If I was to get knocked over by a bus, they'd still be used.*

For most projects, however, sustainability was an issue. In terms of funding, projects sought to secure their work by a range of strategies:

- **Seeking sustainable sources of funding external to the LEA or school.**
  This might be a single source or part of a complex web of sources and might involve approaching other agencies with a view to their contributing resources in kind or sharing the funding burden. Head teachers and LEA officers, therefore, tended to see the co-ordination of different initiatives and funding streams as a prerequisite to sustainability:

  *Networking across a wide range of areas and projects is really needed to ensure that Extended Schooling is a success.*

  (Head, LEA 14)

  *It is about developing strong partnerships in the first instance, as if these are in place you have sustainability.*

  (Officer, LEA 10)

  By the same token, however, the necessity of pursuing multiple funding sources might mean that activities had to be funded by a succession of short-term arrangements. As a (second) head teacher in a LEA 18 school somewhat wryly commented about one initiative:

  *Children’s Fund should extend the running of the new community room for another year.*

  On a more positive note, activities might become more sustainable where they contributed to the targets of other agencies and organisations in a way which made those agencies willing to support them. In LEA 20, for instance, Health was willing to fund the presence of its own staff in schools after pathfinder funding expired for this reason. Likewise, in LEA 8, an FE college was willing to support course delivery on school sites because it helped the college meet its own enrolment targets.

- **Seeking support from the LEA.**
  Some schools reported receiving additional financial support from their LEA. More common, however, was support ‘in kind’ from the LEA, often in the form of help with identifying other sources of funding. The LEA extended schools coordinators often saw an important part of their role as being to direct school towards funding sources and help them with bid preparation.
• **Charging community members for activities.**
In some cases, schools charged participants for the activities they offered. In these cases, a cost analysis exercise was invariably undertaken and participants were surveyed about their willingness to bear some of the costs of the provision. Projects that did charge usually attempted to keep costs down where they were targeting disadvantaged community members. However, this tended to jeopardise the sustainability of provision unless external funding could be found. Others felt that external funding was the only option where an activity was crucial to promoting social inclusion in a disadvantaged community, or where charges would have been beyond the capacity of users to pay.

• **Other strategies**
In addition to these strategies, many schools simply reprioritised their existing budgets in order to support activities, on the grounds that what they were doing was of direct benefit to their pupils. There were also some examples of schools taking innovative steps to raise funding. One school, for example, encouraged its pupils to apply for funding from schemes such as The Prince’s Trust and Millennium Awards Scheme. Pupils involved in this strategy were successful in raising funding for a number of activities including a cycling proficiency course for pupils and community members and a go karting club for pupils. Other schools contacted local businesses for sponsorship or actively sought the support of parents and community members to help raise funds and deliver activities.

These funding issues tended to interact with other aspects of sustainability. For instance, many schools saw long-term sustainability as dependent on appointing or designating a person with responsibility for the co-ordination and delivery of extended school provision. However, this in turn demanded access to funding:

> Funding needs to be secured to ensure sustainability and it needs to be channelled into staffing. The deputy teaches full time and there is no money to release him... If the funding was to continue, it should be used to provide a designated community teacher to manage the project. There’s no future in getting a normal teacher to do it as they would have a class and getting cover is too costly.

(Head, LEA 18)

> To sustain we need people designated to developing and extending the work and we need funding for this appointment.

(Head, LEA 11)

Some projects saw sustainability principally in terms of the ‘drive’ and ‘good will’ of the groups and individuals responsible for their development. Others looked to continuing support and guidance from DfES. A common request was for further guidance material, or for a central support mechanism such as a website, to offer advice on attracting additional funding and ensuring sustainability. Moreover, it was not uncommon for projects to call for greater financial support from the DfES:

> Longer term development will only be assured when the DfES recognise that certain things must be funded.

(Head, LEA 18)
It was also clear that sustainability was about thinking through the long-term implications of an activity. Some activities began with high hopes but did not then have the infrastructure or support to become sustainable. For instance, in LEA 4, computers with dedicated links to local authority social services were placed in schools under secure conditions. The expectation was that this would improve communication, but in practice schools did not receive adequate training in using the software and the initiative progressively fell into disuse. It seems possible that, in the longer term, other promising activities might suffer a similar fate once the initial enthusiasm had evaporated.

Overall, there was a sense that both LEA projects and individual schools were considering the issue of sustainability and, in many cases, had strategies to address it. However, there was also a sense that doing so was something of a struggle in the context of short-term funding. As a head teacher in LEA 24 put it:

_We are not going to give up... We will sustain but we will have to do it off our own backs._

A particular threat to sustainability was that the time limited nature of the pathfinder funding and the ineligibility of many pathfinders to participate in the first wave of the Full Service Extended Schools project meant that there would be a hiatus in funding. Some projects, to be sure, saw this as an opportunity to look at overall direction and strategy and to plan for full-service schooling in the future. For others, however, the hiatus meant that pathfinder co-ordinators could not have their contracts extended, or that they were being forced to devote their time to income generation. This led to a sense of disappointment and frustration:

_The funding vacuum is not helpful. We are going to loose momentum and that is the worst thing for any initiative._

(Officer, LEA 10)

_We are going to get it [additional funding] in 2004/05, which raises an issue about how we are going with what we’ve started this year. Actually it’s a big issue. If there is a one or two year gap, you can actually loose a project completely because people don’t feel valued._

(Officer, LEA 23)

This raised very real issues about sustainability for projects, not in terms simply of a loss of funding, but also of the trust and goodwill they had begun to build up in their communities. As a head teacher in LEA 11 said:

_The community say ‘that was really good but you’ve stopped it. Are you fed up?’ We say ‘No, we can’t sustain it’. Give statutory services a chance, a reasonable amount of money and see us fly...We are becoming professional bidders in order to sustain excellent work. Lots of excellent programmes have stopped._

(Head, LEA 11)

### 3.2 Flexibility

More positively, projects valued the flexibility given to them to use DfES Extended Schools funding as they saw best:

_You’re given a nice general boost, which you can then interpret in your own way and given the flexibility and trust to spend it. I don’t mind adding the school’s_
money to it... I was given the flexibility to adapt it to the way the school’s going, that was the key.

(Head, LEA 18)

This flexibility, projects felt, enabled them to match what they were doing to local need:

What is important is that there is no blueprint. If there was a blueprint there would be problems as it is not a formula. It is about community need and about developing from the point you are already at

(Head, LEA 10)

In turn, this flexibility enabled them to be creative and innovative:

[It is the] best pot of money we’ve had. [We’re] told to experiment. Quality leaders are risk takers – the government say this on one hand, but on the other, many of the pots of money have so many constraints on them – you’ve got to do this, you’ve got to do that, you’ve got to set a target to have done this by that and if you haven’t you’ve failed to achieve etc.. I’ve had aspirational targets but if you’ve too many constraints, you actually stifle innovation whereas the thing I like about this money is that I was told to go and innovate, to try, which is great, so you do it.

(Head, LEA 18)

I’m hoping that this project, almost subliminally will act as the convenient watershed whereby nobody’s blamed for doing it in the past, incorrectly or correctly. It just said, can we all rally round this one now, without anyone losing fake credibility, or better still people feeling that they’ve still got some ownership of it

(Officer, LEA 18)

### 3.3 Leadership and governance

Most projects had developed dedicated management structures at both LEA and school level. It was not uncommon for the LEA to have a lead officer working on the strategic planning and overall management of the project and for there to be an LEA co-ordinator with responsibility for the day to day running and supervision of extended school initiatives. Most projects had an LEA steering group of some kind. This might be made up of the lead LEA officers and head teachers, or it might include school and LEA co-ordinators with representation from other agencies. Additionally, in some LEAs there were community focus groups involving community members and school staff and in a few cases there was direct involvement of community members in the management of the project. LEA 16, for example, appointed residents from a pre-existing community forum to sit on the management committee and help drive forward the developments. In other cases, there was an intention to secure community representation, but this had proved difficult in practice and at best there was a limited presence of one or two community members.

A common pattern was for heads or deputies being seconded to help manage the project at LEA level. In LEA 25, for instance, two experienced heads were seconded to help assist other schools in the LEA develop as extended schools. They worked with other schools in producing action plans, instigating links with agencies, attracting
funding and in a range of governance issues around insurance, health and safety and legalities. This arrangement had the advantage of giving schools external support, but from individuals who fully understood the challenges the schools were facing and this form of support was much appreciated by the recipient schools.

All project co-ordinators were involved in working with other agencies. This varied between – consulting with communities, joint funding bid writing, developing initial links with agencies or enabling activities to continue where they were already up and running, or developing new activities. The role of the co-ordinator was seen as being vital to drive forward developments and sustaining work:

You need a full time person doing the co-ordination and funding to enable the work to happen. The person needs to be skilled at accessing funding.

(Officer, LEA 10)

The need for all of this quite complicated and also quite simple work, does require an awful lot of servicing and facilitation and a lot of effort because of that. So wherever the resource comes from, whether it be the County Council, DFES, regeneration money or whatever… where learning contributes to all of those agendas that we’ve identified then it does require coordination…It’s not going to happen automatically, particularly if there’s a kind of counter-culture.

(Officer, LEA 3)

The co-ordinator role was particularly valued by head teachers who saw the value of the extended schools approach but did not have the personal capacity to focus on this agenda due to the stringent accountability regime of the standards agenda.

Its absolutely key to have the co-ordinator – it means the head’s not taking over or over loading the teaching staff and that someone is responsible for making it (the pathfinder) work

(School Co-ordinator, LEA 14)

The management of extended school initiatives within the school presented challenges to school leaders who were already fully occupied with management of the school’s ‘core’ activities. Some schools, therefore, appointed or seconded their own co-ordinator to manage developments, or were given the support of a school based LEA co-ordinator. Elsewhere, the solution was to remodel leadership structures to make them more distributed and collective. One head teacher explained the remodelling in his school:

The only way we have achieved so much is that our governors redesigned the leadership of the school radically. The governors wanted two heads – one who is an operational head who runs the school and another is a head who kick starts things…Unless we find a way for primary schools to set up new leadership and management they are not going to get it…they are physically unable because of the way the school is structured, regardless of their good vision. It is not because of unwillingness.

(Head, LEA 11)

The head of a school in a different LEA explained the rationale behind the management structures in his school:
I think we've changed the structure in our school a few years ago now. We don't have a deputy head, we have a management team, so we've distributed the leadership much more widely amongst the staff, so everybody now has an influential role. That is an important aspect of this work because then it means that everyone has something to give rather than saying well, that person is the coordinator for that, so that's their job, and then the one person isolated trying to do something...I don't think you can regenerate schools and I don't think you can regenerate communities unless you have teams who are dedicated to it. A number of schools are now doing the same kind of thing in this area, and are considering changing structures.

(Head, LEA 24)

In a school in LEA 19, a head of subject department was given responsibility for developing and delivering extended schooling activities for pupils. In LEA 16, teachers were given responsibility for different aspects of the project. For example, one of the teachers had worked alongside a nutritionist and had developed the knowledge and skills to deliver what she had learnt to pupils. Projects which aimed to adopt a whole school approach saw the collective commitment and enthusiasm of a team as being vital to the success of the initiative:

You've got to have the support of everyone involved. If one part falls by the way, a Head teacher not interested, but a supportive staff it's not going to happen. If the LEA aren't behind it, if the staff aren't behind it, you need all of these different elements, without a doubt, to make it succeed. Otherwise you're not going to get that commitment.

(Head, LEA 1)

Nevertheless, it was often the head teacher who was credited with being the main driving force. Some had taken it upon themselves to learn about similar schemes in Europe and the USA and had a vision of becoming involved in something similar. Frequently, these ‘dynamic leaders’, as they were described to us, were individuals who were not afraid to innovate and had the belief and motivation to make their vision a reality:

It is no different from most other innovative projects. It comes down to leadership and the ability to champion. If those are not in place, the project never really takes off. So if you have a head who wishes this to happen some progress will be made. If that isn’t in place but there’s somebody else there who can offer it, it could still take place. You can have leadership and vision and as long as you’ve got a champion there they will make it happen.

(LEA Officer, LEA 3)

3.4 Community consultation

It is only going to be successful if the community want it and are on board...The fact that it's the community on the steering group, the partners are on the steering group and the community and the partners are constantly involved in everything and that is why it's successful today

(Officer, LEA 16)

Community consultation was more of a priority for some pathfinders than for others, though in almost all there was some level of consultation. There were concerns not to
adopt a top-down approach which failed to value the needs and wishes of the community:

*We must respond to community need...We can’t tell them what they want. They must tell us.*

(Head, LEA 25)

The need to compile an audit of existing provision and undertake needs analysis was a common motivation for community consultation. A head teacher explained that the process enabled the LEA to identify community need and the activities that local people requested to meet their requirements:

*We would get a clearer picture of what was needed and wanted and what might be there anyway, that we weren’t aware of.*

(Head, LEA 2)

The decision to consult with the community was often a pragmatic one based on the notion that pathfinder activities are likely to be more successful if they are tailored around actual needs. Some projects cited examples of previous activities which had not been successful – such as putting on ICT classes with little uptake - and saw consultation as a means of ensuring that activities were now targeted appropriately.

Some expressed a commitment to ongoing consultation rather than simply at the start of the project. Elsewhere, young people were consulted about the development of out of school hours activities that were under consideration. In LEA 19, consultation of young people by young people was a feature. This was, however, the only example of its kind.

Community consultation tended to take the following forms, though many of these overlapped:

- **Drawing on the community consultation of other initiatives.** In LEA 1 there had already been community consultation undertaken by SureStart and by the Neighbourhood Management team. Rather than repeat the process, the pathfinder drew on these consultations. These had identified that training for employment delivered on the school site was seen by the community as a priority, which paved the way for pathfinder activity.

- **The employment of workers whose key role involved community consultation.** In LEA 24 this was part of the role of community development workers. They used opportunistic face to face engagement with small numbers of people, for example with parents at the school gates and at a variety of community meetings.

- **Drawing on existing community forums, particularly in areas of disadvantage.** LEA 16 worked with other community organisations that had access to residents through an existing community forum. Local people who were members of the forum were used to consult with other people.

- **Specific activities to launch the pathfinder project in the community.** Several projects had launch days - one called it a ‘fun day’ - to advertise to the community that the school was an extended school and to secure a wider range of involvement.
• **Small-scale community consultation around particular schools and activities.** In several pathfinders questionnaires were sent to parents, and in some cases pupils.

• **Drawing on the experience of people working in the community.** In some areas, there were experienced community workers who believed they knew the community well enough to make further consultation unnecessary. LEA 4, for instance, worked closely with the Neighbourhood Renewal Team whose role was essentially about understanding the dynamics of particular communities. However, other pathfinders saw a need for renewed consultation even where such local knowledge was available.

Some pathfinders were uncertain about the value and/or feasibility of formal consultation. For several, opportunistic interaction with community members, particularly parents at the school gate, was therefore the principal means of consultation. Elsewhere, there were limits to consultation in that communities were asked about the detail of activities, but only after professionals had already come to the conclusion that intervention of some kind was ‘needed’. This tended to be the case in areas identified as disadvantaged and therefore in need of some kind of ‘transformation’. Typically, professionals had brought together statistics to demonstrate a need and initial plans had gone to the funding bodies without prior community consultation.

This points to different views (often implicit) about the purposes of consultation. In some cases, consultation was a means of enabling the local community to help shape the nature of the services that were to be provided. It was, effectively, a means of involving the community in governance, regardless of whether there was also involvement in formal governance structures. Elsewhere, consultation was more like market research, with community members encouraged to indicate their willingness to support particular activities but not to shape the project overall. Elsewhere again, consultation was limited or absent, perhaps because professionals believed they already knew what the community needed, or because they had decided on the activities they would undertake for other reasons – for instance, to meet an evident need or opportunity within the school.

### 3.5 The place of inter-agency collaboration

Inter-agency collaboration was a fundamental element of the majority of pathfinder projects. It was seen as the only logical way to ensure:

- strategic planning;
- effective delivery;
- increased resources including staffing, funding and equipment;
- sustainability; and
- the regeneration of disadvantaged communities

For some pathfinders, (LEAs 2, 4, 7, 20, 16, 24, 25 and others), a key focus of the project was on developing links with other agencies and on devising a strategic framework for multi-agency delivery. This involved informing other agencies about the extended schools initiative, learning about their agendas and identifying opportunities for collaboration. As one head teacher put it:
We insist on partnership working...Trust is key...We need to learn about other people’s agendas as well as our own.

(Head, LEA 11)

Collaboration was seen as only way to develop a transformatory approach to extended schooling, one which aimed to identify and help overcome the deep-seated problems in disadvantaged communities and the barriers to learning that young people face. The consensus was that:

In the end, we either work together or go down together. It’s no use me just trying to do things for this school, we work collaboratively in this area.

(Head, LEA 24)

Some projects saw no option but to collaborate since the resources available to schools acting alone were necessarily limited:

Other agencies need to do their bit....We know we can’t spread ourselves too thinly. Other services need to do their proactive bit and not just be reactive...We sometimes feel we are a best friend, counsellor, police officer...if other agencies invest in schools they will actually help themselves

(Head, LEA 10)

This sense of the necessity of collaboration could at best lead to attempts to foster a culture of mutual support, sometimes with very practical outcomes. For instance, in LEA 17, project social workers, based in schools, adjusted their holidays to fit in with school holiday times. In these cases, there was a sense that sensitive collaboration could enable schools and other agencies to meet their separate targets but in such a way that children, families and communities were the beneficiaries.

Elsewhere, collaboration was equally real, but the approach might be less strategic. Some projects focused on the delivery of specific activities and links with different agencies arose mainly in this context. LEA 5, for instance, developed a large range of pupil and family focused activities and linked with other agencies and community groups to achieve these. There was a similar approach in LEA 8, where schools liaised with museums, arts organisations, the local college, and the primary care trust. In LEA 19, the focus was very firmly on pupils, in order to develop citizenship and employment skills, with youth democracy high on the agenda. This involved links with local businesses and with a range of national schemes but these links were developed to help support young people, as opposed to the wider community. Nevertheless, the school was represented at community meetings and was happy to share expertise and resources whenever possible. For instance, a senior member of staff who was skilled in bid writing was helping a local community group compile a bid for a community bus. If the bid were to be successful, the school had offered to provide garaging.

The ways projects set about developing links varied considerably. In some cases the LEA took the lead; in others head teachers had already made the links and shared contacts with other schools; in others again, the extended school co-ordinators took on this role. A variety of ways were used to approach agencies – from a mailing of all agencies by the head teacher, to building on already substantial links with different professionals. At school level, heads and co-ordinators were often concerned that they did not know where to start, or where to go for help in thinking about a strategy for interagency work. There were very few examples of agencies making the first
contact with the school. Although schools had, of course, ongoing contact with certain professionals - school nurse, education welfare officer/education social worker, educational psychologist, social worker, speech and language therapist and so on – much of this was reactive and individual pupil focused. Extended schools often sought to use such existing agencies in a more preventative way, particularly with groups other than those these professionals typically worked with. For instance, health workers might be used to run a ‘quit smoking’ class for community members or to offer nutrition advice. There were also a few examples of joint training for professionals, for instance in a health model for multi-agency working (in LEA 20) and in community leadership (in LEA 16).

In some projects, interagency collaboration was built into the management of the pathfinder, as in LEA 1 where the co-ordinator was also the SureStart manager and already worked closely with the neighbourhood management team. This team had already consulted extensively with the community and the pathfinder was able to draw on the outcomes of this consultation. Other projects (such as LEAs 2, 4 and 25) developed multi-agency steering groups at an authority wide or district level and/or multi-agency community focus groups. The multi-agency steering group in LEA 2 consisted of a range of statutory agencies and the focus of their work was developing a tiered referral system and support network for children and their families. LEA 25’s community focus group had representatives from voluntary agencies, the primary care trust, SureStart, a FE college, school governors, parents, Children’s Fund, a local football team, and teachers.

Full service provision, understood as the location of community services other than Education on the school site, was an aim of only a minority of the projects at this stage. There were real problems for schools – particularly smaller primary schools - in establishing such provision within the short time scale of the project. However, encouragingly, in LEA 4, provision which had been established under the earlier Demonstration Project was maintained and developed even when head teachers moved on. Certainly, many had full service provision as a future aspiration and a few (such as LEA 16, 20 and 21) described themselves as already well on the way. One of these (LEA 16) was developing a primary school as a multi-agency resource for the community. The aim was not just to provide service to help pupils, but to meet identified needs for community regeneration. Others had more limited aspects of multi-agency provision on site, or were actively engaged in signposting need to other agencies so that pupils, parents and community members could access support, albeit, from a location other than the school. Others again had an agreement with other agencies that they should work from the school if there was a particular case requiring delivery from the school site, for instance, if a parent found it difficult to attend appointments at the service base outside the locality.

There were some particular difficulties in forging links with Health where projects reported bureaucratic management structures as a constraining factor.

_We don’t have enough joined up thinking between Health [and ourselves]. I mean, we would go for it tomorrow, but Health are very reticent to work with Education, very reticent, even though they’re dealing with the same community, same children, same everything._

(Head, LEA 2)
The principle of locating services in schools might be agreed by the primary care trust but achieving this seemed to be problematic due to what informants saw as the hierarchical decision-making and other aspects of the management of the Health Service. Furthermore, there are certain requirements that schools need to adhere to in order that primary care trusts are in a position to deliver from the school such as standards of facilities (i.e. a confidential area and safe storage of equipment) and these were always able to be met by schools. In one case, the school had funding for Health staff but had to take on the employment of such staff themselves since Health was unable to make quick decisions about whether they could use the funding to employ the worker. In the same way, there were examples of schools employing Education staff to deliver services previously offered by external agencies due to the problems in getting those agencies to deliver the extent of service required by the school – for instance, a teaching assistant undertaking therapeutic group work in school rather than a psychologist or counsellor.

The problems, however, were not all on one side. In some cases there was friction between schools and other agencies when they felt that schools, which already had additional resources for extended activities, were asking them to deploy their own resources in meeting Education targets. The response from schools was that the aims they had for children were those shared by all agencies, and that collaboration was in the interests of their common client group. Some projects were particularly concerned not to duplicate efforts of other agencies or to alienate them or even jeopardise them:

Extended schools cannot put other providers out of business. There is an issue of duplication and this could jeopardise the whole nature of extended schools and individual provision.

(Project Evaluator, LEA 6)

There will be concern from other sectors if all provision is developed in schools. So, that is why we are about partnerships. We can not take livelihoods away from people. People can feel threatened.

(Head LEA 11)

There were reports of some agencies and providers – for instance, childcare providers - being fearful that schools were seeking to duplicate their efforts and therefore reduce demand on their services. In one LEA, community centres felt that their role was being threatened by the development of activities in schools. The school response was that not all community members had access to a community centre and those that did would want a choice. Some co-ordinators reported that external agencies and providers felt that the more strategic approach which characterised some projects threatened their autonomy and might bring demands they could not meet.

Working to the time scales of other agencies was also problematic for some projects. As one school leader commented:

The school is at the mercy of the speed of other agencies and agendas.

(Deputy head, LEA 14)

In LEA 20, funding was used for physical refurbishment of facilities and purchasing of a mobile resource for the delivery of multi-agency activities. The school hoped that the primary care trust would be in a position to deliver as soon as the facility was developed but getting the staff in place proved to be a lengthy process. The school had a Primary Care Trust (PCT) nurse but accessing the services of a doctor was not possible until after the formal end of the project. This delayed the establishment of a
proposed school based sexual health clinic. Similarly, access to specialist staff from
the PCT and Relate was restricted to a few hours a week when ideally the school
would have preferred full time workers.

In some areas Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) had been established and offered an
opportunity for schools to link with their work around community development. There were frequent reports, however, that projects felt that they were overlooked by
LSPs:

*They don’t even see schools as having a role in community renewal...DfES
should make it clear that there is a gap and that extended schools should be a
central strand of the work of LSPs*

(Officer, LEA 11)

Some projects were of the view that collaboration was inhibited because there was
little co-ordination between different initiatives and funding streams at national or
local level:

*People [community workers and officers] who deal with the Neighbourhood
Development Fund and ESF are not aware that Extended Schools is part of
the national agenda.*

(Head, LEA 24)

Clearly, there was a good deal of activity within the pathfinders around the issue of
collaboration, a recognition of the importance of collaborative approaches and some
examples of successful collaborative approaches. However, it is also clear that the
landscape within which extended schools operates continues to be characterised by
fragmentation in terms of service-delivery, targets and imperatives and funding
streams. In this situation, it seems to be important that projects understand the agendas
of other agencies and providers and are prepared to work patiently towards
developing shared approaches.

### 3.6 DfES Guidance and views on a central support mechanism

1. Guidance

DfES produced guidance for the development of extended schools (DfES 2002b) and
the research team was asked to investigate how useful it had proved. A few projects
did not use the guidance on the grounds that it was too lengthy and/or uninspiring:

*I find it tedious and difficult to wade through*

(School co-ordinator, LEA 2)

Elsewhere, the guidance was seen as a resource for the co-ordinator and it tended to
be unread by others. However, other projects felt that the guidance looked
authoritative and was detailed but well structured and easy to comprehend. A head
teacher in LEA 22 described it as:

*Excellent, with good progressive sections. The quality of reading from the
DfES has increased dramatically.*

Most projects found at least some parts of the guidance ‘useful’, particularly the case
study material, and some said it was a ‘useful document for background reading’:

*It is useful for the information on management committees and having third
parties in school*

(Head, LEA 11)
Others felt that the document was helpful when it came to disseminating information about the initiative to members of the leadership team, school governors or external agencies. An officer in LEA 17 explained:

*One of the ways we’ve used it is when we’re trying to get other people on board like the Education Welfare.*

Likewise, a head teacher in LEA 24 described how he used the document to disseminate information about the initiative to school staff and governors:

*It is very useful and very easy to understand...I passed [copies] to the governors and without them they might not have been so keen to embrace it.*

Nevertheless, it was not uncommon for governors or external agencies to request guidance specifically aimed at them - giving them an overview of their potential role in the Extended Schools initiative, and outlining issues pertinent to them. Governors, were not all clear on the particulars relating to the Section 27 Arrangements of the 2002 Education Act and the consequences of this in terms of extended school approaches. They wanted further guidance on this.

Projects highlighted what they saw as other omissions in the document or areas that could have been improved. The main areas that were regarded as being less informative included those sections on governance, site management and community consultation:

*As a broad brush stroke it was fine but it is more of a visionary document than a practical document. It failed to consider inland revenue, corporate tax and VAT...it missed out key major legislative barriers.*

(LEA Officer, LEA 10)

Another officer from LEA 10 pointed out:

*Community consultation was a weakness in the guidance. It ought to have been put in the front of the guidance and seen to be a driver. It can’t be a token gesture.*

Pathfinders also discussed difficulties around identifying, bidding for, co-ordinating and being accountable for different funding streams and stressed the need for more information on this:

*The guidance is very useful, especially the examples of good practice but there was no mention of how to access funding*

(Head, LEA 24)

Likewise, projects understood the value of embedding the Extended Schools Project into a wider range of school and area based and national initiatives but felt that they were sometimes unsure where to start. Not all schools were aware of community or area wide regeneration strategies, very few had links with Local Strategic Partnerships and in terms of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, few schools were aware of the Schools Plus work and their role in contributing to the national agenda. LEAs were clear on how the Extended Schools initiative related to other agendas in their own areas, but called for more guidance on how to achieve co-ordination with other regional and national strategies:
It would be useful if guidance came from DfES on how to have a more co-ordinated approach to enable schools to respond to the new agenda.

(Head, LEA 11)

Other projects, particularly those with a longer history of parent and community engagement strategies, were frustrated by the lack of guidance for projects aiming to develop and redefine practice that was already well-advanced:

Going back to government policy, one of the things that drives me maddest of all, is...that they don’t register that we have got a lot of these things on the ground already and it’s about sharpening up our practice, having another look...There’s nothing in there about the additionality to that.

(Officer, LEA 17)

It is noteworthy that several projects (including LEAs 11, 24 and 25) produced their own guidance which they disseminated to schools in the area. The guidance varied in content but it was able to focus in greater detail on governance or the ‘nitty gritty issues’ that projects felt that the DfES guidance did not address.

2. Central Support Mechanisms

The research team was also asked to investigate what demand there was for some sort of central support mechanism (other than that already provided by the policy team) for extended schools. Projects were of the view that a central support mechanism would be useful and most felt that a web based facility or a telephone helpline would be helpful, providing it was a supportive and non judgemental facility.

A helpline would be good. I prefer to speak to people as you can say ‘This is what I am planning to do. Is that OK?’ and get feedback

(Head, LEA 25)

A telephone helpline would be useful if it was non judgemental. Although the DfES is there to help you but I’m not sure I would want to own up to quite how much of a problem it is...With all due respect to the people at the DfES, you don’t really want to ring them up and talk through an on-the-ground practical issue for fear it might be misinterpreted...The DfES would probably say that we have got named people, but you don’t feel inclined to phone up...I would phone up about an actual framework question.

(Officer, LEA 17)

Other projects suggested a programme of regional conferences, similar to those hosted by the Local Government Association for their Schools for the Community Project.

Seminars and conferences, or video conferences would be useful if there were a mix of academics, policy makers and practitioners.

(Head, LEA 24)

Many projects recommended a support structure involving visits to extended schools to draw on and share good practice:

I think the particular needs that we would have in a school like this, the population we’re talking about, you need to be talking to other people who are working with similar types of populations. For an information exchange to be useful, it needs to have a population, or have access to a population of schools that are dealing with similar kinds of issues.

(Head, LEA 4)
It's crucial to share good practice and visits to other pathfinders would be very good. You could give and go to learn also.

(Co-ordinator, LEA 24)

This idea of mutual support and information-exchange was, in fact, a reality in some places. Not only some LEA co-ordinators, but head teachers, school co-ordinators, teachers and others developed considerable expertise in extended school approaches, particularly where they had been involved in the Demonstration Projects or Local Government Association Pathfinders. They began to know a great deal about the practicalities and legalities of managing extended activities and became expert at bidding for additional funds. Projects such as LEA 4’s, for instance, were involved in sharing their expertise with others through conferences and school exchanges.

3.7 Some implications

Extended schools, in their current form, are a recent phenomenon and a range of teething problems is only to be expected as they begin to be established. In this context, what is remarkable is the resourceful way in which schools and LEAs were tackling these problems. The pathfinder projects, were, of course, made up of ‘enthusiasts’ with access to (albeit limited) additional funding. Nonetheless, this augurs well for the national roll out of an extended schools programme.

With this roll out in mind, there are perhaps two lessons which can be drawn from the experiences of the pathfinders:

- The development of extended schools, at least as interpreted by many projects, is a serious and ambitious venture. As such, it requires dedicated management structures, the deployment of co-ordinators with appropriate levels of time and expertise, a thorough process of community consultation, a willingness to invest in genuine partnerships with other agencies and an embedding of school activities in wider local strategies.

- Given the ambitious nature of these developments, there are aspects of current national policies and structures which are less than helpful. These include the time-limited nature of additional funding, the wider context of initiative-led funding, the different priorities of agencies working with the same communities, and the failure in some cases of extended schools to engage with or be engaged by local strategies.

All of this points to an underlying issue which will need to be addressed as extended schools become more widespread. Is their development simply one short-term initiative amongst many, or is it part of a longer-term vision for how schools should work in the Twenty First Century. If the latter is the case, then it may require some more fundamental structural change. This is an issue to which we shall return in the final chapter.
4. Evaluation findings: outcomes for pupils, families and communities

As we explained in chapter 2, there are a number of difficulties in identifying outcomes from the pathfinder projects and attributing these directly to the work undertaken by these projects. In particular:

- Some projects focused on infrastructure-development rather than delivery and therefore were not in a position to generate outcomes.
- The time scale for the funded project and its evaluation were short, so that outcomes were unlikely to have materialised in many cases until after the formal end of the project.
- The interaction between the project and other actions and initiatives makes it extremely difficult to attribute any outcomes to extended schools alone.
- Many important intended outcomes were to do with cultural change, self-esteem, aspirations and so on, and so were difficult to measure.
- Individual projects differed so widely from each other and had such internal variety that even where it is possible to identify and attribute outcomes, it is difficult to generalise these to all other extended schools or even to a particular approach to extended schools.

In order to counter these difficulties, we shall in this chapter attempt to answer two questions. The first is whether there is evidence of any sort that extended schools can have positive outcomes. This is, of course, a slightly more limited question than asking what were the outcomes from particular projects or what are the outcomes from extended schools as such. The second is what would be necessary for these somewhat wider questions to be answered more robustly.

4.1 Can extended schools have positive outcomes?

1. Impacts

The simplest form of this question is to ask whether extended schools can have impacts of any kind. The answer to this is an unequivocal ‘yes’. These were of different kinds:

- Many projects ran activities which attracted support from pupils, families and/or community members and which participants enjoyed or otherwise found worthwhile. Some examples are given in the next section.
- Some projects had tangible outputs in terms of producing guidance, developing new facilities, training staff or setting up new structures and processes.
- Some projects established new sets of working relationships between professionals, agencies and community organisations.

2. Outcomes for pupils

In some cases, it was possible to identify direct outcomes from projects in terms of improved pupil attainments. Given the time scale of the projects, this was usually the case when activities targeted attainment outcomes directly and were developments of existing initiatives. For instance, the school which was the focus of the LEA 21
project ran a series of arts-based activities and saw it’s GCSE A*-C results rise from 63% to 77% in Art, from 50% to 75% in Music and from 64% to 81% in Drama. Likewise, a school in LEA 1 project extended its programme of revision sessions for older pupils leading up to their examinations. The head reported the outcomes in the following terms:

With the holiday scheme, we have already seen improvements in attendance and GCSE results. Older pupils feel that they are really having a good deal at school and parents feel that we’ve really done something for pupils and the school. We have raised the profile of the school with better GCSE results. It has had a huge impact on teaching and learning as the results were 13% A*-C and last year we got it to 26% and this year we want to get to 30%...The biggest single factor is getting children in and raising expectations.

As this example illustrates, however, impacts on attainment tended to depend on impacts on mediating factors such as attendance, behaviour, self-esteem and direct parental support. For instance, one primary school in LEA 15 worked with an external provider of counselling services to set up provision in the school. In 80% of cases, positive changes in children’s behaviour and performance levels were reported by their teachers. The field notes also include this direct testimony of the scheme’s impact:

I [the researcher] spoke to a mother who described how her child was becoming a school refuser and she credited the time he spent with the [organisation’s] counsellor with helping him maintain a 100% attendance record this term and [it] may have a positive impact on his attainment.

I asked her, “If [the project] had not been set up, would you have been able to find support?”

The answer was “No.”

She burst into tears.

Another school, in LEA 19, introduced a range of activities, including clubs, programmes and business activities, in response to pupils’ requests and, so far as possible, led by pupils. The participants spoke enthusiastically about impacts on them as learners:

We’ve learned about team work and commitment.

I’ve learned about putting the car together [in a go-kart club] and I’ve driven it. I want to be a mechanic when I leave so doing this has helped.

We’ve had to meet with a lot of people and it has helped us to grow in confidence.

I’m doing a GCSE in Maths, Art and IT and I’ve had hands-on experience of using what I’ve learned in these three subjects because we do design and we’ve a website and we do accounts.

A third school, in LEA 24, developed an existing programme of drugs awareness and social development work for pupils at risk of exclusion so that it involved other schools. Again, the pupils’ comments were enthusiastic:

I’ve learned not to go down that path but to go down a different path.
Being involved in this keeps us out of trouble...Also I like [the youth worker leading the programme]. He listens.

I know that you need to have a good education

I’ve made friends with people from other schools. We used to be worst enemies but now we’ve mixed.

In a cluster of one secondary and two primary schools in LEA 8, pathfinder funding was used to fund a full-time nurse to work across the three schools. There was clear evidence of uptake of the service. Between April 28th and Sept 15th 2003 678 pupils and 89 staff attended the health unit from the secondary school and school attendance rose from 93.7% in March 2003 to 94.6% in Sept 2003. Pupils who might otherwise have stayed at home were reportedly coming in to school to see the nurse. Fifty five pupils from one primary school and 61 from the other have also seen the nurse. The secondary school presented the following evaluation:

Number of students being sent home ill has reduced. The service is being heavily used. The school attendance figures have increased. The number of recurrent claimed illnesses was not previously measured. However we now monitor and log every visit and take relevant action to those who are recurrent visitors to the unit. Therefore the project is meeting the objectives that were set and the increased attendance levels should, over time, raise academic levels.

(Business co-ordinator, secondary school, LEA 8)

3. Outcomes for families and communities

In some cases, there were important outcomes for families and communities, particularly where the project had a strong community orientation. For instance, the LEA 16 project seems to have had an impact on community self-perception. It involved locating community agencies on a school site and was undertaken very much at the instigation of the local community and with their full involvement. Although the project was still some way from delivery, testimony from community members suggested that, even at this early stage, this had positive benefits for both the school and the community. Numbers on the school roll ceased to decline and its nursery was full. As one community member said:

It’s not just for young people, it’s not just a school; it’s more than that.

The involvement of the community also seemed to be having a positive effect on their view that they had some status and some control over the conditions in which they lived:

Everyone is having an equal say.

Or again:

We haven’t been excluded.

As the project manager put it:

It has given the community a bit of hope - something to visualise - and it has given some pride. They have been promised so much in the past and it’s not been delivered, but now they can see that there has been investment in the building and now it’s about investment in people.

A related theme which emerged from a number of projects was that extended schools became what one informant called:
a focal point for the community.

(Project development officer, LEA 11)

This was particularly the case for communities that, for a range of reasons, were not easily able to access other resources. For instance, a LEA 2 school, serving a predominantly Asian heritage community, was looking to develop facilities on-site that its pupils and their families could use out of hours. The project co-ordinator explained:

They [Asian heritage parents] are reluctant to let their daughters out. They are not going to let them go to town. They feel like they've got no facilities, they've got no library, the only input they get is at school, so maybe it’s useful to give them the facilities they need here. It’s local, it’s down the road. Mums can come along if they want to and use the facilities as well.

Another school based in LEA 11 and serving a similar area had a similar experience:

We are now becoming a hub. We’ve got firms lining up to fill gaps in training, we’ve got local artists in, adult education in and other training organisations. It is important that we are now being seen as a hub and people are coming in.

(School co-ordinator, LEA 11)

The impact on community cohesion was not restricted to ethnically diverse areas. For instance, the pathfinder in LEA 8 seems to have had similar effects by offering Saturday family learning days as a means to bring together different age groups:

I would get kids for months afterwards coming and saying “I saw Molly at the Post Office and you know what she said…” things like that and that was quite important because as a school we want to develop good relationships with the local community

(School co-ordinator)

The young and old have worked side by side it has been a great way of building bridges in the community

(Community member)

There were also many examples of extended schools having a direct impact on families. For instance, a LEA 1 primary school, running multicultural education classes for pupils and their families and adult education classes for families and the community, reported its impacts in the following terms:

What is on offer gives the parents a lot of experiences they never had. They have responded brilliantly to family learning and are very supportive of their children’s learning. The school has forged non-threatening relationships with parents and they think it’s wonderful. It also gives children cultural experiences they would never have had as our estate is very white...Children see the school as more than about lessons. They see the school and parents work together.

(Acting head)

Similarly, the LEA 24 project wrote about the impacts on families of adult education work in schools in the following terms:

Adult education motivated adults and parents act as role models for their children and increase the motivation and increase the desire for better lifestyle and attainment for their children e.g.:
'No-one in our family has ever been to college but I WOULD LOVE...to make it.'

There has been training towards very real jobs e.g. 7 paid trainees through the intermediate labour market are gaining work experience in schools as classroom assistants alongside quality training to NVQ level 2. Five people are also training as ICT technicians in school under the same scheme:

'I haven’t had a job for ages and I was a bit nervous of being back in school but I am really enjoying it and love doing my homework and having my own file.'

(LEA 24 Project Officer evaluation notes)

The LEA 8 project had comparable effects. Three schools delivered courses sponsored by a local FE College to a total of about 100 adults. Most adults taking these courses received certificates. Where these courses were being offered for a subsequent year, a significant number of adults took further courses, and a small but still significant number of adults went on to do courses in the college itself.

4. Impact on other services

Most projects, as we have seen, used the pathfinder initiative to develop existing links with other services or to initiate new links. In the latter cases, particularly, projects might not yet be at the stage of delivery and therefore impacts on other agencies were hard to determine. Nonetheless, the expectation amongst those agencies was that there would be direct benefit for them. A PCT representative in LEA 2 was typical of the view that schools, as a universal service, offered other agencies better access to local populations than they could achieve in isolation:

If we can put something in there that gets to a larger community or hits one of our targets or gets to the young people then whatever it is then we will seize that opportunity.

(LEA 2, PCT manager)

Some direct evidence of this is, of course, provided by the health-related initiatives reported above. Whilst locating health services in schools improved school attendance, it also gave health workers ready access to children and families who might otherwise not have attended clinics or doctors’ surgeries. As a head in a different authority reported:

The nurse has found when she has appointments [with parents] they turn up 100% of the time which wasn’t the case before.

(Head, LEA 4)

There were comparable benefits for police forces where officers worked in schools. Here, the issue was not simply better access but also a change in perception. For instance, an extended schools co-ordinator in a LEA 14 school commented:

The police are benefiting from their increased profile in school.

Another project explained that police presence in schools and police involvement in school crime reduction programmes had not only reduced levels of juvenile crime in the school holidays, but had resulted in a growing respect for the law:

Benefits include improved relationships with the children, a change in perception of the punitive regime to one of a supportive regime, improved levels of early intervention through discussions with families which is about a preventative approach

(Officer, LEA 20)
These benefits were not universal. For instance, in LEA 16, local residents were resistant to the idea of having Social Services personnel located in school because of the stigma which association with Social Services was seen to bear. Likewise, in the instances cited above where agencies were reluctant to deploy their resources in schools, it is also clear that there is a cost for those agencies in de-centralising and moving out of their established bases.

It is also worth adding that some of the impacts were in the reverse direction. In other words, linkages with other agencies and organisations had an impact on schools and teachers. One school in LEA 15, for instance, contracted a private organisation to provide counselling services for its pupils. As part of the contract, the specialist counsellors undertook behavioural assessments of children and teachers were enthusiastic about the way they could use these and the counselling techniques with which they came in contact in their classrooms. It may be that such ‘reverse’ impacts were more widespread, though there were few reports of them in our data.

5. Some remaining issues in evaluation

Apart from the difficulties of evaluating extended schools to which we have already referred, there are two others which emerge from our interactions with project leaders of various kinds and (where they existed) with local evaluators.

The first issue was hinted at by LEA 2’s Director of Education:

_The challenge I think...for extended schools is to engage the harder to reach people, the more vulnerable groups, the people who don’t feel so confident about going to a school..._

There is an understandable tendency for projects to report – and to direct evaluators towards – their successes. This is not deliberate concealment. Overt failures are rapidly changed or discontinued, which may be why, from twenty five projects with a multiplicity of schools and activities, we were only able to identify one activity that unequivocally failed (a scheme for lighting a path had to be abandoned when the lights were repeatedly vandalised). Perhaps more significant, activities tend to attract the more confident and less alienated children and adults. They are successful for these individuals, who may have real needs and may benefit greatly. However, what is more difficult to determine is who might have benefited more but did not become involved.

There is an issue for extended schools, therefore in terms of how they target these ‘hard to reach’ people’ and the care with which they monitor the effectiveness of their targeting. We saw a good deal of evidence that many projects thought carefully about how the activities they undertook would meet the needs of their areas as they saw them. However, we saw less evidence of careful targeting of the hard-to-reach and no evidence of any monitoring of this aspect of their work.

The second issue is to do with projects’ own self-evaluation procedures. Projects were accountable to DfES for how they used their funds, but they were not required to commission formal evaluations. Although some chose to do so nonetheless, we have already commented on how the flexibility allowed by DfES was much appreciated by projects and probably contributed to the creativity and responsiveness of their work. However, our concern is not to do with whether or not projects engaged in formal
evaluation so much as with how they tended to understand the evaluation process itself.

By and large, local evaluations, whether formally conducted by contracted organisations, or semi-formally reported to DfES, or informally discussed with ourselves, focused on whether milestones had been reached, how funds had been spent, what projects had produced or established and whether participants in activities were satisfied with their experiences. All of these are important, particularly if the purpose of evaluation is understood to be accountability. However, what was missing in many cases was a sufficiently strong sense that evaluation should identify outcomes (rather than activities) or that it should be able to explain how and why particular outcomes had or had not been produced.

We do not see this as the fault of local project managers or commissioned evaluators. The type of evaluation that emerged is a familiar characteristic of separately funded project-style initiatives where the recipients of funding are required to set out in advance what they propose to do and to provide a retrospective account of what they have actually done. Whether this is an adequate model for exploratory ventures such as extended schools, where there is a great deal still to be learned, is a matter of some doubt.

This is an issue to which we shall return in the final chapter of this report. In the meantime, we wish to conclude the current chapter by considering briefly what the somewhat different model of evaluation we used here has to offer and what it allows us to claim even from the limited data which are so far accessible.

4.2 Towards a theory of change for extended schools

In explaining our own methodology, we gave a brief account of theory of change evaluation. That account perhaps bears repeating in the light of what we have now learned about processes and outcomes in the pathfinder projects. Figure 2 below presents a simplified model of how theory of change approaches conceptualise complex initiatives such as these. The assumption is that these initiatives are characterised by multiple actions with multiple outcomes, which themselves have impacts on other outcomes so that chains of causation can be both long and complex.

In the case of extended schools, for instance, Action #1 in the model might be a school offering courses and other activities for parents. Outcome #1 might then be that these adults learn new skills. This in turn might lead to a change in their view of themselves as learners which might make them more willing to engage with the school about their children’s learning and to offer support to their children. This might then lead to a ‘Final outcome’ in the form of raised attainment for those children. The line of causation between the initial action and final outcome (the thick line) is indeed long and therefore both fragile and difficult to trace. Nonetheless, it exists.

Moreover, the attainment outcome for children might not be the only one. Parents’ success in their courses might lead them to undertake vocational training of some sort and this in turn might lead to their moving closer to paid employment (as we saw happen in the LEA 24 project). Their changed view of themselves might have impacts on family functioning and hence on the stability, well-being and educational performance of their children (hence the finer lines of outcomes and interactions in
the model). At the same time, it may be that the school will be doing more than simply offering courses to parents. It might (as in LEA 24) offer work experience placements to adults and this might itself impact on their skills, view of themselves as learners, willingness to engage with school and so on.

In reality, most of the extended schools in the pathfinder projects undertook multiple activities and many of them did so as part of a wider strategy in which other partner organisations and agencies were also active. Moreover, by no means all of the interactions will be positive. It may be, for instance, that one set of actions undermines another, or that there are crucial gaps, or that there are factors outside the control of the partners which inhibit their effectiveness. As a result, the causal web becomes extremely complex and it is difficult both to show how a particular action has a specific outcome at some distance from itself (like our ‘Final outcome’) and to predict with any accuracy what the distant consequences of an action will be.

It is, therefore, appropriate to be very cautious about claiming significant outcomes from extended schools, particularly at a point in time where such outcomes, even if they will ultimately materialise, are unlikely to have worked their way through the causal chain. This makes particularly problematic the more ambitious aims of some projects. For instance, a head in the LEA 11 project claimed that:
Our work is very much about raising aspirations and enabling people to recognise that they have skills. It is about providing hope for people. It is about changing people’s mindsets.

Or again, the co-ordinator of the LEA 24 project claimed that:

It is about raising opportunities and expectations of the whole community

Similarly, one of the heads in the project acknowledged:

You keep having to do that battle again and again with parents who are coming through. There isn’t an overall win situation where you actually change the culture of a community. That’s one of the things we’re going to have to look at through this, how we change the culture of the whole community.

These are laudable ambitions. However, this last head teacher is right to acknowledge how difficult they are to realise. Changes such as these will probably emerge, if at all, as a result of multiple actions across abroad front, will take time to materialise and will be subject to the influence of a wide range of unpredictable and uncontrollable contextual factors. Is there, then, anything we can say on the basis of our evidence about what extended schools are already achieving and might achieve in future? It seems to us that there are three claims that can reasonably be made:

• When extended schools target their activities directly on raising pupil attainments, there is good evidence that they can be successful. Such attainments are not fixed and extra opportunities to learn seem likely to make a difference to what is achievable.

• Likewise, when extended schools target their activities on families and communities, they can generate a wide range of positive benefits.

• Some extended schools are working with sufficiently ambitious aims and as part of a sufficiently wide-ranging strategy to make it possible that they could at least contribute to some fundamental, long-term outcomes, provided that there is also a sufficiently wide-ranging theory of change to inform their work.

This last point is crucial. Outcomes which are proximal to the actions which generate them are important, but are unlikely in themselves to relate to fundamental changes. For instance, pre-examination revision clubs for pupils are an important means of boosting the grades of those pupils who choose to participate. However, if this is all that happens, gains in ‘deep’ learning and profound impacts on the life chances of the majority of young people in the area are likely to be limited. Likewise, a small number of courses for adults may make some difference to those adults who participate, but are unlikely on their own to bring about large-scale transformations in the aspirations and living conditions of the communities from which those individuals are drawn.

However, implicit (and occasionally explicit) in what many informants told us are one or more ‘theories’ which might lead towards more fundamental change. Take, for instance, this comment from a LEA 24 head:

We determined that we couldn’t deal with pupil standards unless we also dealt with parental aspirations and also community aspirations as well.

The theory here seems to be that pupil attainment is about more than how well (in a technical sense) they are taught. It is also to do with ‘aspiration’ - which may refer to attitude, engagement and sense of self as a learner – which is in turn dependent on the ‘aspirations’ in this sense of parents and the community. We have seen evidence, of
course, that extended schools are likely to be impacting on ‘aspirations’ at these three levels. It is not unreasonable to suppose then that the hoped-for impacts on standards will ultimately emerge, particularly since the project in LEA 24 (like many others) is set in the context of a broad multi-agency approach where the work of schools is (hopefully) reinforced by that of other actors in local communities.

The questions which arise about this ‘theory’ are:

- Is the theory of change a valid one. Are ‘aspirations’ really the key and do community, family and pupil aspirations interact in the way implied here? And are they susceptible?
- If the theory is valid, do the actions taken by schools and their partners have the impacts in practice that are hoped for? Are they less effective than they might be, or do they have unforeseen perverse consequences?

In order to answer these questions, we suggest that two conditions need to be met. First, projects need to have access to sensitive measures of outcomes wherever possible. Some outcomes are difficult to measure numerically, but all can be assessed in some way. It therefore makes sense for projects to develop a bank of indicators which they can use to assess the effects they are having. As a step in this direction, we have assembled such a bank from the evaluative literature on extended schools and related initiatives. This is presented in appendix 4 in the expectation that projects will select from, adapt and develop this to meet their own needs. In any event, it ought to be possible for projects to move beyond the perceptions of professionals as the main evidence they rely on for their effectiveness.

Second, projects need to make their theories explicit, locate the actions they intend to take within those theories and track the extent which those actions do indeed have the impacts they intend. This means moving beyond the model of evaluation as accountability. Instead, the evaluation process needs to begin with the planning of projects as those plans are built around a well-informed needs assessment and an account of how particular actions are to start a process which will produce the sorts of changes that will meet those needs. Likewise, monitoring has to be not simply about whether milestones have been met, but about what impacts actions are having and whether these still seem likely to lead to the changes and outcomes that are intended.

The evidence we have is that some projects are not far from meeting these conditions. It would certainly be possible to find in different projects examples of a clear analysis of needs, the articulation of a coherent and convincing theory of change and the collection of detailed monitoring data. What is less clear, however, is that these positive features come together in each project so that meaningful and ongoing evaluation can take place. Not surprisingly, perhaps, most effort in the early stages has gone into the practical business of getting projects up and running in a relatively short time scale. In this context, the lack of prescription at national level, which is so much welcomed by projects, also means that there is no ‘fail-safe’ blueprint to follow which will come close to guaranteeing success. The development of more meaningful project-level evaluation and of the capacity to learn from that evaluation at national level is, we suggest, a useful area for development as the national roll-out of extended schools moves into its next phase.
5. Some conclusions and implications

5.1 Towards a coherent approach

The Extended Schools Pathfinder Project is in many ways an exploratory venture in which schools and LEAs have been encouraged to pursue developments that make sense in their own local contexts. Not surprisingly, the result has been a somewhat diverse set of initiatives with different aims, different forms of organisation and management and different activities. This diversity offers multiple options in terms of the way the extended schools initiative might develop nationally, but at the same time makes it very difficult to identify clear-cut ‘models’ of extended schools which could be tested in terms of their effectiveness in realising explicit and coherent aims.

In some cases, LEAs have replicated the national approach locally. They have clearly decided that there is no one model of extended schools, even at local level, and have opted to fund a wide range of relatively small-scale initiatives in a number of schools. Such an approach may well have had limited, but nonetheless positive, consequences locally, but takes us no nearer to identifying one or more models of extended schools which could be replicated nationally with a reasonable chance of success.

What has been more surprising, however, is the number of local projects which, despite their diversity, appear to have been informed by a common view – we used the term ‘theory’ in the previous chapter – of what extended schools are for and how best they can operate. Even in the projects where LEA strategic guidance has been relatively light-touch, similar views seem to have informed work at school level. As a result, although the pathfinder projects have not led to the development of a model of extended schools, they have moved us closer to being able to formulate a coherent understanding of such schools. This common understanding preserves a place for local diversity but nonetheless makes it possible to build up some shared knowledge nationally of how such schools can operate and what they may or may not be able to achieve.

In chapter 3, we suggested that an implicit definition of the task of an extended school was beginning to emerge from the local projects:

An extended school maximises the curricular learning of its pupils by promoting their overall development and by ensuring that the family and community contexts within which they live are as supportive of learning as possible.

We further suggested that such a definition made it possible to map out the ‘territory’ over which extended schools operate in terms of education issues, social issues and health issues. Viewing extended schools in this way, we suggest, has a number of advantages:

1. It ensures that schools retain a proper focus on learning within the curriculum. There are inevitable concerns that ‘extending’ the work of schools means ‘diluting’ their commitment to their core educational business. However, the definition emerging from the pathfinders sees extended work as an essential means of supporting and developing learning within the curriculum. It is, in other words, the way in which schools deliver their core commitment to curricular learning, not an alternative to that commitment.
2. The definition allows schools to tailor their extended activities to their local circumstances. Thinking in terms of the territory of extended schools rather than of a particular modus operandi means that schools are free to range across that territory as they see fit rather than being committed to particular activities that would need to be mandated nationally.

3. The notion of a territory which can be mapped out also gives schools a means of negotiating with potential partners who are active in the communities they serve. The more widely a school wishes to range, the less likely it is that it will be able to do so in isolation. A striking feature of the pathfinders is the extent to which they have operated as part of collaborative ventures, strategically organised. Clearly, some potential partners amongst community organisations and agencies have greater resources and expertise for working in parts of extended schools’ territory than do schools themselves. It therefore makes sense for schools to enter into collaboration with these partners, not in order to ‘diversify’ out of education, nor to ‘take over’ services offered by other agencies, but to ensure that all the factors which impact on children’s education are as supportive as possible.

4. The definition of extended schools offered here makes it possible to think in terms of a continuum of approaches rather than of a sharp division between ‘extended’ and ‘non-extended’ schools. If the defining feature of extended schools is that they set the curricular learning of their pupils in a wider education, family and community context, then all schools are – or should be – ‘extended’. The distinction, therefore, lies not in what schools see as their role but in how far they feel they need to become directly involved in areas that are distant from their curricular ‘core’.

It is arguable that all schools should be offering extended opportunities to learn, an extended view of what counts as learning and opportunities for families to become involved in children’s learning. Some of the schools in the Pathfinder Project were serving relatively advantaged populations, yet there was still a place for extended activities of these kinds. However, many schools were serving highly disadvantaged populations where the case for the school (with its partners) becoming extensively involved in wider educational, social and health issues was strong. The activities and approaches in the two kinds of school were very different, but the fundamental rationale for what they were doing was identical. It may be that, as the development of extended schools rolls out nationally, this notion of a continuum of responses to a shared imperative may be less divisive and more productive than a rigid distinction between a small number of specially-funded extended schools and a large number of other schools which cannot be expected to undertake extended activities because they are not funded in the same way.

5.2 Do extended schools ‘work’?
The Pathfinder Project has, in fact, been relatively low cost and the investment has yielded a high return. The provision of a fixed sum to a sample of LEAs has generated a great deal of activity across a much larger number of schools. Moreover, it is clear that in many cases the pathfinders funding has been combined with other sources of funding so that its impacts have been maximised. As a developmental project, therefore, the Pathfinder Project appears to have given very good value for money.
However if, as is now the case, extended schools are to be rolled out nationally, it is important to consider whether they offer value for money in terms of their returns to the economy and, more immediately, to children’s learning, to their well-being and to the well-being of their families and communities. There is certainly good evidence that particular activities have beneficial, short-term and limited-scale impacts and at this level, therefore, extended schools offer value for money. As we have seen, however, the ambitions of many projects have been greater than this, as they have sought to tackle some of the more fundamental disadvantages under which children, families and communities labour.

Here, the evidence is less conclusive. This is largely due to the time-limited nature of both the funded projects and this evaluation – though it should also be noted that there is no conclusive international evidence on this point. It is certainly, as many informants told us, too early to say definitively whether extended schools are having the sorts of fundamental and long-term effects at which many are aiming. Nonetheless, it is possible to say that, taking into account the demonstrable immediate impacts they are having and the increasingly convincing ‘theory of change’ which is beginning to emerge, it is reasonable to suppose that they will go on to have at least some important longer-term benefits.

We make three suggestions in relation to this issue:
1. It is, we suggest, important not to allow the nature of the initiative to be determined by the ease or difficulty of its evaluation. In other words, simply because immediate, small-scale effects are easier to identify, this should not mean that extended schools are encouraged to ‘think small’ and thereby forego the possibility of contributing to more fundamental changes.
2. There is clearly need for a longer-term national evaluation than has been possible here and it may be that something of this sort will be possible in conjunction with the national roll-out of full service extended schools. At the same time, however, as we indicated in chapter 4, there is a need for a reconceptualisation of what evaluation means at local level. A shift from evaluation-for-accountability to evaluation for learning and development is much needed and some thought might be given to how such a shift could be encouraged.
3. Extended schools are already drawing on multiple sources of funding, pursuing a wide range of aims and working in increasingly extensive partnerships. Under these circumstances, it is beginning to make less sense to evaluate them as isolated projects and initiatives. What is important is not so much what they do and achieve in their own right, but how they interact with other actions as part of broader strategies. It may be time to think about a more holistic approach to evaluation, mirroring the holistic approaches to intervention being developed locally. This might mean, for instance, taking localities in which extended schools and other initiatives were operating strategically and looking at the overall effects of their actions. Given the nature of these more strategic approaches, this would require some joint funding from DfES in collaboration with other relevant government departments.

5.3 Working practices
In chapter 3, we reviewed the process issues around extended schools as they are now developing. Given what we have said above about the emerging approaches to such schools, it might be worth considering the implications in terms of these process
issues. In particular, so long as extended schools operate close to their ‘core’ territory of learning in the curriculum, it seems likely that they can do very well within existing systems and structures. However, the further they range across their ‘territory’, the more important it seems to be that they develop systems and structures that are designed for the purpose.

In particular:

1. Once extended schools activities become substantial and involve engagement with local communities and community agencies, the task of managing them becomes too great for existing leadership structures to deal with. Some dedicated leadership structure is necessary, whether as part of the school leadership team, or partially separate from it. There seems to be no one model of how this might be done, but steps need to be taken to ensure that the head and senior staff of the school are not distracted from their core responsibilities by the need to manage extended activities.

2. Insofar as extended schools take on a wider, community role, it is important that they find ways of involving the community in shaping and governing their community-related activities. The great danger is that head teachers and their staff will come to believe that they ‘know best’ what is needed in communities without involving community members themselves. Equally dangerous is that they will listen to the voices of the minority of community members who willingly engage with the school without listening to the voices of others who are, as one CEO put it, ‘hard to reach’. The benefits of genuine community involvement are demonstrated in the LEA 16 initiative, where that involvement itself was beginning to bring about positive changes in the community. However, such involvement is not easy to achieve and schools may need to collaborate on this with their partners who already work closely with local communities.

3. This in turn has implications for the relationship between schools and partners. This seems to operate on two levels. First, there is a clear need for extended schools to access guidance – probably in the form of shared information and experience – and there is an important role here both for local co-ordinators and for some sort of national information exchange.

   Second, schools need to be locked into collaborative relationships with a range of organisations and agencies. There is no reason why schools cannot do much of this for themselves, provided they have put in place the staff who can invest the necessary time into this process. However, this model is less likely to work where the aim is not to enlist other agencies into the school’s agenda but to develop a coherent strategy across all partners. Here there is a clear role for a co-ordinating body. We found some evidence that LSPs could fulfil this role – but equally that not all of them had sufficiently understood the possibilities and necessities of involving schools in their work. It seems to be more feasible, in the current situation at least, for LEAs – or, more correctly, local authorities corporately – to take a lead role in developing strategy and bringing schools on board. For LEAs in particular this may raise some difficulties in terms of the expectation that they will focus on raising standards of pupil attainment and will intervene in schools in inverse proportion to the success of those schools as measured by the attainments of their pupils. This model, we suggest, will need to be rethought insofar as schools are expected to rethink their roles so that ‘extended’ activities become to a greater or lesser extent the responsibility of all schools.
5.4 Beyond extended schools projects

Through the Demonstration and Pathfinder phases of the extended schools initiative, the development of such schools has been thought of as a ‘project’. That is, time-limited funding has been made available nationally for schools to develop activities over and above those they would normally undertake. Schools and LEAs have then been accountable for how they have used their funds and evaluations have been commissioned to try to understand what have been the outcomes of these projects.

This way of thinking has clearly been highly effective in generating a range of activity. It has encouraged LEAs and schools to focus their energies in a particular direction and has allowed DfES to retain some control over the use of additional public funds. However, we suggest that it may now be time to move away from this way of thinking about extended schools. We suggest this for a number of reasons:

- In some cases, extended schools have never really been projects in the true sense. Rather, the additional funding has been used to sustain and extend styles of working that were already well-established. It has become part of an ongoing stream of funding to support an ongoing strand of work. The trappings of the project (in terms of bids, reports and accountability) have simply added a bureaucratic burden to the business of sustaining important work.

- Whether extended schools have been entirely new or not, the short-term nature of the funding has been problematic for schools and LEAs. In some cases, as we have seen, projects have cut their coat according to their cloth by supporting a multiplicity of small-scale initiatives. However, since many projects at both local and school level have sought to bring about long-term effects from sustained interventions, short-term funding has simply made it more difficult for them to operate as they wished while imposing all the bureaucratic burdens referred to in the previous point.

- As extended schools have involved themselves in a range of local strategies and collaborations, the model of funding their work separately from that of their partners has become less appropriate – particular since their partners themselves tend to be funded in a similar way, but on different time scales and with different lines of accountability.

We have suggested above that it is now possible to offer a coherent definition of the task of extended schools and that the important question is not whether a school is ‘extended’ but where it sits within the territory of extended activities that concern all schools. This implies that the funding model for extended schools should not be based on enabling them to do something optional and additional, but on maintaining a stream of activity that is central to their educational purpose. At the same time, although the model should not differentiate between extended schools and ‘the rest’, it should be able to reflect the extent and range of activities which different schools will need to undertake.

Funding issues such as this are complex and there are good reasons why the government might be cautious about jeopardising these new developments by subsuming the (relatively limited amount of) extended schools funding within schools’ budgets. Nonetheless, it might be worth considering ways in which funding for extended activities could become part of recurrent funding for schools with some sort of formula-based sliding scale to reflect different circumstances. An even more
problematic alternative – but, we suggest, one that is worth consideration – is whether and how local partnerships involving extended schools might be funded. LSPs offer a model here, but so too do the proposals for ‘integrated’ local authority departments within the Every Child Matters (DfES, 2003, 2004) agenda, together with the ongoing development of Children’s Trusts.

5.5 Extended schools: an idea whose time has come - again?
This mention of other policy developments is not accidental. Extended schools sit well not only with the proposals of Every Child Matters and the emergence of Children’s Trusts, but also with the ongoing work of the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, the continuing exploration of how to improve city schools (Bell, 2003), the work on community cohesion and a whole range of ‘integrated’ initiatives from SureStart to Children’s Fund and the Connexions service. From an overall public policy perspective, what links these developments is a recognition that deeply-ingrained social problems cannot be tackled by government departments and local agencies working in isolation. From an educational perspective, what links them is a realisation that the next phase of the ‘standards agenda’ will need to look beyond what happens in the confines of the classroom and the school and that educational achievement and family and community conditions are intimately interrelated.

It is possible that extended schools could become simply another initiative, with important but essentially small-scale and time-limited effects. However, the government commitment to roll out full-service extended schools in every LEA suggests that something more ambitious is intended. The evidence from the pathfinders, however cautiously it needs to be interpreted, suggests that there is real potential for extended schools to become part of wide-ranging strategic approaches at local level. Those approaches have significant implications for how all schools conceptualise their roles in future.

There is a sense in which the extended school is an old idea which has simply found a new opportunity to flourish. It clearly has its roots in village colleges, community schools and (in disadvantaged localities) in education priority areas. However, none of these quite matches the approaches that are beginning to emerge in some of the pathfinders. There is, therefore, rich potential for a real development in the way in which schools relate to their communities and set about educating their pupils.
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Appendix 1: Pathfinder LEAs

Birmingham
Bradford
Brighton and Hove
Cambridgeshire
Cornwall
Durham
Gateshead
Greenwich
Hertfordshire
Lancashire
Lincolnshire
Medway
Middlesbrough
Newcastle
Newham
Nottinghamshire
Norfolk
North Tyneside
Northumberland
Oldham
Portsmouth
Sefton
Solihull
Tameside
Warwickshire
## Appendix 2, table 1: descriptive characterisation of pathfinder projects

<p>| LEA 1 | U | R | Co+ SMT + St Grp | L | 3 | Y | 2 | 1 |
| LEA 2 | U + 1 R | R | SMT+St Grp | L + S | 10 | Y | 8 | 1 |
| LEA 3 | U+R | R+C (50/50) | LEA Co | L | 9 | N | 3 | 6 |
| LEA 4 | U | R | Co + SMT+ St Grp | L + S | 10 | Y | 1 | 8 |
| LEA 5 | R/U | R | Co | L + S | 3 | N | 3 | 0 |
| LEA 6 | R | R | Co + SMT | L | 12 | Y | 9 | 3 |
| LEA 7 | U | R | Co + SMT | S | 22 | Y | 22 | 5 |
| LEA 8 | U | R | St Grp | L | 10 | N | 7 | 3 |
| LEA 9 | U+R | R+C (50/50) | SMT + LEA Co | L + S | 6 | Y | 4 | 2 |
| LEA 10 | U+R | R | LEA Co + Link W | L | 28 | Y | 15 | 13 |
| LEA 11 | R | C | Co + SMT | L + S | 3 | N | 2 | 1 |
| LEA 12 | U | C | Co + St Grp | L | 3 | Y | 2 | 0 |
| LEA 13 | U | R | LEA Co + Sec | S | 3 | N | 2 | 1 |
| LEA 14 | R | R+C (25/75) | Co + St Grp | L + S | 11 | N | 11 | 0 |
| LEA 15 | U | C | Co + St Grp | L + S | 1 | N | 1 | 0 |
| LEA 16 | U | R | LEA Co + SMT | L + S | 3 | Y | 0 | 3 |
| LEA 17 | R | C | LEA Co + SMT+St Grp | S | 6 | Y | 4 | 2 |
| LEA 18 | R | R | LEA Co + Sec | L + S | 4 | Y | 0 | 4 |
| LEA 19 | U | R + C (50/50) | Co + SMT | L + S | 2 | N | 0 | 2 |
| LEA 20 | R | C | SMT + Devel W | S | 1 | N | 0 | 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Do schools have specialist status?</th>
<th>Are they mainly in disadvantaged areas?</th>
<th>Are other funding sources used to complement the ES?</th>
<th>Do they include a special school?</th>
<th>Is the approach part of a strategic plan (as opposed to an ad hoc approach?)</th>
<th>Is the approach best described as enhancement or transformation?</th>
<th>Are the issues addressed mainly community (C) or education (E) based?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 22</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SMT + LEA Co</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 23</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>St Grp + LEA Co</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 24</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LEA Co + SMT + St Grp + Devel</td>
<td>L + S</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 25</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sec + LEA Co + St Grp</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>14+16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 2, table 2: descriptive characterisation of pathfinder projects continued**
| LEA 19 | Y | Y+N | Y | N | Y | E+T | C+E |
| LEA 20 | Y | Y   | Y | N | Y | E+T | C+E |
| LEA 21 | Y | N   | N | N | Y | E   | C+E |
| LEA 22 | Y | Y   | Y | Y | Y | E   | C+E |
| LEA 23 | N | Y   | Y | N | Y | E+T | C+E |
| LEA 24 | N | Y   | Y | N | Y | E+T | C+E |
| LEA 25 | N | Y   | Y | N | Y | E+T | C+E |
### Appendix 3: main activities undertaken by projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>after schools clubs</th>
<th>breakfast clubs</th>
<th>holiday clubs</th>
<th>specialist support</th>
<th>family learning</th>
<th>adult education</th>
<th>parenting support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning mentors</td>
<td>SHARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting skills sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Homeless children</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 4</td>
<td>Study support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Family literacy classes</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 5</td>
<td>Study support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Easter revision</td>
<td>Family learning days</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 6</td>
<td>Kids Club</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Learning mentors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Support Workers</td>
<td>Family literacy classes</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Family Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 8</td>
<td>Sports &amp; arts focused</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>BEST teams</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEST teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SEN teams</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifelong learning centre</td>
<td>Mother &amp; Toddler group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>BEST teams</td>
<td>Family literacy &amp; Num’cy</td>
<td>Cookery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Youth workers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent drop in centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Behaviour support</td>
<td>Keeping up with children</td>
<td>Literacy &amp; num.G13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>BEST teams</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Summer schools</td>
<td>SHARE</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 19</td>
<td>Sports &amp; arts focused</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Easter revision</td>
<td>Peer support</td>
<td>Lads &amp; Dads</td>
<td>Neigh’d Learning Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK on line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 21</td>
<td>Sports &amp; arts focused</td>
<td>Connexions (on site)</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Neigh' Learning Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 22</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 23</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Behaviour support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>childcare</th>
<th>community use of facilities</th>
<th>community cohesion</th>
<th>crime reduction</th>
<th>health</th>
<th>social services</th>
<th>multi-agency base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>Sure Start provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health promotion</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>Neigh’d nursery</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Links mosques</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech therapy</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 3</td>
<td>Sessional crèche</td>
<td>Community kitchen</td>
<td>Drug awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug awareness</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 4</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counselling service</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Community garden</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>Drug awareness</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 6</td>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>Training rooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother &amp; Baby clinic</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Events for all ages</td>
<td>Community PC on site</td>
<td>Healthy Schools</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 8</td>
<td>Children’s Centre</td>
<td>Community room</td>
<td>Visit to cultural sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health drop in centre</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 9</td>
<td>Neigh’d nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health centre on site</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 11</td>
<td>EarlyExc. Centre</td>
<td>Links mosques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baby massage</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>IT equipment</td>
<td>Community PC on site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Health</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 13</td>
<td>Wrap around care</td>
<td>Footpaths link schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General health advice</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 14</td>
<td>Nursery on site</td>
<td>Business Centre</td>
<td>weekly Police visits x5 month</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 15</td>
<td>Play group</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 16</td>
<td>Sure Start</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nutritional advice</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Internet Café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA 18</th>
<th>Crèche</th>
<th>School mini bus</th>
<th>Family therapy</th>
<th>EWOs</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 19</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>Sexual Health drop in</td>
<td>EWOs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Community prefab</td>
<td>Links with elderly</td>
<td>PC on site</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 22</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Community library</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 23</td>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>Community café</td>
<td>Community nurse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 24</td>
<td>Sure Start provision</td>
<td>Community room</td>
<td>Links being developed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 25</td>
<td>Nursery and crèche</td>
<td>Community room</td>
<td>Links with elderly</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Healthy Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Outcome indicators from other projects and studies

How to use this appendix

Some of the research literature reports impacts and outcomes from extended school approaches and their equivalents. In some cases, details are presented of the sorts of indicators that were used to identify these impacts and the ways in which these were measured or otherwise assessed. The table below sets out this information, albeit in summarised form.

Those who are involved in planning, developing or managing extended schools can use this information in a number of ways:

- The ‘areas of intended impact’ column gives some indication of the sorts of impacts which different extended activities might be expected to have. This may be useful for schools and LEAs wishing to identify the sorts of impacts at which they are aiming.
- The ‘potential indicators’ column directs schools and LEAs towards the particular changes which might indicate that their activities were having the desired impact.
- The ‘data technique’ column shows what kinds of data collection can be used to assess change on these indicators. Schools and LEAs may wish to adopt, adapt or find alternatives for these methods in their own work.
- The ‘source’ column directs schools and LEAs towards the source of our information. A full list of references is given below and, where these are easy to access (as in the case of material placed on web sites), users would be well advised to read the original rather than relying on our brief summary.
- Schools and LEAs may well wish to create a matrix of this sort for themselves, setting out their activities, the areas in which they wish to have an impact, the indicators of any impact and the data collection techniques they intend to use.

Although, as we say in the body of the report, the evaluation of impacts and outcomes from extended schools as a whole is complex, the identification of the immediate effects of particular activities is much less so. Most (though not all) of the evaluations listed here use a mixture of performance data, questionnaire surveys and interviews. These techniques have their limitations, but they are not beyond the capacity of most schools and LEAs to undertake. Moreover, they can provide valuable additional feedback to supplement the perceptions of extended school managers and professionals.
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### Appendix 4, table 1: Outcome indicators from other projects and studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of intended impact</th>
<th>Potential Indicators</th>
<th>Data Technique</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTENDED SCHOOL PROVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Support, Extra curricular activities</td>
<td>Pupil Attainment</td>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>Provided by schools. Multiple regressions performed on results linked with participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Support, Extra curricular activities</td>
<td>Pupil attitudes towards school</td>
<td>Not specified (possibly changes in behaviour and attainment)</td>
<td>Attitude questionnaire administered to pupils containing 5 scales - positive attitudes towards school work, towards school ethos, acceptance of utilitarian purposes of school, academic self esteem, commitment to participation in class and individual discussions with teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Support</td>
<td>Absenteeism / Attendance Pupil Exclusion and Inclusion Raised Expectations of Pupils, Pupil Retention</td>
<td>Average number of half day absences Average number of half days per 100 pupils of temporary exclusion Percentage of pupils progressing to further/higher education and percentage entering employment.</td>
<td>Collecting and analysing quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Hours Activities</td>
<td>Engaging pupils in out of school hours activities</td>
<td>Establishment of after-school and holiday clubs reflecting pupils’ interests. Participation rates</td>
<td>Abbey Wood School-Audit of pupils’ interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Hours Learning</td>
<td>Engaging pupils in out of school hours activities</td>
<td>Levels of personal outcomes for students e.g. motivation and self-confidence, learning outcome, life skills; outcomes for schools, families and communities</td>
<td>Surveys (in particular interviews with and comments from) with pupils, teachers, families, club organisers. Case studies. Attendance rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programme</td>
<td>Climate of school</td>
<td>Parents' perspective – extent to which they view the school as a safe and supportive environment</td>
<td>Survey of parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work</td>
<td>Engaging young people in out of school hours activities</td>
<td>Levels of self esteem and other personal outcomes</td>
<td>Conversations with young people, photos, video/audio tapes, the self-evaluation of young people and recording of accredited learning outcomes e.g. through Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme and records of achievement. Also, attendance rates and progression routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended schooling in general</td>
<td>Pupils attitudes to school, Pupils emotional maturity, Pupils cognitive skills, Future careers of pupils</td>
<td>Attitudes to school, levels of maturity, skills levels and knowledge of career options; rates of attendance, homework completion, pro-social behaviour</td>
<td>Attitude surveys with pupils and teachers. School discipline and attendance records; Observations; Test scores and report cards; Career interviews; Case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended schooling in general</td>
<td>Pupil behaviour</td>
<td>Level of troublesome behaviour</td>
<td>Parent and student surveys asking if the activities helped them to stay out of trouble. Measurements of pupils behaviour over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Eating Programmes</td>
<td>Pupil Health</td>
<td>Level of pupil health</td>
<td>Questionnaire asking respondents to rate the extent to which their school can be described as being health promoting. Compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School councils, circle time, surveys of pupils views etc</td>
<td>Pupil Engagement</td>
<td>Provision of opportunities</td>
<td>Questionnaire to assess extent and number of extra curricular activities compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and numeracy programme</td>
<td>Retention of at risk students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Survey and telephone interviews with project leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and numeracy programmes</td>
<td>Pupil Self Esteem</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>Survey and telephone interviews with project leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full service schools</td>
<td>Literacy and numeracy levels</td>
<td>Numeracy and literacy scores</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full service schooling</td>
<td>Student support, networking with community, identification of at risk needs, teachers skills developed</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Surveys and telephone interviews with project leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full service schooling</td>
<td>Resource sharing among schools</td>
<td>Links / initiative with other schools</td>
<td>Surveys and telephone interviews with project leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>Accessibility of services for students</td>
<td>Provision and ease of access to such services</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Information</td>
<td>Transition of school leavers into vocational training</td>
<td>Percentage of pupils going on to vocational training</td>
<td>Surveys and telephone interviews with project leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY PROVISION**

| Nativity concert at hospice, entertainment for elderly, Community Art Project etc | Community engagement | Level of similar activities | Questionnaire assessing the extent of increased involvement in activities within the community. | Sammons, P. et al (2002) |

**PARENT/FAMILY PROVISION**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literacy and Numeracy classes, 'Confident Parents: Confident Children' course. Lone Parents Group</strong></th>
<th><strong>Parent and family engagement.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Presence of activity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Questionnaire assessing the extent of increased parent / family provision.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sammons, P. et al (2002)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Plus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parental involvement in the school</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level of parental involvement in the school.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abby Wood School: Questionnaire distributed to parents to canvass their skills and enlist their help with after-school and holiday activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>CEDC and Education Extra (2002)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER AGENCY PROVISION / LINKS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sure Start advice on parental health</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parental Health</strong></td>
<td><strong>Health behaviour (smoking, drinking, drug use), Mental health (including depression and self esteem), Physical health</strong></td>
<td><strong>Melhuish, E. (2002)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sure Start</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Dynamics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intimate relationship quality, levels of domestic violence, parenting stress.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A single 1.5-2 hour visit to each home involving an interview with the principal caregiver. NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires. No more specific info given.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sure Start</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parenting / Home Environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quality of home learning environment, parent-child relationship, discipline, family organisation, father contact and involvement, parental literacy</strong></td>
<td><strong>HOME observation (Emotional Responsivity, Cognitive Stimulation - Caldwell and Bradley), Child Behaviour Rating During Assessment (Bayley, 1969). A single 1.5-2 hour visit to each home involving an interview with the principal caregiver. NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sure Start</strong></td>
<td><strong>Childcare</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level of provision</strong></td>
<td><strong>ECERS-R. (Harms, Clifford&amp;Cryer, 1998), ECERS-E (Sylva et al. 2000), Adult Child Interaction Scale (Arnett, 1989). A single 1.5-2 hour visit to each home involving an interview with the principal caregiver. NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires. No more specific info given.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Local environment quality, housing adversity, belonging to neighbourhood, density of acquaintanceship, local social ties, perceptions of local danger / disorder</td>
<td>Local Environment Quality checklist, Belonging and Perceptions of Local Danger / Disorder - Barnes (1997). NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires. No more specific info given.</td>
<td>Melhuish, E. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start</td>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Numerous measures, for more detail, see Sure Start Methodology Report.</td>
<td>A single 1.5-2 hour visit to each home involving an interview with the principal caregiver. NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires. No more specific info given.</td>
<td>Melhuish, E. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start</td>
<td>Utilization of services</td>
<td>Visits to GP over recent period, and for whom. Use of A&amp;E and specialist services (e.g. mental health), contacts with relevant agencies. Views about volume, quality, and appropriateness of services used, whether service providers dealt with problems or referred them, speed of response to a problem and follow up care.</td>
<td>A single 1.5-2 hour visit to each home involving an interview with the principal caregiver. NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires. No more specific info given.</td>
<td>Melhuish, E. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start</td>
<td>Economic Context</td>
<td>Current / recent training / education activities of parents. Benefit family is receiving.</td>
<td>A single 1.5-2 hour visit to each home involving an interview with the principal caregiver. NESS website also has numerous links to local evaluative material such as locally developed questionnaires. No more specific info given.</td>
<td>Melhuish, E. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School involvement with other education, health policy and social policy initiatives.</td>
<td>(Not stated) Sharing of resources, increased access to services, economic advantages etc</td>
<td>Number of school links</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Sammons, P. et al (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dental health Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pupils Dental Health</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of pupils brushing teeth twice a day, % of pupils having regular dental check ups</td>
<td>Collecting quantitative data</td>
<td>Sammons, P. et al (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Health Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pupils Fitness</strong></td>
<td>Percentage walking / cycling to school, % taking vigorous exercise</td>
<td>Collecting quantitative data</td>
<td>Sammons, P. et al (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Health Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pupil Diet, smoking, alcohol etc</strong></td>
<td>Percentage over / underweight etc</td>
<td>Collecting quantitative data</td>
<td>Sammons, P. et al (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police and YOT contact</strong></td>
<td><strong>Crime levels</strong></td>
<td>Rate of burglary&amp; theft, rate of drug arrests, rate of violent crime, rate of juvenile contact with the police</td>
<td>Uniformly available statistics</td>
<td>Melhuish, E. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Community Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Levels of health</td>
<td>Number of health visits</td>
<td>Allan, J &amp; Remedios, R (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Community Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promoting citizenship and social inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Extent of promotion of citizenship and social inclusion</td>
<td>Number of initiatives put in place to bring people together and number of people who attend</td>
<td>Allan, J &amp; Remedios, R (2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPEN/SPECIALIST FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Survey of around 14,600 11-16 year olds and validated archival indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Survey of around 14,600 11-16 year olds and validated archival indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Community Schools</td>
<td>Meeting needs of pupils, parents and community</td>
<td>Level of community engagement, increased support for vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Sammons, P. et al. (2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of partnership working, management and delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School, parent and pupil surveys (conducted by the evaluation team and some schools) to explore a range of issues including views on community engagement, support for vulnerable groups, partnership working, leadership, effectiveness of strategies for promoting better health etc. Case studies produced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>