London Student Pledge Evaluation

Lesley Hoggart, Karen Mackinnon,
Kathryn Ray, Rebecca Taylor and Sandra Vegeris
Policy Studies Institute

Carl Parsons
Canterbury Christ Church University

department for
children, schools and families

London Student Pledge Evaluation

*Lesley Hoggart, Karen Mackinnon,
Kathryn Ray, Rebecca Taylor and Sandra Vegeris*

Policy Studies Institute

Carl Parsons

Canterbury Christ Church University

Content

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Policy Studies Institute, in partnership with Canterbury Christ Church University, was commissioned by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) to conduct an evaluation of the London Student Pledge (LSP).

The LSP formed part of the London Challenge Strategy (2003-2008), and was designed to widen young people's experiences and raise aspirations through the creation of enrichment activities for them inside and outside school. It offered 10 challenges for London secondary school students to achieve before the age of sixteen:

1. I will have had the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to.
2. My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated - at school or outside.
3. I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts.
4. I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production.
5. I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay.
6. I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities.
7. I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue.
8. I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths.
9. I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end.
10. I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology.

Since 2003, 25 organisations have been part-funded through the LSP to provide students with opportunities to achieve these Pledges. The evaluation focused on 21 organisations that received LSP funding during the last three years of the programme. Evidence was also collected from providers that did not receive LSP funding, and teachers and students who organised and participated in activities.

Key Findings

- All stakeholders thought that the funding had increased the enrichment opportunities available for London school children.

- Pledge activity was reported by teachers and students to have had a significant and diverse range of benefits for students and schools.

- Providers were agreed that if they wanted to target more disadvantaged schools and children, then more time and resources were needed to ensure those schools' involvement. The funding had enabled them to do this.

- The evidence was inadequate for judging costs and value for money, primarily because standardised information on project budgets was not a requirement of grant administration, and cross-subsidisation was difficult to audit. In addition, judging value for money would require qualitative judgements of the value of very diverse and complex provision.

- The activities that were part funded by an LSP grant tended to be arts related; few providers offered experiences of science and technology

- There was a general lack of awareness of the 10 Pledge challenges among all stakeholders.

Methodology

The main aims of the evaluation were:

1. To assess whether the funding programme adds value to the London Student Pledge and the London Challenge Strategy
2. To evaluate the delivery and impact of the programme of funding
3. To help inform the decision about whether the Department should support similar work in other cities, and how this might be done effectively
4. To contribute towards the overall evaluation of the London Challenge Programme

The evaluation was carried out in autumn 2007 and spring 2008. It combined quantitative and qualitative methods, and consisted of four strands:

<u>Strand A</u>: A census postal survey of all organisations (approximately 200) who had registered their interest in LSP provision on a dedicated website.

<u>Strand B</u>: Detailed research with the 21 providers who received LSP funding since 2005, and a comparison sample of 10 providers who had not. The methods used at this stage of the research were: a financial audit; semi-structured interviews with project staff; and collection of management Information (MI) data.

<u>Strand C</u>: Detailed research with a sample of ten schools that had participated in activities that were part funded by the LSP. The methods used for this stage of research were: semi-structured interviews with school staff and focus groups with students.

<u>Strand D</u>: Overarching analysis that drew together the multiple strands of evidence.

Summary of main findings

This summary draws on all the data sources outlined above.

Provision of Pledge activities

- Twenty-one organisations who received LSP funding were studied. Grants ranged in value from £3,000 to £1,600,000 and, in many cases, made a significant contribution towards the costs of delivering LSP-related activities. Funded organisations offered a range of opportunities to students, including theatre, visual arts, sports, residential stays, volunteering and debating. These activities varied in length and intensity: from one-off events, to projects that spanned a school year, to residential stays.

- The majority of activities on offer were associated with the visual and performing arts. In contrast, opportunities related to environmental/science education were under-represented.

- Providers reported that the LSP funding enabled them to devote extra time and effort to the attempt to work with schools experiencing deprivation and educational underachievement. Providers noted that the challenges of working with schools were magnified in these areas and the extra money gave them the resources required to support the participation of staff and students. Additionally, some providers used the

money to develop new programmes specifically aimed at the Student Pledge (and London Challenge) remit, whilst others were able to extend the breadth of their provision.

- There was considerable variation in the extent of the coordination and promotion of the Pledge. Particularly striking was the lack of awareness of the Pledge challenges, on the part of the providers and, even more so, at the schools visited. There was limited knowledge of the Pledge itself amongst those organisations included on the website, and even the providers that have been part-funded by DCSF were not all fully aware of the Pledge or London Challenge. Providers from the comparison group, moreover, were not aware that the Pledge had funding opportunities

Funding process and monitoring

- The majority (17/21) of the organisations included in the study had received repeat LSP funding over two or three years. The data suggest a lack of transparency over funding decisions (with no open competition for funds), and what might be seen as too light a touch in the monitoring of part-funded provision. Providers described the grant application and monitoring arrangements as 'informal' and 'light touch'. The light touch does mean that managers of providing organisations were able to proceed with their work providing for schools. This approach also reduced the administrative burden normally associated with funding applications, and allowed flexibility in how providers allocated money within a project.

- A number of drawbacks, however, also stem from the light touch. Uneven monitoring makes it virtually impossible to report, at the individual project and overall programme levels, the unit cost for different activities, and to calculate the unit cost for different activities.

- Despite minimal monitoring and reporting requirements, all providers reported they evaluated their projects, often as a requirement of other funding bodies.

- A substantial number of providers (10) had no funding in place to sustain LSP-related provision beyond 2008, while nine stated that they had full or partial funding to support future activities, or similar activities in the future.

Offer and take up of activities

- Good practice by providers included working with key school staff, and tailoring activities to the expressed needs of schools. Once a good relationship was established with a school, often through an individual teacher, providers would be called on year after year.

- There was little evidence that schools had developed a strategy for the promotion and take up of Pledge opportunities. The research has shown that there is great unevenness in the extent to which teachers, and schools, will be pro-active and in some cases even responsive, to Pledge offers. The selection of students to take part in activities can often depend on one teacher taking advantage of an opportunity for some of their students.

- Both providers and school staff identified barriers that presented a challenge to the offer and take up of the opportunities by schools. These included: limited teacher time; staff turnover; student behaviour problems; lack of support from senior staff for extra-curricular activities; and tensions with the attainment agenda. Providers noted that some disadvantaged schools faced too many barriers to participate at all.

Outcomes for schools and students

- Pledge activity was reported by teachers and students to have had a significant range of benefits for students and schools. Positive changes were reported in curriculum based skills, confidence, staff-student relations, and behaviour and attitudes to learning.

- Some of the evidence suggests the exposure to new experiences enabled students to begin a process of 'enrichment' activities, nurturing aspirations that were sustained beyond the funded activity.

Value for money

- The evidence that was collected suggests that Pledge funding has facilitated the participation of large numbers of London's secondary school children in a wide range of worthwhile extra-curricular activities. Perceptions from all the stakeholders interviewed for this study were that such activity has great value for school students and their schools. It was estimated that more than 66,000 additional students participated in Pledge funded projects.

- The projects were all very different so that it is difficult to compare costs. Project accounts were not standardised and, together with substantive project-to-project differences, it was not possible to draw an accurate comparison of provision that was supported by the Pledge. Consequently, it has not been possible to calculate the added value of the funding.

- The evidence suggests that many of the providers did provide value for money in the activities that they delivered. The added value of part-funded activities stemmed primarily from the additional resources that the organisations were able to draw in to their activities (such as world class actors and directors), and the way that some activities were designed to be self-sustaining after funding ended. Another way in which providers developed sustainability was through providing skills training (for staff or students) for an activity that the school could then take on themselves.

- In order to make a fuller assessment of additionality and value for money of the Pledge funding stream, it would be necessary to perform a longer-term follow-up study, including a comprehensive assessment of the other funding sources available to providers to support similar activities, and other providers drawn upon by schools.

Conclusions

The London Student Pledge programme has the potential to reinforce the Extended Schools and Every Child Matters agendas, as well as the City Challenge programmes, by offering a framework for enhancing the life opportunities of secondary school students. The following points draw on the evaluation evidence and are presented to the DCSF and stakeholders as suggestions for consideration.

1. Pledge-related enrichment activities are worthwhile and the DCSF should consider how to support such activities. However, if funding were to continue, clear criteria need to be developed and publicised.
2. Any future funding should be more closely scrutinised and monitored.
3. The DCSF needs to monitor the quality of Pledge provision, and promote universal access to that provision.

4. Local authorities could be given the responsibility for overseeing Pledge activities in their schools, and would need to be allocated resources to do this.

5. The Student Pledge could be promoted as a tool to help schools plan and monitor extra-curricular activities; and as something all their students can aspire to. It would be sensible to encourage Pledge-focused activities as part of the implementation of the Extended Schools policy.

6. Schools need easily accessible, reliable and up-to-date information about the range of Pledge activities offered, and about the providers.

7. Schools should to be alerted to the fact that monitoring extra-curricular activities is increasingly becoming an area of responsibility which needs significant staff input and management.

8. Schools also need guidance on how to ensure that all children can be offered appropriate activities.

Chapter 1:   Introduction

Aims

The London Student Pledge (LSP) is an initiative which aims to widen young people's experiences and aspirations through the creation of opportunities for them to learn across ten broad areas of activity both inside and outside of school. It comprises ten challenges for London school students to achieve before they are sixteen:

1. I will have had the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to.
2. My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated - at school or outside.
3. I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts.
4. I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production.
5. I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay.
6. I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities.
7. I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue.
8. I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths.
9. I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end.
10. I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology.

In recent years a number of initiatives have aimed at encouraging extra-curricular activities among school children and developing better links between schools and communities. These include Extended Schools (DfES~Teachernet, 2005), Community Schools, Study Support (Wilson et al, 2004; DfES, 2006) and, within London, the Mayor's Children and Young People Strategy. Extended school activities and extra-curricular initiatives have been offered in an organised and monitored way in a minority of schools where an 'Extended Learning Management Team' promotes the involvement of students across an array of activity from Arts and Culture to residential stays and informal education "fun trips" (QiSS, 2006). The Children's Plan: Building Brighter Futures (DCSF 2007) has reiterated the government's commitment to the provision of 'universal opportunities for positive activities'. Studies from the US have shown that extra curricular activities can have positive benefits to students in relation to improved attainment and reduced drop out rates (Chambers and Schreiber 2004, Mahoney 2000).

The Pledge is one part of the London Challenge strategy (2003-2008) that aims to help London secondary schools raise educational standards. The London Challenge operates at three levels: school, local authority and London-wide, with an overall aim of making London a leading learning and creative city. It targeted five boroughs for extra help with the schools. These were Hackney, Haringey, Islington, Lambeth and Southwark. The aim is to bring the benefits of experiential learning to *all* young people in London, including disadvantaged students who may currently have fewer opportunities to do this. This is particularly relevant given the high child poverty rates in London (DMAG Briefing, 2006). While opportunities for some of the areas of experience will arise at school, others will be facilitated by voluntary sector and other partner organisations. Over 200 providers in London initially showed support for the Pledge by offering activities designed to meet one or more of the Pledge expectations, and signing up to the Pledge website. Over five years, the London Challenge programme has part-funded approximately 25 of these, in order to help increase such provision to secondary school students in London. The focus of this research is on the impact of this funding on opportunities for extra-curricular activities in London.

The evaluation

The research, commissioned by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) has focused on the programme of funding to support the Pledge. This includes how it has been delivered and what the impact has been on the opportunities for extra-curricular activities for secondary school students in London. It has done this by collecting evidence from different stakeholders on the programme of funding and the activities that it supports. The data provide a broad range of information in order to assess the effectiveness of the funding programme and to inform DCSF in deciding how similar initiatives might be supported. The research also set out to assess the extent to which the funding programme has provided added value, (over and above activities that would otherwise be provided to schools) by collecting data from organisations that have been part-funded and those that have not, and from schools that have participated in part-funded, and non-funded, activities. A central aim of the research has been to identify good practice, which might be shared, transferred or used more widely when working with schools in different areas of the country.

In summary, the aims of the research were:

1. To assess whether the funding programme adds value to the London Student Pledge and the London Challenge Strategy
2. To evaluate the delivery and impact of the programme of funding
3. To help inform the decision about whether the Department should support similar work in other cities, and how this might be done effectively
4. To contribute towards the overall evaluation of the London Challenge Programme

Objectives

The evaluation had three main objectives:

- **Funding.** To assess the cost of enhancing the opportunities for extra-curricular activities for secondary school students in London.

- **Offer and take up**. To examine the extent to which the funding has improved the provision, and take-up, of extra-curricular activities that offer the experiential opportunities envisioned by the Pledge.

- **Evaluating outcomes.** To assess whether the funding programme has added value to the London Student Pledge and thereby to the London Challenge Strategy.

Methodology

The methodology selected for this evaluation combined quantitative and qualitative methods, and consisted of four strands: strand A, provider postal survey; strand B, provider site visits; strand C, school visits; strand D, overarching analysis.

- Strand A: a census postal survey of all London providers (approximately 200) who deliver activities in support of the Pledge and registered on the Pledge website.

The survey was conducted during October-December 2007 to collect information from LSP part-funded providers and other organisations that had registered an interest in LSP and may offer activities to the target student population.[1] Fifty-three organisations responded (21 part-funded[2] and 32 non-funded providers).[3] The questionnaire was administered mainly by post but an electronic version was made available for those who wished to reply via email.

The survey sampling frame was known to be over-generalised and there were many duplicate organisations within the contact lists. The survey was seen very much as a scoping exercise to profile the part-funded provision and to identify other (not LSP part-funded) organisations that provide LSP activities. The survey enabled the collection of standardised information to aid comparisons. Questions elicited information on: main types of activities on offer; activities that correspond to the London Student Pledge; size (staff, participant numbers); descriptions of participant groups: age, numbers, demographics; geographical area covered; sources of funding; plans for sustainability; evaluation activities; views about the Pledge. A copy of the survey instrument is available in Appendix A.

- Strand B: detailed qualitative research consisting of site visits and interviews with the 21 providers who have obtained funding through the London Challenge programme since 2005, and a comparison sample of 10 of those who have not.

Thirty-one organisations participated in the half-day site visit - all 21 LSP part-funded organisations and 10 other organisations that provide similar activities and registered their interest in the Pledge but have not received funding from the Pledge grant scheme. These other organisations were identified from responses to the Provider Survey and, among those who agreed to take part, were purposively selected to match the types of activities offered by the part-funded providers. The site visit consisted of a recorded semi structured interview with one or more key informants, usually project delivery staff and / or staff responsible for procuring project funding. An audit instrument had been sent out to providers in advance and responses to these were reviewed during the visit. Additional information on provision was obtained from a tour of facilities, promotional materials, reports and evaluations.

---

[1] Only those providers who received LSP funding during financial years 05/06, 06/07 and 07/08 were included in the survey. The wider population of LSP providers was undefined at the time of the study. Surveys were sent to 256 organisations identified from the LSP website but it was not known if all these organisations supplied LSP related activities. To boost response rates, the survey was followed by a reminder letter and telephone calls. Direct communication revealed that a substantial number of the organisations were not involved with LSP activities. The non-funded provider respondents are therefore not necessarily representative, rather, they should be taken as an indication of other organisations delivering activities to London KS3 and KS4 students.

[2] These organisations had received a Pledge grant in at least one of the previous three years (05/06, 06/07, 07/08) of the scheme.)

[3] Although a survey was not returned by one part-funded provider, relevant information was retrieved from the Strand B site visit so that all part-funded providers are included in the survey data analysis.

During the site visits to providers, researchers gathered information about: the delivery and effectiveness of the organisation's Pledge activities, including relationships with participating schools, the effectiveness of any targeting and barriers to effective take-up; their perceived contribution to the London Student Pledge; the delivery and effectiveness of the funding, including the funding process, the adequacy of funding, sustainability and alternative funding sources. Refer to Appendix B for the interview topic guide and audit instrument.

- Strand C: detailed research with a sample of schools (ten) who have participated in Pledge-related activities part-funded through the London Challenge programme.

The sampling of the 10 schools followed completion of Strand B, and a number of criteria were used when selecting the schools. The first was that these were schools that had participated in activities that had been organized by one or more of the providers from strand B within the last year. Secondly, one school within each of the five London Challenge target boroughs were sampled (with the exception of Hackney where a number of schools were unable to take part in the research). These four schools were supplemented by six schools in a range of inner and outer London boroughs. Schools were also sampled by the type of provision they had received, i.e. drama, sport, dance, etc, in order to obtain a broad cross section. Although some schools were in receipt of several different types of LSP provision, one of these was chosen as the primary focus for the fieldwork. Finally, sampling took into account schools position in the families of schools (DfES 2006a) classification in order to obtain a cross section and ensure the inclusion of more deprived schools.

With the need to keep disruption for the school to a minimum, researchers focused on achieving two semi structured staff interviews and a student focus group in each school. The first staff interview was with the class teacher who had organized the students' participation in an activity. Where possible and appropriate a second interview was sought with a staff member who could give an overview of where the Pledge activities sat in relation to other activities organized by the school. This second staff member was identified and interviewed in 6 of the 10 schools (see appendix C for staff topic guides). The 10 focus groups each consisted of around 8 students on average usually from one class or year group with the ages ranging from 11 to 16). The focus group began with a short questionnaire asking students to identify how they felt about the activity with answers on a 4 point scale ranging from 'yes a lot' to 'not at all'. They were also given the opportunity to tick which Pledge activities they felt the provision had helped them to achieve. The focus group discussion that followed, explored issues of what they liked and disliked about the activity, what they felt they had learned and how the activity might have changed their attitudes and aspirations in any way (see appendix D for questionnaires and topic guides).

In addition to the fieldwork in 10 schools, two students were interviewed independently of a school. They had taken part in a provision that worked with individual students and where the school played little or no part in mediating the activity. These two students were both recruited to the research via the provider and interviewed on a one to one basis although the format of the interview followed the format of the focus groups beginning with the questionnaire and then following the same topic guide.

All students were provided with an information sheet on the project and consent forms and where the focus group took place without a teacher present they also obtained parental consent (see appendix E).

- Strand D: overarching analysis.

The research thus employed a range of methods to assess whether, and the extent to which, the funding programme has effectively improved the ability of providers to offer, and schools to take up, the enrichment opportunities envisioned by the London Student Pledge. In the final stage of the research these data were drawn together, and the views and opinions of

the different stake-holders were compared. At this stage of the research an additional interview was conducted with one key informant who had played a role in designing and implementing the Pledge initiative.

The evaluation of an initiative where the elements of the provision were so disparate in nature was a challenge. The research team adopted an iterative and flexible approach in order to respond to difficulties with data collection and analysis. In particular, the complexity, and lack of comparability of the providers' funding arrangements, and the variable quality of the financial records, emerged as a major issue early in the research process. This resulted in a decision, in consultation with the DCSF project manager, to strengthen the focus on the qualitative element of the research with the providers and not to provide a full cost-effectiveness analysis. The focus of the over-arching analysis was how, and whether, the Pledge funding had succeeded in enhancing enrichment opportunities for London's school students; and the perceived value of this funding.

The Report

The rest of this report comprises a further five chapters. Chapter two looks at the types of activities offered to students and the coverage of the ten LSP statements. It compares LSP part-funded providers to other organisations who registered on the Pledge website and also responded to the postal survey. A detailed discussion on the nature and extent of funding these providers received is covered in Chapter 3. Chapter four moves on to look at the delivery of the part-funded activities, from the perspectives of both the providers and the schools, drawing out any differences between the experiences of the two. This chapter also draws out key challenges and elements of good practice in the offer and take-up of Pledge activities. Chapter five, also drawing on data from the schools and the providers, turns to an assessment of the outcomes of the Pledge funding programme. Chapter six ends the report with conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 2:   London Student Pledge Providers

Introduction

This chapter first describes those providers that have received an LSP grant, looking at organisational characteristics, types of activities offered to students and coverage of the 10 LSP statements. It goes on to compare LSP part-funded providers to other organisations that signed up to the Pledge and also responded to a postal survey on LSP activity provision. Whilst mainly drawing on the survey data (on which all the tables are based), the comparison is supplemented by data from the provider site visits, and also from the student questionnaire. Details on the nature and extent of funding these providers received are discussed in Chapter 3.

LSP part-funded providers

The 21 organisations that received funding from the DCSF (formerly DfES) to support delivery of London Student Pledge activities across the years 05/06, 06/07 and 07/08 represented good coverage of the region with most offering activities to students in both inner and outer London - 19 indicated they serve Inner London while 18 said they serve the Outer London region. Ten also provided activities to students outside of London. Table 2.1 breaks down the take up of provision by different student groups, as reported by the LSP part-funded organisations. All but one reported they regularly deliver activities to the KS3 and KS4 LSP target age groups. Fourteen stated they work with all student groups, including pre-school and Advanced Secondary levels; only six of the providers reported working exclusively with KS3 and KS4 students.

Table 2.1: Main student groups who access activities as reported by LSP part-funded organisations

	Multiple frequencies
	N
Key Stage 3 (11-14)	*18*
Key Stage 4 (15-16)	*19*
Primary / Infant	*11*
Other[4]	*11*
All	*21*

* includes pre-school and Advanced Secondary levels

Although London Student Pledge branding and funding has been available since 2003, organisations have been offering similar activities for longer. On average, part-funded organisations have been providing LSP related activities for 4.4 years - this ranged from 1.9 to 13.8 years. The size of organisations varied greatly from two to 887 staff. On average, staff comprised approximately twice as many paid employees (20) as volunteers (12). Providers reported they engage with an average of 16,340 secondary students each year (ranging from 150 to 130,000) and these students accounted for just over two-thirds of their total yearly participants.

---

[4] Includes pre-school and Advanced Secondary levels. This includes all the activities of the provider and is not therefore confined to those activities that were part-funded through the Pledge. One provider, however, did acknowledge, in the site visit interview, that Pledge funds were used to help finance activities for primary school children. This had not been the intention of Pledge funding.

Types of activity

Organisations generally concentrated on one area of provision and offered specialist services to the LSP student population. Provider activities broadly clustered around five categories of provision (displayed in Table 2.2). By far the most common category of activities related to the arts (performing arts or arts education and activities), offered by 15 (75 per cent) of the providers. These included arts appreciation and hands-on opportunities over a broad spectrum of arts provision. For instance, one art gallery provided an artist in residence over a school year, during which time the artist would facilitate an art project with the students and also take them to visit the artist's work studio and a public gallery. Some theatre-based providers supplemented production visits with workshops for students held either in school or at the theatre and supplied resource packs for students and teachers based on the production they would be attending. A literature-focused provider ran a programme in which well-known authors worked with students in schools to produce a written piece. Another provider arranged music training in schools with lunchtime and after school sessions on voice, percussion, drumming and MCing.

The remaining provision was distributed among 'training in leadership and enterprise awareness (including student placements)' (3), such as coordinating community volunteering; and 'sporting, physical or outdoor education' type activities (2) such as a mini Olympics coaching programme. One provider was engaged in running residential courses, operating as an umbrella organisation for several different providers including PGL, Outward Bound, the National Trust, as well as their own field studies centres. This provider offered a broad range of curriculum courses, covering sciences and geography, and adventure courses which focused on outdoor activities.

Table 2.2: Activities offered by LSP part-funded providers

Frequency

Type of activity	Example activities	N
Performing arts / arts education / arts activities	Theatre: audience access; student / teacher theatre workshops; script writing Visual arts: art gallery visit; artist facilitated project; art criticism Music Dance Literature	15
Training leadership / enterprise awareness / student placements	Volunteering Debating	3
Sports / physical and outdoors education	Non-traditional sports; coaching mini Olympics	2
Environmental / science education	Residential stays	1
Other activities		1
*Total**		*22*

* One part-funded provider has been double counted and is included in both the sports and arts education categories.

Coverage of the London Student Pledge

Organisations were presented with the list of 10 Student Pledge statements and asked to indicate which were addressed through their service provision. These are reproduced in Table 2.3 according to prevalence of responses. The majority (18/21) of LSP part-funded providers indicated they were aware of the London Student Pledge. During follow-up interviews, some recognised the funding stream as the London Challenge, while others were able to talk generally about the ethos of the programme (to provide opportunities for young people to experience cultural activities and events). A small number of respondents knew very little about the Pledge or London Challenge. Among those who were not familiar, it is possible that these questionnaires were completed by staff who had not been involved in the procurement of funding or possibly the delivery of activities. Some interviewees had not been part of the original application process (because of staff turnover in the organisations) and so had less of a sense of the original aims of the funding, but again this varied.

When considering the 10 statements that constitute the Pledge, most providers related their activities to the recognition of student talents and participation in a public event. Taken together, all 21 of the part-funded organisations reported that their provision covers either the statement "My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated" or "I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts".

It was less common for part-funded activities to relate to Pledges about volunteering, project design/delivery, expressing views on London, or appreciation for different cultures and faiths (each supported by six or seven - around a third - of providers). Finally, only two of the LSP part-funded providers recorded their provision against the statement "I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology". In general, the distribution of LSP statements covered by the part-funded providers aligns with the types of organisational activities presented in Table 2.2. Therefore, it is not surprising that provision is weighted towards arts participation and arts events.

All LSP part-funded organisations indicated they addressed more than one of the Pledges. The median number of LSP statements covered was five, while 17 (over 80 per cent) of providers were engaging students in more than three of the Pledges. This suggests that, although most part-funded organisations are delivering Pledge experiences through an arts related forum, they are enabling students to cover a variety of the Pledges. Still, it should be noted that science and technology activities are under-represented among the LSP part-funded providers.

A few respondents voiced concern about the lack of information available on the Pledge initiative. Another issue that was raised related to the need for grant funding bodies to extend commitments beyond one year to ensure that these activities for young people are sustainable.

Table 2.3: Coverage of London Student Pledge statements by part-funded providers

Multiple frequencies

	N
My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated	18
I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts	18
I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue	14
I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay	13
I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production.	12
I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities	7
I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end	7
I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths	7
I will have the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to	6
I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology	2
All part-funded providers	21

Other organisations involved in LSP activities

To establish a basis for comparison, the study also included organisations registered on the LSP website who did not receive the LSP grant. This section compares LSP part-funded providers to the other organisations (herein 'other providers') who responded to the postal survey (n=32), a further ten of which participated in a site visit and follow-up interview. Again, it should be borne in mind that these other providers are not a representative sample and should be treated as indicative of the provision that is available.

Awareness of LSP

The other providers varied quite widely in their remit, and given these divergent experiences, they had very different interests in and thus knowledge of the London Student Pledge. Fewer than half of the 32 other organisations that responded to the survey question indicated they were familiar with the Pledge. During follow-up interviews, several said they had heard of the London Challenge but struggled to make the link between their activities and the Student Pledge. One, for example, referred to signing up for a 'Learning Outside the Classroom' manifesto launched by the DCSF, but was unsure if this involved the Pledge. Another provider, based in an Outer London borough, saw the Pledge as something more relevant to Inner London providers. By contrast, a third organisation had signed up to the Pledge very enthusiastically, saying that the Pledge activities matched the framework that they were using to map young people's expectations for their education.

LSP provision

Similar to the LSP part-funded providers, other organisation provision was weighted towards the arts - 12/32 offered arts-related activities. Yet, a substantial amount of other organisations' provision was also clustered around life skills training/leadership and student placements (9/32 providers). As reported in the survey, coverage of the London Student Pledge by other providers was slightly skewed towards the statements: 'I will have been on

an educational visit or overnight stay' and 'My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated.' On average, other providers covered a narrower range of the Pledges, while 80 per cent of LSP part-funded providers reported that their provision covered more than three of the 10 Pledges, under a third of other providers did so. (Refer to Table 2.4.) Similar to part-funded providers, relatively few of the other providers hosted activities that corresponded to the statement, 'I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology'. This finding was confirmed by the student questionnaire data. When presented with the Pledge list and asked to indicate which ones they had achieved to date, very few students had marked this statement.

Table 2.4: Number of LSP statements related to provider activities

Frequencies

	LSP part-funded providers	Other providers
3 or fewer LSP Pledges	4	13
More than 3 LSP Pledges	17	19
Median number of Pledges	5	4
Total	21	32

Delivery structures

There were more differences between part-funded and other providers regarding their structural characteristics. Other providers had been delivering LSP related activities to students for far longer, nearly three times longer than LSP part-funded organisations (12.3 years compared to 4.4 years). Other providers also relied much more heavily on volunteers and on average they employed more than three times as many volunteers but almost half as many paid employees as their part-funded counterparts.

Summary

The survey findings suggest that LSP part-funded provision is biased in favour of the arts – visual and performing arts and arts appreciation. Fifteen of the 21 part-funded providers described their provision in this way and all reported that their provision covered either the statement "My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated" or "I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts". In contrast, activities related to environmental / science education were under-represented; only two of the LSP part-funded providers reported their activities were relevant to the Pledge, "I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology".

In contrast with other organisations that also work with KS3 and KS4 students, however, LSP part-funded organisations appear to provide a wider coverage of the 10 individual Pledges. They were also more likely to be familiar with the idea of the Pledge, although in cases of staff replacement that knowledge was often not transferred.

Chapter 3:   London Student Pledge Funding

Introduction

This chapter draws upon a number of data sources to give an overview of the cost and scope of extra-curricular activities provided for London secondary school students through the Pledge funding. This is primarily based on quantitative data from the cost study, but also draws upon qualitative data from the interviews and documentary analysis.

To carry out the cost study, site visits were conducted with all 21 part-funded providers and ten comparison providers that did not receive LSP funding. Although the audit instrument was sent in advance of the visit, data on costs from the part-funded projects was variable and incomplete and even more so from the non-funded projects. The 21 part-funded projects were not part-funded for all years and our analysis examines the part-funded projects for the two years separately, 2005-06 and 2006-07. The 2007-08 predicted figures are given only in Table 3.1; these show anticipated rises in LSP funding and proportionately larger rises in the total finance expected to be allocated to work with young people. Parallel analyses of each of the two completed years offers an opportunity for comparison across the two years and a check on consistency, most important because of the level of estimation that has been necessary from the figures supplied. There was great inconsistency in the figures collected and numerous estimates and combinations of figures have had to be made by the researchers. Providers have had great difficulties in determining post hoc how much LSP funding and how much funding from other sources was allocated to individual initiatives. They have also struggled to report how the funds were distributed across different sorts of expenditure necessary to keep an organisation going. A range of information sources were drawn on by providers (Management Information Systems, accounts departments, evaluations and other documentation) but in most cases it has been insufficient to permit any robust aggregation.

Therefore, it has been particularly difficult to show the proportions of funding spent on administrative tasks, training etc. Nonetheless, using these multiple lines of evidence, it was possible to provide a picture of the programme financing from which policy implications can be drawn, both for the allocation of funding and for future monitoring and management procedures.

Funding and numbers

The LSP grant recipients were organisations of different sizes and territorial coverage - some were national. Collectively, they had turnovers of over £40M annually. Over a three year period, 21 providers were part-funded to enhance their ability to support elements of the London Student Pledge. The amount was around £2.5M each year.

Table 3.1 sets out the numbers of projects part-funded and the total funding available for the most recent three years of the scheme. It also sets out the figures made available by some of the providers on their total expenditure on Pledge-related work with young people. Altogether, it is evident that the LSP funding available and allocated to *additional* provision for young people is considerable. The LSP grant funding almost doubled the value of funding available to these organisations to address Pledge goals. The contribution of LSP funding to these organisations is significant - and acknowledged to be so by the providers. Six received grants for all three years, ten for two years and five for one year.[5] One provider, the Field

---

[5] These data are for the most recent three years of the scheme (05/06; 06/07; 07/08). Data supplied by DCSF.

Studies Council, received £1.6M in each of the three years. The value of the remaining grants ranged from £3,000 to £239,000.

Table 3.1: Projects part-funded 2005-08

Year	Number of part-funded providers	Total LSP funding	Total finance allocated to education and young people work by part-funded providers	Number of responses giving total finance information
2005-06	12	£2,306,550	£4,524,000	11
2006-07	17	£2,515,285	£5,304,000	17
2007-08 (predicted)	15	£2,539,485	£6,176,000 (predicted)	11

In the survey, nineteen of the 21 part-funded providers cited information on the status of their future funding (refer to Table F1). A substantial number of providers (10) reported they had no future funding in place to sustain LSP related activities beyond 2008 while nine stated that they had full or partial funding to support similar activities in the future. This varied by type of provider activity and organisational size. Those organisations that specialised in training and student placements reported they had no funding in place to sustain these activities beyond the current year. By contrast, organisations that offered either sport or science based activities reported they had funding to sustain them beyond 2008. Very few (only three out of 12) of the small-to-medium sized organisations (those with less than 65 staff and volunteers) reported they had funding to sustain LSP activities beyond 2008. In comparison, all but one (four out of five) of the larger organisations (those with more than 65 staff and volunteers) had funding for LSP related provision beyond 2008.

Table 3.2 shows the funding allocation over two years, according to broad types of provider activities. The analysis in Table 3.2 excludes the Field Studies Council which accounted for more than half of the funding in each of the years. A similar pattern emerges for both years with Pledge funding allocated mostly to arts-related initiatives. This finding corresponds to the number of projects part-funded for this area of extra-curricular activity and verifies the discussions in Chapter 2.

Table 3.2: LSP-part-funded projects and the focus of their provision

	Number	2005/06 LSP funding	%	Number	2006/07 LSP funding	%
Performing arts/arts education/arts activities	7	353,550	50.0	12	494,951	54.1
Training in Leadership / enterprise awareness / student placements	2	282,000	39.9	1	227,250	24.8
Sports / physical and outdoors education	1	30,000	4.2	2	103,000	11.3
Other activities	1	41,000	5.8	1	90,084	9.8
Total	11	706,550		16	915,285	

It is important to note that work on Pledge related activities was also part-funded from other sources. Table 3.3 indicates the amounts and sources of funding as reported by the providers. It shows a consistency from year to year in the amounts provided from different funding sources. Participation fees constituted the main source of financial support, followed by a central government loan and the LSP grant. LSP part-funded providers who reported access to 'other' sources of funding specified that this funding came from trusts, foundations, Arts Council England or corporate sponsorship.

Table 3.3: Funding sources and work with schools and young people

	Part-funded providers	
Funding source	Amount of funding 2005/06 N = 12	Amount of funding 2006/07 N = 17
Participation fees	£9,262,000	£9,469,000
Central government grant	£5,867,000	£6,080,000
LSP grant	£2,245,000	£2,397,000
Private donation	£1,915,000	£1,773,000
Local government grant	£577,000	£614,000
Lottery Grant	£98,000	£380,000
Other	£6,299,000	£7,938,000

Table 3.4 indicates the numbers of schools, teachers and students reported to have benefited from the LSP programme and, within that, the number specifically part-funded by LSP. The table shows that approximately double the number of students are benefiting from Pledge related activities as are directly part-funded by LSP (2006/7 figures). There will inevitably be double counting in that some schools (teachers and students) may be involved in more than one activity. The significant increase in numbers of schools and teachers involved in 2006/07 is entirely explained by one, new infrastructure project (see below) reported to be reaching all London secondary schools with web information. It should be noted that aggregated participation estimates are likely to be generous. Figures reported by provider organisations are likely to include multiple counts of schools, teachers and students who had taken up more than one activity offered by an organisation and / or been involved with different providers.

Table 3.4: Schools, teachers and students involved in LSP related and LSP part-funded activities

Year	Number of providers reporting	Funding	Schools	Teachers	Students
2005/06	12	All LSP-related activities	2829	3976	73127
		Specifically part-funded by LSP	1682	2212	53597
2006/07	16	All LSP-related activities	3504	6019	94634
		Specifically part-funded by LSP	1919	3822	47113

Table G1 itemises activities of the range of providers and shows the range and numbers of schools, teachers and students involved. Provision covered a wide range of activity such as, staff development for teachers, curriculum resources, theatre visits and workshops, gallery visits and support materials, and pupil residentials.

Table 3.5 indicates the large numbers of schools, teachers and students participating in activities. The providers have been divided into four categories because of the distinctive differences in what they offer:

- The Field Studies Council - providing and coordinating residential visits

- Infrastructure projects - working at the school level, providing information or bringing schools together in partnership

- One-off events - e.g. festivals, concerts

- Longer duration programmes - activities that continue for the course of the school year.

The longer duration projects, such as theatre and sporting activities, involved over 1,000 schools and over 30,000 students.

Table 3.5: LSP part-funded providers - categories and numbers

Category	Year	No of Providers	Schools	Teachers	Students
Field Studies Council* London Challenge *New Views* residential administered by FSC	2005/06	10	235 (326 courses)	1353	13527
	2006/07	10	245 (inc. courses & teachers' workshops)	774	13983
Infrastructure projects	2005/06	0	0	0	0
	2006/07	2	594	1410	0
One-off events	2005/06	2	5	38	205
	2006/07	0	0	0	0
Longer duration programme	2005/06	9	1409	1223	31377
	2006/07	13	1120	1660	30691

* in collaboration with 10 other organisations coordinated by FSC.

Column totals are not given since this will almost certainly introduce further multiple counting as many of the schools and their teachers and students will be involved in more than one category of activity.

Student numbers across Key Stages 2, 3 and 4, as reported by LSP part-funded providers are set out in Table 3.6. The bulk of beneficiaries were secondary students. However, the figures suggest that KS2 students were also benefiting from the Pledge-related activities; five out of 12 providers in 2005/06 and eight out of 17 providers in 2006/07 reported they worked with these younger students. Totals for separate Key Stages were difficult to arrive at since some providers did not keep data on students by Key Stage.

Table 3.6: Key stage characteristics of students

Year		Part-funded providers	
		Number of students involved (number of providers reporting)	Number of providers catering for Key Stage but not providing number broken down by KS
2005/06	KS2	6,800 (2)	3
	KS3	11,284 (7)	3
	KS4	18,999 (8)	2
2006/07	KS2	11,618 (5)	3
	KS3	21,938 (9)	4
	KS4	16,899 (7)	3

Comparison providers

Usable financial information was received from only four (out of 10) comparison providers who did not receive LSP funding. These data are not tabulated due to the diversity and varied quality of the information supplied. Indications from these organisations are that many schools, teachers and students are being served, some at full cost. Slightly less than half of the comparison providers reported they have funding in place to sustain their LSP activities beyond 2008. This was similar to the LSP-part-funded providers.

Data from the survey suggest that, compared to LSP-part-funded providers, other provider organisations were more likely to charge participation fees to help cover the costs of their LSP activities - half indicated they receive these fees, compared to just over a third of the LSP-part-funded providers (Table 3.7). A lottery grant was also a more important funding source to the other providers.

Table 3.7: Provider funding sources

	Number of part-funded providers	Number of comparison providers
Central government grant	13	12
Participation fees	8	16
Private donation	8	10
Local government grant	5	11
Lottery grant	2	10
Other	7	12
No source of funding recorded	0	3
All providers	21	32

Costs per student

This section presents a picture of costs per student averaged across projects, or per school in the case of two of the projects. Table 3.8 provides an aggregate costing per student for project running costs reported for 2005-06 and 2006-07. Whilst it is clear that a lot of young people are receiving inputs at a significant level of cost - mostly highly subsidised - simply dividing the total grant by total students is a crude measure. It does not account for differences amongst the activities or the amount of supervision required. Further analyses in this section will help to explain the cost allocation across the two years.

Table 3.8: Overall costing per student for LSP-part-funded projects

	Numbers of LSP-part-funded providers catering directly for students	LSP Grant (total)	LSP student numbers[6]	Mean cost per student
2005-06	12	£2,306,550	53157	£43.39
2006-07	13	£2,376,201	45895	£51.77

Where sufficient detail on attendance of activities was provided on the audit tool, it was possible to estimate the numbers involved in individual activities, acknowledging multiple activities supplied by one provider. Table G1 itemizes activities of the LSP part-funded providers and shows the range and numbers of schools, teachers and students involved. This listing reinforces the diversity of provision available through Pledge funding and the range in the volumes of students and schools that were engaged. The numbers involved were, in some cases, very considerable.

Table G2 gives an indication of the range of activities and charges related to each of the constituent activities. Tables G3 (2005/06) and G4 (2006/07) break this down still further to an hourly charge per student and the actual cost to the student, taking account of the reduction resulting from the LSP funding. Some activities for large groups cost as little as £0.63 per student hour. Student workshops over 16 hours may cost £3.13 per hour but no cost to the student (Activity 1036 - 2005/06). A five day residential may cost £210 to manage but cost the student nothing. Reflecting on these data, it is evident that more detailed accounting would help assess the appropriateness and the vale for money of the expenditure.

The next subsections examine the four categories of projects as listed in Table 3.5 and their costs.

---

[6] Does not include any count for the infrastructure projects.

Field Studies Council

The Field Studies Council received £1.6 million per year. Table 3.9 shows the numbers of schools, teachers and young people who are catered for by the residential provision and teacher training.

Table 3.9: Field Studies Council ~ school, teacher and student numbers

		Number of providers	Schools	Teachers	Students
2005-06	All LSP-related at FSC Centres	1	331	740	12585
	Specifically part-funded by LSP at FSC Centres	1	71	231	2312
	All specifically part-funded by LSP - other providers but co-ordinated by FSC	10	235 (326 courses)	1353	13527
2006-07	All LSP-related at FSC Centres	1	349	928	13,923
	Specifically part-funded by LSP at FSC Centres	1	34	124	1243
	All specifically part-funded by LSP	10	245 (inc. courses & teacher workshops)	774	6954

£1.6M funding allowed £1.53M to be allocated directly to residential course fees. The contribution to the individual students averaged £113 in 2005/06 and £220 in 2006/07. The full cost of residential visits ranged from £90 to £234 depending on the type and length of course. Any remaining costs not covered by the LSP grant were sourced by contributions from the students or their schools.

This is clearly a very important provision where there is an emphasis on including those who might not be able to afford it or from schools that habitually do not perform well.

One-off events

Two projects were part-funded in one year for one-off events. Table 3.10 shows the numbers of schools, teachers and students involved. It also indicates that the vast majority were part-funded from income generated from sources other than LSP. The providers report that the contribution from LSP was helpful in topping up the funds required.

Table 3.10: One-off events 2005/06 ~ school, teacher and student numbers

	Number of providers	Schools	Teachers	Students
All LSP-related	2	89	632	3,300
Specifically part-funded by LSP *	2	5	38	205

* The 'specifically part-funded by LSP' are part of the total of 'All LSP related'

The £58,000 received by these two projects crudely equates to a cost of £283 per student - but this is almost certainly not a fair reflection on the activities supported. Some of the activities would have been with small groups over several days and have involved considerable supervision and inputs. Again, some further information and the nature of the experience would help judgements about worth and inform decisions about future funding.

Infrastructure Projects

In 2006/2007 two infrastructure projects were part-funded (Table 3.11). These have targeted schools and teachers, either for the supply of support for partnerships or for the development of a website. The two providers report that all of the funding received for their projects came from LSP. The numbers reported to be reached by the organisation that provided a website are very large particularly in contrast to the organisation that encouraged partnership development through brokering relationships.

Table 3.11: Infrastructure projects 2006/07 ~ all specifically part-funded by LSP

	Number of providers	Schools	Funding
Website development	1	572	£48,000
Partnership development	1	100	£25,000

The funding for the two projects totals £73,000. All of the activities were part-funded by the Pledge. The reach of the website is calculated to be all London secondary schools (572) and the cost per school was therefore £83.92.[7] The development of partnerships between schools is more demanding of labour and averages out at £250 per school.

---

[7] Without surveying all the schools it is not possible to calculate how many schools used the website. This was beyond the scope of this evaluation.

Longer duration projects

Most of the initiatives were of a longer duration, some available all year round. The numbers of schools, teachers and students involved was considerable and the numbers catered for specifically by funding from LSP was also large - about half of the total. Refer to Table 3.12.

Table 3.12: Longer duration programmes ~ school, teacher and student numbers

		Number of providers	Schools	Teachers	Students
2005-06	All LSP-related	8	2,422	3,155	71,502
	Specifically part-funded by LSP*	8	1,118	1,638	33,190
2006-07	All LSP-related	15	2,582	3,133	59,273
	Specifically part-funded by LSP*	15	1,490	1,470	40,957

* The 'specifically part-funded by LSP' are part of the total of 'All LSP related'

Dividing the total grant by the number of student beneficiaries gives a cost per student for the provision of £19.50 in 2005/06 and £20.30 in 2006/07. There is wide variation in costs per student/activity (ranging from £6 to £400), both within and across providers, and this is partly explained by the different durations of activities. Table G2 sets out charges for the specific activities noted on the audit tool. Also set out is the charge to the student, which is, in most cases, nil.

Value for Money

One can note from the variable cost information given that large numbers of schools, teachers and students were served by the LSP funding. Even acknowledging the multiple counting of schools, teachers and pupils, large numbers have been touched by these enrichment activities.

Adhering to a strictly computational model, it is noteworthy that costs vary considerably and that a basis for judgement, and about prioritising for future funding, is not easily available from current data. Because costing data supplied was very much in aggregate form it is difficult to determine with confidence the cost for activities per hour of activity (eg for residentials). The data provided, even if detailed and consistent (which it was not), would have been difficult to manipulate to support judgements about additionality, value-added or value for money. Indeed, value for money calculations need to include in any calculation a judgement on *quality of provision or outcome.*

Table G2 includes at the end of the list some information on non-part-funded providers' activities supporting the LSP. These generally charge full costs. Some providers have significant other government funding and can set up activities at little or no charge to the student. Some subsidise to some extent and some charge full cost.

Provider views on LSP funding

This section presents provider views on the LSP funding stream, including their experiences of applying for funding, their views about the funding stream (in relation to other funding they received); and what they felt constituted the 'added value' of the LSP funding.

Table 3.13 displays the distribution of responses to the question, 'How important is the LSP funding to your provision?' All but one part-funded provider indicated the grant was important for delivering their LSP projects and this indicates how highly valued the funding was.

Table 3.13: How important is the LSP funding to your provision?

	Number
Very important	13
Quite important	4
Not very important	1

Twelve part-funded providers supplied an estimate on the number of extra students that participated in their projects as a result of LSP funding - this totalled 66,628 students. Written comments on the audit tool help to elucidate the importance of LSP funding:

> *'The LSP provides half or all our funding so it is very important to us. It is also important as it enables us to provide a unique service to London schools and artists…[We] believe the funding should continue if the government are serious about supporting extra curricular activities'.*

> *'We are indebted to the Department of Children, Schools & Families for its belief in our work and for allowing us to grow and develop... We believe your support has created a meaningful legacy for both teachers and young people - as well as enabling us to bring outstanding practitioners into direct contact with young people to help them explore and understand how theatre and the arts can impact their lives. Thank you for this most valued opportunity'.*

> *'The grant has been instrumental in the delivery of programmes for young people in schools who otherwise would not have had the opportunity to participate'.*

> *'The London Student Pledge is about a right to culture for young people. It provides important support to organisations working with young people in order to ensure that young people not only know what's out there for them, but are given the tools, the language, the support to make visits, speak out and take part in culture as citizens'.*

Other organisations emphasised the importance of the LSP grant for influencing corporate and other funders, and thought that the continuation of funding from corporate donors was in part dependant upon the foundation of funding from the London Challenge.

The LSP funding process

Information about the funding process was collected through interviews with key staff. The providers overwhelmingly agreed that the LSP funding application process was 'easy', 'straightforward' and 'light touch'. This was both in terms of the process of applying for funding, as well as the monitoring and reporting requirements. Several providers spoke about an 'informal' process of applying for funding that in many cases took the form of a telephone conversation or face-to-face meeting to agree project details, followed by a short write-up of the project scope and delivery targets by the provider. This straightforward approach to receiving funding was welcomed by the vast majority of the providers, who felt that it made a

welcome change from 'the hoops' that they were normally required to jump through in order to gain funding.

There were a number of advantages identified by providers:

The process reduced the considerable administrative burden that was normally associated with applying for funding. This was particularly important for smaller organisations that did not have a fundraising department or a large administrative team, and allowed more energy to be devoted to the delivery of projects:

> 'that is so time effective, which means that people have got more time to actually be doing the delivery of the work than jumping through the hoops'

The 'light touch' monitoring allowed the providers to be flexible in how they allocated the funding within the overall parameters of the project or activity. Some providers spoke about the benefit of being able to shift funding between different budget headings, as needs arose.

A large number of providers spoke about how the ease of obtaining funding indicated a relationship of 'trust' with the DCSF which was very important to them. In particular, the way that they had been able to negotiate the scope and content of projects with DCSF indicated to them that DCSF trusted them as an organisation and valued their specialist skills:

> 'more than anyone else that have part-funded us, there was an implicit trust in the [provider] as an organisation based on track record,'

Finally, related to this, those providers who spoke about negotiating the scope and content of projects with DCSF also felt that this resulted in the development of projects which accorded with the mutual objectives of *both* organisations. This was felt to be more advantageous than the usual process of applying for funding, in which providers had to alter their activities or objectives to more closely align with those of funders:

> 'it was like somebody understood what it is you are trying to do and said "Do it" and that's so rare you know. … one of the problems in the charity world, as you may know, is that you end up chasing money, and when you start chasing you end up sort of twisting yourself out of position, you start doing things that aren't really **you** because you want that money, because you need it to support you, and with the DFES [now DCSF] money, it was to get money to do what it is that we do.'

Providers, who had been able to work with DCSF to design activities which met their objectives, also spoke of not wasting time putting in speculative applications that would not be successful.

In terms of the delivery of the funding, the vast majority of providers felt that this had gone smoothly and had few complaints. A small number noted that funding had arrived late, which caused difficulties because activities that had been booked had to be delivered without funding in place. There also appeared to be some variation among providers in how much flexibility they were accorded in spending the funds. One provider spoke of not being able to roll money over financial years, which caused difficulty when they had not spent all the money for a particular year.

However, other providers indicated that - in consultation with DCSF - they had rolled money over from one year to the next. A few providers suggested that it might have been useful to have the funding delivered according to academic rather than standard financial years (i.e. Sep to Sep rather than Apr to Apr) to match the timescales that schools work on . It was sometimes difficult for providers to have the money in place in time to deliver activities for the 'peak' summer period.

Most providers also said that the funding they received was adequate for what they wanted to do and a few described it as generous. Only a few providers had experienced difficulties with funds being unexpectedly reduced in subsequent years, which meant that they had had to scale back projects or source funds from elsewhere. The rationale behind the amount of funding received was not always transparent to providers. For example, one provider talked about how the DCSF had requested matched funding from the organisation one year, which they had found but which had had a detrimental effect on their other activities. When, in the following year they had declined to contribute matched funding, the LSP funding had been restored to the initial amount, which the respondent felt seemed 'arbitrary'.

Relationships between providers and funders

The providers varied in the nature of the relationship they described with the funders at DCSF. Many spoke very positively about the funders, particularly those who received funding over a number of years. These providers spoke about maintaining a good working relationship with DCSF so that although the funding was renewable on an annual basis, this involved simply a telephone call or a meeting to agree funding and targets for the following year. Some spoke of very useful and positive meetings with the funders each year in order to improve and develop activities:

> *'It's been every year a mutual kind of discussion about what's worked and new ideas that we have and things that we'd like to do as a result of the experiences we've had in previous years, and yes it seems to have worked really well.'*

Others said that while funding was not guaranteed from one year to the next, the funder was prompt in notifying providers of what would be available to allow for forward planning.

However, a minority of providers felt that their relationship with DCSF was poor. These were generally providers who had had fewer years of funding. Some spoke of finding it difficult to contact DCSF; phone calls and emails being unanswered. After an initially positive experience of applying for funding, one provider remarked that communication soon diminished: *'you just felt as though you were just out on the periphery of the whole thing'*

Some providers said that they were not able to locate the appropriate contact person in DCSF when they wanted to renew their funding; others said that they were not able to ascertain information on reporting requirements. This seemed to coincide with a period of staffing changes at DCSF; while staffing changes within some of the provider organisations also exacerbated the breakdown in communication. It seemed that some relationships were maintained throughout these periods of turbulence while others were not.

Monitoring and evaluating requirements

As with the initial application procedure, monitoring and reporting requirements were almost universally reported to be minimal. One provider commented:

> *'it seemed such a strange experience for us to have quite a lot of money, that we were kind of allowed to do what we wanted, and then no-one asked us for any information back.'*

All providers agreed a set of delivery targets with the funder, which were usually in the form of a numerical target for the number of schools, students or activities that would be achieved. One organisation felt that the emphasis of the funder - as reflected in the delivery targets - was on quantity at the expense of quality; however, the vast majority of providers felt that the targets were appropriate and proportionate. Indeed, most said that they had either suggested

the targets themselves or negotiated them with DCSF. The vast majority had met their targets but few felt that this was closely monitored.

In most cases, this 'light touch' monitoring from DCSF did not prove to be problematic, and the majority of providers conducted their own monitoring and/or evaluation in the absence of any rigorous reporting requirements. However there were a small number of cases where the minimal requirements had inhibited adequate monitoring and evaluation. For example one provider said that in the absence of any steer from the DCSF on reporting requirements, evaluation had simply slipped off their agenda. Another organisation commented that their evaluation process had been driven by the more rigorous monitoring and reporting requirements of their private sector backers. Other providers conducted evaluation as a principle of good practice, and several were involved in developing innovative evaluation processes. This was evident in provider organisations that were linked to national bodies with expertise in evaluation (such as the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council). The evaluations conducted ranged from simple post-activity questionnaires distributed to participants, to more sophisticated evaluations which sought views from a range of different stakeholders (students, teachers, other school staff, other partner organisations, etc.), and sometimes used innovative methods such as longitudinal or peer research. Almost all providers collected customer feedback on an ongoing basis, which they used to improve delivery, and the majority also attempted to measure outcomes for students. The extent of sophistication in this was variable, and some expressed concern over how the outcome of an artistic experience could be adequately measured and quantified:

> 'who knows what takes place, particularly when they are in the auditorium and there is that connection, and it's had an impact on their life, but how do you define what that is? Because it's an emotional response and that's what makes it so powerful and that's what makes it so fantastic.'

Some also spoke of the importance of tracking longer term outcomes in order to make an adequate assessment of the impact of part-funded activities.

Summary

It is evident that a great deal of valuable work is going on by organisations part-funded by the London Student Pledge and others who have signed up to it. There may also be merits to light touch monitoring and management of the scheme in that managers of provider organisations have been able to proceed with their work providing for schools, teachers and students. The wide range of enrichment opportunities made possible by LSP funding is clearly reaching large numbers of school, teachers and students. Funding decisions, however, might be made with greater transparency. In addition, whilst striving to include the more deprived schools is a goal of the scheme and an expressed intention of the providers, it is not clear that the expenditure actually results in the more deprived schools and the more deprived students always taking up the offer. This issue is discussed further in chapter five.

A number of drawbacks do stem from this light touch monitoring and management. These are as follows: difficulties in reporting, at the individual project and overall programme levels, the unit cost for different activities; and difficulties in showing how the grant has made the provision more affordable for schools and students or extended it to larger numbers. This means that whilst each of the organisations receiving funding from the London Student Pledge may be regarded as 'social enterprises' and may need to draw on a number of funding sources to cover costs and ensure sustainability, what is an hourly or daily cost for a student engaging in different sorts of activities is often unclear and incalculable, as is the cost of subsidising individual activities. Therefore, in terms of judging value for money, the information is not forthcoming in such a way that it would be helpful in the allocation of funding for future years.

Chapter 4: Offer and Take Up: Provider and school relationships

Introduction

This chapter describes how the activities that were provided with Student Pledge funding were delivered to schools, from the perspectives of both the providers and the schools, drawing out any differences between the experiences of the two. It primarily draws on the qualitative data from the site visits to all the part-funded providers and the schools.[8] The chapter begins by discussing the different models of delivery that were utilised by providers and then examines the relationships between providers and schools. Finally it draws out key challenges and elements of good practice in the offer and take-up of Student Pledge activities.

Relationships between schools and providers

Relationships between the schools and providers were generally very positive. From information collected through school site visits, almost all of the school staff reported good interaction with the LSP providers. Many teachers spoke of providers in glowing terms. One described the relationship as 'very supportive', enhanced by 'constant communication' between the provider and the school. Another reported that the provider had 'gone beyond' what was expected from the activity. In this case an entrepreneurship provider had supplied curriculum resources for the school as agreed but gone on to put the students in touch with successful entrepreneurs. In many cases an ongoing association developed between a teacher and provider contact which continued for several years.

This section goes on to examine the relationships between LSP providers and the schools in more detail. It describes ways in which the providers promoted or marketed their activities, and the responses they encountered from schools. It considers the different strategies employed by providers to involve schools, and to maintain their involvement, and the strategies schools utilised to identify and work with providers. The barriers faced by both schools and providers in working together are explored from the perspectives of both, and examples of good practice identified.

Provider models of delivery

There were three main models of delivery that can be identified among the LSP part-funded providers:

- working directly with students;
- training teachers, capacity building and providing resources;
- signposting and brokering relationships.

---

[8] The methodology for these visits is detailed in chapter two. This is qualitative data based on purposively selected (not random) samples, and is therefore not presented numerically. The issues that are presented represent themes that are evident in a number of different data sources. Individual cases, and exceptions, are noted.

The majority of providers worked directly with students in schools. Provider staff, whether artists, actors and directors or sports coaches, typically went into schools for a pre-arranged period to coach or teach the students. Some hired freelance specialists to liaise with the students both as a means of extending their provision and to offer students teaching and coaching by experienced professionals. For example, one provider employed professional dance instructors to deliver training in schools. A few organisations delivered an activity in their own venue. One gallery, for example, invited a young person to come in to view each of their new exhibitions throughout the year. They then worked with that individual on a one-to-one basis to enable them to present their feelings about the exhibition at a public event.

Other organisations used a delivery model that benefited students indirectly by imparting new skills and teaching techniques to teachers or other intermediaries. This served to build capacity within schools. Activities in this category included training teachers to work with students to stage a Shakespeare play, coaching teachers on entrepreneurship to help students set up and run a small business, and training teachers to deliver sports leadership courses. A second element to this model was the provision of instructional resources to teachers. This might take the form of a resource pack to accompany a theatre visit or a standalone pack with a curriculum focus.

A third model of delivery entailed the part-funded organisations acting as brokers between schools and various opportunities. A website provided a database of arts providers for schools to access, while another provider co-ordinated partnerships among schools and local sports facilities that offered coaching sessions.

These three delivery models were not mutually exclusive. A number of providers offered courses or resources for teachers to work with in addition to their own direct work with the students. One provider used all three delivery models: it was an umbrella organisation for a group of providers of residential courses, acting as a central point of contact for schools wanting to take-up courses, marketing the courses to schools and directing schools to the most appropriate course. It also organised teacher training and introductory sessions for teachers on organising and running field trips and worked directly with students at the provider's own facilities.

Finally, not all LSP activities were organised and run through a school although the majority were. One provider, a gallery, offered an intensive programme of work with individual young people who they recruited using a variety of strategies that included outreach work with youth centres and schools.

Developing 'good practice' in working with schools

Providers worked hard to maintain good relationships with schools, and developed a number of strategies aimed at involving schools in activities and maintaining their involvement. Many providers noted how difficult it was simply to establish communication with appropriate teachers in schools and acknowledged that schools and teachers are 'bombarded' with information, policy initiatives, and advertising for activities for their students. They therefore felt that they had to 'work hard' to attract attention. They were also aware that there were barriers that limited the involvement of some schools, and that similar barriers also made the activities difficult to sustain in some cases. Thus some providers also developed strategies to help them deal with the possibility of schools 'dropping out'.

The principal strategies deployed by providers included:

- Locating key people in key places
- Tailoring activities
- Requiring commitment from the school

Locating key people in key places

Many providers (both part-funded and from the comparison group) identified the role of local authorities as particularly important in their relationships with schools. They talked about the activities needing a 'champion' in schools, and also that in many cases key personnel in local authorities made all the difference. One provider noted that whether the activity was over or under subscribed varied considerably depending on the local authorities involved. They were more successful when they found someone in a local authority that they could work with, who *'knew the people and knew how to get them and phone them regularly to carry on chivvying'*.

Another said:

> *'the key ingredient would be making sure that relationships with the local authority are developed, because they are such a key strategic partner in all of this. If you want to work with the schools you need the local authority being supportive, and in boroughs where the local authority partners haven't been as forthcoming that's been reflected in the performance of the schools and the engagement of the schools.'*

Developing relationships with individual teachers to promote the value of activities was also important. One organisation referred to the importance of *'teachers that are willing to go beyond their everyday activities'*. Once relationships were established, teachers would often sign up for activities year after year. In order to locate these teachers, providers spent a lot of time phoning and emailing schools, attending meetings of relevant teachers within boroughs, or organising briefings in schools or with groups of schools. One provider set up a call centre every year dedicated to promoting the provision and providing support to teachers who signed up. Some providers used the technique of organising 'taster workshops' in the schools, and one provider organised 'teacher forums' to collect feedback on needs and requirements. Working closely with the schools was seen by one provider as '*consulting with your audience*' in order to produce better outcomes. Some organisations had an infrastructure already in place with links to schools, and they noted that this network enabled them to market their activities more directly.

Providers also identified the need to be flexible in the way they communicated with school staff, using the method that worked best (mobile phones, fax, email, etc.). A flexible approach was also needed for accommodating sudden cancellations that could happen for a range of reasons including Ofsted inspections, last minute changes in exam timetabling, teachers on sick leave, and poor behaviour of students.

Tailoring activities

Another approach taken by providers in marketing activities and developing relationships with schools was to seek to understand better what the schools and school students wanted and to tailor their provision accordingly in order to stimulate increased demand from schools. To this end, some providers involved teachers in an advisory capacity to ensure that the activities were likely to appeal to schools

Developing demand also entailed meeting the needs and wishes of the students. Some sports providers noted that they had started to develop dance programmes in addition to other sports courses as they had recognised a demand for this from female students. Other activities developed following feedback from students included skate-boarding, fencing and parkour (free running).

Many providers thought that what they offered appealed to schools because it was an additional way that students could learn material for their GCSEs. Although the Pledge had not originally been designed to support the curriculum, 'selling' it to the schools in this way was seen as a pragmatic way of boosting demand. Many activities, especially those related to the arts and literature, were therefore consciously tailored to the curriculum with the aim of helping students appreciate and understand what they are learning:

> 'the whole thing was designed from the start to show that Shakespeare can be fun, that it can inspire young people, and that it's relevant and accessible'.

Other projects facilitated cross-curricular learning, or could be used in a number of different subject areas. It is important to note, however, a strong counter-position. Some providers specifically rejected doing curriculum-related work:

> 'because we don't do curriculum orientated work, we don't do, "Let's help your students directly get better exam results".'

This provider stressed the importance of identifying teachers that had a similar outlook. Another talked about making learning 'fun' and pointed out that too much emphasis on attainment might miss opportunities to contribute to students' 'well-being'.

Generating commitment from schools

Even when schools had been successfully recruited to the activity, many providers had problems keeping schools 'on board', noting that some schools started, but were not able to sustain, their involvement:

> 'it's been very frustrating from our end to provide really unique, one off opportunities, with extraordinary input from people, and then be let down at the last minute, very frequently by teachers who just can't show up because they feel inevitably that it's something, one thing too many for them to do'.

This was especially the case if what was being organised was a lengthy programme: providers felt that some schools were *'not prepared to make the commitment'* to either run the programme for the required length of time or in the way specified by the provider. Providers thus talked about the importance of gaining commitment from the school in order to ensure that the activities were maintained and that schools did not drop out:

> 'we have to be quite strict because in the past there have been problems where schools might have just not been as committed as we would like and aren't willing to let the children go out, or change their minds at the last minute, or management aren't really on board, or the teachers are kind of excited but then lose interest'
> .

One provider asked participating schools to sign a contract outlining commitment to the activity timeframe and confirming that senior staff and school governors were supporting the project.

Take-up of activities by schools

Schools' engagement with particular Pledge activities appeared to be the result of a combination of the interests and enthusiasm of a particular staff member and the wider ethos, priorities and support structures within the school. Having staff that took on the responsibility and championed the activities was key to take-up, as was the support provided from more senior staff within the school. Whether or not the activities had a direct bearing on the school curriculum was also a major consideration in terms of the way that activities were organised and the support that they attracted within the school.

Accommodating the curriculum

Some LSP activities on offer were more relevant to the school curriculum than others. From a school's perspective, those more closely linked to the curriculum could more readily be accommodated into planning and timetabling. It was also common with curriculum related activities for an entire class to attend the activity. For example, one teacher viewed a theatre directing course as an excellent introduction to the subject for her new GCSE Drama class:

> *'the timing of it would mean it would be the first thing that they would do in GCSE drama. I thought what a brilliant way to start your GCSE drama course to work with a professional director and professional actors and go to see a show all in this neat little package'*

This teacher had made use of many of the LSP part-funded courses at a theatre company in the two years she had been in post, taking KS3 and KS4 classes to performances. Another teacher pointed out that exposing an entire class to an activity would achieve a good mix of abilities and attitudes, e.g., Gifted and Talented, students with a statement of special educational needs, and a fairly equal mix of boys and girls.

Other types of provision were not immediately linked to the curriculum and these tended to be organised by teachers with a specific interest in the activity. These were not viewed as suitable activities for undertaking in class time and staff tended to use quite a different system for recruiting students. For example a five day residential programme was offered to students on a first come first served basis and required a £10 deposit. In a similar vein, some activities were targeted to special groups of students such as those with learning difficulties or those identified as Gifted and Talented.

Teacher champions

Mirroring the accounts of providers, it was evident within schools that activities had usually been organised and taken forward by individual teachers who were enthusiastic about the activity and championed it within the school. Teachers' accounts demonstrated that they often went 'beyond their everyday activities' (as a provider noted) to ensure that their students took up the opportunity to participate.

For example, one teacher stated:

> *'I don't mind doing the paperwork and doing all the organisation to make it happen. Not everyone else is keen on that.'*

In the majority of cases, these were teachers who organised the activity within their particular subject area in order to enhance the curriculum in some way. Reflecting the nature of the provision, as outlined in Chapter 2, these were mostly teachers in English, drama, sports or dance. In some cases, staff were looking for creative ways to enrich the curriculum teaching by offering complementary activities, but which did not have direct links to the syllabus. In a number of instances, activities were organised by teachers as part of a strategy to establish new courses and examination subjects within the school, for example table tennis within the PE curriculum in one school. They were sometimes organised by teachers who were new to the school as well.

Support within the school

In addition to the enthusiasm and commitment of individual teachers, those organising the activities in schools also spoke of the importance of support from other school staff. A supportive head teacher was considered to be very important. In some cases, teachers felt that head teachers and senior school management were more supportive if the activity was related to the curriculum in some way. Others spoke of head teachers that were supportive of non- or cross-curricular learning outcomes such as student leadership, which had generated support for an activity. Some teachers also felt that it was partly down to the personal interests and enthusiasms of head teachers.

Support was needed from senior staff because activities often took place in school time and students sometimes needed to miss other lessons in order to undertake the activity. Hence considerable negotiation with other teachers in the school was often required. This was facilitated by a supportive head. For example, one teacher stated:

> *'[the head is] keen for these kinds of things to come in, so if it means jiggling things around a bit he is more than happy for that to happen.... he's really flexible and the rest of the staff are really flexible so I don't feel worried about it'*

While all but one of the teachers interviewed felt that they had this senior management support, either within their department or within the school, several spoke about needing further support in order to get activities established and 'mainstreamed' within schools. One teacher spoke of 'a certain scepticism' about the activity outside of their department, which was gradually being broken down as the team became more successful in competitions. Another teacher implementing sports leadership courses stated *'it's just taking a little bit of time to get the course really recognised within the school'*.

Barriers that limit participation

While providers had developed a range of strategies in order to successfully engage schools and schools had taken up numerous opportunities, both providers and schools also identified a number of key barriers and challenges in the take up of activities. The most significant of these included:

- Teacher time
- School timetables
- Tensions with the 'attainment agenda'
- Teacher / provider partnership tensions
- Staff turnover
- Student behaviour
- Activity continuity

By and large, both providers and teachers raised the same issues as barriers and challenges to the take-up and implementation of Pledge activities, although in some instances there were clearly different expectations of responsibilities and roles on each side. It should be noted that the schools visited were all schools who had taken part in at least some Pledge activities, and therefore we are not able to report the views of schools completely unable to take up activities. Providers, however, were able to comment on why schools had not been able to take up activities where this was known. Generally it was felt by providers to be the less successful schools that faced the most barriers to taking up Pledge activities, and these schools also required the highest levels of support from providers when they did take up activities.

Teacher time

The most significant barrier, from the perspective of the providers, was school resources, principally the availability of staff time. Providers felt that Pledge activities could be 'one thing too many for schools', and that some schools could not spare staff time, even when activities were free of charge, due to the other demands placed on them. As noted above, providers and schools were often relying on the enthusiasm and commitment of teachers who were going beyond their normal remit in organising activities. Support from other staff and senior management within the school was vital in facilitating this.

Several teachers also referred to time consuming administrative and logistical hurdles that they had to overcome in implementing the activities in schools. These ranged from paperwork (e.g., distributing and collecting consent forms and feedback forms from students and parents) to logistical challenges such as taking students to activities outside of school and organising assessors for activities. One teacher commented that providers did not always seem to be aware of the difficulties involved:

> *'I sometimes feel that they don't understand fully the constraints of working in a school environment'*

Timetabling

Some providers talked about struggling with providing activities that did not neatly fit within school timetables, either in terms of the daily timetable or the scheduling of school activities over the year. For example, one provider running a directing course initially wanted to run a three hour intensive session, but schools could only operate with one and a half hour sessions and so they had to adapt the provision. A provider offering residential courses talked about peak demand from schools during one week in July - due to exam timetabling - and not having sufficient capacity at one point in time to meet the demand. Teachers also raised this as an issue.

In the majority of schools visited, activities were undertaken during class time. This was often felt by teachers to be preferable to trying to organise activities in lunchtimes or after school because of the competition from other extra-curricular opportunities hosted within schools. This was particularly the case where the activities were voluntary, as one teacher explained:

> *'I do find that when students get to Year 10 their commitment to extra-curricular declines, it's difficult to hold them'*

Most teachers were able to negotiate with other teachers to take students out of occasional lessons in order to attend the activity, but some noted that this became less possible as the students moved into Key Stage 4 and exam pressure became more significant.

Tensions with the attainment agenda

As discussed above, whilst teachers generally reported that schools were supportive of the activities, some also noted tensions with attainment. Many teachers felt that activities were more supported by the school if they fed directly into the curriculum and student attainment. For example, one teacher spoke of the constraints posed by working within 'a system that seeks to want some kind of tangible measure of output'. This teacher felt that the activity was supported within the school partly because it offered a BTEC qualification and therefore contributed to student attainment. Another teacher said that the activity was undertaken specifically in order to enhance the teaching of speaking and listening skills, which is a core aspect of the GCSE curriculum in English. She felt that she would not have been supported in taking it up within the school if there had not been this link.

Providers also recognised that where schools had limited resources and were struggling in league tables, raising attainment tended to take precedence over other opportunities. They recognised a tension between the 'attainment agenda' of schools, and their desire to participate in 'enrichment' activities.

Teacher / provider partnership tensions

Another issue identified by some teachers and providers concerned the level of involvement of school staff in planning and facilitating activities. This mainly related to provider led activities that were delivered in the classroom environment. Some teachers felt that the material could have been more successfully delivered if it had been developed more in partnership. For example one teacher stated:

> *'you know if a [professional] is coming into your classroom with your kids that you should have a say in what you do with the kids and how you deliver the work for the workshop'*

In this instance, the teacher felt that she could have been better informed about the parameters of the project at the outset, especially the extent to which the professional would be given a 'free hand' to manage the children in the classroom. In another case, a teacher commented on the lack of teaching skills among provider

staff delivering a workshop in schools, which she felt could have been improved through better partnership working[9]:

> 'when people visit the school they need to deliver things alongside teachers'

At the same time, some providers also gave examples of where they had struggled to achieve the required input from school staff. One spoke of having to pull out of an activity because there was insufficient support from teachers:

> 'we actually had to pull out of one school which was a shame because they [the students] were great, the teacher just wasn't there, our staff weren't being supported'

This provider and others tried to avoid such occurrences by holding meetings with school representatives to inform them of what would be involved and what would be expected of them and the students, as well as by taking on board feedback from teachers in planning future activities. This was usually an effective strategy, although there were still some cases where there were ambiguities over, for example, the responsibility for disciplining students.

Staff turnover

Staff turnover was also a problem for providers because it resulted in a lack of continuity in the relationship with schools, particularly given the importance placed by providers on developing relationships with individual members of staff. Providers referred to examples where one staff member booked the course, but then it was handed over to another who did not have ownership or knowledge of the activity. Staff turnover was especially problematic for providers that allocated resources to training teachers.

Within schools, staff turnover made it difficult for provider activities to be renewed and offered in subsequent years. Where there was very high staff turnover, it was also more difficult for teachers to mainstream activities within the school. For example one teacher who had attended inset training and taken students to a workshop then faced considerable challenges in trying to introduce the activity to the high number of NQTs (newly qualified teachers) in the department:

> 'they're constantly trying to get … to grips with the basic stuff and sometimes, you know, "Oh let's now introduce you to xxxxx", and they're still trying to manage classes and understand the requirements of the GCSE'

Student behaviour

A final issue raised by both providers and teachers was the behaviour of students. A number of theatre providers mentioned the importance of appropriate behaviour in the theatre venue. One provider said that it was problematic if schools had '*a rigid equity of inclusion policy*', because they needed to be able to exclude young people if they did not behave appropriately. Many teachers also spoke similarly of the

---

[9] In this case the quality of the workshop was felt to be poor because it was staffed by volunteers (students) rather than by professional skilled staff. The provider organisation has since changed this practice, as a result of feedback.

importance of maintaining high standards of behaviour and being able to exclude students who behaved badly from activities.

How this was achieved and the extent to which poor student behaviour could be accommodated varied according to the activity. One provider who was based full-time in a school offering sports coaching spoke of continual struggles with student discipline throughout the first year of the activity although this had been resolved over time. Some theatre providers talked about spending time and effort welcoming young people and guiding them in theatre etiquette. One sent etiquette details to the teachers who then signed a contract to say that they had discussed this with their students. They thought that this approach worked, and cited the example of a free matinee attended by 1500 school children at which '*you could hear a pin drop*'.

Most providers had procedures in place for discussing and agreeing responsibilities for discipline with schools, although occasionally a lack of clarity was apparent, with one teacher stating:

> *'I wasn't quite sure from my teacher's hat how much involvement they wanted me in disciplining the kids … they probably thought I might have been a bit bossy'*

Summary

The three delivery models used by providers all had something to offer schools although it was the first two models 'working directly with students' and 'training teachers and capacity building' that were the most prevalent and entailed close relationships with schools. On the whole relationships between providers and schools were very good. Although providers often found the process of recruiting new schools challenging, they had developed strategies to assist with this. Once they had established relationships with a key staff member this could lead to a long and fruitful relationship between the school and the provider. Many teachers signed up to activities year after year.

There were, however, challenging issues in the process of offer and take up of the activities. Both providers and school staff identified issues of teacher time, staff turnover, student behaviour and tensions with the attainment agenda as barriers or challenges in the successful take up of Pledge activities. It was also felt by providers that less successful schools (disproportionately affected by all these issues) faced the most barriers to offering Pledge activities.

Examples of good practice in providers' work with schools were seen in their strategies for identifying and working with key staff, their willingness to tailor courses to the needs of schools, and their procedures to negotiate and agree respective responsibilities between school and provider staff. Trust was required on both sides, with teachers needing to know that the providers would be able to provide good quality, appropriate provision to their students; and providers needing to feel that the school was committed to running the activity, supportive of its goals and willing to maximise its potential for the students.

Chapter 5:   Evaluating Outcomes

Introduction

This chapter turns to an assessment of the activities provided to schools and an analysis of the outcomes of the Pledge funding. The focus is on examining the intended and perceived outcomes from the perspectives of the providers and the schools. The chapter draws on data from visits to the providers and the schools in order to analyse the extent to which the Pledge funding enabled enrichment activities that would not otherwise have taken place; for London secondary students who might not otherwise have had exposure to such opportunities; and on the perceived benefits and value of activities. The data from the schools is used to examine the views expressed by the providers.

The first section analyses the ways in which providers attempted to involve and target schools and students that might not ordinarily have participated in such enrichment activities. This is followed by an analysis of how schools themselves targeted or selected students to participate in the activities. This section highlights the particular priorities of schools and teachers and the difficulties of implementing universalist and inclusive goals on the ground.

The chapter moves on to explore staff and student views on the benefits of participating in Pledge activities. It explores staff and student reflections on outcomes, including perceived improvements in curriculum focused skills, staff and student relationships, confidence, behaviour and attitudes to learning, followed by developments in student aspirations and plans for the future. The final section assesses issues of value for money, additionality, and sustainability of Pledge activities, explored from both provider and school perspectives.

Providers' targeting of schools and students

One motivation behind launching the London Student Pledge, and funding a number of providers, was to ensure that London secondary school students had universal access to activities that would help them meet the ten Pledge challenges. This meant opening up enrichment activities to children that might not otherwise have had such opportunities, and implied some degree of targeting with respect to the Pledge offers. The extent to which this was facilitated by the funding is examined in this section.

In the survey, LSP part-funded providers familiar with the London Student Pledge were asked for their views on the initiative. The majority had very positive views, describing it as an '*invaluable opportunity*' and as an '*excellent initiative*'. Over half made reference to how the Pledge enabled them to widen the scope of their existing activities to include socially disadvantaged and under-achieving groups of young people and this included expanding provision to a wider range of London schools. Several providers acknowledged that Pledge funding enabled them to initiate new projects and to sustain existing projects.

There were a number of different ways in which the part-funded providers targeted their activities. Sometimes boroughs were targeted, sometimes schools, and sometimes schools within target boroughs. Providers also aimed to attract a diverse range of students, often paying particular attention to minority ethnic groups. A number of providers mentioned targeting schools with high numbers of refugees and asylum-seekers. Some made an effort to get special schools on board, as well as students with special educational needs within mainstream schools.

Many providers targeted the London Challenge boroughs,[10] with one basing its engagement strategy on London Challenge objectives: first targeting the five boroughs; then schools within these boroughs, working from the bottom of the 'Families of Schools' table. Other providers noted that targeting within boroughs was not always effective; rather, they looked at where the highest levels of deprivation were within a borough to target their activities. Other providers gave priority to the Keys to Success schools[11] or schools with a high proportion of children in receipt of free school meals.

In contrast to the London Challenge focus on five (Inner London) boroughs, there were also a number of providers who argued that there was a need to target Outer London boroughs:

> *'a lot of these kids they are quite ghettoised, you know, they live in their own communities and they don't get into Central London. It's exactly what the London Challenge is about, they don't experience what's best of living in London because they live just that much out of the way.'*

Overall, the research evidence suggests that the Pledge funding enabled a number of providers to target particular groups who had not previously been using their services or activities. Providers were agreed that if they wanted to target more disadvantaged schools and children, then more time and resources were needed to ensure those schools' involvement. The funding had enabled them to work with more disadvantaged children (or more disadvantaged schools) who would otherwise not have been able to take up the opportunities (because of cost). One organisation's activities had previously been dominated by private schools and the Pledge funding had enabled them to increase their reach into state schools.

This finding is supported by the fact that the providers in the comparison group were more likely to be demand-led. One of these providers, for example, said that when they go to work in a new borough, they open up the activity to everyone, but then work with those schools who show an interest: *'in essence it is about people who are most capable of running with it that we all work with'*. This is also confirmed in the experiences of providers that had been part-funded in some years but not in others, one noting that after their funding ended, some of the schools *'just don't have the budget to continue it'*. It is important to note, however, that many of the providers interviewed - including some in the comparison group - were also successful in securing funding from other sources (as noted in chapter three). Some of this other funding was also for work targeted at disadvantaged groups.[12]

Providers felt the LSP funding was valuable in '*widening the horizons*' and '*opening up doors*' for students who would never previously have had such experiences. Theatre and visual arts providers spoke of the students looking at art or theatre in new ways and of the activities *'giving them choices that otherwise they wouldn't have had'*, such as to think about a career in the arts. Providers also spoke of the activities opening up new horizons for the students geographically, for example introducing students to West End theatres and encouraging them to see these facilities as belonging to them:

---

[10] For more information, see http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/london/las/5boroughs/

[11] For more information see http://www.dfes.gov.uk/citychallenge/keystosuccess.shtml

[12] Those in the comparison group that did target their activities were often part-funded through different government grants. One was part-funded by London Challenge (although not by the London Student Pledge); one received other DCSF funding for their activity; and one was part-funded by the local authority within which it was located. This adds to the evidence that suggests that some form of targeted funding encourages providers to engage with schools that find it more difficult to participate in extra-curricular activities, either because of financial or other barriers.

'what happens in London is that so many people who lived on the doorstep of the West End never went because they thought it was for other people and not for them, and to say to these young people, "This is for you, it belongs to you too", and to see the smile on their face, and to see them respond so positively, is fabulous'.

Schools' selection / targeting of students

While the part-funded providers often emphasised that they used the funding to help them target schools that would not otherwise be able to participate, often those in disadvantaged areas, they had limited control over which students took up the activities *within* schools. From the school site visits, there was less evidence that LSP activities were reaching the more disadvantaged students within schools. The mechanisms used by staff within schools for selecting or enabling students to participate in activities varied considerably. Several factors played a role in determining how recruitment took place. One was the degree to which the activity was tied in to the curriculum, a second was the number of students who could participate, and finally schools also had different policies on using extra-curricular activities as rewards or as motivational devices for disengaged students.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the degree to which an activity supported the teaching curriculum had a strong bearing on take up. Likewise, teachers could use the curriculum to justify student inclusion. Sometimes this entailed an entire class taking part, provided an activity could accommodate the numbers. In this case, students were not given a choice to participate because the activity was embedded into mainstream teaching. Staff felt that this method of allocating students to activities usually achieved a good mix of students.

In other cases, opportunities were selectively made available - both curriculum and non-curriculum linked activities. This included selection on the basis of academic ability, aptitude and, to a lesser extent, according to a quota system. Sometimes students were selected by teachers on the basis that they would be the most likely to succeed and gain the most from the activity. Students selected to take part in one workshop, for example, were those who were strong in English and had confidence in their oral skills. One student commented that he had been selected because of previous acting experience; another because of involvement in public speaking and another because of confidence in class. Selection on the basis of aptitude was also evident with a performance-based programme: students who showed the most aptitude for and were most interested in the activity were selected to take part in a series of professional workshops.

Another approach was to target activities among students who were underachieving and / or had behaviour problems. This was less common among schools that participated in the research, although there were some examples. One teacher had taken a group of 'disaffected children' on an adventure trip but it had not been a success and this method of recruitment was not used for future activities. In another case, a teacher had selected a group of underachieving students to take a course but found that the students '*really struggled*' to complete the course, despite the provider's claims that it was suitable for those with low academic ability.

Some teachers expressed unease about offering opportunities based on academic and behavioural characteristics. Staff in one school talked about wanting to extend opportunities to the 'grey students', meaning those not defined as either SEN or gifted and talented and who, it was felt, often tend to miss out on these types of initiatives.

Other types of provision were offered on a voluntary basis driven by quotas. The adventure holiday activity, for example, was offered on a first-come first-served basis (with a £10 deposit). An entrepreneurship course was also open to volunteers who were required to write a business plan and submit a CV to take part. The course was oversubscribed and the teacher emphasised that it attracted a mix of participants:

> *'this is a genuine inclusive activity so it's not the preserve of any one group, the targeting of students isn't aimed at a particular ability it's solely aimed at levels of interest'*

Role of the Student Pledge

A lack of awareness among some providers about the Student Pledge (discussed in chapter two) was also mirrored among teachers and students in the schools that participated in the research. The vast majority of staff - all of whom were participating in Student Pledge part-funded activities - were unaware of the Pledge. None of the students indicated on their questionnaire that they had been aware of the Pledge at the time they took part in the activity. Even where staff had responsibility for co-ordinating out of school hours learning, there was often little knowledge of the Pledge. Moreover, Pledge activities that were organised by subject teachers in class time were not necessarily seen as part of the remit of 'out of school hours learning'. Hence there was rarely systematic monitoring within schools of students' take up of Pledge activities.

Only one teacher interviewed was aware of the Pledge. This was a teacher who was also in charge of 'enrichment' and 'enterprise' for the school. The teacher was positive about the value of the Pledge and reported that other teachers in the school (such as the head of pastoral care) were also aware of the Pledge and had organised activities in order to contribute to it.

Once the Pledge was explained to teachers, the majority enthusiastically agreed with the principles and felt that it should be promoted in schools. One teacher stated:

> *'[students] should know that actually as part of your education, "These are the sorts of things that you should be involved in, not just sitting exams, you know, yes, but by the end of your career in your secondary school, you should have had an opportunity to do all of these things", and "Have you?".'*

Teachers therefore recognised the benefits of student involvement in Pledge supported activities, but it was apparent that fulfilment of the individual Pledges was not acting as a driver for participation.

The benefits for students of participating in Pledge activities

What was valued in activities

Among students and teachers who took part in the research there were diverse views on what had been gained from participating in Pledge activities. This is unsurprising given the breadth of activities delivered. However there was also a broad consensus across participants about the characteristics of activities that were considered to be of more or less value to them.

As described in chapter 4, activities that enhanced the curriculum or that developed other valued learning outcomes, such as leadership or life skills, were often championed by individual teachers. Other elements that teachers valued when selecting (and repeating) activities included providing new experiences for students that were different to those experienced within the classroom and engaging with professionals with specialist expertise that was not available within the school. Teachers valued activities that provided a challenge to students either in terms of the skills required or in terms of their awareness and knowledge. For example, an art teacher spoke of challenging students' preconceptions of art:

> *'I think it's important to do that, to challenge the kids and to get them to experience what modern day art is and how it's moved on, to challenge their preconceptions'*

Students also spoke of enjoying activities that provided them with a challenge. Those participating in a series of contemporary dance workshops commented that it was completely different to the types of dance that they would normally be involved in; some were hesitant at first but also enjoyed the challenge: *'it was so different to what we'd done, we'd never danced like the way they did'.*

Many students also spoke of liking activities that were practical and active, offering them a break from 'sitting in classrooms'. The residential outdoor courses were a good example of an activity outside of the school environment, which provided a challenging set of experiences. Students who had participated in this activity acknowledged that it had been '*hard work*', but were enthusiastic and energised by what they had achieved. Conversely, activities that too closely mirrored what students did in school were less popular with students.

Overall, teachers talked about valuing activities that engaged the students; that were delivered by providers who were able to effectively communicate; and activities that were appropriately structured towards learning outcomes and appropriately paced. Both students and teachers welcomed the opportunity to take-up opportunities that brought in providers that had specialist expertise not available within schools, such as specialist sports coaches or professional artists, actors, directors and dancers. This imparted specialist skills to students and also potentially widened their horizons and aspirations.

Outcomes for Students

The students and school staff both identified numerous positive outcomes for students from taking part in the Pledge activities. These ranged from the concrete acquisition of skills and knowledge, through to 'softer' outcomes such as increased confidence and team working skills.

Improving curriculum relevant skills

Activities targeted at curriculum content offered the students skills which were useful for progressing in a subject or doing well in GCSEs. The directing and playwriting courses, for example, taught students about analysis of language and subtext; skills that were likely to improve their critical ability in relation to reading and watching plays. Those who had taken part in the debating activity could also clearly see how their experience of public speaking helped them with English where speaking and listening skills were assessed as part of the GCSE.

Students valued activities that offered them skills that would help them to achieve in their curricular subjects or which offered transferable skills that they could see an application for. For example, students who had set up their own businesses as part of one activity were pleased with the extra qualification that it provided (a BTEC) and saw its value in college applications.

Direct correlations between activity and improved exam success were harder to gauge. Although teachers often felt that the activities had tangible results, they were reluctant to make claims about them improving examination outcomes, noting that it wasn't possible to do so without the use of systematic evaluation techniques that could compare results. Some students, however, were certain that taking part in activities had improved their grades.

Building confidence

Both staff and students cited the acquisition of soft skills and changes in attitudes to school and learning as some of the main benefits to participating in the activities. An increase in self confidence was a central outcome that cut across all of the activities. Increased confidence was linked to increased maturity and sense of responsibility by several of the teachers. The comments of one teacher were typical of many:

> *'I do think there is a direct impact because the skills that they gain in terms of the self-confidence, the presentation skills in presenting things to an external audience and the preparation that goes into that, working alongside team members and having to negotiate with members of staff, whilst you can't measure those, you can see the actual result in terms of the confidence of the children and the growing maturity and the fact that they do really start to take responsibility for themselves.'*

Several activities were said by students to build confidence and presentation skills which they felt would be valuable in college/university and job applications.

Improving attitudes to school and learning

Staff and students cited the importance of the social aspects of the activities they were involved in, which often involved group work with other students whom they did not know and/or other adults. Such activities improved the relationships between staff and students; facilitated the development of communication and negotiation skills and team working; and helped create a supportive learning environment. In some cases, new relationships had the capacity to break down cultural and ethnic boundaries. The chance to go away with other students on trips was particularly effective at building and strengthening relationships. One teacher talked of '*a real sense of camaraderie*', not only between students, but also between students and staff. He explained that:

> *'every time you go on xxxxx with a group of kids it really cements your relationship and you can develop some lifelong friends'.*

The example of a sports club was one which was particularly salient in terms of developing relationships, because the coach (employed by the provider) was seconded to the school full-time. As well as coaching the students at breakfast club, lunchtime club and after school, he took the team on tournaments at weekends, often involving overnight stays. The coach spoke of developing intensive and supportive personal relationships with the students, helping them to deal with difficult personal issues:

> *'me being by their side I'm hoping to keep them on the straight and narrow'*

He also developed and maintained relationships with their parents and with their teachers. This supportive relationship was confirmed by the students in the team. One referred to the coach as *'like a father figure to us'* and another referred to the team as *'like a family'*.

Certain activities appeared to be particularly effective in bringing about shifts in students' attitudes towards school and learning, and through that students' behaviour in school. Teachers found that improved relationships, particularly between staff and students, had a significant effect on students' behaviour. Speaking of a particular student, one teacher said:

> *'when we came back he developed enormous confidence with this group of staff, it changed his behaviour in the school totally, you know, he went from being a very confrontational young man to being almost a model member of the community.'*

One of the students made a similar point about how changed relationships with the teachers also impacted upon their academic work:

> 'say like our English teacher, we would be really good mates when we came back to school... and obviously we have to do much better.'

Some staff felt that taking part in activities had given them more bargaining power with students in the classroom. One course was perceived to have had a transformative effect on two students with behaviour problems who had been given responsibilities by the professionals they were working with. In addition to the confidence boost this gave the young people, the teacher felt that these examples were useful in her interaction with students in the classroom, acting as a benchmark of good behaviour.

In a different way, a sports club, held in the mornings, lunchtime and after school, proved to be a successful strategy for improving students' attendance. Students in the team stated: *'it gives us something, like a good thing to come to school to do.'* Moreover two students confirmed the coach's view that participation in the club had diverted them from 'anti-social behaviour' outside of school:

> 'it's good for me because it keeps me off the streets, because before I started xxxx I used to hang around with all my friends doing bad things'

Broadening horizons and encouraging aspirations

Many activities, both those related to the curriculum and those developing cross-curricular skills, were felt to broaden the students' horizons and raise aspiration levels. An outward bound course, for example, was seen by the teacher as influential in widening horizons and perceptions, by giving the students a breadth and variety of experience: *'it's an amazing experience for them; you take so much for granted'*. The students themselves were also adamant about the transformative nature of their experiences; they spoke of working as a team, gaining confidence, and pushing themselves '*beyond their comfort zone*' by surviving difficult situations and doing things that they never thought they could do. Similarly, students who went on a trip to India (as an offshoot of Student Pledge activities) also saw the trip as transformative:

> '*it's helped me out a lot, it's changed my life, and I know I will use all this stuff in the future, so really and truly I just hope that they don't stop doing this stuff'*.

Some students were able to identify ways in which their future plans and aspirations had changed as a result of taking part in activities, and others noted how participating in the activity had opened up new avenues for them almost immediately. A student on one course, for example, had used the experience to get a place on a voluntary youth work scheme, whilst two students involved in sports coaching were involved in informal coaching of younger students in their lunch hour. With regard to future plans and aspirations many students felt that participating had confirmed their career choices rather than transforming them, but for others, the activities had opened up a wider array of possibilities, such as going into law, starting a business or wanting to be a director. In these cases the Pledge activity had helped develop aspirations and the results may not be visible until some time in the future.

This section has highlighted the significant and overwhelmingly positive impact that the majority of the activities had on those who participated. Outcomes such as increased confidence and making new friends were mentioned by most of the students in focus groups. The activities that had the most pronounced impact appeared to be either those that took the students farthest away from the school environment, for example residential trips and visits

and activities that focused on a very different skill set to those in the curriculum; or activities that were more long lasting and intensive.

Value for money for schools and government

This final section explores a number of the key intended outcomes of the Pledge funding, including value for money, additionality and sustainability.

Value for money for schools

Given that many of the Pledge activities were available free or at a significantly reduced cost because of the London Student Pledge funding, schools were generally extremely enthusiastic about the value for money for their school of running these activities. Indeed participating teachers felt that the lack of financial cost to the school was a crucial factor in enabling them to take up the activities.

Assessments of value for money varied to an extent, however, depending upon the activity and its cost. Some activities operated on a capacity building model which meant that after an initial outlay the school was able to run the activities themselves very cheaply. The school which ran the dance leadership course, for example, received the staff training and resource pack for free through the Pledge funding and then in subsequent years had to pay only for the student log books (£10 each) so cost was not an issue (unless there was staff turnover and a new teacher required training). The entrepreneurship programme was run on a similar basis.

Many schools, however, were participating in quite costly subsidised activities. If the Pledge funding finished they said that they would have to pass additional costs onto the students which would make access more exclusive. Some said that the activity would not be offered at all because students would not be able to afford to go. Several referred to examples of subsidised activities (not Pledge part-funded) that had been taken up by their school in the past but could not be repeated once funding had been withdrawn.

One teacher noted that if activities became more costly then the school would make judgements based upon the perceived impact on student performance. Anything seen as an 'extra', not directly related to performance, would be de-prioritised. Reflecting on whether she would have been able to attend a training session if a higher cost had been attached, she stated:

> 'I wouldn't have been allowed to go on that I don't think, because a lot of the time, you know, it was an extra … and it wasn't necessarily seen as, you know, a direct need at that time, … it wasn't training for attainment or achievement ….'

As this quote implies, teachers also noted that it would be particularly difficult to get funding from within schools for new activities, whose value was as yet unknown. Referring to whether a sports coach would have been paid for by the school at full cost, the teacher concerned felt that this was unlikely:

> 'the Head … would have to balance, you know, spending money on someone, with the outcomes, you know all the predicted outcomes, all their perceived outcomes, because when you have a new sport in the school you don't know what's going to happen, it could be a disaster, it could be a flop,')

Sometimes activities that were initiated with Pledge funding had been continued in schools with Gifted and Talented funding because there was a specific funding stream attached, but this limited participation to those students who were in the Gifted and Talented groups and again reduced access.

Value for money for government

The issue of whether activities provided value for money for government was more complex to assess. In the main, providers identified two principal ways in which they felt that they offered value for money. One was that they were able to draw on their resources as an organisation to supplement and enhance the part-funded activity in some way. Secondly, some providers designed activities that were sustainable after funding ended and hence were felt to provide a legacy for students that outlasted the funding stream.

Organisational resources

Many providers spoke about how their organisation offered added value because of the resources and contacts that they were able to bring to the provision. A number spoke about how they gave London students the opportunity to work with '*world class*' professionals (such as artists, photographers, playwrights, directors, writers) and in world class facilities:

> '*we have experienced senior famous playwrights meeting these young people, going into the schools, coming into the workshops*'.

A theatre-based provider said that '*you're getting something pretty special*' because the organisation is involved in '*delivering what we think is world class theatre*'. Another commented that the students had access to a high-profile choreographer, as well as '*professional theatrical venues to perform in with professional quality lighting*'. As noted earlier, the involvement of specialist professionals was a key element in whether teachers saw activities as providing added value too.

Organisations that acted as intermediaries or brokers rather than directly providing activities also felt that they offered added value because of the networks and infrastructure that they already had in place. One provider who distributed the LSP funding to Schools Sports Partnerships to develop activities, described this as '*locking into a system*' that was already established and effective. Others also spoke of the cost effectiveness of working through existing infrastructures:

> '*so [Pledge funding] pays for the direct delivery, which has got to be good value for money, rather than paying for an infrastructure that supports the direct delivery, because the infrastructure's already there*'.

This is supported by the data presented earlier on how some providers found it more challenging to make contact with schools without existing infrastructure channels to operate through.

Sustaining activities

A second way in which providers felt that they offered added value was in providing activities that continued after the funding ended, thus creating a longer lasting legacy for students. Some spoke of designing sustainabilit*y* into their activities in order to ensure that they would continue to be provided after the funding ended. For some, sustainability was integral to the way that they worked, for example those providers who worked with teachers to enhance their skills or resources, rather than directly with students. One organisation that developed partnerships between schools and arts organisations said that the activity was not a '*time bound piece of work*' but was intended to change cultures and attitudes in schools, and to '*enable and empower*' teachers and senior management:

> '*it's a relatively small amount of money with a view to developing the capacity, you know, in these schools for future work.*'

Another provider who acted as an intermediary distributing funding to smaller projects talked about how they ensured that these providers designed sustainability in to their activities:

> *'so if they send in an application that said they're spending two thousand pounds on coaches at eighty pounds an hour, we'd go, "Yeah right, you know, that's not going to work. So actually what about your volunteers, your leaders for this, for that and the other, to make this more sustainable?".'*

Other providers had started to 'design in' sustainability as funding started to come to an end. One provider spoke of providing different 'tiers' of support to schools each year they took part, with the eventual aim of activities being mainstreamed either by the school or by a collaborating arts organisation.

A number of providers felt that short-term funding was effective in order to bring schools on board, which could then be sustained by the school contributing a larger amount of money. In this case, it was felt that the initial exposure of the school to the activity was as important as the financial subsidy offered by the provider in sustaining involvement over the longer-term:

> *'my opinion is that it should be [time limited] because as I said, what you don't want to do is get the schools dependent on the funding, either they want to do this or they don't, and if they really think it's worthwhile, then once they've had the first freebie, if it's worthwhile they'll find a way of financing it.'*

However other providers acknowledged that some schools would have difficulty continuing their involvement without a subsidy, especially the more challenging schools that Pledge activities were often aimed at, as described earlier.

This was also confirmed by the data from schools. While some activities had been able to be sustained after funding finished, and some schools spoke of participation in Pledge part-funded activity opening up doors to their participation in a range of other related activities, other schools had not been able to sustain involvement. As noted above, the sports/dance leadership courses operated on a capacity building model (free initial outlay costs followed by a nominal fee each year) and the school visited which took up this activity had been able to sustain and expand the activity (offering additional courses) over three years. However other schools experienced difficulties. The activities organised were often new departures for the schools concerned and sometimes attached to departments or courses which were also in the process of becoming established. Some teachers spoke of frustration about not having in place a range of related activities that would help to embed the activity within the school. One teacher who had spent a considerable amount of time building up a new activity felt frustrated in her attempts to embed the activity within the school due to a lack of resources:

> *'other people in the school were very interested in getting it going, they were, I just think, you know, we didn't have any … we didn't have the resources at that point … I think you might find if you went to another school that hadn't had the same sorts of staffing issues and issues within the department that they had managed to spread it out across the school.'*

Providers also spoke about added value stemming from the way in which good practice developed in the context of LSP part-funded activities was transferred into other activities that the organisation subsequently provided. This ranged from altering delivery methods to ironing out problems encountered, to incorporating new ways of working with students. One arts provider, for example, spoke of using the contacts developed through their part-funded activity to establish a young people's panel which would feed into the development of new programmes and activities in the future. Moreover, several providers, particularly those that were less well-established, felt that receiving Pledge funding had given them *'extra clout'* in

obtaining further grant funding subsequently, because of the status attached to government funding, and others said that the learning from their part-funded activity had been built into new activities which also strengthened their case with funders. Therefore the Pledge money could be seen as contributing to the provision of enhanced opportunities beyond the confines of the directly part-funded activities.

It needs to be borne in mind that providers were generally adept at articulating how their activities offered value for money. As discussed in chapter three, the monitoring and reporting requirements attached to the Pledge funding were relatively 'light touch' and in some cases not rigorously pursued. Hence it would be difficult to make a more rigorous assessment of value for money for individual activities based on project outcomes. Moreover, in considering whether the funding programme as a whole offered value for money for the government, it is also necessary to consider the *additionality* of the funding, ie whether it enabled activities that would not otherwise have taken place. This is considered further in the next section.

Additionality

For the schools that had taken part in Pledge activities, the additionality of Pledge funding was taken as a given. The fact that provision was heavily subsidized enabled them to take up activities and/or enabled more students to participate than would have been possible without subsidization. Moreover, as discussed earlier, they felt that participation brought additional and often significant benefits to the students. At the same time, however, many schools also participated in a range of other highly valued extra-curricular activities that were not Pledge funded but had other funding sources attached that allowed schools to participate at a subsidised level. Hence it was difficult for school teachers to assess the additionality of the Pledge as a programme of funding. As discussed earlier, it was clear that the Pledge itself, as distinct from the funding stream, was not contributing to additionality, in the sense that it wasn't stimulating increased participation in activities - given that few schools were aware of it.

The additionality of the LSP funding for providers, that is what it enabled them to offer that they would not otherwise have been able to, was also difficult to determine precisely. Responses from providers varied according to their funding structures and the types of activities offered. Providers varied in how distinct their LSP part-funded activities were: some were using LSP money to subsidise, expand or target their 'core' activities, while others had designed specific Pledge-related projects. However in the vast majority of cases, Pledge-part-funded activities were similar or related to activities that were already being offered by the organisation, and often organisations had similar activities part-funded under different funding streams.

When providers were asked what they felt the Pledge funding had enabled that they would not otherwise have been able to provide, responses fell into two main categories. First, a majority of the providers felt that the funding had enabled them to increase the *reach* of their activities in some way. Many providers said that the funding had allowed them to diversify activities to new audiences. One provider working with teachers to deliver entrepreneurial training to students stated *'without a doubt it gave us additional reach'.* Another provider said that they went from a position, prior to receiving Pledge funding, where they had one or two schools signing up a year, to a position, at the end of their three year funding period, where they had activities offered in almost all schools in London. Some spoke of being able to offer activities to a new age group or within boroughs or schools that they had not worked in before. As discussed previously, a key feature of the increased reach of activities brought about by Pledge funding was the expansion of activities to include socially disadvantaged and under-achieving groups of young people in a wider range of London schools.

Secondly, a smaller group of providers said that the funding had enabled them to develop *different* activities than they had been previously providing. Some spoke of the Pledge funding allowing them to offer more in-depth activities in particular schools or with particular students that they would not otherwise have been able to. This was considered to have resulted in a deeper and richer experience for the students involved. One arts organisation working with a small number of students, stated: *'I think the value comes in that, in working with smaller numbers at a deep level'*. Sometimes these new activities were said to be '*pretty unique*', amongst the activities offered to school students, such as the directing course offered by one provider. Some providers, particularly those who had received funding for a longer period, also talked of their activities developing and improving over that time.

Additionality of the funding stream

While it was relatively easy for providers to specify what the additional funding enabled, it is more difficult to assess whether these benefits could have been provided within already existing funding streams. One way in which providers addressed this was in talking about the unique aspects of the Pledge funding stream. As discussed in chapter three, providers particularly welcomed the Pledge funding stream because the light touch application and monitoring procedures posed little administrative burden and because the demand-led nature of the funding enabled organisations to have a much greater role than would normally be the case in deciding on the content of the part-funded activities.

One of the problems that providers referred to in replacing Pledge funding with other funding sources in the future was the issue of having to fit activities into the specific requirements of other funding bodies. While providers acknowledged that there were numerous funding sources available for work with children and young people, the LSP funding stream had particular value to them because its goals and objectives, in terms of outcomes for participants, were generic and holistic, and thus it was able to accommodate activities that organisations were already skilled at delivering. In contrast, many other funding sources had a much narrower remit, either geographically or in terms of social group. Some providers also said that the Pledge funding stream was unique in terms of enabling in-depth work with a small number of young people, in contrast to the more quantitative outcome measures favoured by other funders. A few also spoke of it being difficult to obtain funding from private sector organisations or individual donors for work in schools because this was perceived to be a core area of government funding. Finally, providers also noted that it would be difficult to sustain Pledge activities with new funding sources because most funding bodies preferred to fund new rather than existing activities.

Providers also spoke of the importance of the LSP funding stream in terms of the development of their own organisation - which also then had a knock-on impact in terms of enhancing opportunities for London students. Some smaller and less well-established organisations felt that the funding had operated as 'seed corn' money that enabled their organisation to grow through '*capacity, reach and building a reputation*' and then to take-off with funding from other sources. One very new organisation went as far as to say that their organisation would not have survived without LSP funding, which came at a crucial time in the organisation's development. Other organisations were much larger and well-established, but even in these cases, some providers said that the funding had a marked impact on their organisation, by allowing it to '*take a risk*' by developing in a new direction, by opening up its activities to a whole new audience, or by replacing an existing funding source which had been withdrawn. Again providers felt that these benefits would not have been realised within the confines of other funding sources that were available.

Summary

Most providers displayed considerable proficiency in promoting the value of their activities. With this note of caution in mind, the evidence suggests that many of the providers did provide added value in the activities that they delivered. The added value of part-funded activities stemmed primarily from the additional resources that the organisations were able to draw in to their activities (such as world class actors and directors), and the way that some activities were designed to be self-sustaining after funding ended.

Pledge funding also acted as an enabler for the providers in a number of ways. Some were able to develop new programmes specifically aimed at the Student Pledge remit, whilst for others the funding gave them a much needed boost in their early days of operation. In many cases the area of activity had then become established and the providers were able to continue with their provision without Pledge funding. The most significant way, however, in which the funding acted as an enabler for the providers seems to be with respect to targeting provision towards areas, and schools, experiencing deprivation and educational underachievement. Providers noted that the challenges of working with schools were magnified in these areas and that the extra funding gave them the resources - principally time – in order to work to overcome these challenges. It should nevertheless also be noted that many of the providers - including some in the comparison group - received funding from other sources that facilitated, and in some cases required, targeting their provision.

The funding helped providers to develop new and innovative programmes, and enabled some to engage with schools in more deprived areas. Teachers welcomed a significant and diverse range of benefits for their students, and valued being able to take part in such high quality opportunities without excluding students on the grounds of cost. For those schools and students that did take part, the evidence suggests that Pledge activity can effect a significant and diverse range of benefits for students including improvements in curriculum based skills, confidence, staff-student relations, and behaviour and attitudes to learning, as well as a broadening of horizons and increased aspirations and career planning. However, there was little evidence of the coordination of activities at school level that would be needed in order to work towards universality of experiences and equity of provision. Those teachers and students interviewed were keen recipients of provision but the lack of staff with a supervisory role in relation to these types of activity meant that support within the schools was uneven. The research in the schools has shown that if there is little monitoring at the school level, the selection of students to take part in such activities may be quite unsystematic.

The impact of the Pledge itself in schools (as distinct from the funding of activities) was, however, marginal with the majority of staff and students being unaware of the Pledge, and, correspondingly, little systematic support and monitoring of Pledge-related activities occurred within schools.

Chapter 6:   Conclusion and recommendations

Evidence from this study confirms that the £2.6M annual funding for the London Student Pledge to a small number of providers has contributed towards improving the opportunities of a significant number of London's school students to take advantage of some of the high quality experiences available within London. Although there is insufficient evidence on the impact of the funding to make a judgement about value for money, the funded activities were clearly worthwhile and welcomed by all the stakeholders. The variety and diversity of provision that the funding has facilitated is impressive in its scope, though uneven in its coverage of the 10 Pledge statements.

The data from providers has shown that Pledge part-funded providers have developed their work in a number of ways, partly as a consequence of the additional funding. As well as enabling some targeting of activities to areas of deprivation and underachieving schools, the analysis of the data reveals a number of other ways in which the funding could be seen as worthwhile. It had been used to establish new programmes, some of which have funding in place to sustain them after the 07/08 funding has ended.

Pledge funding enabled some providers to better target their activities at more disadvantaged schools, but at the level of the schools, activities were not always targeted in the ways in which providers had anticipated. This was due to a number of reasons, including links made by schools between the activities and the curriculum, teachers' perceptions of who would benefit from the activities and the policies of schools on the provision of extra-curricular activities. Schools - often individual teachers - developed their own selection criteria. Even without such internal targeting, however, these activities had been taken up by students who wouldn't otherwise have been able to, because of either cost or an absence of opportunity.

A number of providers had also built on the part-funded programme to develop their other activities for London secondary school students. There is thus some evidence to suggest that, as intended, the funding did enable some students to begin a process of engagement with 'enrichment' activities that may well have raised their aspirations and hopes for the future, by starting a process that was sustained beyond the funded activity. Another way in which providers developed sustainability was through providing skills training (for staff or students) for an activity that the school could then take on themselves. This was successful in many cases, although some schools also faced challenges in embedding activities related to the availability of resources and senior staff support.

The cost analysis has shown that the individual student cost of an activity is difficult to calculate and varies substantially, and therefore a judgement of value for money is not straightforward. The funding has made these opportunities available at a lower cost and to more children than would have been possible otherwise. However, what is being offered is very different and assessing value for money requires political and value judgements to be made. Examples from the range of activities offered by theatre companies illustrate this point: a large number of school students can benefit from subsidised theatre seats, whilst a very small group of students may benefit from a more intensive programme, working with leading professionals in their field (directing, playwriting) but at a higher per student cost. Other activities, such as the provision of specialist sports coaches, are costly because of the intensiveness and duration of the activity The qualitative evidence from the schools suggests that intensive programmes might be costly but are likely to have a more substantial and durable outcome for the individual students than, for example, a one off theatre visit.

There was considerable variation in the extent of the coordination and promotion of the Pledge. Particularly striking was the lack of awareness of the ten Pledge challenges, on the part of the providers and, even more so, at the schools visited. The London Student Pledge was launched as part of the London Challenge with its own website and a list of ten areas of opportunities for students. Our analysis of the data has shown that there is limited knowledge of the Pledge itself amongst those organisations included on the website, and even the providers that have been part-funded by DCSF for Pledge-related activities are not all fully aware of the Pledge challenges. Providers from the comparison group, moreover, were not aware that the Pledge had attracted funding opportunities. The data suggests a lack of transparency over funding decisions, and what might be seen as too light a touch in the monitoring of part-funded provision. In addition, it appears as though the different elements of the Pledge have not received equal support in terms of funding.

Uneven coordination of Pledge activities was also evident at local authority and school level. It was generally down to the initiative of individual teachers to take advantage of the opportunities that had been developed. It was rare for schools to have a strategy for such enrichment activities, or a member of staff taking responsibility for over-seeing the spread - or otherwise - of such activities amongst their student population. Where teachers were co-ordinating out of schools hours learning, the enrichment activities offered through the Pledge were not necessarily integrated into this programme. Moreover, teachers and students in schools were very rarely aware of the Pledge itself. Hence while teachers recognised the benefits of student involvement in Pledge supported activities, the Pledge was not fulfilling its potential to act as a driver for enhanced participation in such activities.

The way in which some providers sought to use the funding to help build sustainability for particular projects is important, and clearly has implications for the development of Extended Schools. Out of school providers, such as those that participated in this research, will inevitably play a significant role in Extended School provision. The Extended Schools agenda appears to favour what LSP is trying to do and once schools have staff time allocated to provision of after school and out of school activities, liaison between schools and providers could be further improved. It is helpful when there is a person to coordinate and promote relevant activities, either within the Local Authority or at the school.

Recommendations

1. **Pledge-related enrichment activities are worthwhile and the DCSF should consider how to support such activities. However, if funding were to continue clear criteria need to be developed and publicised.** The evidence suggests that Pledge funding has facilitated the participation of large numbers of London's secondary school children in a wide range of extra-curricular activities. Perceptions from all the stakeholders interviewed for this study are that such activity has great value for school students and their schools. The Student Pledge, as part of any Challenge strategy, however, needs to examine the rationale behind any funding and specify the desired outcomes. Decisions need to be made about the extent to which funded activities are designed to raise attainment or whether there are other government priorities (for example *Every Child Matters* outcomes) that are served. At the very least, there is a need for providers and schools to consider in what ways the experiences offered contribute to different aspects of a child's development, such as; attainment, attendance, behaviour, well-being, citizenship.

2. **Funding criteria should also take into consideration examples of good practice identified in this research.** These include: that activities are likely to be sustainable after funding ends; that the organisation brings to the schools additional unique resources in some way; that funding is targeted towards disadvantaged schools; that providers and schools work together to develop activities; and that users (school staff and students) are also involved in evaluating and developing activities.

3. **Any future funding should be more closely scrutinised and monitored.** Although there is evidently a lot of good practice in the provision of activities, the nature of the management of the funding makes it difficult to judge value for money, or to calculate the added value of the funding. Without losing the light touch management and monitoring approach, there would be benefits in directing fund holders more and receiving a greater degree of feed back on numbers, types of students engaged in activities and how the money is allocated.

4. **The Department for Children, Schools and Families needs to monitor the quality of Pledge provision, and promote universal access to that provision.** This would include looking at the spread of activity across the ten Pledge areas which is uneven and needs reconsideration. It also needs to ensure that activities are sustainable in the schools. Encouraging the sharing of good practice between providers, including how to evaluate provision, would also be valuable.

5. **Local authorities should be given the responsibility for overseeing Pledge activities in their schools, and need to be allocated resources to do this.** The research has shown that there is great unevenness in the extent to which teachers, and schools, will be pro-active and in some cases even responsive, to Pledge offers. Local authority children's services are best placed to help schools, with limited staff time available for such activity, to access information and resources, and there would be value in designating and supporting 'champions' in each local authority to promote, and tailor, Pledge activities within the Extended Schools agenda. It may be advisable, for example, to target activities more suitable for under-achievers towards those schools struggling with the attainment agenda. Trying to ensure universality of access to appropriate activities should be seen as part of their responsibility under Every Child Matters.

6. **Centres of expertise for particular activities could be identified and supported.** Many of the providers drew upon expertise and resources that schools would have no other way of accessing. These included professional artists, and pre-existing networks. Support for these providers could be through direct funding, or by channelling the funding through schools (or local authorities) and providing them with more information about the

opportunities available. There may be scope for more joint working between providers organising similar activities.

7. **The Student Pledge should be promoted as a tool to help schools plan and monitor extra-curricular activities; and as something all their students can aspire to. It would be sensible to encourage Pledge-focused activities as part of the implementation of the Extended Schools policy.** The research has shown that the ability of schools to respond to the opportunities created by Pledge providers is uneven. The Pledge should therefore be seen as something that schools can work towards implementing. A checklist of Pledge activities could form part of each student's yearly planner.

8. **Schools need easily accessible, reliable and up-to-date information about the range of Pledge activities offered, and about the providers.** This could be facilitated through a number of means:

   a. The Pledge website should be revisited and regularly updated

   b. There would be benefits to re-advertising the Pledge and getting providers to renew their commitment to the scheme

   c. Schools and other organisations could be informed through City Challenge networks

   d. The Art-based website (infrastructure project) could be expanded to include all Pledge-related activities

9. **Schools should to be alerted to the fact that monitoring extra-curricular activities is increasingly becoming an area of responsibility which needs significant staff input and management.** The research in the schools shows that the selection of students to take part in activities may be quite arbitrary, and can often depend on one teacher taking advantage of an opportunity for some of their students. School management need to take more responsibility for overseeing such activities.

10. **Schools also need guidance on how to ensure that all children can be offered appropriate activities.** Schools also need to be able to make sure that, within a universal offer, children from deprived backgrounds are supported and targeted for participation.

References

Chambers, E, A. and Schreiber, J, B. (2004) Girls' academic achievement: varying associations of extra-curricular activities, *Gender and Education*, vol 16 (3) pp 327-346

DCSF (2007) The Children's Plan: Building Brighter Futures, London: Department of Children, Schools and Families.
www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/childrensplan/downloads/The_Childrens_Plan.pdf

DfES (2006) *Study Support: A national framework for extending learning opportunities*, London: Department of Education and Skills

DfES (2006a) *Families of Schools: secondary schools,* London: Department of Education and Skills

DfES~Teachernet (2005) *Extended Schools, Access to Opportunities and Services for All*.
www.teachernet.gov.uk/_doc/8509/Extended-schools%20prospectus.pdf

DMAG Briefing (2006) *Child Poverty in London Income and Labour Market Indicators*, London: Data Management and Analysis Group, Greater London Authority

Jack, G. (2005) Assessing the impact of community programmes working with children and families in disadvantaged areas, Child and Family Social Work, vol 10 pp 293-304

Mahoney, J, L. (2000) School Extra-curricular Activity Particiaption as a Moderator in the Development of Antisocial Patterns, *Child Development*, Vol 71 (2) pp 502-516

QiSS (2006) *unpublished case study material*, Canterbury: Quality in Study Support.

Wilson, D., Gammie, H., Moore, J. and QiSS (2004) *The Study Support Code of Practic*e, London: Department of Education and Skills

Appendices

Appendix A: Provider survey

<div align="center">

The London Student Pledge

(Part of the London Student Challenge)

</div>

If you require an electronic version of this questionnaire or if you have any queries, please contact Hilary Salter on ☎ 020 7911 7543 or h.salter@psi.org.uk .

This questionnaire forms part of an evaluation of the London Student Pledge, supported by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), being carried out by the Policy Studies Institute (PSI). The initiative aims to broaden secondary students' learning experiences by promoting and enabling participation in a variety of extra-curricular activities. The evaluation will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the initiative by obtaining views from students, school staff and activity providers. This questionnaire is intended to supply an overview of providers. PSI researchers would then like to visit some providers to find out more about their experiences and views on the Student Pledge. Participation in this research is voluntary but we do hope you will help us by filling in this questionnaire. The information you provide will help improve future support for student activities.

Please follow the instructions for each question carefully and note that some questions may involve more than one answer.

1. What activities does your organisation provide (both related and not related to the school children)?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Below are the ten statements in the *London Student Pledge*. Please indicate which statements apply to the activities you provide for young people.

   *Please tick **any** that apply* ✓

   10 things to do by the time I am 16 …

   I will have had the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to. ☐

   My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated. ☐

   I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts. ☐

   I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production. ☐

   I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay. ☐

   I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities. ☐

   I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue. ☐

   I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths. ☐

   I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end. ☐

   I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology. ☐

3. What date (approximately) did your organisation start offering activities related to the Student Pledge?

Please specify month and year ……..…………………

4. Which are the main groups of students (formal education) that your organisation ***aims to work with***?

*Please tick **any** that apply ✓*

KS3 (11-14)	☐
KS4 (15-16)	☐
Primary/Infant School students	☐
Other (please specify)	☐

………….………………………..

5. Where are the secondary schools you work with located?

*Please tick **any** that apply ✓*

Inner London	☐
Outer London	☐
Outside the London region	☐

6. How many staff (volunteers and employees) work for your organisation?

Please specify number of employees ……....

Please specify number of volunteers ……....

7. Approximately how many secondary students (ages 11 to 16) participate in your activities each year?

Please specify number of students ……....

Please specify as a proportion of all your participants .... (%)

From what sources does your organisation obtain operational funding for Student Pledge related activities?

*Please tick **any** that apply ✓*

Participation fees	☐
Local government grant	☐
Central government grant	☐
Lottery grant	☐
Private donation	☐
Other (please specify)	☐

…………………………………….

8. Does your organisation currently have funding in place that will sustain activities beyond 2008?

Please tick ✓ **one**

Yes ☐   No ☐

Please briefly explain.

_____

_____

9. When working with secondary schools, what do you charge per student?

If the charge varies by activity, please specify the activity and the charge for each.

Activity	Charge per student (£)	Does the charge cover your costs?	
		Yes ✓	No ✓

10. Do you evaluate or monitor your activities?

Please tick ✓ **one**

Yes ☐   No ☐

If, *yes*, please explain how.

_____

_____

11. Were you aware of the London Student Pledge prior to receiving this questionnaire?

Please tick ✓ **one**

Yes ☐   No ☐

What are your views on this initiative?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Please use this space to add any other comments about your provision or about this study.

_____ 64

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your help.

Please return your completed questionnaire to Hilary Salter at PSI in the enclosed pre-paid envelope by <u>October 19th 2007</u>.

Please provide your contact details on the next page as we want to know how best to contact you if you are one of the providers selected to be interviewed in November or December 2007.

Contact details:

Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr)	
Name(s):	
Organisation:	Position:
Address:	
	Post code
Telephone:	Email:
Website:	Best time to ring

Which days and times of the week would it be convenient for you to be interviewed? If your organisation is selected for the next stage of the study, we will contact you and arrange a convenient date and time.

e.g. Thursday afternoons, Wednesdays only, any morning

If you do not wish to be interviewed can you please contact Hilary Salter on ☎ 020 7911 7543 or email at h.salter@psi.org.uk . We will still need your contact details to ensure that we do not contact you again for a response to this questionnaire.

Thank you.

Part-funded

Appendix B: Audit instrument Part-funded

Evaluation of the London Student Pledge

Cost and output data

Serial Number from Strand A

Contact details: (these can be filled in from Strand A data if we have them)

Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr)

Name(s):

Organisation: Position:

Address:

                                                                 Post code

Telephone: Email:

Website:

Researcher:

This part of the evaluation of the London Student Pledge asks for details of costs and outputs over the last two financial years. The data are needed to help understand the extent to which this level of funding has supported access to cultural, sporting and other developmental opportunities which supplement what schools can do.

The information you provide is recognised as confidential and will only be shared amongst members of the research team. No details of the financial dealings of any organisation will go further in any report we give, oral or written.

We hope you can help us with this.

Please note: **Q.2- 8** are to be completed for financial year **2006/07**

and **Q.9-15** are to be completed for financial year **2005/06**

The questions ask about your **London Student Pledge (LSP) grant**. You may also know this as London Challenge funding.

They also ask about activities you carry out which are **LSP-related**. These include any activities which meet one or more of the Pledge statements (overleaf) and which are provided to **London secondary school children**.

Part-funded

The Student Pledge offers London students the opportunity to say:

Before I am sixteen...

1. I will have had the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to.
2. My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated - at school or outside.
3. I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts.
4. I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production.
5. I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay.
6. I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities.
7. I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue.
8. I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths.
9. I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end.
10. I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology.

Part-funded

Q.1 Please record turnover for the last two years and anticipated turnover for next year.

	2005/06	**2006/07**	Anticipated **2007/08**
Total Turnover of organisation (volume of business)			
Total finance allocated to Education and Young People work			
Contribution from Grants			

Please complete Q.2-8 for financial year <u>2006/07</u>

Q.2 Please describe the sorts of activities in which you have engaged in support of the LSP during the year **2006/07**. Please also identify the part of your LSP-related work which is specifically part-funded by a London Student Pledge (LSP) grant.

Activity area	**Numbers involved**			
		Schools	**Teachers**	**Students**
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			

Part-funded

Q.3 From what sources does your organisation obtain operational funding? Please record the amount of funding and the proportion allocated for LSP-related activities.

Funding source	Amount of funding received	Proportion used for LSP-related activities
London Student Pledge (LSP) grant		
Participation fees		
Local Government grant		
Central government grant		
Lottery Grant		
Private donation		
Other		

Q.4 Total number of student participants:

in LSP-related activities

in activities specifically part-funded by an LSP grant

Q.5 Characteristics of participants

		Number of Participants	If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick all that apply
Age:	KS2 (5-11)		
	KS3 (11-14)		
	KS4 (15-16)		
Other student characteristics where you specifically target groups of young people (for example disability, deprivation) :			
Student Characteristic	Number of Participants	If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick	

Part-funded

Q.6 For *all* your LSP-related related work, what is the cost per student per hour for each category of activity

Activity area	Actual cost per student	Duration of activity (e.g. hour, half day etc)	Amount charged to student	Amount of actual cost covered by LSP grant

Q.7 is there a different cost for different groups?

Please tick ✓ **one**

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, please record rate by activity and group.

Activity area	Type of group	Cost	Duration

Part-funded

Q.8 Please record the allocation of LSP grant funding across key organisation functions (as actual amount to nearest £50 or proportion of allocation).

Key functions	Amount to nearest £50	Proportion/percentage allocated
Total allocated to the student experience (i.e.direct activity with students)		
Can you break down other costs by:		
Management Costs:		
Admin		
Monitoring		
Promotional		
Recruitment		
Training		
Premises costs		
Overhead costs		
Any other breakdowns:		

Part-funded

Please complete Q.9-14 for financial year 2005/06

Q.9 Please describe the sorts of activities in which you have engaged in support of the LSP during the year **2005/06**. Please identify the part of ALL your LSP related work which is specifically part-funded by the London Challenge through a London Student Pledge grant.

Activity area	Numbers involved			
		Schools	**Teachers**	**Students**
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			
	All LSP-related work			
	Specifically part-funded by LSP grant			

Part-funded

Q.10 From what sources does your organisation obtain operational funding? Please record the amount of funding and the proportion allocated for LSP-related activities.

Funding source	Amount of funding received	Proportion used for LSP-related activities
London Student Pledge (LSP) grant		
Participation fees		
Local Government grant		
Central Government grant		
Lottery Grant		
Private donation		
Other		

Q.11 Total number of student participants:

in LSP-related activities

in activities part-funded by an LSP grant

Q.12 Characteristics of participants

		Number of Participants	If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick all that apply
Age:	KS2 (5-11)		
	KS3 (11-14)		
	KS4 (15-16)		

Student Characteristic		Number of Participants	If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick

Part-funded

Q.13 Cost per student per hour for each category of activity

Activity area	Actual cost per student	Duration of activity (e.g. hour, half day etc)	Amount charged to student	Amount of actual cost covered by LSP grant

Q.14 is there a different cost for different groups?

Please tick ✓ **one**

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, please record rate by activity and group.

Activity area	Type of group	Cost	Duration

Part-funded

Q.15 Please record the allocation of LSP grant funding across key organisation functions (as actual amount to nearest £50 or proportion of allocation).

Key functions	Amount to nearest £50	Proportion/percentage allocated
Total allocated to the student experience (i.e. direct activity with students)		
Can you break down other costs by:		
Management Costs:		
Admin		
Monitoring		
Promotional		
Recruitment		
Training		
Premises costs		
Overhead costs		
Any other breakdowns:		

Q.16 How important is the LSP grant funding to your provision?

Very important ☐

Quite important ☐

Not very important ☐

Not at all important ☐

Part-funded

Q.17 Can you please explain your answer

[ ]

Q.18 If, very or quite important, please can you estimate the number of extra students that have participated in your provision, as a result of the LSP grant funding?

[ ]

Non-funded

Appendix B: Audit instrument Non-funded

Evaluation of the London Student Pledge

Cost and output data

Serial Number from Strand A

Contact details: (these can be filled in from Strand A data if we have them)

Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr)

Name(s):

Organisation: Position:

Address:

Post code

Telephone: Email:

Website:

Researcher: ………………………………….…..

This part of the evaluation of the London Student Pledge asks for details of costs and outputs over the last two financial years. The data are needed to help understand the extent to which this level of funding has supported access to cultural, sporting and other developmental opportunities which supplement what schools can do.

The information you provide is recognised as confidential and will only be shared amongst members of the research team. No details of the financial dealings of any organisation will go further in any report we give, oral or written.

We hope you can help us with this.

Please note: **Q.2- 8** are to be completed for financial year **2006/07**

and **Q.9-14** are to be completed for financial year **2005/06**

The questions ask about any activities you carry out which are **LSP-related**. These include any activities which meet one or more of the Pledge statements (overleaf) and which are provided to **London secondary school children**.

Non-funded

The Student Pledge offers London students the opportunity to say:

Before I am sixteen...

1. I will have had the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to.
2. My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated - at school or outside.
3. I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts.
4. I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production.
5. I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay.
6. I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities.
7. I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue.
8. I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths.
9. I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end.
10. I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology.

Non-funded

Q.1 Please record turnover for the last two years and anticipated turnover for next year.

	2005/06	**2006/07**	Anticipated **2007/08**
Total Turnover of organisation (volume of business)			
Total finance allocated to Education and Young People work			
Contribution from Grants			

Please complete Q.2-8 for financial year 2006/07

Q.2 Please describe the sorts of activities in which you have engaged in support of the LSP during the year **2006/07**

Activity area	**Numbers involved**		
	Schools	**Teachers**	**Students**

Non-funded

Q.3 From what sources does your organisation obtain operational funding? Please record the amount of funding and the proportion allocated for LSP-related activities.

Funding source	Amount of funding received	Proportion used for LSP-related activities
Participation fees		
Local Government grant		
Central government grant		
Lottery Grant		
Private donation		
Other		

Q.4 Total number of student participants in all LSP-related activities

Q.5 Characteristics of participants

		Number of Participants	If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick all that apply
Age:	KS2 (5-11)		
	KS3 (11-14)		
	KS4 (15-16)		
Other student characteristics where you specifically target groups of young people (for example disability, deprivation) :			
Student Characteristic	**Number of Participants**	**If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick**	

Non-funded

Q.6 Cost per student per hour for each category of activity

Activity area	Actual cost per student	Duration of activity (e.g. hour, half day etc)	Amount charged to student	Amount of actual cost covered by Grant funding

Q.7 is there a different cost for different groups?

Please tick ✓ one

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, please record rate by activity and group.

Activity area	Type of group	Cost	Duration

Non-funded

Q.8 For your LSP-related activities, please record the allocation of finance across key organisation functions (as actual amount to nearest £50 or proportion of allocation).

Key functions	Amount to nearest £50	Proportion / percentage allocated
Total allocated to the student experience (i.e. direct activity with students)		
Can you break down other costs by:		
Management Costs:		
Admin		
Monitoring		
Promotional		
Recruitment		
Training		
Premises costs		
Overhead costs		
Any other breakdowns:		

Non-funded

Q.9 Please describe the sorts of activities in which you have engaged in support of the LSP during the year **2005/06**

Activity area	Numbers involved		
	Schools	**Teachers**	**Students**

Q.10 From what sources does your organisation obtain operational funding? Please record the amount of funding and the proportion allocated for LSP-related activities.

Funding source	Amount of funding received	Proportion used for LSP-related activities
Participation fees		
Local Government grant		
Central government grant		
Lottery Grant		
Private donation		
Other		

Non-funded

Q.11 Total number of student participants in all LSP-related activities

Q.12 Characteristics of participants

		Number of Participants	**If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups - tick all that apply**
Age:	KS2 (5-11)		
	KS3 (11-14)		
	KS4 (15-16)		
Other student characteristics where you specifically target groups of young people (for example disability, deprivation) :			
Student Characteristic	**Number of Participants**	**If number unknown but Provider caters for these groups – tick**	

Q.13 Cost per student per hour for each category of activity

Activity area	**Actual cost per student**	**Duration of activity (e.g. hour, half day etc)**	**Amount charged to student**	**Amount of actual cost covered by Grant funding**

Non-funded

Q.14 is there a different cost for different groups?

Please tick ✓ one

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, please record rate by activity and group.

Activity area	Type of group	Cost	Duration

Q.15 For your LSP-related activity, please record the allocation of finance across key organisation functions (as actual amount to nearest £50 or proportion of allocation).

Key functions	Amount to nearest £50	Proportion/percentage allocated
Total allocated to the student experience (i.e. direct activity with students)		
Can you break down other costs by:		
Management Costs:		
Admin		
Monitoring		
Promotional		
Recruitment		
Training		
Premises costs		
Overhead costs		
Any other breakdowns:		

Appendix B: Part-funded Providers topic guide

Notes to interviewers

Explanations / rationales for each section are notes in italics

Anything in bold should be asked as it is

Areas/issues to be covered in each section are listed as prompts

Probes should be used where necessary and as appropriate

INTRODUCTION

My name is […] and I work for the Policy Studies Institute, which is an independent research organisation. The Department for Children, Schools and Families has asked us to evaluate their funding of the London Student Pledge - part of the London Challenge. *[interviewer to have details of the ten Pledge statements available for reference]*

We would like you to tell us about the activities that you organise for London's secondary school children. The information that you give us will play an important role in helping us evaluate the delivery and impact of the London Student Pledge.

Because provision is so varied, some of these questions may seem more relevant to you than others, so please feel free to say more on these. Also please feel free to say if you prefer not to answer a question. Anything you tell me is confidential and will be fully anonymised in any reporting of this evaluation

Do you have any questions before I start?

May I please have your permission to tape the interview, as we are very interested in the detail of what people say, and it's very difficult to take full notes?

You have already received an outline of the questions that we would like to discuss in this interview, and we will cover these in the order listed.

Section One: What is offered to schools, and what is the take-up

We are looking for provider views on the delivery and effectiveness of their organisation's Pledge activities.

Throughout: specify time period.

1. **Can you tell me what you know about the London Student Pledge? [talk about what the Pledge is if there is little or no knowledge]**

   How they heard about it

   Why they decided to become involved

   When they became involved

2. **Can you describe the extra-curricular activities that your organisation offers to secondary-school children? [interviewer to refer to the survey questionnaire and ask them to elaborate - if info available.]**

   Type of activity, hours of activity

   Age groups

   Were there any delivery challenges?

   Were they overcome? How?

   Which LSP category?

Provide examples.

3. **Have any activities been over or under-subscribed?**

   How do they market their activities?

   Has this posed a problem (sustainability, needing to expand the provision)?

   What have they done to try and address this?

4. **Can you give any examples of good practice in the provision of activities?** *(if have already given examples ask for their 'best' practice example)*

   Probe on what makes them good examples

5. **What are the characteristics of schools and students that take up the opportunities?**

   Any targeting?

   If so, how successful has this been?

   Are there any barriers preventing schools/students taking up these opportunities?

   How might these be overcome?

   What kind of relationships do they have with participating schools? (e.g., repeat business, length of partnership)

   What could be improved?

6. **How many schools and how many children (approx) do you work with?**

   Specify time period under discussion

   Try and get list of schools they work with

Section Two: Providers views on the funding of London Student Pledge activity

We are looking for provider views on the delivery and effectiveness of funding - including the London Challenge funding (adjust questions depending on whether the provider is part-funded by DCSF)

7. **Co-part-funded providers only** *(ask relevant question)*

What are your views on the London Challenge/Student Pledge funding?

> Experiences of the process of applying for funding
>
> Views on the adequacy of funding
>
> Experiences of the delivery of funding (eg. Conditions attached, length of time for funds to arrive etc)
>
> Has the funding altered their way of working at all? [probe on change to activities, target marketing, schools they work with etc]

8. **Part-funded/non-funded mix** *[these are providers who have previously received LSP funding but are currently NOT supported]*

> **How are your LSP activities part-funded?**
>
> Views on funding ending
>
> *Prompt/probe on all the above*

9. **Co- part-funded providers only** **Did you agree to any delivery targets, and what were they?**

What was outlined in the grant agreement? NB ask for copies of any paperwork.

> Have they met the targets?
>
> How was this achieved?
>
> If not, why not?

10. **Co- part-funded providers only** **How do you think the activities offer value for money for the Department? [*we are asking them to talk about the benefits in relation to the costs*]**

> What would they have done if they had not received the funding?
>
> What are the effects of short term funding? Repeat funding?
>
> Do they feel they have had sufficient time to establish relationships with schools? *Link back to what they may have said earlier about relationships with schools*
>
> What are they able to do that they would not be able to do without funding

11. **Co- part-funded providers only** **How do you plan to (or how did you) sustain activities after the funding ends/ended?**

Section Three: Evaluating outcomes

12. **Do you evaluate your Pledge-related practice and if so, how?** *[ask for any documentation]* *[Refer to questionnaire response, if available]*

> What are the important indicators used for monitoring their service?
>
> Who provides feedback? (students as well as school rep?)
>
> Has this led to any changes in their practice?
>
> Any examples of good practice?

13. **What do you think about the contribution your organisation is making to the London Student Pledge?**

> How could this be enhanced/ improved?
>
> Views on the role of the voluntary sector broadening experiences and aspirations of students in London

Section Four: Closing

14. **Is there anything that you would like to add, that we have not covered?**

Thank you for your time!!

Try and get list of schools they work with to take away

Try and take any other paperwork they may have: evaluations; grant agreements etc.

Appendix B: Non-funded Providers topic guide

LONDON STUDENT PLEDGE TOPIC GUIDE: PROVIDERS
NON-FUNDED 29/10/2008

Notes to interviewers

Explanations/rationales for each section are notes in italics

Anything in bold should be asked as it is

Areas/issues to be covered in each section are listed as prompts

Probes should be used where necessary and as appropriate

INTRODUCTION

My name is […] and I work for the Policy Studies Institute, which is an independent research organisation. The Department for Children, Schools and Families has asked us to evaluate their funding of the London Student Pledge - part of the London Challenge. *[interviewer to have details of the ten Pledge statements available for reference]*

Before I am sixteen...

1. I will have had the chance to express my views on London issues and be listened to.
2. My academic, sporting or creative talents will have been celebrated - at school or outside.
3. I will have taken part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts.
4. I will have taken part in a play, musical or reading that involves either acting, speaking or helping with the production.
5. I will have been on an educational visit or overnight stay.
6. I will have had the opportunity to help others through voluntary activities.
7. I will have been to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue.
8. I will have learnt to understand other cultures and faiths.
9. I will have planned, delivered and evaluated a project from beginning to end.
10. I will have experienced cutting-edge science and technology.

We would like you to tell us about the activities that you organise for London's secondary school children. The information that you give us will play an important role in helping us evaluate the delivery and impact of the London Student Pledge.

Because provision is so varied, some of these questions may seem more relevant to you than others, so please feel free to say more on these. Also please feel free to say if you prefer not to answer a question. Anything you tell me is confidential and will be fully anonymised in any reporting of this evaluation

Do you have any questions before I start?

May I please have your permission to tape the interview, as we are very interested in the detail of what people say, and it's very difficult to take full notes?

You have already received an outline of the questions that we would like to discuss in this interview, and we will cover these in the order listed.

Section One: What is offered to schools, and what is the take-up

We are looking for provider views on the delivery and effectiveness of their organisation's Pledge activities.

Throughout: specify time period.

1. **Can you tell me what you know about the London Student Pledge? [talk about what the Pledge is if there is little or no knowledge]**

    How they heard about it

    Why they decided to become involved

    When they became involved

2. **Can you describe the extra-curricular activities that your organisation offers to secondary-school children?** *[interviewer to refer to the survey questionnaire and ask them to elaborate - if info available.]*

    Type of activity, hours of activity

    Age groups

    Were there any delivery challenges?

    Were they overcome? How?

    Which LSP category?

    Provide examples.

3. **Have any activities been over- or under-subscribed?**

    How do they market their activities?

    Has this posed a problem (sustainability, needing to expand the provision)?

    What have they done to try and address this?

4. **Can you give any examples of good practice in the provision of activities?** *(if have already given examples ask for their 'best' practice example)*

    Probe on what makes them good examples

5. **What are the characteristics of schools and students that take up the opportunities?**

    Any targeting?

    If so, how successful has this been?

    Are there any barriers preventing schools/students taking up these opportunities?

    How might these be overcome?

    What kind of relationships do they have with participating schools? (e.g., repeat business, length of partnership)

    What could be improved?

6. **How many schools and how many children (approx) do you work with?**

    Specify time period under discussion

    Try and get list of schools they work with

Section Two: Providers views on the funding of London Student activity

We are looking for provider views on the delivery and effectiveness of funding - including the London Challenge funding (adjust questions depending on whether the provider is part-funded by DCSF)

7. <mark>**Non-funded applicants only**</mark>

   How are your LSP activities part-funded?

   > Experiences of the process of applying for funding from other bodies, and (if relevant LSP)

   > Views on not receiving LSP funding, OR not knowing about the funding

   > Has not receiving funding altered their way of working at all? (failed applicants) [probe on change to activities, target marketing]

   > Feelings about hearing about funding possibilities only recently

8. <mark>**Non-funded (or mixture) providers only**</mark> **How have you sustained Pledge activities?**

   > How about in the future?

   > What would they be able to do (that they are not able to do now) with extra funding **or** what were they able to do when part-funded compared with when unpart-funded?

   > Have they ever had any shortfalls

Section Three: Evaluating outcomes

9. ***Do you evaluate your Pledge-related practice and if so, how?*** *[ask for any documentation] [Refer to questionnaire response, if available]*

   > What are the important indicators used for monitoring their service?

   > Who provides feedback? (students as well as school rep?)

   > Has this led to any changes in their practice?

   > Any examples of good practice?

10. **What do you think about the contribution your organisation is making to the London Student Pledge?**

    > How could this be enhanced/ improved?

    > Views on the role of the voluntary sector broadening experiences and aspirations of students in London

Section Four: Closing

11. **Is there anything that you would like to add, that we have not covered?**

Thank you for your time!!

Try and get list of schools they work with to take away

Try and take any other paperwork they may have: evaluations; grant agreements etc.

Appendix C: Class teacher topic guide

LONDON STUDENT PLEDGE TOPIC GUIDE: CLASS TEACHERS

Class or subject teachers that have organised a selected activity for their students and been the point of contact for the providers

Notes to interviewers

Explanations / rationales for each section are notes in italics

Anything in bold should be asked as it is

Areas / issues to be covered in each section are listed as prompts

Probes should be used where necessary and as appropriate

INTRODUCTION

My name is […] and I work for the Policy Studies Institute, which is an independent research organisation. The Department for Children, Schools and Families has asked us to evaluate their funding of the London Student Pledge – part of the London Challenge. *[interviewer to have details of the ten Pledge statements available for reference]*

We would like you to tell us about ……………… that you have organised for children in this school. The information that you give us will play an important role in helping us evaluate the delivery and impact of the London Student Pledge.

Some of these questions may seem more relevant to you than others, so please feel free to say more on these. Also please feel free to say if you prefer not to answer a question. Anything you tell me is confidential and will be fully anonymised in any reporting of this evaluation

Do you have any questions before I start?

May I please have your permission to record the interview, as we are very interested in the detail of what people say, and it's very difficult to take full notes?

You have already received an outline of the questions that we would like to discuss in this interview. We will cover these in the order listed, but there will probably be other questions that come up in the course of the interview.

Section One: Student Pledge activities

1. Can you tell me what you know about the London Student Pledge? *[talk about what the Pledge is if there is little or no knowledge Show list of Pledge activities]*

How they heard about it? Was there any marketing?

Did they 'opt in' to the Pledge? When? How? Why?

2. Refer to the specific activity that we want to evaluate and check that teacher has been involved. Also check details:

Year

Provider

Type of activity, hours of activity (extra-curricular or in class time)

Cost

How did they learn about the provider?

3. Why and how did you decide to organise this activity?

Related to curriculum/subject area?

Perceived benefit to particular groups of students

Was cost a factor?

Was relationship with providers a factor? (return to this in question 7)

4. What were the characteristics of children that took up this opportunity?

Who selected the students?

Was it over- or under-subscribed?

Did this pose a problem? How was it addressed?

5. Did you face any difficulties in organising this activity? If so, how were they overcome?

Cost

Teacher time

Teacher turnover

Time in the curriculum

Access issues and other barriers to children taking up opportunities?

Additional pressures (eg exams)

NB. How might these be overcome?

6. What kind of relationship do you have with providers?

repeat activities, length of partnership

what works? What could be improved?

7. Can you give any examples of good practice in the provision of activities? *(if have already given examples ask for their 'best' practice example)*

Probe on what makes them good examples

Do they feel well informed about types of activity available?

Can they identify any additional areas of provision they would like to see?

Section Two: Funding

8. What is the cost per student of the activity we have discussed?

>Cost charged to school, and cost charged to student (how is any difference part-funded)

>What is covered? Eg. Is travel covered?

>Do you think the activity offers value for money for the school?

9. What difference does it make having this activity available free, or at low cost?

>Any alternative sources of subsidising/covering the cost of such activities

>What would they normally expect to pay for such activity

10. What are your views on the London Challenge funding for Student Pledge activities?

>Are you aware of whether this activity was part-funded by the DCSF or not

>Has the funding altered the activities they offer at all? (range of activities offered, frequency, amount of children involved, etc.)

>Are they aware of any strategy the school has in place for Pledge challenges

Section Three: Outcomes for the children

11. Did you evaluate the activity, and if so, how? *[ask for any documentation]*

>What were the indicators used for monitoring the activity?

>Who provided feedback?

>Has this led to any changes in practice?

12. How have your students benefited from this activity? *Probe on:*

Do you think the children enjoyed the activity, (why and how)?

What do the children gain from taking part in the activity –

>knowledge and understanding,

>technical skills,

>confidence/ social skills

>health and fitness

>motivation

13. Do you think the children's attitudes and values change at all as a result of taking part in the activity,

>(why and how)?

>Do you think the children's behaviour changes as a result of taking part in the activities, (and how)?

14. Are there links between outcomes for the activity and learning outcomes improved exam results SATs, GCSEs etc?

Section Four: Closing

15. Overall what do you think about the value of the activity you organised?

Would you continue to work with that provider again if they were providing the activity in the future?

16. Overall, what do you think about the value of the London Student Pledge?

Are there any things about the Pledge and the funding that could be improved?

Are there other activities you would like to see available to schools within the remit of the Pledge

17. Is there anything that you would like to add that we have not covered?

Thank you for your time!!

Try and take any other paperwork they may have: evaluations, letters etc

Appendix C: Co-ordinator teacher topic guide

LONDON STUDENT PLEDGE TOPIC GUIDE: CO-ORDINATING TEACHERS

(someone with overall responsibility for extra curricular activities; heads of year, subject heads, deputy head etc)

Notes to interviewers

Explanations / rationales for each section are notes in italics

Anything in bold should be asked as it is

Areas/issues to be covered in each section are listed as prompts

Probes should be used where necessary and as appropriate

INTRODUCTION

My name is […] and I work for the Policy Studies Institute, which is an independent research organisation. The Department for Children, Schools and Families has asked us to evaluate their funding of the London Student Pledge – part of the London Challenge. *[interviewer to have details of the ten Pledge statements available for reference]*

We would like you to tell us about the activities that have been organised for children in this school. The information that you give us will play an important role in helping us evaluate the delivery and impact of the London Student Pledge.

Because provision is so varied, some of these questions may seem more relevant to you than others, so please feel free to say more on these. Also please feel free to say if you prefer not to answer a question. Anything you tell me is confidential and will be fully anonymised in any reporting of this evaluation

Do you have any questions before I start?

May I please have your permission to record the interview, as we are very interested in the detail of what people say, and it's very difficult to take full notes?

You have already received an outline of the questions that we would like to discuss in this interview. We will cover these in the order listed, but there will probably be other questions that come up in the course of the interview.

Section One: Student Pledge activities

1. Can you tell me what you know about the London Student Pledge? *[talk about what the Pledge is if there is little or no knowledge Show list of Pledge activities]*

How they heard about it? Was there any marketing?

Did they 'opt in' to the Pledge? When? How? Why?

Does the school have a strategy for meeting the Pledge?

Were additional activities provided because of the Pledge?

2. Can you describe the activities that have been organised for children in this school that relate to the Pledge over 2005/6, and 2006/7?

Show list of Pledge activities and ask which the school has participated in

For each, ask:

Year

Provider

Type of activity, hours of activity (extra-curricular or in class time)

Age groups

Subject areas

Cost

Have you worked with a particular provider more than once?

Are activities continuing?

3. How do you decide which activities to organise?

Any targeting or selection of:

- types of activities

- groups of students

Related to curriculum?

Is cost a factor?

Is relationship with providers a factor?

How do they learn about providers?

4. Do you face any difficulties in organising activities to meet the Pledge?

Cost

Teacher time

Teacher turnover

Time in the curriculum

Additional pressures (eg exams)

Do they feel well informed about types of activity available?

Can they identify any additional areas of provision they would like to see?

NB How are any difficulties overcome?

5. What are the characteristics of children that take up the opportunities?

Who selects the students?

Have any of the activities been over- or under-subscribed?

Has this posed a problem? What have they done to try and address this?

Any barriers to children taking up opportunities?

NB How might these be overcome?

6. What kind of relationships do you have with providers?

repeat activities, length of partnership

what works? What could be improved?

7. Can you give any examples of good practice in the provision of activities? *(if have already given examples ask for their 'best' practice example)*

Probe on what makes them good examples

Section Two: Funding

8. What are your views on the London Challenge funding for Student Pledge activities?

Are they aware which Pledge provision was part-funded by the DCSF and which not?
Views on the adequacy of the subsidy

9. What difference does it make having these activities available free or at low cost?

Has the funding altered the activities they offer at all? (range of activities offered, frequency, amount of children involved, etc.)

What would they normally expect to pay for such activities

Any alternative sources of subsidising/covering the cost of such activities

Did the part-funded activities offer value for money for the school

Section Three: outcomes for the children

10. Do you evaluate the activities, and if so, how? *[ask for any documentation]*

What are the indicators used for monitoring activities?

Who provides feedback (teachers, children)?

Has this led to any changes in their practice?

11. How do you think students benefit from participating in Pledge activities?

Probe on curricular knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, behaviour change, etc.

How does the school benefit?

Section Four: Closing

12. Overall, what do you think about the value of the London Student Pledge?

Probe separately on the Pledge itself and the Pledge funding

Ask how they might judge the value for money of activities

Will you (continue to) use the Pledge in the future to structure extra curricular activities for students?

Are there any things about the Pledge and the funding that could be improved ?

13. Do you think the Pledge should be replicated in other areas of the country?

14. Is there anything that you would like to add, that we have not covered?

Thank you for your time!!

Try and take any other paperwork they may have: evaluations, letters, costs etc

Appendix D: Focus group topic guide

<div align="center">

LONDON STUDENT PLEDGE

RESEARCH WITH SCHOOL STUDENTS

PROTOCOL AND GUIDANCE FOR RESEARCHERS

</div>

Notes to interviewers

You will need to customise the research instruments according to the activity that we are focussing on. Where this is necessary the space has been highlighted.

Please be familiar with the provider data that relates to the activity we are looking at.

In this guide and the topic guides explanations/rationales for researchers are in italics.

Anything in bold should be asked as it is.

Areas/issues to be covered in each section are listed as prompts.

Probes should be used where necessary and as appropriate.

Research questions to be addressed (partially) by the questionnaire and in these focus groups:

Evaluating outcomes:

- *What are the views of participants of the activities? (How do they rate the activities? Why did they choose particular activities? How satisfied were they with the activity?)*

- *What other activities have participating schools been involved with during the course of one year?*

- *Do schools make links between the activities they have been involved with and student's learning outcomes?*

- *Are students aware of specifically working towards fulfilling the 10 elements of the Student Pledge?*

  - *What are the barriers to participation? (schools and students)*

  - *Do schools evaluate the activities? If so, who does this (teachers and/or students), and how is it done?*

  - *Do schools make links between the activities and other student outcomes: improving attendance, attainment and behaviour?*

  - *Are they able to identify any added value from the providers part-funded by London Challenge?*

INTRODUCTION

My name is […] and I work for the Policy Studies Institute, which is an independent research organisation. The Department for Children, Schools and Families (the government department that runs schools as well as other things) has asked us to do some research on activities that have been organised for students in secondary schools.

We would like you to tell us about ……………………

The information that you give us will help us to write a report about different activities that school students have taken part in.

Taking part in this research is voluntary. You do not have to do it if you do not want to, and you can also stop taking part at any point in time. Also please feel free to say if you prefer not to answer a question. Everything that you do tell me is confidential – we will not tell anyone else (for example teachers, or parents) and no names will be used in the report.

If there is something that you would like to say about the activity that you do not want to talk about in a group, you can tell me afterwards, or you can make a recording, or you can send me an email.

Can I just collect in the consent forms before we start? *Then researcher must go through the forms and make sure that the students are adequately informed to consent to take part in the research.*

Do you have any questions before we start?

There are two parts to this session: First we have a very short questionnaire for you all to fill in. Then we will talk about these issues as a group.

1. [Researcher hand out questionnaire. Tell them they do not have to put their names on the questionnaires, and reassure them about confidentiality. Then go through question by question, asking them to indicate their response as you go along.] Something like: I would like you to answer X question. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested to find out what **you** think.Etc. … [Collect questionnaires when completed.]

2. Now I would like us to talk some more about **…………..** We will go through the questions one at a time. *Hand out the list of questions (this is the questions without the prompts) and make sure they understand. Explain that there will be other questions that might be asked as we go along, but that these are the main questions. Prompt and probe as necessary and appropriate.*

INTRODUCTION TO FOCUS GROUP

You already have a list of the questions, and we will cover these in the order listed. *Researcher to read out question, and make sure students understand it, at relevant point in Focus Group.*

TOPIC GUIDE: FOCUS GROUPS (SCHOOLS)

1. **What did you think about the ………….. that you have taken part in? [*tie this in with their responses to the questionnaire]***

   Why did they take part

   How long ago was this

   Did it fulfil expectations

   What did they like about the activity

   Was there anything that anyone disliked about the activity

   Would they normally take part in that type of activity (with family, friends)

   Did they have to pay anything for the activity (travel)

2. **There was a question on the questionnaire – I feel I have learnt something new from ….. We would now like to talk about this in more detail. What do you think you have learnt from taking part in the activity?** *(double-check responses and adjust question accordingly if necessary eg. What had you hoped to learn, and why do you think you did not learn this)*

   Start with open question – no prompts – but then ask questions around the following different aspects of learning. Can be customised before visit.

   - Knowledge and understanding eg. Learning about something

   - Skills eg. Learning how to do something

   - Attitudes and values eg. Feelings, attitudes towards theatre, museums etc

3. **Do you think that taking part in …………….. has changed what you might do in any way?**

   Plans for the future/aspirations

   Attitude towards studying/getting qualifications etc

   Behaviour

   Relate to questionnaire: made more interested in ………; changed the way I think about ………..

4. **What do you think about other out of school activities, trips that are organised by this school?**

Help learn, change behaviour, attitude towards studying etc

Issue of charging for activities

5. **Why do you think your school arranged for you to take part in ....**

What had they heard about the London Student Pledge/London Challenge?

Views on London Challenge

Views on living in London and what London has to offer (do they identify with London as 'their' city?)

Why do they think they were selected to take part in the activity

Are students aware of working towards fulfilling the 10 elements of the Student Pledge

Has activity contributed towards this?

6. **Is there anything that anyone would like to add, that we have not covered?**

Thank you for your time!!

Appendix D: Student questionnaire

School Ref:

1. **Please circle the smiley that best describes how you feel about the [activity].**

For the next set of questions, please circle the one answer that best matches your views:

2. **I feel I have learnt something new from [activity].**

    Yes, a lot   **Yes, a bit**   **Not much**   **Not at all**

3. **Taking part in [activity] has made me more interested in [course].**

    Yes, a lot   **Yes, a bit**   **Not much**   **Not at all**

4. **Taking part in [activity] has made me more interested in [eg going to museums, theatres].**

    Yes, a lot   **Yes, a bit**   **Not much**   **Not at all**

5. I knew about the London Student Pledge at the time I took part in [activity].

    Yes   No   Don't Know

Below are the ten challenges in the London Student Pledge. Please tick the challenges that you think ……….. has helped you achieve..

*Please tick **any** that apply* ✓

10 things to do by the time I am 16 …

Have my say on London issues and be listened to. ☐

Celebrate my academic, sporting or creative talents. ☐

Take part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts. ☐

Take part in a play, musical or reading that involves acting, speaking or helping with the production. ☐

Go on a school visit or overnight stay. ☐

Help others through voluntary work. ☐

Go to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue. ☐

Learn more about other cultures and faiths. ☐

Plan, deliver and review a project from beginning to end. ☐

Experience cutting-edge science and technology. ☐

School Ref:

Below are the ten challenges in the London Student Pledge. Please tick the challenges that you think you have achieved so far at this school.

10 things to do by the time I am 16 …

Have my say on London issues and be listened to. ☐

Celebrate my academic, sporting or creative talents. ☐

Take part in a public event - either sports, dance or concert or visual arts. ☐

Take part in a play, musical or reading that involves acting, speaking or helping with the production. ☐

Go on a school visit or overnight stay. ☐

Help others through voluntary work. ☐

Go to an artistic or sporting event at a major London venue. ☐

Learn more about other cultures and faiths. ☐

Plan, deliver and review a project from beginning to end. ☐

Experience cutting-edge science and technology. ☐

Thank you very much for your time.

Appendix E: CONSENT FORM focus groups - parents carers

CONSENT FORM: FOCUS GROUP
Parents / carers consent

Title of Project: Evaluation of the London Student Pledge

School:

Name of Researcher:

Date:

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information leaflet given ☐

to ……….. (child's name) for the above study.

2. I understand that ………. (child's name) participation is voluntary and they

☐

can withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.

3. I agree that their participation may be recorded ☐

4. I agree to allow ……………. (child's name) to take part in the study ☐

Name	Date	Signature

Researcher	Date	Signature

Appendix E: CONSENT FORM focus groups - school students

CONSENT FORM: FOCUS GROUP

Title of Project: Evaluation of the London Student Pledge

School:

Name of Researcher:

Date:

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet

for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw

at any time, without giving any reason.

3. I agree that my participation may be recorded

4. I agree to take part in the above study.

Name	Date	Signature

Researcher	Date	Signature

Appendix E: Focus groups infosheet final

Students experiences of taking part in London Student Pledge activities

Focus Group Discussion

We would like you to take part in this study. Before you decide if you want to, this leaflet will tell you why we are doing this research and what it will mean for you.

If you have got any questions after you have read this we will be happy to talk to you and explain more.

The researchers' names are Kathryn Ray, Rebecca Taylor and Lesley Hoggart. We work at the Policy Studies Institute, an organisation that carries out research about government social policies. **We have interviewed lots of different people about all sorts of issues.**

You can contact us on 020 7911 7520 if you have any other questions.

Appendix E: Focus groups infosheet final

Why are we doing the project?

We have been asked, by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) - the Government department that runs schools - to find out what school children think about taking part in specially organised activities. We would like to ask you about

....

This is one of the ten London Student Pledge activities and the government want to know whether to pay for more of these activities in London and in other cities. But they need to know whether young people found them useful, interesting or enjoyable.

What will happen if I take part?

Kathryn, Rebecca or Lesley (the researchers) will talk to you with a small group of other students at your school who also took part in the activity. This is called a focus group.

We will first ask you to complete a very short questionnaire. We will then have some group discussion and ask you what you remember about...

We would like you to tell us what was good about the experience, what was not so good and whether you would like to do something similar in the future.

Why have I been chosen?

You were selected by your teachers who thought you would be happy to talk about your experiences

The group discussion will be recorded. We will type up the recording without using your names and then the recording will be destroyed.

The discussion will take about an hour. Anything you say will be confidential (that means no one else will be told what you say). Your name will not be used in any report or in any other way.

What might be bad about taking part?

You might feel shy, or embarrassed during the discussion, but if you do we will do our best to help you. We have interviewed lots of people and they usually find speaking to us ok.

What might be good about taking part?

What you say might help the government to decide whether to provide more or better or different out of school activities.

Do I have to take part?

NO……

If you do decide to take part you will be asked to sign a consent form. Your parent/carer will also need to sign a consent form. You will still be free to drop out at any time and without giving a reason.

What happens after the discussion group?

We will write a report which will summarise what the staff and school students tell us about the London student Pledge activities. Your school will receive a copy of the report.

Appendix F: Provider Survey Table

Table F1 - Funding beyond 2008 by main activity

Counts

Does your organisation currently have funding that will sustain activities beyond 2008?	Funded providers N No		Yes	Other providers N No		Yes	All N No		Yes
All activities*	21	9	10	32	15	14	53	24	24
Sports / physical and outdoors education	2	2	0	3	2	0	5	4	0
Performing arts / arts education / arts activities	15	6	7	12	6	6	27	12	13
Environmental / science education	1	1	0	3	2	1	4	3	1
Training leadership / enterprise awareness / student placements	2	0	2	9	2	6	11	2	8
Other activities	2	1	1	5	3	1	6	4	2

* Note: Five providers did not respond to this question. The 'yes' category includes 3 providers who reported having funding for some of their projects but not all.

Appendix G: Financial Audit Tables

Table G1: Funding, provision by providers and numbers ~ part-funded providers

Provider	Activity		Schools	Teachers	Students
1029	Provision of curriculum	LSP grant	21	31	
	Teacher training	total	21	31	630
	Teacher training	LSP grant	21	31	630
1031	INSET	LSP grant	16	23	
	INSET	total	24	32	
	Resources DVD	LSP grant	23	92	4920
	Workshops	LSP grant	5	10	340
	Workshops	total	11	22	686
	Performances in school	LSP grant	23	92	4920
	Performances in school	total	41	164	8640
	Resources DVD	total	41	164	8460
1035	Engagement at secondary	total	4	5	698
	Engagement at secondary	LSP grant	4	5	300
	Enquire	total	4	4	1220
	Independent visits	total	10	19	261
	Primary workshops	total	11	32	1547
	Secondary residential	total	8	9	2444
	Talent Club	total	13	.	2000
	Family Pack	total			240
1036	Art design		32	32	800
1055	Fresh Direction		8	16	183
	Part-funded tickets		74	148	1805
1070	ten@Random	LSP grant	11	11	203
1102	Website		2234	2234	
1114	Arts		30	40	2000
1118	New Views residential		130	697	6954
	Teacher workshops		77	77	
1144	Insight sessions		16	25	250
	Resource pack		140		
	Travel Billy Elliot		40	150	1350
	Travel from special school		49	225	779
	Travel students to theatre		140	453	4077
	Workshops special student		49		

1145	Education matinees	LSP grant	20	20	400
	Playwriting initiative	total	6	6	120
	School playwriting	LSP grant	2	2	120
	Week long projects	total	3	3	9
1169	Exhibition notes	total	9	9	450
	Group tours of exhibition	total	60	80	2000
	Pressing Issues	LSP grant	5	10	150
	Teen talks	LSP grant			10
	Welcome	LSP grant	260		
	Work placements	total	2		6
1254	Band	total	3	2	75
	Band	LSP grant			75
	Dhol	total	2	2	79
	Dhol	LSP grant	2	2	79
	Drum percussion	total	1	1	23
	Drum percussion	LSP grant	1	1	23
	Vocal Performance	total	8	4	282
	Vocal Performance	LSP grant	8	4	282
1255	Brokering relationships	LSP grant	22	100	.
1257	Young Cultural Creators	total	40	40	1029
1258	Student performance		116	116	2900

Table G2: Costs of components

ID (part-funded)	Activity	Cost per student	Duration (hrs)	Charge	LSP grant
1029	Neft module	22.00	50	0.00	18.30
1031	Performances in school	7.00	1		
1031	DVD / workpacks	7.00	1		
1031	Workshops	7.00	2		
1035	Creative connections	11.00		6.66	5.18
1036	Art workshops	50.00	16	0.00	
1055	Part-funded ticket scheme	19.00	2	0.00	15.00
1055	Fresh direction scheme	54.00	5	0.00	54.00
1059	Minority olympic sports	40.48			
1070	Dance workshops and performance	8.00	30	0.00	8.00
1118	Residentials	210.00	40	0.00	210.00
1144	Travel to theatres	15.00	4	3.00	12.00
1144	Billy Elliott special performance	13.50	4	0.00	13.50
1144	Insight sessions	10.00	4	0.00	10.00
1144	In-school workshop	17.50	4	0.00	17.50
1144	Teachers' resource pack	3.00	4	0.00	3.00
1145	Playwriting in schools	132.00	28	35.00	
1145	Educational matinees	6.00		5.00	
1151	Student level 1SL	12.00	30	0.00	12.00
1151	Student DL	12.90	30	0.00	12.90
1151	Tutor training	145.00	8	0.00	145.00
1169	Pressing issues workshop	55.48	16	0.00	55.48
1169	Teentalk	75.00	28	0.00	75.00
1169	Work placements	400.00	36	0.00	0.00
1169	Exhibition notes	3.00		0.00	0.00
1169	Welcome pack	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
1169	Group tour	2.00	1	2.00	0.00
1254	Vocal performance & band	95.00	16	0.00	95.00
1257	Young cultural creators	45.00	6	0.00	45.00
1258	Workshops	48.64	4	0.00	0.00

ID (non-funded)	Activity	Cost per student	Duration (hours)	Charge	LSP grant
1130	2 day summer residential	114.00	47	114.00	0.00
1130	2 day winter residential	91.20	47	91.20	0.00
1130	5 day residential summer	265.00	115	265.00	0.00
1130	5 day residential winter	212.00	115	212.00	0.00
1041	Student leadership course	234.00	18	234.00	0.00

Table G3: Costing by activity within project 2005/06 (LSP part-funded projects)

ID	Activity	Cost per student	Duration	Charge	LSP grant	Overall cost per student hour	Cost to student per hour
1003	Student workshops	50.00	8	0.00	50.00	£6.25	£0.00
1003	London competitions	10.00	16	0.00	10.00	£0.63	£0.00
1003	National competitions	20.00	24	0.00		£0.83	£0.00
1036	Art workshops & visit	50.00	16	0.00		£3.13	£0.00
1055	Part-funded ticket scheme	17.00	2	0.00	17.00	£8.50	£0.00
1059	Minority olympic sports			0.00			
1070	Ten@random	8.80	2	0.00	8.80	£4.40	£0.00
1118	Residential	177.00			113.00		
1144	Bringing students & teachers to theatre from mainstream schools	14.00	4	3.00	11.00	£3.50	£0.75
1144	Bringing students & teachers from special schools	14.00	4	3.00	11.00	£3.50	£0.75
1144	Two Insight sessions prior to performances	10.00	4	0.00	10.00	£2.50	£0.00
1144	In-school workshops for special school students	16.00	4	0.00	16.00	£4.00	£0.00
1144	Develop teachers resource packs for 18 productions	2.75	4	0.00	2.75	£0.69	£0.00
1145	Playwriting groups	71.00	24	35.00		£2.96	£1.46
1145	Education matinees	14.00	4	5.00		£3.50	£1.25
1151	Tutor training SL	12.00	30	0.00	12.00	£0.40	£0.00
1151	Tutor training DL	12.90	30	0.00	12.90	£0.43	£0.00
1151	Tutor training	145.00	8	0.00	145.00	£18.13	£0.00
1169	Welcome	1.70	40	0.00		£0.04	£0.00
1169	Creative Partnerships	272.00	24	0.00	0.00		
1169	Exhibition notes & group Tours	2.00	1	0.00	0.00	£2.00	£0.00

ID	Activity	Cost per student	Duration	Charge	LSP grant	Overall cost per student hour	Cost to student per hour
1169	Teen talks	80.00	12	0.00	0.00	£6.67	£0.00
1183	Musician visits		2	0.00		£0.00	£0.00
1183	Choir rehearsal		6	0.00		£0.00	£0.00
1183	Concert		2	0.00		£0.00	£0.00
1184	Creative workshops	6.66			518.00		
1254	Vocal Performance	95.00	16	0.00	95.00	£5.94	£0.00
1254	Band & instrumental	95.00		0.00	95.00		

Table G4: Costing by activity within project 2006/07 (LSP part-funded projects)

ID	Activity	Cost per student	Duration (hrs)	Charge	LSP grant	Overall cost per student hour	Cost to student per hour
1029	Neft module	22.00	50	0.00	18.30	£0.44	£0.00
1031	Performances in school	7.00	1			£7.00	£0.00
1031	DVD/workpacks	7.00	1			£7.00	£0.00
1035	Creative connections	11.00		6.66	5.18		
1036	Art workshops & visit	50.00	16	0.00		£3.13	£0.00
1055	Part-funded ticket scheme	19.00	2	0.00	15.00	£9.50	£0.00
1055	Fresh direction scheme	54.00	5	0.00	54.00	£10.80	£0.00
1059	Minority olympic sports			0.00			
1070	Ten@random	8.00	30	0.00	8.00	£0.27	£0.00
1114	Festival dev work	25.00	10	0.00	25.00	£2.50	£0.00
1118	Residential	210.00		0.00	210.00		
1144	Bringing students & teachers to theatre from mainstream schools	15.00	4	3.00	12.00	£3.75	£0.75
1144	Bringing students & teachers from special schools	15.00	4	3.00	12.00	£3.75	£0.75

1144	Bringing students to student matinee of Billy Elliott	13.50	4	0.00	13.50	£3.38	£0.00
1144	Running 5 Insight sessions prior to performances	10.00	4	0.00	10.00	£2.50	£0.00
1144	Conducting in-school workshops for special school students	17.50	4	0.00	17.50	£4.38	£0.00
1144	Develop teachers resource packs for 18 productions	3.00	4	0.00	3.00	£0.75	£0.00
1145	Play writing in schools	132.00	28	35.00		£4.71	£1.25
1145	Education matinees	6.00		5.00			
1151	Tutor training SL	12.00	30	0.00	12.00	£0.40	£0.00
1151	Tutor training DL	12.90	30	0.00	12.90	£0.43	£0.00
1151	Tutor training	145.00	8	0.00	145.00	£18.13	£0.00
1169	Pressing issues workshop	55.48	16	0.00	55.48	£3.47	£0.00
1169	Teen talks	75.00	28	0.00	75.00	£2.68	£0.00
1169	Work placements for young people	400.00	36	0.00	0.00	£11.11	£0.00
1169	Exhibition notes	3.00		0.00	0.00		
1169	Welcome resource book (distribution)	0.00	0	0.00	0.00		
1169	Group tours of Exhibitions	2.00	1	2.00	0.00	£2.00	£2.00
1254	Vocal Performance	95.00	16	0.00	95.00	£5.94	£0.00
1254	Band & Instrumental	95.00		0.00	95.00		
1257	Young cultural creators	45.00	6	0.00	45.00	£7.50	£0.00
1258	Theatre workshop	48.64	4	0.00	0.00	£12.16	£0.00

department for
children, schools and families