Extended Schools Subsidy Pathfinder Evaluation

Interim Report

Mark Peters, Hannah Carpenter and Oliver Norden
BMRB Social Research

Dr Liz Todd and Colleen Cummings
Newcastle University

department for
children, schools and families

Extended Schools Subsidy Pathfinder Evaluation

Interim Report

Mark Peters, Hannah Carpenter and Oliver Norden
BMRB Social Research

Dr Liz Todd and Colleen Cummings
Newcastle University

Table of Contents

Executive summary

This report examines data collected so far as part of the evaluation of the extended schools disadvantage subsidy pathfinder.

Findings are based on:

- A quantitative survey of schools

- Collections of management information from schools

- Qualitative mapping research and case studies amongst Pathfinder schools

As such, all findings are self-reported.

Further research amongst schools, parents and pupils is planned for later in the evaluation and a full report on all aspects of the evaluation will be produced in 2010.

In four out of five schools (80 per cent) respondents agreed that "Economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended school activities" showing how necessary the subsidy is in order to increase participation in activities amongst these pupils.

The defined and flexible models (chapter 1)

Clusters following the flexible model were free to choose how they defined economic disadvantage, but all included pupils eligible for free school meals (and most included children in care) as part of their target group.

Half of schools on the flexible model had been involved in choosing the definition of the target group, and in all clusters following the flexible model, at least one school within the cluster had been involved in choosing the definition.

Most schools following the flexible model found it easy to identify which pupils should be included in the target group, but three in ten schools found this difficult. Identifying eligibility criteria could be time consuming but schools adopting this model felt that this extension to planning time was time well spent as they were confident that the most needy pupils were being targeted.

Schools following the flexible model were more likely than those on the defined model to think they were using an effective definition of economic disadvantage, and where schools had been involved in defining the target group, they were even more likely to think the definition was effective.

Nine in ten school following the defined model thought there were pupils who ought to be included in the target group, but did not meet the defined model definition.

More schools on the defined model found it difficult than easy to meet the requirement of providing two hours of activities a week to the target group.

Consultation (chapter 2)

Three quarters of schools had engaged in consultation, 66 per cent with pupils and 57 per cent with parents. Schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to have engaged in consultation than those with lower levels.
Most schools that had introduced new activities had engaged in consultation suggesting the message about the importance of got through to the majority of schools involved in the pathfinder. However, 11 per cent of schools had introduced new activities without having engaged in consultation.

Both pupils and parents were most commonly consulted using questionnaires or surveys, however more innovative and informal methods of consultation were being used by several schools and were deemed to be effective in gauging views of both students and families.

Promotion of activities (chapter 3)

Three in ten schools agreed they struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in activities, and secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to struggle. Apathy amongst some students and parents and a culture of not having a good selection of free or subsidized activities from which to choose, prior to the subsidy, was a factor some schools were up against.

Almost all schools had done something to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group. The most common methods employed were sending letters to parents, and speaking informally to parents and pupils. However, there were also information sessions, coffee mornings, market place events and other methods employed to promote uptake. Encouraging promotion through word of mouth was also deemed to be an effective strategy. Certain subgroups had done more to promote activities to economically disadvantaged pupils: schools following the flexible model; schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils; schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in activities.

Three in ten schools agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma that prevents them taking part in activities. Seven in ten schools had used strategies to avoid stigmatisation when using the subsidy. These included approaching parents rather than pupils, and being discrete about who gets the funding. Steps taken to avoid stigma also included the use of non discriminatory language when speaking with students and families and the promotion of the idea of 'entitlement'. Some schools / LAs had rebranded the subsidy as they felt the official title was inappropriate.

Participation in activities (chapter 4)

Eight in ten schools were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group, and most of these (82 per cent) were taking registers at all activities.

On average 35 per cent of the target group had taken part in activities in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy).

Amongst target group pupils that had taken part in any activities, the average number of hours taken up was 43 hours across the summer term and summer holidays, which breaks down as 40.5 hours during term time (or 3.1 hours per week) and 2.5 hours during the holidays.

Across the whole of the target group the average take up was 17 hours across the summer term and summer holidays, which breaks down as 16 hours (or 1.2 hours a week) during term time, and one hour during the holidays.

There was enormous variation in the levels (and hours) of take up between different schools. After the introduction of the subsidy a notable increase in the proportion of the target group taking part in activities was observed. In the spring term 2009, on average, 63 per cent of the target group had taken part in any activities, compared with the average of 35 per cent in the summer term 2008. Some of the case study examples provided in the appendix also illustrate impact in terms of increased levels of participation in activities amongst pupils in the target group.

On a scale of 0 to 10, schools thought on average that the subsidy had had an impact of 3.9 on participation rates of the target group. Schools on the flexible model and schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils thought the subsidy had had a greater impact so far.

Using the 0 to 10 scale schools thought on average that the subsidy would have an impact of 7.8 on future participation rates. Again schools on the flexible model and those with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils thought the subsidy would have a greater impact.

Charging for activities (chapter 5)

Most schools were charging for activities before the introduction of the subsidy (five per cent for all activities, and 65 per cent for some), but three in ten schools did not charge for any activities before the subsidy. This did raise some issues about whether the introduction of a charging system might deter students from participating.

Four in ten schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy, and this proportion increased amongst schools that had charged for activities before the subsidy. Amongst schools that had charged for activities before the subsidy, those following the flexible model and those with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to have changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy.

Over a third (36 per cent) of schools who had changed their charging practices had stopped charging the target group for any activities, and a further eight per cent had stopped charging any pupils for activities. Some schools who had not charged for activities prior to the subsidy, opted not to introduce a charging policy for the subsidy.

Use of external providers (chapter 6)

Nearly nine in ten schools were working with external providers and half of these had formed new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy. Schools following the flexible model were more likely to have made new partnerships.

External providers were being used for a wide range of activities, but most commonly for sporting activities.

Schools recognised the need to work collaboratively with a range of partners and welcomed the opportunities that partnership working provided. Some providers offered provision from the school site, in other cases, schools signposted to local provision.

Benefits of the subsidy (chapter 7)

Two in five schools were explicitly targeting or supporting economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in activities before the subsidy, and this was more common in schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils.

Where schools were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy, two thirds had a clear definition of which pupils they were targeting. Most commonly this was pupils who were eligible for free school meals, but other definitions were also used. Methods used to promote activities to economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy were similar to those used after the introduction of the subsidy. Amongst schools that had been promoting activities to the target group before the subsidy, 86 per cent tried new ways of engaging the target group after the subsidy had been introduced.

Three in ten schools were using schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils.

Around two thirds of schools had done each of the following as a result of the subsidy:

- Provided new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils

- Increased the number of activities offered to economically disadvantaged pupils

- Improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities

- Improved the quality of its provision for economically disadvantaged pupils

Schools following the flexible model were more likely to see the above impacts, as were schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils.

Amongst schools that had not yet provided new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils with the subsidy, 90 per cent thought the subsidy would enable them to do this in the future.

Schools, partners, pupils and parents were optimistic about the range of wider benefits for those pupils accessing activities and benefitting from the subsidy.

Staff workload (chapter 8)

In 78 per cent of schools staff workloads had been increased by managing the subsidy funding. An increase in workloads was more common amongst secondary schools and schools following the flexible model.

Most commonly, it was the workloads of the headteacher and administrative or support staff that had been increased.

Most schools coped with the increased workload by working longer hours or reassigning workloads between staff, although a few took measures to increase staff resource.

Identifying and overcoming challenges (chapter 9)

Two in five schools had encountered problems or barriers in implementing the subsidy, and this was more common amongst secondary schools than primary schools.

The most frequently cited problem was the additional workload of organising or running the activities and, related to this, some schools mentioned the administration of the funding, and the lack of funding for administrative time.

Nearly eight in ten schools would have liked some additional support to implement the subsidy; the two main areas of additional support schools wanted were: help with or funding for the time spent on administration and implementation of the subsidy; and more guidance as to what the money can be spent on.

Introduction

The policy understanding underlying the subsidy pathfinder is that schools can make an important contribution to the renewal of disadvantaged areas, and to the life chances of people living in those areas, by opening their facilities to community use and by offering a range of services to children and young people, and to local residents. This has been one of the important aims of the current extended schools roll out, but not the only aim. Although extended schools can be traced back to community-oriented schooling in England, and in other parts of the UK to at least to the establishment of the Cambridgeshire Village Colleges in the 1920s, and from there through to the community schools of the 1970s and beyond, this was not the more immediate roots of the current policy. These lie in the Schools Plus report[1], produced as part of the development of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal[2] and the extended school demonstration[3], pathfinder[4] and national evaluation[5] projects that followed.

It is the intention that by 2010 all children will have access to extended provision through their schools (DfES, 2005)[6]. This new commitment is clearly located within the Every Child Matters and national childcare agendas, and is closely related to the Full Service Extended Schools (FSES) initiative. Schools are asked to focus on five areas:

- Childcare (in primary schools, a safe place to be in secondary schools);

- A varied menu of activities;

- Parenting support;

- Swift and easy access (to other agencies and providers);

- Community access to ICT and other facilities.

They are also invited to consider working in clusters with other schools and in collaboration with other providers, so that extended provision can be made available to children, families and local people without each school having to provide all of these services and activities individually. This recognises that schools in the national roll out will be of all kinds and in all sorts of circumstances, and will face the challenge of defining aims and priorities that are appropriate to contexts which may be very different from those in which the majority of FSESs found themselves. Key elements of the core offer include providing students with a varied range of activities from which to chose, and offering multi-agency support. As such, extended schools are well placed to enhance achievement, even in circumstances where schools are serving very disadvantaged communities, which might otherwise prove challenging.

---

[1] DfEE (1999) Schools Plus: Building learning communities. Improving the educational chances of children and young people from disadvantaged areas: a report from the Schools Plus Policy Action Team 11(London, DfEE).
[2] Social Exclusion Unit (2000) National strategy for neighbourhood renewal: a framework for consultation (London, The Stationery Office), and Social Exclusion Unit (2001) A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal: national strategy action plan (London, Social Exclusion Unit).
[3] Dyson, A., Millward, A. & Todd, L. (2002) A study of the extended schools demonstration projects (London, DfES).
[4] Cummings, C., Dyson, A. & Todd, L. 2004 *Evaluation of the Extended Schools Pathfinder Projects*, Research Report No 530, (DfES, London)
[5] Cummings, C., Dyson, A., Muijs, D. Papps, I., Pearson, P., Raffo, C., Tiplady, L. and Todd, L. (2007) *Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative: Final Report.* DfES Research Report 852.
[6] DfES (2005) Extended schools: access to opportunities and services for all. A prospectus (London, DfES)

The Government has committed significant investment (over £1bn) in extended schools over the years 2008-9 to 2010-11. This funding was to enable every extended school to offer high-quality services, accessible to all, especially the most disadvantaged. This includes over £200million to enable extended schools to do more to support disadvantaged children and young people. This funding has specifically aimed to ensure that economically disadvantaged children and young people can access the full range of activities offered in extended schools. Although the extended schools strategy is aimed at all schools, it has always been part of an overall policy to make an impact on disadvantage. The current subsidy was introduced with this in mind. To find the most effective method of delivering this subsidy funding to the children and young people most in need, the DCSF is running a pathfinder, that started in September 2008. The pathfinder is testing two different levels of flexibility regarding eligibility and use of funding.

- The first model (the 'defined' model) defines eligibility tightly as those eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) and Children in Care (CiC), and requires the funding to be spent on a regular 2 hours a week of activity during term time and 30 hours during school holidays.

- The second model (the 'flexible' model) gives schools more flexibility in defining disadvantage, and allows greater flexibility in terms of frequency and cost of activities as long as the impact of activities can be sustained.

These two models are intended as a means to generate learning on different aspects of delivery. Whilst the DCSF is interested in knowing which of the two different models seems to be more effective in terms of delivering uptake of activities, the Department is moreover concerned to find ways that schools could make sure that the funding and indeed the activities, reach the young people most in need. This research therefore evaluates the differential merits of the two levels of flexibility, as they are used in the pathfinder schools, in achieving increased access of economically disadvantaged young people to a wide range of activities.

Research objectives

The broad overall aim of this research is to find out how funding can best be targeted so as to engage disadvantaged children and young people in activities through extended schools. The focus is on implementation and management of the subsidy through the pathfinder schools rather than attempting to assess long term outcomes.

The research also makes comparisons of the flexible and defined models. These comparisons are not intended to result in concluding that either the flexible model is best, or the defined model is best, but to uncover the advantages and disadvantages of each model and provide learning as to how each has been implemented.

There are a range of detailed research questions to be answered by the evaluation. It should be noted that this is an interim report, and there is more research planned as part of the evaluation. Therefore, not all of the research questions below are addressed in this report as some will be addressed by the further planned research. The research questions are:

- How best to target the funding at those disadvantaged pupils who would most benefit from the funding (incuding the advantages & disadvantages of a strict free school meals definition of eligibility)?

- How to build in consultation with pupils and the use of funding in the light of schools' experience in the pathfinder?

7

- Whether the defined model commitment (fixed hours per week and during school holidays) is more or less advantageous than giving schools and pupils flexibility to choose?

- What are the practical implications of giving schools this flexibility?

- In addition to comparing the two pathfinder models, the evaluation will also shed light on:

  o Current practice on charging for activities, as well as any changes brought about by making funding available specifically for the most disadvantaged children and young people.

  o Whether the subsidy pathfinders create real additional benefits and avoid overlap with other schemes funding activities for disadvantaged children and young people.

- In order to answer the main research questions above, the following detailed information will be provided as part of the evaluation:

Managing the funding

  o What is the average cost of provision per hour per pupil, and how much variation is there in the cost? (This has not yet been addressed, but will be answered by further research planned as part of the evaluation)

  o For schools with flexible entitlement: What is the average number of hours taken up per pupil in the target group and how much variation is there in this number?

  o Does the subsidy funding affect charging policy (for activities) in schools? If so, how?

Identifying and reaching the target group

  o For schools with set eligibility criteria: do schools experience problems in applying a centrally defined basis for targeting children and young people?

  o For schools with flexible eligibility criteria: what eligibility criteria for the subsidy do schools use and what rationale and evidence are these based on?

  o How do schools promote the uptake of the subsidy among the target group?

  o How do schools create a sense of entitlement in children and families to secure real consumer power that might generate interest and motivation in taking part in activities?

  o What effect has the subsidy funding had on participation rates of disadvantaged children and young people?

Designing the offer

  o How do schools consult with disadvantaged pupils and their parents about what activities they would like to see provided?

  o Are schools offering greater choice to their pupils and parents in terms of the activities provided or signposted to?

Additionality

- o Are schools providing additional activities with the subsidy funding?

- o Can we demonstrate additionality from the subsidy funding, avoiding duplicating or displacing funding sources already used by schools to subsidise disadvantaged pupils?

Staff workload

- o How do schools manage the transactional impact on staff workloads (heads, teachers and others) of administering the funding?

- o What are seen to be the most successful ways of managing workloads?

Tracking

- o How do schools track take up of the offer among the target group?

- o How do schools track the amount spent / number of hours of activity taken up per pupil? (This has not yet been addressed, but will be answered by further research planned as part of the evaluation)

Outputs from this research are to be used to guide policy decisions in scaling up the pathfinders later in 2009, and rolling out the subsidy nationally in 2010, as well as providing examples of best practice for disseminating nationally through guidance.

Summary of research components (Methodology)

The evaluation consists of a comprehensive programme of research with various different qualitative and quantitative strands, and research conducted with different respondent groups. The complete evaluation involves:

- Mapping research

- Two waves of quantitative surveys with pathfinder schools

- Analysis of three tranches of management information

- Two waves of case studies in pathfinder schools

- Quantitative survey of disadvantaged pupils and families in pathfinder schools

This interim report draws on data and research from the mapping research, the first quantitative schools survey, the first round of case studies and analysis of the first two tranches of management information. A brief explanation of each strand conducted so far is included below.

The second quantitative survey of schools, the second wave of case studies, the third collection of management information and the quantitative survey of pupils and families are planned for later in 2009.

It should be noted that all quantitative findings included in this report are based on self-reported data provided by schools. Case study findings are based on interviews with a wider range of respondents (school staff, cluster leads, LA leads, parents and pupils) but data is still all self-reported.

Mapping visits

A mapping exercise was first carried out to help clarify what data could be collected at the subsequent strands of the research and particularly to assist the development of the quantitative surveys. Face to face depth interviews were carried out in four local authorities (LAs). Two LAs had adopted the flexible model and two were using the defined model. Within each LA interviews were conducted with primary schools and secondary schools.

Quantitative telephone survey of pathfinder schools

All schools involved in the pathfinder were sampled for inclusion in the first telephone survey with the exception of 29 schools that were used for piloting the questionnaire. Interviews were conducted with head teachers or those with responsibility for the extended schools subsidy funding at their school. The survey fieldwork took place between December 2008 and February 2009 during which time 340 schools were interviewed resulting in an 82 per cent response rate. The questionnaire used for this survey is included in appendix 4.

These initial school interviews sought to establish how the schools stood pre-subsidy, their experiences of early implementation and plans for the future. Schools will be followed up with a second telephone interview later in 2009 to establish what changes have occurred when the implementation of the subsidy has reached a more advanced stage.

Management information

A short form was sent out to all schools to establish a baseline measure of the numbers of economically disadvantaged pupils attending extended schools activities prior to the subsidy funding. The form also requested the definition of the target group of economically disadvantaged pupils from each school. A copy of this form is included in appendix 5.
A total of 226 forms were returned giving a response rate of 51 per cent. This first set of management information creates a baseline against which future management information can be measured.

A much shorter form of just five questions was sent to schools in March 2009, requesting information on the take up of extended services during the Spring term 2009. A copy of this form is included in Appendix 6. Forms were returned by 170 schools, equating to a 38 per cent response rate. Of the schools that returned this management information relating to the Spring term, 125 had also returned a baseline management information form, allowing direct comparisons to be made in the take up of activities for these schools.

Case Studies

Qualitative data on the implementation of the subsidy pathfinders was collected through 10 case studies, five focused on secondary schools, four on primary or infant schools and one on a key stage 2 and 3 special school located on the same campus as two Pupil Referral Units. These case study schools were located in ten different clusters within seven different Local Authorities (LAs). Four of the case study LAs were piloting the defined model and three were piloting the flexible model. Face to face in-depth interviews were carried out with key extended services personnel including, in schools, the person(s) responsible for the implementation of the subsidy (this might be a member of the senior management team, a school based extended schools co-ordinator, a parent and family support advisor, for

example) and also with cluster leads and LA leads. Parents and pupils were interviewed where this was possible and in eight of the 10 clusters it was possible to speak with either pupils or parents, or a combination of both. In the two clusters where this was not possible, the evaluation team were able to draw on feedback collected from parents and pupils by the schools and/or cluster co-ordinators. Interviews were face to face and were either conducted one to one or in small groups. A very small number of telephone interviews were conducted when, on occasion, it was not possible to speak with all key personnel during case study visits. Thematic analysis of the case study data aimed to triangulate the quantitative survey. The case studies, written as small vignettes provide a picture of the ways different schools and clusters were implementing the subsidy. These can be found in appendix 1.

Report Layout

Once all stages of the evaluation are completed a final report will be published in 2010. However, this interim report draws on the findings from the strands of research conducted thus far.

The report is structured around ten topics in relation to the implementation and management of the disadvantage subsidy:

- The defined and flexible models

- Consultation

- Promotion of activities

- Participation in activities

- Charging for activities

- Use of external providers

- Benefits of the subsidy (additionality)

- Staff workload

- Problems, barriers and additional support

- Cost of provision

Findings from the quantitative survey of schools, management information and case study visits are organised into these topic areas.

Throughout the report findings from the case studies are included in boxes, so that qualitative data can be easily differentiated from quantitative data.

The profile of schools involved in the pathfinder

There are 442 schools involved in the extended schools disadvantage subsidy pathfinder, spread across 37 clusters within 18 LAs.

Of all LAs in the pathfinder, five were using the defined model and 13 were using the flexible model. This equated to 149 schools (34 per cent) following the defined model and 293 (66 per cent) following the flexible model.

The pathfinder included 345 Primary schools, 71 Secondary schools, 18 Special schools and 7 Pupil Referral Units.

Pathfinder guidance

Local Authorities and schools involved in the pathfinder were provided with guidance by TDA and DCSF about how the subsidy should be used. A full guidance document is included in appendix 7 of this report, but the guiding principles are included below:

Entitlement: The funding should enable children and young people from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and children in care ('the target group') to access activities from which they would otherwise be excluded due to their inability to pay.

Participation: The funding should be used to secure the target group's participation in extended schools activities.

Additionality: The funding should be used to make existing activities more accessible to the target group, and / or to commission new activities that better meet their needs.

Involvement: The target group and their parents/carers should be fully involved in choosing, designing and continuously improving the range of activities on offer.

Relevance: Activities should be attractive and relevant to the target group.

Demand: The target group and their parents/carers should be able to exercise real control of the funding identified for them, in the same way as children and young people whose participation is not excluded by inability to pay.

Open to all: Any new activities should form part of the universal extended schools offer, and be open to all children and young people.

1 The defined and flexible models

Two different models were employed on the pathfinder, the flexible model and the defined model. The defined model was more closely controlled, stipulating both how the target group should be defined, and how many hours of activities schools should be offering to pupils in the target group using the subsidy.

This chapter examines the definition of the target group (for the flexible model), the effectiveness of the target group definition and the ease of delivering the defined model requirement.

1.1 Definition of the target group

The definition of the target group that schools in the defined model had to follow, was children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Schools on the flexible model however, had some freedom in how they chose to define economic disadvantage. Of the 293 schools involved in the pathfinder that were following the flexible model, 127 returned a completed baseline MI form that included a definition of the target group. So for these 127 schools it is possible to look at the components that made up their target group.

However, it appears that the definition of the target group was generally set at cluster level rather than school level, so it is more useful to look at this information on a cluster basis. Data from the collection of management information is available for 18 of the 27 clusters that were following the flexible model. Amongst these 18 clusters:

- All 18 were using eligibility for free school meals as one of their criteria

- 14 out of 18 were including children in care in their target group.

The realisation that **'… with economic disadvantage, it doesn't matter how you define it, it will be likely to have free school meals and children in care in it anyway, '** (LA Lead Secondary F and primary E) was something that also came out of the case study visits.

Whilst most clusters have used the defined model definition as the initial basis of their target group, they have used other criteria also:

- Nine clusters included families who were unemployed or on benefits, or had low incomes or debt problems

- Four clusters included single parent families

- Three clusters included families who could not afford to pay for school trips or who were eligible for free services such as uniform grants

- Four clusters included families who were homeless or living in temporary or poor accommodation

- Ten out of the 18 clusters included children with special educational needs or disabilities

- Five clusters included young carers in their target group

- 11 clusters used postcode or area based data such as IMD, IDACI or ACORN[7]

- Five clusters included recent migrants or traveller families

- Three clusters included pupils for whom English was an additional language

- Four clusters included pupils who were disengaged with school or at risk or exclusion

- In five clusters inclusion in the target group was (partly) at the discretion of the school / headteacher / cluster lead

- Seven clusters used the Common Assessment Framework (CAF), or included children who were considered vulnerable or families with social services involvement/where a child protection plan was in place

- Five clusters included pupils with difficult family issues or emotional trauma such as bereavement

- Three clusters used academic criteria such as having a low reading age or underachieving at KS2.

So clusters were using a wide range of economic and non-economic factors to define eligibility for funding from the subsidy.

Not underestimating the importance of removing economic disadvantage as a barrier to participation, several LAs and schools implementing the flexible model wanted to include other indicators of disadvantage (defined more generally) to ensure that pupils experiencing a range of barriers to participation could benefit from the subsidy. For example, one school in the case study interviews used the child poverty index which in itself is a combination of economic and socio-educational indicators such as having special needs and lower achievement. This school, an EBD special school, and the cluster and LA within which it was based, were reluctant to disentangle 'economic' disadvantage from other aspects of disadvantage that pupils experienced and applying certain indicators from the Child Poverty Index ensured that the criteria for selecting the target group was sufficiently broad to meet their key aims.

1.2   School involvement in choosing the definition

Around half (51 per cent) of schools following the flexible model had had some involvement in choosing the definition of the target group. For the remaining 49 per cent the school had no involvement in choosing the definition. However, this does not mean that in some clusters the definition of the target group was chosen without consulting any school staff. In all clusters following the flexible model, some schools had been involved in choosing the target group definition and some had not.

---

[7] These are measures (mostly based on ONS Census data) that give a measure or how affluent or how deprived a particular area is, based Census Output Area (or postcode). The areas are small (averaging around 300 households) and so can predict with a high degree of accuracy the affluence of the people living within them.

It appears that secondary schools were more likely to have been involved than primary schools (60 per cent compared with 48 per cent), although due to the small number of secondary schools responding to this question (35) this difference is not statistically significant. Smaller primary schools (those with less than 200 pupils) were more likely to have been involved in defining the target group than larger ones: 58 per cent compared with 43 per cent of primary schools with 200 pupils or more.

Where schools had been involved with choosing the definition of the target group, they were asked how easy it was to come up with an effective definition of economically disadvantaged pupils. Responses to this question were varied, 19 per cent said it was very easy and 33 per cent said quite easy, while 35 per cent found it quite difficult and 10 per cent found it very difficult.

Some case study school personnel implementing the flexible model reported on the process of working out a definition as being time-consuming.

The case study research also identified that a perceived benefit of implementing the defined model was the pre-specified criteria for selecting pupils. Some defined model schools expected there may have been difficulty coming up with an effective definition of economic disadvantage had they been piloting the flexible model.

Further to this, one LA lead identified that the speed of starting the delivery of activities was accounted for by not having to dedicate time to identifying the criteria for selection:

'Fixed was good initially as we could get cracking. It was easy to access the number of free school meals and looked after children…we could get started with our summer activities and it could have been time consuming to go with the flexible model' (LA lead, Secondary I and Primary J)

Elsewhere, the assistant headteacher of Secondary C indicated his satisfaction in that valuable time was not spent on identifying criteria:

'You've got to have clear and smart criteria and although we went for flexible initially and were declined, we think this was for the best and we are sticking with FSM, eligibility for FSM and children in care for the roll out. Other local authorities have spent considerable time trying to work out their criteria.'

1.3   Ease of identifying pupils in the target group

For schools following the flexible model, once the target group definition had been chosen, schools needed to identify which pupils met the condition(s) of their definition. Most schools found this easy to do, 22 per cent found it very easy and 43 per cent found it quite easy. However, 25 per cent of schools found it quite difficult and five per cent found it very difficult to identify which pupils were included in their target group.

One school following the flexible model explained the difficulties they were encountering;

> '[A] *huge challenge of using the flexible model is that whilst schools will know exactly who is claiming Free School Meals or who's Looked After, they will have no idea who's getting a means-tested benefit, and the parents don't particularly want them to know what benefits they are on and so that is the challenge and so we're really working with family support staff and front line workers to identify families and make them aware of provision.'* (Cluster Co-ordinator, Secondary G)

1.4 Effectiveness of the target group definition

As part of the telephone survey of schools, all respondents were asked how much they agreed with the statement "The definition of disadvantage that we use is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils". Responses are shown in table 1.1, broken down by model type. As the table shows, respondents from schools on the flexible model were much more likely to agree their definition was effective than respondents from schools on the defined model.

Opinions on the effectiveness of the definition were even more positive amongst schools on the flexible model where school staff had been involved in choosing the definition: 74 per cent agreed (including 15 per cent who strongly agreed) compared with 58 per cent agreement amongst schools on the flexible model where the school had not had any involvement in choosing the definition.

Table 1.1 : Agreement with statement "The definition of disadvantage that we use is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils" Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	Flexible model %	Defined model %
Strongly agree	11	6
Agree	55	41
Neither agree nor disagree	17	18
Disagree	13	26
Strongly disagree	3	6
Don't know	2	3
	(n=231)	(n=109)

All respondents to the schools telephone survey were also asked how effective they thought the target group definition they used was in enabling them to reach children who cannot afford to pay. Table 1.2 shows the answers given to this question broken down by model type. As before, respondents in schools on the flexible model were more likely to think the definition was effective than those in schools on the defined model.

Amongst schools on the defined model there was some overlap between those who disagreed that the definition of disadvantage is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils, and those who thought the target group definition was not effective in enabling schools to reach children who cannot afford to pay. Of schools on the defined model, 18 per cent fell into this category of being very negative about the defined model definition of the target group.

Table 1.2 : Effectiveness of target group definition in enabling schools to reach children who cannot afford to pay Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	Flexible model %	Defined model %
Very effective	19	10
Quite effective	55	47
Not very effective	16	28
Not at all effective	4	9
Don't know	7	6
	(n=231)	(n=109)

Where schools were following the defined model, 90 per cent of respondents thought that there were pupils in the school who ought to be included in the target group, but these pupils did not qualify for free school meals and were not in care and therefore were not included in the target group by the defined model definition of economic disadvantage.

This finding was strongly confirmed by responses in the case study interviews. Personnel in both defined and flexible case studies reported that there were likely to be children and young people who were excluded from access to provision by the operation of the defined, FSM, model. As one LA lead (for secondary School G located in a LA piloting the flexible model) noted:

> '…*We recognise that the eligibility of free school meals only gives you a certain amount of information, there are other levels of understanding of disadvantage that we wanted to use to support families.'*

In this particular LA, the decision was taken to widen out the criteria to include all families in receipt of all means-tested benefits, a model which it was anticipated:

> '*Catches those whose parents are perhaps working full time but still only have enough for the basics and so I think that absolutely key.'* (Community Improvement Partnership Manager)

Elsewhere (Secondary School A and Primary School D - each piloting the flexible model), the LA lead stressed her view that:

> '*FSM is not a good indicator. It is too raw these days. Our FSM has gone down to 38% and yet we have 80% of hard pressed families…the benefits they receive have taken them above the line [for FSM eligibility]. It's not as good an indicator as it once was. It is far too limiting an indicator.'*

Adding:

> '*Having flexibility meant we could interpret it and able to expose more kids to enrichment activities.'*

These examples, illustrating the benefits of flexibility and the downside of a criteria based on free school meals and children and young people in care, could have been illustrated many times over. For these prime reasons, colleagues piloting the flexible model were satisfied with the definition they had chosen, despite the time taken to reach agreement. A key reason from several case studies related to fairness and inclusion - far more (and in some cases all) pupils could have access to activities. A lack of fairness and exclusion was commented on within the majority of the defined case studies, but some also felt that this was unavoidable or at least freed the school from having to make the decision. As the PSA (Parent Support Adviser) in Primary F noted:

> *'We could have done with some flexibility but having clear lines has benefitted us. It is just families I work with are just above the line but you have to draw the line somewhere. Getting it going was hard enough anyway.'*

A headteacher elsewhere (Primary J) gave a similar account, noting:

> *'I must admit it would have been hard to find a criteria. Lots of families genuinely struggle and I couldn't in all honesty, think of a criteria to hit all these children, partly because I don't know the complexity of the benefit system…Using free schools meals is the easy option but it seems to me that parents who try hard are penalised in other ways. If I knew enough abou how to define disadvantage I'd do it as this [the defined model] misses lots of children.'*

Feelings were far less sanguine, however, when schools felt that a certain cohort of needy pupils were still missing out. As the teacher with responsibility for implementing the subsidy in Primary School B explained that had the school been piloting the flexible model, rather than the defined:

> *'Everyone would have got it really…very few childen would have to pay. One issue is that lots of people eligible for FSM don't take it. Parents are too proud. There are lots of cases where parents work but have little income and they don't get any additional help…some would say with fixed it is unfairly distributed.'*

A member of the administrative support team in the same school discussed having received complaints from some low income parents whose children are not eligible for free schools meals.

> '**Some people that are not working are on more money [than those who are in low paid work]…they can't afford it and so they've been complaining…they say 'where am I going wrong?'**

Several of the schools implementing the flexible model, however, discussed their appreciation of not having to try and impose a rigid model which would not be appropriate to the context in which they worked. Colleagues in the special school and PRUs, for instance, discussed the need for an element of flexibility when implementing the subsidy in the context of special schools and PRUs. Comments included:

> *'Had we been given the defined model it would have been extremely difficult. Free school meals is one thing but many families won't fill in forms and won't apply. We give all children a free meal in any case as meal time is a part of their taught time. Free school meals as a formula for the defined model won't work for children in these settings'.* (deputy headteacher, Special School H)

> *'Some students on campus are dual registered. There are students in the pupil referral units also registered in mainstream schools and whereas we would know their needs, if we were given the defined model, pupils in the pupil referral unit wouldn't access the money [it would go to the mainstream school].'* (deputy headteacher, Special School H)

The LA lead for the subsidy also discussed the inclusive 'tailor made' aspect to the model which has meant that schools and PRUs in the LA are offering something that is appropriate to the pupils and families that they serve:

> *'We've had great lengths to go to [implementing flexible] and this has been hugely time consuming but across the city this has given schools something very relevant and tailor made…schools wanted to work with chaotic families so this has been hugely worthwhile. It's given the whole thing meaning.'*

An important consideration in the implementation of the subsidy is the context within which schools are located. We have seen that for special schools and PRUs there must be consideration around dual registration, and elsewhere there will be contextual factors that determine the suitability or otherwise of the defined model. In another area, for instance, the headteacher of a secondary school serving an area characterised by a changing poplation noted:

> *'It [the defined model] is hugely limiting. Students on free school meals may be no more needy than those not on free school meals. There is lots of migration of families and seasonal work here and whereas their weekly wage may be above the threshold for free school meals, they may not be working for six months of the year…the flexible model would have been more straightforward and with the money we could have provided significant benefits for many more…it is exclusive and so morally unjust.'*

1.5   Delivery of the defined model requirement

The defined model required that schools should use the subsidy funding to provide two hours of activities a week to pupils in the target group[8]. Respondents in schools on the defined model were asked how easy the school had found it to meet this requirement. Responses were mixed, but more schools had found this difficult than easy. Seven per cent of respondents said this had been very easy and a further 26 per cent found it quite easy but 36 per cent of respondents said this had been quite difficult and 14 per cent found it very difficult. The remaining 17 per cent of respondents were unable to answer, most likely because their schools were still at a very early stage in the implementation of the subsidy.

---

[8] The defined model also required that pupils should be offered 30 hours of activities during school holidays. This was not covered by the survey as when the survey fieldwork took place most schools had not had a holiday period since they had received the subsidy funding.

Information from the case studies confirms this finding and suggests that the defined model requirement lacked the flexibility that might have suited young people in terms of their access of activities. In Special School H (following the flexible model), for example the cluster lead discussed her view that limited flexibility would have had on delivery of activities:

> *'If the delivery model was defined, even if we had the flexibility to identify our own criteria for disadvantage, we'd be on our knees. Defined delivery would mean that schools could not have done half as much as they have done...there would be constrained to do it in my cluster had we been given the defined model.'*

Amongst primary schools on the defined model, smaller schools were more likely to have found it easy to meet the two hours a week requirement than larger schools: 43 per cent of primary schools with less than 200 pupils found it easy to meet this requirement compared with 24 per cent of primary schools with 200 pupils or more.

Key Findings:

- Clusters following the flexible model generally used the defined model definition of economic disadvantage as the initial basis of their target group, and then added a wide range of other criteria.

- Half of schools on the flexible model had been involved in choosing the definition of the target group. In all clusters following the flexible model at least one school had been involved in this.

- Most schools following the flexible model found it easy to identify which pupils should be included in the target group, but three in ten schools found this difficult.

- Schools following the flexible model were more likely to think they were using an effective definition of economic disadvantage than schools on the defined model, and where schools had been involved in defining the target group they were even more likely to think the definition was effective.

- Nine in ten schools following the defined model thought that there were pupils who ought to be included in the target group but did not meet the defined model definition.

- Case study schools piloting the flexible model found it to be a more inclusive model, although defining the criteria for inclusion could be time consuming.

- Case study school piloting the defined model felt that they were able to commence the implementation stage sooner than they would have been able to do had they needed to set their own criteria and some appreciated that this model lifted off the responsibility for schools to decide who should benefit. A reported downside of this model was the lack of flexibility meaning that those children just outside of the criteria were not able to benefit.

- More schools on the defined model found it difficult than easy to meet the requirement of providing two hours of activities a week to the target group.

2   Consultation

Consulting economically disadvantaged pupils and parents about the sort of activities they would like to be offered using the subsidy is an important part of the pathfinder. Economically disadvantaged pupils are more likely to engage with activities if the activities on offer are ones that appeal to them. Previous research by Ipsos MORI[9] shows that more needs to be done to align services to what parents and pupils actually want.

2.1   Whether schools have employed consultation

Three quarters (74 per cent) of schools had employed some consultation with either pupils or parents in their target group about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy. Consulting pupils was more common than consulting parents, 66 per cent of schools had engaged in consultation with pupils and 57 per cent had consulted with parents (49 per cent had consulted both).

As shown in table 2.1 schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to have consulted parents and pupils in the target group than schools with lower proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils. Also, schools following the flexible model were more likely than those following the defined model to have consulted pupils, but no more likely to have consulted parents.

Where schools had not engaged in consultation, there may be plans for them to do so in the future. It is useful to look at whether schools had engaged in consultation broken down by whether the school had introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy; four distinct groups can be identified:

- 52 per cent of schools had both consulted parents and/or pupils and introduced new activities;

- 21 per cent of schools had engaged in consultation but not yet introduced any new activities;

- 11 per cent of schools had not engaged in consultation but had introduced new activities;

- 15 per cent of schools had neither engaged in consultation nor introduced new activities.

This shows that the majority of schools that had introduced new activities had engaged in consultation, suggesting that the message about the importance of consultation did get through to most schools involved in the pathfinder. However, the above reveals that a significant minority (11 per cent) of schools had introduced new activities without engaging in consultation. Having introduced new activities without consulting parents or pupils was more common amongst secondary schools than primary schools (21 per cent compared with nine per cent).

---

[9] 'Extended Schools Survey of Schools, Pupils and Parents - A Quantitative Study of Perceptions and Usage of Extended Services in Schools', DCSF Research Report RR068, Emma Wallace, Kate Smith, Julia Pye, Joanne Crouch, Ali Ziff and Kirsty Burston, 2009.

Table 2.1 : Whether schools consulted with pupils and parents about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)					
	All schools %	Flexible model %	Defined model %	< 20% eligible for FSM[10] %	20% + eligible for FSM %
Yes - pupils	66	71	53	61	77
Yes - parents	57	58	54	52	65
No	26	23	31	30	16
Don't know	1	0	2	1	0
	(n=340)	(n=231)	(n=109)	(n=195)	(n=104)

2.2 Methods of consultation employed

Amongst schools that had consulted with pupils in the target group the most common method of consultation used was to ask pupils to complete questionnaires or surveys (46 per cent). Around a quarter (27 per cent) of schools consulted pupils by speaking to them informally, and a similar proportion (25 per cent) arranged discussions with a school or student council. Focus groups or other meetings with pupils were used by 17 per cent of schools. Other methods of consulting pupils were quite rare:

- Sending letters to pupils - seven per cent

- Using the school assembly - six per cent

- Market place events or taster sessions - six per cent

- Through advertising - three per cent

- Through a website - three per cent

- Using a suggestion box - two per cent

The methods used by schools to consult pupils can be separated into active methods (speaking to pupils), and passive methods (such as sending letters, questionnaires, websites). Two thirds (66 per cent) of schools had used active methods to consult with pupils, while the remainder (34 per cent) had used only passive methods.

Schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to use questionnaires or surveys of pupils than schools with lower levels: amongst schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals 59 per cent had done this compared with 38 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals[11].

---

[10] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).
[11] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

Pupils certainly appreciated being asked about their preferences and reported feeling confident that their views would be considered. In Secondary G, for example, comments from pupils included:

> *'We are asked in tutor groups, about once a month, about how we would improve the school and we were asked about what activities we'd like…our form reps have also taken this to the school council.'*
> *'We said bowling and go carting and I think they'll listen to our ideas.'*

These examples could be multiplied many times. Pupils discussed valuing being asked and felt this gave them a sense of ownership.

Case study data suggested that there is a realisation in schools of the need to go beyond some of the more obvious methods. Several schools were using a range of approaches and were viewing consultation as an on-going activity. In Special School H, for instance, the emphasis was on ongoing and informal consultation between school staff and pupils. Conversations, which were effective in gathering students' views, would take place on the bus journey home, at lunchtimes and other opportune moments. Moreover, all staff in school were encouraged to actively engage with pupils and all were trained on consultation techniques. As the cluster co-ordinator explained:

> *'Staff know every child and consultation is ongoing. It is there all the time and there is a whole school approach.'*

In this school, all activities have been arranged as a consequence of consultation.
In another cluster schools (primary J and Secondary I) adopted a 'personal touch' approach, and hosted consultation coffee mornings for pupils and parents and spoke individually with pupils and families to gauge their views on activities. The cluster co-ordinator explained that whilst this approach is time consuming, it is effective in that:

> *'It's winning hearts and minds and developing relationships and trust…the paper format doesn't always work.'*

Elsewhere again, the focus was on ongoing and informal conversation. The deputy headteacher at Secondary A discussed an approach that worked for her, one which she likened to *'a conversation in the context of a relationship.'* She noted: *'I think kids are getting sick of questionnaires,'* and also identified that:

> *'Sometimes it's about opening kids' eyes'…they wouldn't necessarily mention canoeing and so…you can offer them some alternatives to begin with.'*

The same school hosted a market place event which gave local providers the opportunity to promote their activities and gave the school the opportunity to informally consult with students and parents (in this and feeder primary schools) about their preferences for activities. This notion that consultation involved education to encourage pupils to look beyond things they already knew about was identified in several schools. The cluster co-ordinator in Primary B stressed the importance of offering pupils a menu from which to identify their preferences, as according to her: *'Often students will say football because they know what football is about.'* Others looked to young people to suggest activities not already thought of by the school. The market place approach used by some schools, on the other hand, placed pupils in the role of consumers able to interview providers.

Just as schools, have recognised the importance of informal consultation with pupils, they also acknowledge that the same applies when consulting with parents. Coffee mornings, information sessions, discussions with parents at the school gates, and informal conversations between parents and PSAs have all proven to be effective ways of gauging parents views.

Similar methods had been used to consult parents of pupils in the target group. Amongst schools that had consulted parents the most commonly used method was asking parents to complete questionnaires or surveys (53 per cent). A third (33 per cent) of schools had sent letters to parents, and a quarter (24 per cent) had spoken to parents informally. Other methods of consulting parents were less frequently used:

- Focus groups or other meetings with parents - eight per cent

- Parents evenings - four per cent

- Through events such as market days or roadshows - four per cent

- Telephoning parents - three per cent

- Through advertising - three per cent

- Open days - one per cent

- Using a suggestion box - one per cent

- At a school council - one per cent

Again, methods used to consult parents can be broken down into active and passive methods: 40 per cent of schools had used active methods while 60 per cent had only used passive methods.

Primary schools were more likely to have asked parents to complete questionnaires or surveys (58 per cent compared with 33 per cent of secondary schools), while secondary schools were more likely to have sent letters to parents (51 per cent compared with 29 per cent of primary schools).

Schools with higher levels or economically disadvantaged pupils were again more likely to have used questionnaires or surveys to consult parents: 71 per cent of schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals had consulted parents using questionnaires or surveys compared with 46 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals[12]. Further detail about consultation methods can be found in the Case Studies in Appendix 1.

---

[12] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

Key Findings: 25

- Three quarters of schools had engaged in consultation, 66 per cent with pupils and 57 per cent with parents.

- Most schools that had introduced new activities had engaged in consultation suggesting the message about the importance of consultation got through to the majority of schools involved in the pathfinder. However 11 per cent of schools had introduced new activities without having engaged in consultation.

- Both pupils and parents were most commonly consulted using questionnaires or surveys.

- Ongoing and informal consultation was regarded as important and was used to supplement more formal survey centred consultation techniques.

- The most participative methods found imaginative ways to place pupils in the position of being able to both learn about a range of activities wider than their current knowledge but also to enable them to find out more about those activities.

- Pupils and parents appreciated being asked for their views. This gave them a sense of ownership.

3 Promotion of activities

Promotion of activities is an integral part of increasing the uptake of activities amongst economically disadvantaged pupils. This chapter examines how schools have tried to engage the target group.

3.1 Engaging the target group

All respondents to the telephone survey of schools were asked how much they agreed with the statement "We struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities". More respondents disagreed than agreed with this statement, but three in ten schools (30 per cent) did struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils. Full responses are shown in table 3.1.

As the table shows, secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities, half (50 per cent) of secondary schools struggled to do this.

Table 3.1 : Agreement with statement "We struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities" Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	All schools %	Primary schools %	Secondary schools %
Strongly agree	6	5	10
Agree	24	22	40
Neither agree nor disagree	18	19	17
Disagree	42	44	31
Strongly disagree	8	9	2
Don't know	1	1	0
	(n=340)	(n=270)	(n=48)

Despite three in ten schools agreeing that they struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in activities, eight in ten respondents to the telephone survey of schools (79 per cent) agreed with the statement "Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that we offer" and only five per cent disagreed. This suggests that there is generally a great deal of enthusiasm amongst economically disadvantaged pupils for taking part in extended schools activities.

Overall, 20 per cent of schools agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate and agreed that they struggle to engage them in activities. This seems to be a contradiction, but there are possible reasons why respondents may have answered in this way:

- Some economically disadvantaged pupils at the school are keen to participate, but the school struggles to engage others;

- Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate but there are barriers preventing them from taking part (such as the cost of activities, or transport to get to activities) which makes it hard for the school to engage them.

Case study findings also identified additional possible reasons for this. One school (Secondary E) for instance, discussed a culture in the community of apathy which meant that parents and young people did not regard participation in activities as 'the norm.' According to the extended schools co-ordinator (based in school) this was perhaps due to lack of confidence in pupils and parents. Regarding this, the headteacher also pointed to problems encountered by young people and families which manifest as barriers to enagement:

> *'There is the issue of a lack of commitment from the very young people we are trying to target. They have such disruptive lives that they don't commit to anything for long. There can be 20 youngsters at an activity one week, 12 the next.'*

A PSA (Parent Support Adviser) working in the cluster in which Primary F is based also noted apathy as a possible barrier to participation:

> *'Encouraging engagement is continuous. It's hard when you hear, 'We have your letters and are just thinking about it.' There can be a bit of complacency and, well, not having the energy to bother to walk to activities. You need continuous niggling, reminding and plugging of activities. You just need to be persistent.'*

Primary schools were much more likely than secondary schools to agree that pupils are keen to participate (83 per cent compared with 58 per cent). These results are shown in table 3.2. Consultation appears to play an important role in the process of engaging the pupils. Schools that had consulted with pupils about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy were more likely to agree that pupils are keen to participate in the activities that they offer than schools that had not consulted pupils (83 per cent compared with 74 per cent).

Table 3.2 : Agreement with statement "Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that we offer" Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	All schools **%**	**Primary schools** **%**	**Secondary Schools** **%**
Strongly agree	29	31	15
Agree	51	52	44
Neither agree nor disagree	14	12	29
Disagree	5	4	10
Strongly disagree	*	0	0
Don't know	2	1	2
	(n=340)	(n=270)	(n=48)

3.2 Methods used to promote activities

All but a minority (seven per cent) of schools had used some methods to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group. Letters to parents were the most frequently employed method of promoting activities amongst the target group, 55 per cent of schools had used this. Speaking informally to parents (31 per cent) and pupils (25 per cent) were also popular ways of encouraging participation.

A quarter of schools (24 per cent) used advertisements at school (such as posters) to promote the uptake of activities, 15 per cent used school assemblies, and 12 per cent held focus groups or meetings with pupils in order to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group. A wide range of other methods had been undertaken by smaller proportions of schools:

- Letters to pupils - seven per cent

- Questionnaires or surveys to parents - seven per cent

- Questionnaires or surveys to pupils - seven per cent

- Focus groups or meetings with parents - five per cent

- Telephoning parents - five per cent

- Using the school or student council - five per cent

- Using a website, email or text messaging - five per cent

- Parents evenings - four per cent

- Open days - two per cent

- External agencies or individuals (such as health visitors or family workers) coming to talk at the school - two per cent

- Co-ordinated help with other organisations (such as children's centres) - one per cent

- Using local media or press - one per cent

- Taster sessions - one per cent

- Home visits to parents - one per cent

- Other methods - nine per cent

The methods used to promote activities can be classed as active (talking to parents or pupils) or passive (sending letters, questionnaires, websites, advertisements etc). Two thirds of schools (67 per cent) had used active methods to promote the uptake of activities, while a quarter (25 per cent) had only used passive methods.

Case study interviews revealed various themes in approaches to promotion. Themes included persistence, parental involvement, and taking advantage of a range of different opportunities. In Primary J, the headteacher, an advocate of the 'more personal' approach, conducted one to one meetings with parents / carers and pupils. She explained:

> *'I made a point of seeing them all…Parents have been very positive. I say, no one need know, just me and the bursar. This is empowering parents.'*

Also older pupils in school have been told about the 'project' and have been encouraged to discuss it with their parents. The headteacher suggested, however, that they need not disclose the 'project' to other pupils: *'I say to the children that they don't have to say to others that they don't pay.'* In secondary I (in the same LA but different cluster) year tutors have met with eligible pupils on a one to one basis. This school also hosted a coffee morning for pupils and parents (personal invites went out to families) with the dual purpose of consulting and also promoting provision. In both clusters in this LA, promotional material for holiday activities has also gone out to pupils and families and has included the wording: **'We may be able to subsidise those students who are keen to join in but need financial assistance.'** (promotional literture for Secondary I and cluster schools) and **'External funding has also been secured to enable children who receive free school meals the opportunity to take part for free.'** (promotional literture for Primary J and cluster schools). Leaflets go out to all children but are given out to pupils entitled to the subsidy first. Also the leaflets are posted on the LA websites (one dedicated to promoting local activities for young people) and goes in the local newspapers.

Elsewhere, two schools used a pass-book system to encourage ownership. In both cases pupils were not used to such a system so needed gentle reminders. In one school the pass-book was promoted to parents in home visits and at parents' evenings. This school also included reminders to pupils on the school bus home and at other opportunities. Regarding the pass book system, the deputy head at Special School H said:

> *'This gives them [pupils] a sense of real ownership and their own budgeting of the money all links in with citizenship.'*

Another school (Primary F) had a similar variety of methods: letters home in pupils' book bags; phone calls home; newsletters; and time limits to book certain activities, despite employing this variety of approches, encouraging take up is not without its problems, as the PSA (Parent Support Adviser) for this school explained:

> *'It is hard work to get them to take it up. I'm still sending out letters and ringing up. Then I put an ad in the newsletter and gave a time scale of a week for a certain activity and this worked…I said 'if you are entitled to pathfinder you have to book swimming lessons by this week. This got them to take the first bite.'*

Across the LA in which primary F is located, the word 'grant' has been used to advertise the subsidy to parents and the amount of £300 is specified. Regarding this, the PSA added *'I think the word 'grant' is problematic as some parents have asked when they have to pay it back.'*

Elsewhere, Secondary A hosted a market day event with the purpose of promoting local provision and encouraging a greater level of partnership working with local providers and services. However, as the survey data shows, letters to parents was one of the most popular methods used to promote activities. In the cluster in which Primary B is located, for example, this strategy of sending out letters to eligible families was deemed the:

> *'Quickest and most discrete way of letting the parents of FSM children know that they can access extended school activities with no additional financial burden to themselves'* (Taken from the Cluster action plan for 2008-09)

In the same cluster, the cluster co-ordinator is meeting with other local providers such as Sure Start, Play Development and a local agency specialising in offering family support, to encourage them to to spread the word to families and engage them in activities funded through the subsidy. Many other schools used letters to inform families of the subsidy, and also the activities on offer, and whilst this was felt to be an efficient way of disseminating information, the importance of wording the letter in a way that is concise and clear is important. One parent, in Secondary E, discussed the merits of the subsidy and praised the school for its work to implement it but also noted:

> *'The letter could have been worded differently…it could have been explained better.'*

Another school (Secondary C) used a very different tactic by promoting the two hour a week entitlement as a requirement: all year 8 pupils opting for a subsidised residential had, as a condition of the visit, to undertake 2 hours of sustained activities a week in subsequent weeks. This strategy, which also involved one to one meetings with all eligible year 8 pupils and their parents, has proven to be very successful. However, the methods employed to encourage pupils in other year groups to access activities in school, or locally, have proved to be much less fruitful. In the words of the assistant headteacher:

> *'We've written to all parents and said students were entitled to around £300 each. I explained they [pupils] could do anything as long as it was regular. I had no response but one. Parents find it difficult to ask. This one parent opted for swimming lessons and we said we'd happily pay and also buy a bag, towel and trunks. The only way of really getting this started is to invite parents in with students. Word of mouth will also help.'*

Others again offered pupils taster sessions with the view to encouraging take up of the subsidy and sustained engagement in activities. The extended schools co-ordinator (school based) in Secondary E, for example, explained:

> *'We need tasters like this as some young people just say football and they are not interested in anything else…we needed to showcase activities so have people coming in. The boxing guy will be coming in as lots of young people said they wanted to do boxing but they weren't aware of providers. He might provide a club here or students might go down to his club depending on numbers'.*

In this LA, local providers are being commissioned to offer taster sessions.

Schools following the flexible model had, on average, used more methods to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group than schools following the defined model. In particular, schools following the flexible model were more likely to have sent letters to parents (59 per cent compared with 47 per cent on the defined model) and held focus groups or meetings with pupils (14 per cent compared with six per cent on the defined model). Flexible model schools were also more likely than defined model schools to have used active methods to promote uptake (71 per cent compared with 59 per cent).

Schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils had also, on average, used more methods for promoting activities to the target group than schools with lower levels of economically disadvantaged pupils. Schools with lower levels of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to have done nothing to promote uptake amongst the target group: nine per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals had done nothing compared with just three per cent of schools where 20 per cent or more were known to be eligible for free school meals[13].

Schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities had also, on average, used more methods to promote activities than schools that disagreed they struggled to do this. This suggests that where schools were struggling to engage economically disadvantaged pupils this was not through lack of trying, but a possible wider, more deep seated challenge.

There was a tendency for secondary schools to be more likely to aim their promotion of activities at pupils, and primary schools to be more likely to target parents, although most differences are not statistically significant due to the small number of secondary schools in our survey sample.

3.3   Future plans for promoting activities

Amongst schools that had already started promoting activities to the target group 74 per cent had further plans for promoting activities in the future. Amongst the 23 schools that had not employed any methods of promoting activities to the target group at the time of the survey, 16 planned to do so in the future. This left three schools that did not have any plans to promote activities and four schools where the respondent did not know if they would promote activities in the future.

Where schools were planning on doing (more) promotion of activities in the future, 20 per cent were intending to continue using the same methods they were already using. A further 30 per cent were going to use some of the same methods and some new ones, and 50 per cent of schools were planning on only using methods they had not already used to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group.

The actual methods schools were planning to use to promote activities in the future were similar to those that had already been used, and are shown in table 3.3. Around six in ten schools (58 per cent) were planning on using active methods of promoting uptake amongst the target group in the future while three in ten (39 per cent) were only planning passive methods. However, if we look only at new methods schools were planning to use in the future (methods they had not used before), 42 per cent of schools were planning on using new active methods and 36 per cent were planning on using new passive methods - the remainder of schools planning further promotion of activities were intending to continue using methods they had already used.

---

[13] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

One case study school (secondary E) which identified a culture of apathy in the community, felt that more needed to be done to encourage pupils to engage in sustained participation in activities at school or in the community. Although current limited resources do not permit this, and the level of partnership working is not what it might be (as, according to the school) some local providers do not have the capacity to assist), one idea the school has for promoting take up in the future would be for key workers to attend initial sessions of activities with pupils and retain regular communication with pupils to help ensure their continuing attendance. Discussing this, the school based extended schools co-ordinator said:

> *'I feel children and young people need a buddy, mentor, youth leader, sports champion or youth service to take them along to the activity initially. They can generate the commitment to sustain attendance. Parents won't go along. Perhaps it is a lack of self-confidence why some parents and young people don't commit and no one is there to help them commit'.*

Table 3.3 : Methods schools are planning to use in the future to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group
Base: All schools with plans to promote the uptake of activities in the future (252)

	%
Send letters to parents	40
Speak to parents informally	26
Advertisements at school (e.g. posters)	23
Speak to pupils informally	17
School assembly	10
Focus group or other meeting with pupils	8
Website/internet/email/text message	6
Questionnaire/surveys to parents	6
Parents Evenings	6
Focus group or other meeting with parents	5
Send letters to pupils	5
Telephone parents	4
Questionnaire / surveys to pupils	4
Co-ordinated help with other organisations (e.g. children's centres)	3
External agencies/individuals coming to speak (e.g. health visitor / family worker)	3
Within current activities	3
Local media/press	2
Taster session	2
School/student Council	2
Home visits to parents	1
Open days	1
Pupils speaking to other pupils	1
Other Answers	16
No Answer	2
Don't know	1

3.4 Stigmatisation

All respondents to the telephone survey of schools were asked how much they agreed with the statement "Economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma, which prevents them from participating in activities". More respondents disagreed than agreed with this statement, but three in ten schools (31 per cent) agreed that stigma was an issue. Primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to disagree that economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma. These results are shown in table 3.4.

Stigmatisation appears to be more of an issue amongst special schools and pupil referral units. Amongst the 17 special schools included in the survey, 10 agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma, and three of the five pupils referral units agreed with this statement.

Schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils were also more likely to agree that such pupils face a sense of stigma: 46 per cent compared with 24 per cent of schools that disagreed they struggled. This suggests that, for many schools that struggle to engage the target group, the sense of stigma pupils face is part of the reason why schools struggle to engage these pupils in activities.

Table 3.4 : Agreement with statement "Economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma, which prevents them from participating in activities" Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	All schools **%**	**Primary schools** **%**	**Secondary Schools** **%**
Strongly agree	4	3	4
Agree	27	24	33
Neither agree nor disagree	11	10	19
Disagree	42	45	33
Strongly disagree	15	17	6
Don't know	2	1	4
	(n=340)	(n=270)	(n=48)

All schools were also asked about strategies they had used to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation for economically disadvantaged pupils. One in five schools (20 per cent) said there was no stigma, and a further nine per cent had not used any strategies or could not answer the question. The remaining 71 per cent of schools had used strategies to avoid stigmatisation.

A full list of strategies used is shown in table 3.5, but the strategies can be grouped into four themes:

1. Approaching parents so pupils do not know who is being subsidised - primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to use this approach;

2. General discretion in approaching parents and pupils, for example one school said "approached everyone on a one to one basis…";

3. Not discriminating, having activities open to all/free to all - schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to use this approach than those with lower proportions;

4. Organising the funding so that pupils do not know they are being subsidised/in the target group, for example, one school said "they believe it's a raffle or a [prize] draw, we are also looking at a ticketless system so there's no way of knowing who's paying or not".

The avoidance of stigma was, for most case study schools, just part of how they approached the task of promotion. When asked how the school promoted the subsidy in a way that avoided stigma, the LA lead for Primary J and Secondary I said:

> *'Don't worry too much about stigmatisation. You can get hung up on this and sometimes you just need to say, 'Look, this is for you, you can access this.'*

One assistant head took care not to use any negative language (Secondary C) but instead to use the term 'entitlement'. Similarly, others (e.g. Special School H, Secondary I, Secondary A and Primary J) refrained from terms 'subsidy' and 'disadvantage' and promoted the activities as 'extra cash', as a 'well-done will', or in the case of Primary F and Secondary E (schools in the same LA but different clusters) the subsidy was rebranded 'Give it a go!'. In a couple of schools where most pupils were included in the target group (e.g. Secondary A) all pupils were entitled to the subsidy[14], which the school assumed would avoid any feeling of stigma and meant that they need not be concerned with saying 'yes' to some and 'no' to others (that may be almost as needy economically).

Others felt that 'avoiding stigma' was not an issue as parents had responded very positively to the subsidy and had been very forthcoming in accessing further information and discussing entitlement. The PSA (Parent Support Adviser) in primary F reported, for example:

> *'There is no stigma. They are pleased to be getting the activities and free school meals. Some feel they are very happy to get the crumbs of the pie that the government feast on.'*

However, avoiding stigma was identified, by others as a potentially very difficult process. The headteacher of a school in the same cluster as Primary J reported:

> *'There is a tension about making a song and dance about it and avoiding feelings of unfairness for the other youngsters [who are not entitled to the subsidy]. It is a hugely difficult process.'*

He also raised the following issue:

> *'The notion of providing for the targetted group is problematic. You can't categorise the target group so we are pushing forward on an individual basis [arranging activities as individuals request them] but then you can't spend the money.'*

The importance of communication with both pupils and parents in a way that avoids stigma is regarded by most schools and LA as significantly important. The survey data confirms this but the feedback, collected from case study visits, also points to the importance of this. A parent in Secondary G talked openly about her views, saying:

> *'…But when I first split up from my ex-husband, I didn't like to admit things, didn't like to apply for things, I was embarrassed and I should imagine that a lot of other parents would feel the same ... don't want to admit to people in case they put you in this stigma bracket that the government and the press think single parents are like.'*

---

[14] This goes against DCSF guidance which specified that the subsidy should only be directed at the target group.

In a different school, parents discussed appreciating the sensitive approach that the school (Secondary C) had taken:

> *'The lovely thing here is that we are never made to feel like poor parents. …this is the lovely thing about it…there have been issues of not wanting to feel degraded in the past but the lovely thing here is that [name of staff member] is dealing with it so you are not going in cap in hand and feeling humiliated…it used to be the case that after a while they [children] know not to ask you for money and they will even hide letters [from school]…this has all been so very helpful.'*

Table 3.5 : Strategies used to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	
	%
There is no stigma	20
By approaching parents rather than pupils (through meetings/ telephone etc)	17
Everything is very confidential/discreet/not publicly announced	12
Send direct letters to the parents	9
We use personal and private approaches towards the parents	9
We use personal and private approaches towards the children	6
We make sure the target group don't know they're in the target group	5
Activities are offered/open to everyone	5
Send out blanket letter/advertise to everyone	4
By not subsidising the individuals directly/clever payment systems	3
Activities free to all/don't charge anyone	2
We don't call them the target group/economically disadvantaged/don't use that terminology	2
Make up reasons for receiving subsidy (i.e. they've won a raffle or something)	1
Use very subtle marketing	1
By promoting the right sort of activity for the right sort of groups	*
Other Answers	13
No Answer	7
Don't know	2

Key Findings

- Three in ten schools agreed they struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities.

- Almost all schools had done something to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group. The most common methods employed were sending letters to parents, and speaking informally to parents and pupils.

- Persistence, creativity, and using a range of approaches characterised the promotion activities of several of the case study schools.

- Certain subgroups had done more to promote activities to economically disadvantaged pupils:

  - Schools following the flexible model

  - Schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils

  - Schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in activities.

- Three in ten schools agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma that prevents them taking part in activities.

- Seven in ten schools had used strategies to avoid stigmatisation when using the subsidy. These included approaching parents rather than pupils, and being discrete about who gets the funding.

- Case study findings pointed to a careful focus on language used with parents and pupils, an avoidance of the terms 'disadvantage' and 'subsidy'. An emphasis on 'entitlement' was also seen as an important way of promoting the subsidy in a way that avoided stigma.

4 Participation in activities

The main aim of the subsidy is to increase the number of economically disadvantaged pupils taking part in extended schools activities, and also to increase the number of hours they spend participating. This chapter examines participation of economically disadvantaged pupils before the introduction of the subsidy and what impact the subsidy has had on participation rates so far, but first we can look at whether schools thought that cost was a barrier to participation amongst the target group.

In four out of five schools (80 per cent), respondents agreed with the statement "Economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended school activities" showing how necessary the subsidy is in order to increase participation in activities amongst economically disadvantaged pupils. A minority of respondents (12 per cent) disagreed with the statement; responses are shown in table 4.1. Levels of agreement were similar across primary and secondary schools, and schools with higher and lower concentrations of economically disadvantaged pupils.

Table 4.1 : Agreement with statement "Economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended school activities" Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	
	%
Strongly agree	32
Agree	48
Neither agree nor disagree	6
Disagree	10
Strongly disagree	3
Don't know	2

4.1 Tracking take up

Most schools (79 per cent) were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group, but a notable minority (22 per cent) were not. Schools following the flexible model were more likely to be tracking take up than those following the defined model (83 per cent compared with 70 per cent).

Amongst schools that were tracking take up, 82 per cent said registers were taken for all activities, and a further 15 per cent said registers were taken for some activities. A minority of schools who were tracking take up said registers were not taken at any activities (three per cent). Amongst primary schools registers were more likely to be taken for *all* activities than amongst secondary schools (88 per cent compared with 54 per cent); this could be due to secondary schools offering a wider range of activities than primary schools.

4.2 Take up before and after the subsidy

Overall take up

The baseline management information included information on both the number of pupils in the target group participating in activities, and the number of hours pupils in the target group were taking up during the summer term and summer holidays 2008. The information requested from schools was fairly detailed, and not all schools had tracked take up of activities amongst economically disadvantaged pupils before the introduction of the subsidy. As a result schools found this information quite difficult to complete accurately and, where

schools provided them, answers were sometimes estimates. However, analysis of the data for schools that were able to respond can provide useful estimates of the levels of take up before the introduction of the subsidy.

In addition, management information on the number of pupils in the target group participating in activities was collected relating to the spring term 2009. Comparing this to the baseline management information gives a measure of whether the target group's participation in activities has increased as a result of the subsidy.

On average, 35 per cent of the target group were taking part in any extended schools activities in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy). However, this average hides enormous variation between schools where none of the target group were participating and schools where all of them were. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of the proportion of pupils in the target group taking part in any activities.

The average proportion of target group respondents who had taken part in any extended schools activities in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 was similar for primary and secondary schools. Perhaps surprisingly this was also similar for schools that charged for (at least some) activities and schools that did not charge for any activities. The link between charging and take up of activities is a complex one. It is important to note that some schools who charged for activities may have offered some free, or they may have charged most pupils but not economically disadvantaged pupils.

After the introduction of the subsidy, during the spring term 2009, on average 63 per cent of the target group were taking part in any activities, suggesting there had been a strong improvement since the introduction of the subsidy. As with the baseline data there was huge variation between schools in the proportion of the target group taking part in activities. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of the proportion taking part both before the subsidy, and during the spring term 2009.

Participation of the target group in any activities in the spring term 2009 was higher amongst primary schools than secondary schools: 66 per cent on average amongst primary schools compared with 43 per cent amongst secondary schools.

Table 4.2 : Proportion of the target group taking part in any activities before the introduction of the subsidy, and during the Spring term 2009
Base: All schools responding to management information

	Baseline %	Spring term 09 %
Less than 10%	13	6
10% up to 20%	20	5
20% up to 30%	19	5
30% up to 40%	13	8
40 % up to 50%	10	9
50% up to 60%	8	13
60% up to 70%	5	10
70% up to 80%	3	13
80% up to 90%	4	7
90% or more	6	26
Average proportion	**35%**	**63%**
	(n=221)	(n=170)

Where schools had provided both baseline and spring 2009 management information, a direct comparison can be made between the proportion of the target group taking part in any activities at that school before and after the introduction of the subsidy.

For 79 per cent of these schools the proportion of the target group taking part in any activities had increased since the introduction of the subsidy and for three per cent it had remained the same. For the remaining 17 per cent of schools the proportion of the target group who had participated had decreased since the introduction of the subsidy. There are several reasons why a decrease could have occurred:

- Of the 21 schools where a decrease had occurred, five reported an increase in the size of their target group (these were flexible model schools that had most likely not yet fully identified which pupils fell into their target group when completing the baseline management info). In most of these schools there had actually been an increase in the number of target group pupils taking part in activities, but due to the greater number in the target group, the proportion had decreased.

- Differences could also be seasonal the baseline management information related to the summer term 2008, so comparisons with the spring term 2009 may not be entirely valid if schools tend to put on more activities during the summer term than the spring term.

- Baseline data also included the summer holidays whilst the spring management information related to term time only.

Comparing the data another way, across the 125 schools that provided both sets of management information, during the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy) 4528 economically disadvantaged pupils had taken part in any extended schools activities, while during the spring term 2009 (after the introduction of the subsidy) 9245 economically disadvantaged pupils had taken part in any extended schools activities.

The total number of hours taken up by the target group in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 could also be calculated from the baseline management information for schools that were able to provide sufficient information. Amongst those who had participated in any activities, the target group had on average taken up 43 hours of extended schools activities per pupil across the whole of the summer term and summer holidays. This breaks down as 2.5 hours during the summer holidays, and 40.5 hours (or 3.1 hours a week) during the summer term.

Looking at the whole target group, including those who had not taken part in any extended schools activities, the average take up was 17 hours per pupil across the whole of the summer term and summer holidays. This breaks down as one hour during the summer holidays, and 16 hours (or 1.2 hours per week) during the summer term.

Again, there is enormous variation between schools in the average number of hours participating pupils were taking up, from schools where the average was around half an hour per pupil to schools where pupils were taking up over 250 hours of activities across the summer term and summer holidays 2008.
Pupils in secondary schools tended to take up more hours of activities than those in primary schools: 58 hours per participating pupil in secondary schools compared with 40 hours per participating pupil in primary schools.

Take up of different types of activities

From the baseline management information we can also look at participation and hours taken up in various different types of activities. Detailed information on this is in included in appendix 2, along with comparisons to spring term management information where possible. Table 4.3 below shows the average proportion of the target group participating in each type of activity for both the summer term 2008 (pre-subsidy baseline) and the spring term 2009. As the table shows, participation in all types of activity has increased since the introduction of the subsidy.

Table 4.3 : Average proportion of the target group taking part in activities before the introduction of the subsidy, and during the Spring term 2009 Base: All schools responding to management information		
	Baseline **%**	**Spring term 09** **%**
Breakfast and afterschool clubs	17	31
Regular activities	27	42
One-off term time activities	18	28
	(n=221)	(n=170)

4.3   Effects of the subsidy on take up

The previous section examined changes in participation rates by comparing the baseline management information to management information collected after the introduction of the subsidy. There were also some measures included in the telephone survey of schools to gauge respondents' *opinions* of the effect of the subsidy on participation rates. Data collected during case study visits supplements the survey findings.

All respondents to the schools survey were asked to say, on a scale from 0 to 10 (where 10 is the highest impact and 0 is no impact) how much impact they thought the subsidy had had on the participation rates of the target group. Using this scale, the average response was 3.9. The average was slightly higher amongst schools on the flexible model than schools on the defined model (4.0 compared with 3.5) suggesting that the flexible model had a slightly higher impact at this early stage. The total distribution of answers is shown in table 4.4, both for all schools and for schools on the flexible and defined models.

Schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils thought the subsidy had made more of an impact so far: the average response was 4.3 amongst schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals, compared with 3.6 amongst schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals[15].

As might be expected, schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities tended to think the subsidy had had less of an impact so far than schools that disagreed with this (average responses of 3.6 and 4.3 respectively). And schools that were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils for support before the introduction of the subsidy tended to think the subsidy had had a greater impact so far than those that were not (average responses of 4.4 and 3.6 respectively). These results are related as schools that were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy were less likely to be struggling to engage them.

---

[15] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

As shown in table 4.4, one fifth (21 per cent) of respondents thought the subsidy had had no impact so far. These are mostly schools that had made little progress with the implementation of the subsidy funding: only a quarter (24 per cent) of them had used the subsidy to introduce new activities whereas (as shown in section 7.4) 63 per cent of all schools had introduced new activities.

Table 4.4 : Impact the subsidy has had on participation rates so far (using a 0 to 10 scale) Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	All schools %	Flexible model %	Defined model %
0 (no impact)	21	19	28
1	2	2	3
2	7	6	8
3	12	13	9
4	12	11	13
5	12	12	12
6	8	8	7
7	13	16	6
8	6	6	6
9	1	1	1
10 (highest impact)	2	1	3
Don't know	4	4	6
Average score	3.9	4.0	3.5
	(n=340)	(n=231)	(n=109)

The case study findings show, that in some schools, impact on participation rates, to date, has been very promising. In primary F, for instance, the PSA (Parent Support Adviser) reported that: **'There has been a massive increase in participation. Almost a 100 per cent take up,'** and elsewhere the increase in participation has been measurable. The deputy headteacher at Special School H reported that most pupils were accessing a range of activities and any under-spend would be used for a summer term trip which would include all other pupils entitled to the subsidy. Secondary I have around 107 eligible pupils (11 per cent of the number on roll) and of those 65 pupils have accessed the subsidy (61 per cent), and of the 19 eligible pupils in Primary J (nine per cent of NOR), a primary in the same LA but different cluster, 14 pupils have accessed the subsidy (74 per cent) and many of these have partaken in holiday provision. Some holiday provision in both clusters is open to all eligible children from across the respective clusters and data suggests that take up for certain activities is constitued primarily by pupils eligble for the subsidy. For example, of the 427 places taken on trips during holiday periods, 263 places were taken by subsidy children and adults; the 'Beadbugs' holiday activity attracted 15 chidren - all were entitled to the subsidy; beach sculpture attracted 20 children and 7 adults, 20 of whom were eligible; and jewellery making attracted 10 children, all entilted to subsidy. However, certain activities e.g. horse riding, did not attract any young peple entitled to subsidy funding.

The teacher responsible for the subsidy in Primary B, discussed an increased take-up which she felt would improve further as the subsidy becomes more established and embedded:

> *'Last year we had eight clubs and 18.5 % of children on free schools meals were attending them whereas now 58% of children are attending and that's only in the first two terms, autumn and spring…I was disappointed that we've only got to 58% though.'*

The teacher also discussed outcomes for a subsection of the targeted group of eligible pupils:

> *'All children on the child protection register are coming to at least two hours a week. There are ten families we've targeted, involving 17 children and this has been really good. These ten families, for the first time ever, are on board.'*

New activities in the same school are predominantly attended by pupils entitled to the subsidy. As the same teacher explained:

> *'With cookery, uptake has been brilliant and there is a waiting list for next term. We debated about what we could charge and went for £9 for six weeks and this is purely filled by children in the targeted group, all on FSM, who've accessed it free. There has been a huge response to arts and crafts at £9 for six sessions and this is filled with FSM children and 2 paying children.'*

Numbers have increased in other schools, although caution must be taken when identifying whether increased participation extends to pupils more generally or relates specifically to those in the target group e.g. in Primary D nine or ten pupils initially attended breakfast club when there was a £2 daily charge (but free for subsidy pupils). Now it is free for all and 20 to 25 attend daily. In another school (Secondary A), the subsidy is open to all pupils (flexible model using the Acorn Index criteria) but certain activities are targeted e.g. for incentivisation trips for pupils who achieve a certain target. A year eight pupil, who had been offered a trip to the pantomime as a reward for good attendance, noted:

> *'We got to go as we had got 95 per cent for attendance and everyone, well almost everyone from year eight went.'*

Where schools have offered residential trips (e.g. Secondary C) or activities over a period of a week (as is the case in Secondary E) good numbers of pupils have been able to participate, who might not have been able to were it not for the subsidy. The residential for year eight pupils in Secondary C attracted 'about half of year eight,' and of these;

> *'Almost all have kept to their agreement of doing two hours of extra curricular activities each week, since they've been on the trip…they signed an agreement, parents, students and the school signed the form.'* (deputy headteacher)

Whereas 20 pupils in secondary E (of around 90 pupils entitled) have accessed funding to pay for trips during 'activity week'. Others (15 pupils) have used their money for music tuition and seven intend to access activities offered outside of the school.

Respondents to the telephone survey were also asked to say, using the same 0 to 10 scale, how much impact they thought the subsidy would have on participation rates of economically disadvantaged pupils in the future. Results to this question were more positive with an average answer of 7.8, suggesting that the lower ratings at the previous question reflected the early stage of implementation of the subsidy rather than any failings of the pathfinder.

Again, schools on the flexible model gave higher ratings than those on the defined model: averaging 7.9 for the flexible model and 7.3 for the defined model. Table 4.5 shows the total distribution of answers, both for all schools and for schools on the flexible and defined models.

Respondents in schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils thought the subsidy would have a greater effect on participation rates than those in schools with lower proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils: amongst schools with at least 20 per cent of pupils known to be eligible for free school meals the average response was 8.0, while the average response was 7.6 amongst schools with less than 20 per cent of pupils known to be eligible for free school meals[16].

As well as thinking the subsidy had had less of an impact so far, schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities also tended to think the subsidy would have less impact in the future: these schools gave an average response of 7.5 compared with an average response of 8.1 amongst schools that disagreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils.

As table 4.5 shows there were no respondents who thought the subsidy would have no impact on participation rates, although there were a handful who thought it would have very little impact. The majority of respondents though (77 per cent) gave an answer of seven or higher.

Table 4.5 : Impact the subsidy will have on participation rates in the future (using a 0 to 10 scale) Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	All schools %	Flexible model %	Defined model %
0 (no impact)	0	0	0
1	*	0	1
2	1	1	1
3	2	1	2
4	3	2	5
5	6	4	10
6	7	5	11
7	15	18	10
8	31	29	33
9	17	21	7
10 (highest impact)	15	14	16
Don't know	5	5	5
Average score	**7.8**	**7.9**	**7.3**
	(n=340)	(n=231)	(n=109)

---

[16] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

Key Findings

- Eight in ten schools were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group, and most of these (82 per cent) were taking registers at all activities.

- On average 35 per cent of the target group had taken part in activities in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy).

- Amongst target group pupils that had taken part in any activities, the average number of hours taken up was 43 hours across the summer term and summer holidays, which breaks down as 40.5 hours during term time (or 3.1 hours per week) and 2.5 hours during the holidays.

- Across the whole of the target group the average take up was 17 hours across the summer term and summer holidays, which breaks down as 16 hours (or 1.2 hours a week) during term time, and one hour during the holidays.

- There was enormous variation in the levels (and hours) of take up between different schools.

- After the introduction of the subsidy a notable increase in the proportion of the target group taking part in activities was observed. In the spring term 2009, on average, 63 per cent of the target group had taken part in any activities, compared with the average of 35 per cent in the summer term 2008.

- On a scale of 0 to 10, schools thought on average that the subsidy had had an impact of 3.9 on participation rates of the target group. Schools on the flexible model and schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils thought the subsidy had had a greater impact so far.

- Using the 0 to 10 scale schools thought on average that the subsidy would have an impact of 7.8 on future participation rates. Again schools on the flexible model and those with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils thought the subsidy would have a greater impact.

5 Charging for activities

This chapter examines the charging practices employed by schools before the introduction of the subsidy, and how the subsidy has changed these practices.

5.1 Charging practices before the subsidy

Five per cent of schools were charging for all extended schools activities before the introduction of the subsidy, and a further 65 per cent were charging for some activities. A notable minority (29 per cent) of schools did not charge for any activities before the introduction of the subsidy.

The case study interviews suggest that amongst schools that did not charge before the subsidy there was some reluctance to introduce a charging policy with subsidised or free rates for some, and a charge for others as this might prevent those pupils who previously attended prior to the subsidy to continue to attend and benefit from the provision.

Not charging for any activities was more common amongst secondary schools than primary schools (44 per cent compared with 25 per cent), and of the five pupil referral units included in the survey, none charged for any activities.

Not charging for any activities was also more common amongst schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils: amongst schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free schools meals, 40 per cent said they did not charge for any activities, whereas amongst schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals only 20 per cent said they did not charge for any activities[17]. These results are shown in table 5.1.

Schools that did not use external providers to provide any activities were more likely to say they did not charge for any activities than schools that did use external providers (49 per cent compared with 26 per cent) suggesting that it is perhaps more common for schools to charge for activities provided by external providers - although findings from the quantitative survey are not conclusive, this suggestion is supported by interviews in case study schools where there were reports of teachers continuing to offer their time after school so that costs of activities could be kept down. When external providers were introduced, fees for tutors often meant that a charge needed to be introduced to help sustain provision. This was particularly the case where schools were not in receipt of additional funding from other sources for extended schools activities.

---

[17] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

Table 5.1 : Whether schools charged for extended schools activities before the introduction of the subsidy Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	All schools %	Primary schools %	Secondary schools %	<20% eligible for FSM %	20% + eligible for FSM %
Yes, all activities	5	5	2	6	4
Yes, some activities	65	69	54	74	55
No	29	25	44	20	40
Don't know	1	1	0	1	1
	(n=340)	(n=270)	(n=48)	(n=195)	(n=104)

Further information of charging practices before the introduction of the subsidy, including the amounts charged for different types of activities, can be found in appendix 3. The charging data included in appendix 3 is taken from the baseline management information.

5.2   Changes to charging practices as a result of the subsidy

Case study interviews suggested that the subsidy had led to more thought being given to charging. Whilst the interviews support the survey findings (below) that some schools did not charge at all, others had introduced different fees to different parents.

Whether or not schools had changed their charging practices as a direct result of the subsidy depended on whether they had been charging for all, some or no activities before the introduction of the subsidy. As might be expected, schools that had been charging were more likely to have changed their charging practices than those that had not. These results are shown in table 5.3.

Where the school had been charging for some or all activities, schools following the flexible model were more likely than those following the defined model to have changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy: 49 per cent of schools following the flexible model had compared with 36 per cent of schools following the defined model. This may be due to timing, section 7.4 shows that schools following the flexible model tend to have made more progress with the implementation of the subsidy than schools on the defined model. It is possible that more schools on the defined model will change their charging practices, they just have not done so yet.

Further to the above, schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged respondents were more likely to have changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy: 57 per cent of schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals had changed their charging practices compared with 41 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals[18].

---

[18] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

Table 5.3 : Whether schools have changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)				
	All schools %	**Charged for all activities** %	**Charged for some activities** %	**Did not charge for activities** %
Yes	39	59	44	23
No	59	35	55	74
Don't know	2	6	1	3
	(n=340)	(n=17)	(n=222)	(n=99)

Amongst schools that had changed their charging policy, the most frequent change made was no longer charging pupils in the target group for activities (36 per cent). Eight per cent said they no longer charged any pupils for activities and 17 per cent had stopped charging for some activities.

Decreasing the price of activities was the change made by 16 per cent of schools and eight per cent had decreased the price specifically for the target group.

In Secondary I, for example, a new wider range of holiday provision was on offer to pupils in this school and also in the cluster primary schools. Most activities during half term in the cluster were available for £1.00 a session with up to 4 sessions a day, whilst others were free, and others again incurred a higher charge e.g. rock climbing, was charged at £5 per session. Parents entitled to the subsidy were eligible for further reductions or free access to these activities.

A similar charging policy was introduced in the other cluster in the LA (in which primary J was located) although there was greater variance in the charges per activity, ranging from free to £9.00 per day for certain activities with additional charges for certain trips e.g. the soccer school run by professional coaches in primary J was charged at £9.00 per day and the additional trip to a football stadium was priced at £30.00. other activities during the holidays were free and some were priced at a subsidised rate of £1.00.

Whilst all activities in secondary A were offered to all without charge, a charging policy was introduced at Primary D, a school in the same LA but different cluster. Prices were as follows for February 2009 half term provision:

08.30am-12pm £5 (subsidised £3)
1pm-4pm £5 (subsidised £3)
Full day £12 (subsidised £7)
Full week £55 (subsidised £30)
School D also offer to pay for attendance at holiday provision offered in the community and if a full week is charged at around £50.00-£80.00 the school has offferd to subsidise this charge for eligible families.

Some term time provision at Primary D is free e.g. breakfast club is being trialled at no charge for all and cycling training for reception and KS1 incurrs no charge, whereas there is a £1 a day charge for the after school club (childcare provision) although the more traditional school clubs (run by teachers) are all free.

Elsewhere, for instance in secondary C, some provision is offered free (again this tends to be that run by teaching or support staff) whereas certain activities e.g. street dance which is led by a trained instructor incurs a charge of £2.50 per session. The subsidy is available to cover any costs for those pupils in the targeted group. In the same school the subsidy is available to cover the cost of residentials and also to enable pupils to access activities offered by local providers. This model of encouraging take up of local provision is also heavily promoted by other schools including Primary F, Special School H and Secondary E.

A minority (five per cent - six schools) who had changed their charging policy had *started* charging for some activities as a result of the subsidy, when they had not previously done so. These were all schools that had introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy.

In primary B, for example, a charging policy was introduced in the cluster for new activities so that, **'Only activities run by teachers or funded by someone else are free.'** (cluster co-ordinator) The same co-ordinator added: *'I think everyone paying 50p is sometimes better than some paying £3 and others paying nothing.'*

Schools which took part in the telephone survey were also keen to point out the benefits of the subsidy when answering this question, some of the verbatim answers given were:

> "We can offer a different range of activities which were too expensive to offer before… we can offer it knowing it can be funded for them [economically disadvantaged pupils]".
> "We can now open up to disadvantaged children…make things available for kids that wouldn't otherwise afford things for example purchase football boots or pay for a school trip".
> "We've used it to subsidise the entire activity because the target group are the majority".
> "We used the grant to fund things that we have not been able to fund in the past".

Equally, the case study findings were as optimistic and positive in tone and included:

'…to find the money was going to be a real struggle and so when the funding came through it was a massive relief'. (Parent Secondary C)

'I wouldn't have been able to afford it … being a single parent on benefits you don't have a lot…'I mean it's all down to bills comes first, food, clothes, anything the children need and activities come last and if I haven't got any money that week to go out anywhere or do anything we don't, we just go to the library or go for a walk … if we didn't have the boxing club to go to we actually wouldn't do anything because we just haven't got spare funds.' (Parent Secondary G)

'This has made choice wider and given loads of new opportunities and choice for them to do something they really wanted to do so they can try something different, something that parents wouldn't have been able to afford' (deputy headteacher Secondary A)

'We don't have a problem but I don't see why others who can't afford it miss out. They could need it more. I've got a car and I've got an income so I've more choice than others. Others have not got the same opportunities.' (Parent of a pupil not entitled to the subsidy - Primary D)

Key Findings

- Most schools were charging for activities before the introduction of the subsidy (five per cent for all activities, and 65 per cent for some), but three in ten schools did not charge for any activities before the subsidy.

- Four in ten schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy, and this proportion increased amongst schools that had charged for activities before the subsidy.

- Amongst schools that had charged for activities before the subsidy, those following the flexible model and those with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to have changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy.

- Over a third (36 per cent) of schools who had changed their charging practices had stopped charging the target group for any activities, and a further eight per cent had stopped charging any pupils for activities.

6 Use of external providers

External providers can be used to give pupils access to extended services that schools themselves do not have the resources to provide. This chapter looks at schools' use of external providers and whether new partnerships have been formed since the introduction of the subsidy.

6.1 Whether work with external providers

The vast majority of schools (88 per cent) were working with external providers in order to provide extended schools activities, and this was similar for both primary and secondary schools and across all clusters.

Where schools did work with external providers around half (51 per cent) had made new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy. Most schools (82 per cent) that had formed new partnerships had introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy.

The case study reports (in appendix 1) illustrate the range of partners that schools and clusters had developed. Schools were quite clear that they could not extend their range of activities without embracing partnership working. As the deputy headteacher of Secondary A put it:

> *'We couldn't do it if it was just about what schools can provide. We need outside providers and partnership working.'*

Likewise, the deputy head and cluster lead at Secondary I explained:

> *'The school thrives on partnership working. We already had a good grounding but this has built up levels of partnership working.'*

Some schools e.g. Primary B were working with a range of providers including community, statutory and voluntary agencies. Primary B intended to cement relationships further, and foster more of a sense of multi-agency working, by bringing partners together at locality meetings. The cluster has also started to work with certain partners to match fund activities e.g. the local rugby club have received money from the Community Chest (funding body) and this is being matched by subsidy funding so that the provider can go into cluster schools to offer rugby training, can run rugby camps during holiday periods and can also provide transportation and financial assistance to buy kits.

Other schools hosted partnership events soon into the implementation phase e.g. Special School H and Secondary A. The purpose of these events was to foster good relationships with local providers and enable pupils and families to find out about activities in their locality. Others again made the promotion of local provision a priority. This was certainly the case in Primary J and Secondary I. Discussing the model in Primary J, the cluster co-ordinator said: *'We try and use local providers whenever possible.'* Brochures outlining the services of local providers have been published, the cluster has commissioned activities from certain providers for holiday periods, and some taster sessions have been offered involving providers coming into school to give pupils a flavour of what they offer.

It is important to recognise that schools are very careful about the providers that they work with, ensuring that they meet all safeguarding criteria and are suitable to work with the particular cohort of pupils. Special School H explained that only certain providers are appropriate to work with pupils with challenging behaviour and other special educational needs:

> **'We can't just use any old providers. They'd eat them up and spit them out…we need to use our staff.'** (deputy headteacher)

Schools in two clusters (Primary F and Secondary E within the same LA) have gone to great lengths to ensure that partners are on board and that they are accredited. The LA have produced a 'providers' pack detailing information such as how to invoice, refer pupils to activities, and providing a good overview of the subsidy. Secondary E are also working very closely with the Children's University which has increased substantially their range of partner providers and subsequently the scope of activities on offer (this partnership was deemed to be highly appropriate as common aims included extend participation in after school / holiday / weekend activities for young people aged seven to 14).

Others are working with partners to encourage take up of provision e.g. Primary B is working with Social Services and the Play and Development Service in the council and Primary F and other schools in the same cluster have worked with services aimed at supporting the same cohort of young people, to help with the promotion of the subsidy and to encourage take up.

Schools following the flexible model were more likely to have made new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy than those following the defined model (55 per cent compared with 44 per cent). This may be due to timing, section 7.4 shows that schools following the flexible model had generally made more progress with the implementation of the subsidy than schools following the defined model.

6.2 Types of activities run by external providers

Based on management information provided by schools, 76 per cent were using external providers to provide activities. This is lower than the finding from the telephone survey that 88 per cent of schools were working with external providers. Where schools responded to both the baseline management information and the telephone survey it is possible to compare answers from the two sources. In most cases data from the two sources matched. However, there were 30 schools which had responded they did not use external providers on the baseline management information, but responded that they did use them during the telephone survey, and 17 schools that had responded they did use external providers on the baseline management information, but that they did not use them during the telephone survey.

One possible reason for the discrepancy is the timing of fieldwork. Data collection for the telephone survey took place after collection of the baseline management information so it is possible that the situation had changed. Most of the schools that responded they did not use external providers on the management information, but that they did on the telephone survey did say that new partnerships had been formed with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy.

Schools that were using external providers, according to management information, provided details of the types of activities they were using these external providers for.

Looking at all the activities listed by schools as being provided by external providers, the most common types of activities to be provided externally were:

- Sports - 45 per cent, football accounts for 18 per cent and there were a wide array of other sports including archery, basketball, cycling, gymnastics, kayaking, sailing, swimming, table tennis, trampoline and yoga.

- Dance - 9 per cent

- Martial arts - 7 per cent

- Music / singing - 7 per cent

Between them these accounted for two-thirds (68 per cent) of all activities provided by external providers. The remaining activities provided by external providers were a wide range of things including breakfast and afterschool clubs, arts and crafts, drama, language tuition, church groups, brownies and scouts, gardening, cookery, circus skills and first aid.

The case studies also illustrate, the range of partnerships with providers and agencies is vast and varied, as is the extent of the activities on offer.

Key Findings

- Nearly nine in ten schools were working with external providers and half of these had formed new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy. Schools following the flexible model were more likely to have made new partnerships.

- External providers were being used for a wide range of activities, but most commonly for sporting activities.

7 Benefits of the subsidy (additionality)

This chapter examines whether the subsidy has created real additional benefits, and avoided overlap with other schemes already in place for funding activities for disadvantaged pupils.

7.1 Support for economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy

Two in five schools (41 per cent) were explicitly targeting or providing support for economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in extended schools activities before the introduction of the subsidy, while 57 per cent of schools were not (two per cent did not know). So for more than half of schools, the subsidy funding has introduced a focus on getting economically disadvantaged pupils involved in activities.

Nearly half (48 per cent) of schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals were targeting or supporting pupils to take part in activities compared with 37 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible[19].

Schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in activities were less likely than schools that disagreed to have been specifically targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the introduction of the subsidy (29 per cent compared with 48 per cent). This suggests that where schools were struggling to engage pupils after the introduction of the subsidy, part of the reason for this may be their limited experience of trying to engage these pupils in the past.

Amongst schools that were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in activities before the introduction of the subsidy, two-thirds (67 per cent) had a clear definition of which pupils they were targeting.

These schools were most commonly targeting pupils who were eligible for free school meals (59 per cent), but there were several other measures being used by schools also:

- Pupils from low income families - 32 per cent

- Families in receipt of specific state benefits (such as income support, Jobseeker's Allowance, housing benefit or working tax credit) - 30 per cent

- Children in care - 15 per cent

- Disadvantaged pupils with special educational needs - nine per cent

- Families from specific geographical areas - seven per cent

- Pupils with behavioural problems - five per cent

- Families in temporary or poor accommodation - four per cent

- Pupils from refugee or asylum seeker families - three per cent

---

[19] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

A fifth (21 per cent) of schools with a clear idea of who they were targeting said they were doing so based on their knowledge about pupils and families, rather than using any specific criteria. Eight per cent were targeting support at all pupils at the school.

7.2 Promotion of extended schools activities before the subsidy

Schools that were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in activities were asked how they promoted extended services to this group before the introduction of the subsidy. The most commonly used methods were:

- Sending letters to parents - 51 per cent

- Speaking to parents informally - 30 per cent

- Advertisements such as posters at the school - 19 per cent

- Speaking to pupils informally - 14 per cent

- Focus groups or other meetings with parents - eight per cent

- Promotion within current school activities - seven per cent

- Parents evenings - six per cent

- School assemblies - six per cent

- Questionnaires or surveys to parents - six per cent

- Sending letters to pupils - five per cent

- Using family (link) workers or social workers - five per cent.

Just over half (54 per cent) of these schools were using active methods (talking to parents or pupils) to promote the uptake of activities before the subsidy, while 45 per cent were using passive methods (sending letters, questionnaires, advertisements at schools etc).

These are similar to the methods that were being used by all schools to promote activities to the target group after the introduction on the subsidy (as shown in section 3.2). However, comparing methods used to promote activities to economically disadvantaged pupils before and after the introduction of the subsidy, the majority (86 per cent) of schools that had been targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy were now using different or additional methods to promote activities. This is an encouraging finding in so far as schools were beginning to try new methods to engage the target group (as opposed to continuing with the status quo).

Schools that agreed they struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils were particularly likely to have used new methods to promote activities since the introduction of the subsidy, 97 per cent of this group had (all but one school). It is a positive finding that these schools are trying new methods to target the hard-to-reach, although at present this has made little impact to the sense of 'struggle' they face.

7.3 Other schemes for funding activities for economically disadvantaged pupils

Three in ten schools (31 per cent) were using schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils. There was a tendency for secondary schools to be more likely than primary schools to be using other schemes (40 per cent compared with 29 per cent), although (due to the fairly small number of secondary schools) this difference is not statistically significant.

Where schools were using other sources of funding they were asked what sort of schemes they were using:

- 41 per cent were using local authority funding, including general funding allocated to the school for extended services;

- 39 per cent were using funding from the voluntary sector/charities such as the big lottery fund, local charities and churches;

- 22 per cent were using schemes that were funded privately or by commercial organisations such as local businesses or sports clubs;

- Six per cent were using money supplied by the school from sources such as the school fund.

All case study schools found the subsidy funding a significant and highly important aspect of funding for activities for economically disadvantaged young people. Many felt it had enabled them to run the range of activities that they had hoped to offer in the past, but without designated funding, were unable. In these cases, new activities offer real additionality. A few reported being involved in other initiatives in the past such as EAZs (Primary J) although reported activities were not sustained when funding ended. Others are currently involved in funded schemes with which they have strategically linked the subsidy, so as to maximise resources. Secondary E, for instance, is a Children's University school, or in this case a 'youth university' school, as are other schools in the cluster. As the aims of both are related in that they are about encouraging participation in activities outside of school hours, it made sense, the cluster co-ordinator felt, to link the two so as not to duplicate but to further enhance the offer. Elsewhere (secondary I), a school was already working with 'Positive Futures' a national social inclusion programme which uses sport and leisure to engage young people, and the subsidy strategically links in with that - again the intention was to 'join up' rather than reproduce.

Other schools (e.g. secondary E) again reported the benefits of the subsidy in that they no longer had to go to the PTA with a 'begging bowl' or use other school funds to subsidise activities for certain economically disadvantaged pupils. And there were a few examples of using subsidy funding to match fund e.g. in the cluster in which Primary B is located, the rugby club already had Community Chest funding which was being match funded through the subsidy. In the same cluster, it was reported that the subsidy was being used to fund places for children on the child protection register although the teacher with responsibility for the subsidy explained that Social Services would have normally funded these places (rather than fund the places on this occasion they were working with the school to promote uptake).

7.4   Effects of the subsidy on schools' provision of activities

Offering new activities

In 63 per cent of schools the subsidy had enabled the school to provide new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils, and in 37 per cent of schools the subsidy had not (yet) enabled this. Amongst the schools that had not introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy 90 per cent thought the subsidy would enable the school to introduce new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils in the future. This suggests that, in almost all schools, if new activities had not been introduced this was due to the implementation of the subsidy being at an early stage, and not due to any failing of the pathfinder.

Schools following the flexible model were much more likely than schools following the defined model to have introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy: 69 per cent compared with 49 per cent. It is possible that flexibility in the model led to an encouragement to look more openly and critically at current offerings and therefore encouraged more flexibility overall in the provision delivery, although there is no data to support this

There was also a difference based on the levels of economically disadvantaged pupils present in the school. Amongst schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals[20], 75 per cent had introduced new activities, while amongst schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible, only 55 per cent had introduced new activities. It is possible that where schools serve economically disadvantaged areas, there is a perception of a need to work harder to engage children and young people in activities. Whilst this is only a supposition, during case study visits it was schools in disadvantaged areas that discussed problems of apathy rather than those in less disadvantaged areas.

Increasing the number of activities on offer

In 63 per cent of schools the subsidy had enabled the school to increase the number of activities that it offered to economically disadvantaged pupils. While there was significant overlap between these schools and those that said they were providing new activities the two groups did not match exactly:

- 55 per cent of schools had increased the number of activities on offer and were providing new activities;

- Eight per cent of schools had increased the number of activities on offer to economically disadvantaged pupils but were not providing new activities - this suggests that these schools may have started to subsidise activities that were already running so that economically disadvantaged pupils could afford to participate;

- Seven per cent of schools were providing new activities but had not increased the number of activities on offer - this suggests that these schools had introduced new activities to replace old ones;

- 29 per cent of schools had neither introduced new activities, nor increased the number of activities on offer to economically disadvantaged pupils.

---

[20] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

As with introducing new activities, schools following the flexible model were more likely than those following the defined model to have increased the number of activities on offer to economically disadvantaged pupils: 70 per cent compared with 49 per cent. Similarly, schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals were more likely to have increased the range of activities on offer to economically disadvantaged pupils than schools were less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible: 76 per cent compared with 59 per cent[21].

Case study schools reported being able to now offer much more choice to pupils. The cluster co-ordinator for Primary B explained that a key aim of the subsidy was to offer a **'Breadth of activities to give individuals a wide choice and broaden their horizons'** (taken from cluster action plan for 2008-09). The subsidy has enabled this to happen. She said:

> *'It's not football anymore. We offer more choice. There is fencing, judo, cheerleading, gymnastics and more. At Chinese New Year we did tai chi and dancing with dragons…There is much more on offer. We've given breadth of choice and given opportunities to children that they wouldn't have had.'*

The teacher with responsibility for implementing the subsidy In Primary B added:

> *'We had eight clubs and now we have 21, before school, at lunchtimes and after school…it is the breadth of things that we can now offer.'*

Similar outcomes were reported in other schools. The deputy headteacher at Secondary A, for instance, expressed her appreciation for what the subsidy has enabled school to offer:

> *'This has made choice wider and given loads of new opportunities and choice for them to do something they really wanted to do so they can try something different, something that parents wouldn't have been able to afford…kids know that they can ask for what they want and that school will do something about it…They wouldn't, for instance, have been able to go to the pantomime. This is broadening experiences.'*

Where the subsidy had not enabled schools to increase the number of activities on offer to economically disadvantaged pupils (36 per cent of schools), this does not necessarily mean that the subsidy will not have this effect in the future. It is possible that these schools had made slightly slower progress in implementing the subsidy.

Improving access to activities

Respondents to the telephone survey of schools were also asked whether the subsidy had improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities. In 69 per cent of schools this had occurred, and in 29 per cent it had not (two per cent did not know). Again, where this had not happened this may be due to the timing of the survey; these 29 per cent of schools may be able to improve access to activities for economically disadvantaged pupils using the subsidy in the future.

---

[21] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

The case study visits suggested that access to activities had been opened up for eligible pupils. The PSA (Parent Support Adviser) at primary F, for example, collected feedback regarding access. One of the exemplars she gave read:

> *'All in all I think this is a fantastic provision. For many parents it has literally been not having that £3.50 to go to dance or football club or to go swimming that stopped participation.'*

In another school, (Secondary E) the headteacher explained that during the annual enrichment week, whilst those pupils whose parents could afford it, went on residential and trips abroad, the economically disadvantaged young people had little choice but to engage in school based activities such as arts and crafts and field sports:

> *'All the middle class kids did all the wonderful things whilst the working class kids stayed and played rounders.'*

These pupils now have the opportunity to go to trips and spoke enthusiastically about the prospect. One pupil explained:

> *'I'm going to [residential trip to a theme park] for about four days and then we'll do a presentation. It's in July and I feel great I can go. If it wasn't for this I'd be at school doing juggling.'*

Another pupil (a young person in care) noted:

> *'During activities week in the summer I'm getting to go to [residential trip to a theme park] coz this is for children in care and those getting free school meals, [name of staff member at school] told me. I spoke to my carers and said I'd always wanted to go and they think it is a good opportunity coz they don't have to pay. I would never have got to go as it is a hundred and something pounds…my mate got the money also and so it's really good.'*

Parents of pupils were as sanguine. One father discussed what the subsidy has meant for him and his family

> *'I'm unemployed now, have been for a year or more now, and my wife doesn't work. Last year she [his daughter] did the basic activities in school. £5 a week it cost for crafts. She couldn't have gone away as I wasn't working. I think it would have been £90. I could have asked my dad to help as a Christmas present or something…there were about 40 activities from which to choose from…To be honest, even when I was working we had high outgoings and couldn't afford it. Now it is really hard to manage and we have to budget for everything. My parents couldn't afford trips and it is still on my mind 30 odd years later.'*

Improving the quality of provision

In 65 per cent of schools the subsidy had enabled the school to improve the quality of its provision for economically disadvantaged pupils, while in 34 per cent of schools this had not happened so far.

Similarly, the case study visits found that not all case study schools were delivering their intended offer at the time of interview, so gauging improvement in the quality of provision proved somewhat difficult. However, all schools professed to offering some new activities and were confident that future plans for activities could be followed through.

Schools following the flexible model were again more likely to have seen an improvement in the quality of provision. In 71 per cent of schools following the flexible model the subsidy had enabled the school to improve the quality of its provision compared with 52 per cent of schools following the defined model. Once again, schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils were also more likely to have seen this effect: 74 per cent of schools where at least 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals had improved the quality of their provision compared with 63 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were known to be eligible for free school meals[22].

The parents and pupils survey later in 2009 will examine whether parents and pupils are experiencing greater choice in terms of the activities provided or signposted to.

Table 7.1 : Effects of the subsidy on schools' provision of activities Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	All schools %	Flexible model %	Defined model %
Subsidy has enabled the school to provide new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils	63	69	49
Subsidy has enabled the school to increase the number of activities it offers to economically disadvantaged pupils	63	70	49
Subsidy has enabled the school to improve economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities	69	71	65
Subsidy has enabled the school to improve the quality of its' provision for economically disadvantaged pupils	65	71	52
	(n=340)	(n=231)	(n=109)

---

[22] This is the proportion known to the eligible for free school meals. Statistics on eligibility have been taken from DCSF's EduBase database of all schools in England (extracted November 2007).

One might assume that the subsidy might take effect more quickly amongst clusters following the defined model, as these clusters would not have to spend time deciding how to define their target group. Both local authorities following the defined model that were involved in the mapping visits had identified getting a head start as a potential benefit of the defined model. However, it appears that the opposite is true and schools following the flexible model have been faster to introduce new activities, as well as increase the number and quality of activities offered.

This may just be a matter of timing, schools on the flexible model have been faster in implementing the subsidy, or this may show a failing of the defined model - schools following the defined model are finding it difficult to increase their offer under the constraints of the model. The second survey of schools, due to take place in late 2009, will show whether schools on the defined model have 'caught up' or whether the defined model really is less effective than the flexible model.

One note of caution is that whilst the subsidy has, in the majority of cases, already increased the range and quality of activities on offer, this could be, in some cases, at the detriment of other aspects of the extended schools core offer.

For instance, in secondary I, whilst the school now offer a varied programme of holiday activities that they are proud of, the emphasis of the cluster co-ordinator has been on developing this provision (an aspect of the core offer that had previously been somewhat neglected) meaning equal attention could not be given to other key elements of the core offer. She explained:

> '*I'm an extended schools co-ordinator but the rest of my role has been put to one side and just been about the subsidy. It is a real struggle capacity wise and we are still learning all the way.*'

Key Findings

- Two in five schools were explicitly targeting or supporting economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in activities before the subsidy, and this was more common in schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils.

- Where schools were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy, two thirds had a clear definition of which pupils they were targeting. Most commonly this was pupils who were eligible for free school meals, but other definitions were also used.

- Methods used to promote activities to economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy were similar to those used after the introduction of the subsidy.

- Amongst schools that had been promoting activities to the target group before the subsidy, 86 per cent tried new ways of engaging the target group after the subsidy had been introduced.

- Three in ten schools were using schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils.

- Around two thirds of schools had done each of the following as a result of the subsidy:

    o Provided new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils

    o Increased the number of activities offered to economically disadvantaged pupils

    o Improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities

    o Improved the quality of its provision for economically disadvantaged pupils

- Schools following the flexible model were more likely to see the above impacts, as were schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils.

- Amongst schools that had not yet provided new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils with the subsidy, 90 per cent thought the subsidy would enable them to do this in the future.

8   Staff workload

This chapter examines whether there had been an increase in staff workloads as a result of the subsidy, which types of staff members this had affected, and how schools had coped with the increased workload.

The findings in this chapter show that, for many schools, the additional workload of managing and administering the subsidy has been an issue. However, it should be noted that some impacts on workload may be a direct result of this being a pathfinder:

- Schools involved in the pathfinder were 'starting from scratch' when implementing the subsidy, but schools involved in later roll out of the subsidy will have far more guidance (based on learnings from the pathfinder) on how the subsidy can be used. The evaluation itself (particularly the collection of management information) has taken up some school staff's time. The evaluation is only being undertaken amongst pathfinder schools and so will not affect schools involved in later roll out of the subsidy.

It is therefore likely that when the subsidy is rolled out nationally, the increase in staff workload will be not be on the same scale reported below.

8.1   Whether managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in staff workload

In 78 per cent of schools, managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in workload for staff at the school.

Schools following the flexible model were more likely to report an increase in workload than schools following the defined model (85 per cent compared with 64 per cent). This may be due to schools on the flexible model having made more progress than schools on the defined model in terms of provision of new activities, as shown in section 7.4.

An increase in staff workloads was also more common amongst secondary schools than primary schools (88 per cent compared with 77 per cent).

Almost all case study schools referred to an increase in workload. This has been a cause of much frustration amongst case study schools, clusters and LAs. One LA lead asserted:

> *'It [the subsidy] is fantastic but there are huge difficulties making it work…there have been two main assumptions, that local authorities have strong central capacity [to deliver] and that schools have the capacity. There is also the assumption that schools are already offering [ES provision]. There is this idea that you can give money to schools and co-ordinators will deliver it'.*

The decision was taken in this LA for the funding to be managed at LA level. This, it was felt, would lessen the administrative burden in school and ensure that good accountability mechanisms were in place. Elsewhere, e.g. School G, all the subsidy funding went direct to schools. Where this has happened, there has been an implication on workload. The LA lead for the LA in which School G is based noted:

> *'100% of the funding does go direct to the cluster and the schools for activities but obviously there is a burden of responsibility in terms of administration, promotion, monitoring and evaluation, somebody has to pick up those levels of work and it doesn't just happen and it is quite a considerable amount of work.'*

For one case study school (Secondary I) the workload increase had deflected time away from other areas of the ES core offer. Even where there was management and administrative capacity, this was at the expense of other areas of work. Many commented on the time simply to arrange activities, even for one family, if the model in place involved working at the level of individual pupils and families. Staff movements, particularly the loss of cluster co-ordinators, had exacerbated the workload impact. Where the activities used other local providers, there was less impact on management workload and also on that of teachers and support staff who traditionally ran many of the activities in school. Section 8.2 considers those staff members for whom their workload has increased the most. Some schools did identify a particular impact for certain staff members, others discussed an impact at various levels in school. As the head at the secondary school in the same cluster in which case study Primary J is located stated, for instance:

> *'There is a capacity issue in a whole raft of ways, in managing, spending, monitoring and evaluating. We don't have the capacity to spend the subsidy appropriately.'*

He added:

> *'If there are 200 children on free schools meals and an allocation of so much for each and you can't pay for staffing, how can I run the activities? We'd need ten groups [of activities] running five days a week. How many activities is that? We don't have the capacity to spend it in a way that is effective.'*

8.2   Types of staff members whose workload had increased

Workloads had most commonly increased for the headteacher (46 per cent) or administrative or support staff (44 per cent). Table 8.1 shows, for each type of staff member, whether there had been any increase in workload, and whether workloads had increased a lot or a little. In a fifth (20 per cent) of schools the workload of the headteacher had increased a lot, and for a similar proportion (18 per cent) the workload of administrative or support staff had increased a lot as a result of managing the subsidy funding. For other members of staff it was quite rare for there to be a large increase in workloads as a result of managing the subsidy funding.

The types of staff members for whom workload increased varied between primary and secondary schools. In primary schools it was more common for the headteacher's workload to increase (50 per cent compared with 29 per cent in secondary schools) and for administrative or support staffs' workloads to increase (46 per cent compared with 31 per cent in secondary schools). While in secondary schools it was more common for the workloads of other members of the senior management team to increase (40 per cent compared with 16 per cent in primary schools) and for the extended services co-ordinator's workload to increase (27 per cent compared with 10 per cent in primary schools).

Table 8.1 : Staff members for whom workload has increased as a result of managing the subsidy funding Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)			
	Any increase %	Increased a lot %	Increased a little %
Headteacher	46	20	25
Other members of the senior management team	20	9	11
Administrative or support staff	44	18	25
Extended services co-ordinator	11	6	5
Bursar	8	3	5
Teaching staff	7	3	4
Other staff members	5	3	1
	(n=340)	(n=340)	(n=340)

Case study schools reported a significant demand on administrative workers in school but also on senior management in school and in the LAs. One LA Co-ordinator (for the LA in which secondary C is located) noted:

> *'I was naïve not to realise how much time it would take up and other people at school and in the Local Authority had no idea how much time would be involved…in one of our primary schools a Learning mentor has taken it on, supported by the Head…paper work is just too much.'*

She added**:**

> *'It has been a real burden on admin staff but we have found ways around it because of the good will of the staff. With the CAMHs pathfinder, money was given for admin at local authority and school level and we didn't get that for this.'*

The LA lead in the same LA held similar views and spoke about the need to have the right capacity at various levels within the LA:

> *'…it is also important to be mindful that we have the right infrastructure in the Local Authority…people might struggle with capacity. We've managed to get the overall strategic level right and now have someone to deal with delivery at operational level and it is important for someone to have this time to go out and visit heads…someone with credibility, experience and skills.'*

Elsewhere, there were concerns reported about the impact at LA level, when the initiative is rolled out nationally. The cluster co-ordinator for Special School H explained:

> *'For the team, this is just a small part of our jobs. When this is rolled out nationally we are worried.'*

This particular LA were not alone in their view.

There were also reports of impact on the work load of other staff. In one school (Primary F) the PSA (Parent Support Adviser) was involved in setting up the subsidy and this did impact on her workload, much to the displeasure of the headteacher) but now wishes she had more time to dedicate to the smooth running of the programme. She explained;

> *'It took a good day a week at first which didn't please my line manager even though this fits into my job description. If I could even dedicate half a week now it would mean a better take up.'*

In another LA, a secondary school (one of the schools in the large cluster in which Secondary E is based) benefits from an in house extended schools co-ordinator. The headteacher appreciates the fact that he does not need to attend to the day to day management of the subsidy but recognises that with the focus on delivering and promoting 'activities,' other aspects of the co-ordinators job have suffered:

> *'We have capacity but then [name of ES co-ordinator] has had to drop other things to do the pathfinder work.'*

The case study interviews showed little evidence that there had been an increased workload for teachers - and a comment typical was that 'teachers are always keen to volunteer', the assumption being that this was nothing new in terms of delivering activities. However, one school (Primary B) was frustrated by, her view that there was an assumption, that teachers and/or teaching assistants will continue to work on 'goodwill.' She was further frustrated as she did not think that the subsidy could not cover overtime. The cluster co-ordinator also stressed her view that:

> *'There has been an impact. Lots of work has been put onto TAs, often they volunteer their time. There has also been an impact on the head's time. The schools actually see me as an Extended Schools co-ordinator and not just for the subsidy. Lots of heads call in and say, 'is it Ok to spend the subsidy on this and that' and this takes time.'*

8.3   What schools have done to cope with the additional workload

If workloads had increased for any member of staff as a result of managing the subsidy, respondents to the telephone survey of schools were asked what the school had done to cope with the additional workload. A minority of schools had taken measures to increase their resources in order to manage the additional workload:

- Five per cent had taken on new (temporary) staff

- Three per cent had appointed an extended services co-ordinator or passed work onto an existing extended services co-ordinator (who did not necessarily work at the school)

- Three per cent had given staff time off teaching in order to spend time managing the subsidy funding

- Three per cent had increased salaries or paid staff overtime to cover the extra work they were doing managing the subsidy funding

While most schools had coped using existing resources: 35 per cent said school staff worked longer hours; 20 per cent said workloads had been re-assigned between staff; and 19 per cent said they just got on with it.

Working longer hours was more common amongst schools on the flexible model than schools on the defined model (39 per cent compared with 23 per cent).
Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to re-assign the workload between staff (31 per cent compared with 19 per cent). One might expect re-allocation of tasks to be more practical in secondary schools due to the larger pool of staff available.

Case study interviews correlate with the statistical evidence. Some schools did simply 'get on with it' but found this difficult without additional capacity. In one cluster (the cluster within which Secondary I was based) a second cluster co-ordinator has been appointed to support primary schools. Elsewhere there are examples of:

- A teacher taking the lead in Primary school B (and she has been given Wednesday afternoons as non teaching time);

- A school based co-ordinator who has recently been appointed in Secondary A, to work alongside the deputy head (who felt she could no longer manage the additional workload in school single handed);

- And of support staff such as PSAs (e.g. in Primary F and Special School H) embracing the work with parents as part of their core role.

Having a school based designated extended schools co-ordinator was deemed to be a facilitating factor. Secondary E benefitted from this, which meant that the headteacher need not dedicate so much time to the subsidy.

Key Findings

- In 78 per cent of schools staff workloads had been increased by managing the subsidy funding. An increase in workloads was more common amongst secondary schools and schools following the flexible model.

- Most commonly, it was the workloads of the headteacher and administrative or support staff that had been increased.

- Most schools coped with the increased workload by working longer hours or reassigning workloads between staff, although a few took measures to increase staff resource.

9 Identifying and overcoming challenges

The pathfinder is intended to test the effectiveness of the subsidy, but also to provide learning on the implementation process. It is therefore important to identify any problems or barriers schools in the pathfinder faced, and any additional support they required so that these can be addressed for the 'scale-up' of the subsidy.

9.1 Challenges faced

Around two in five schools (41 per cent) had encountered problems or barriers in implementing the subsidy.

A higher proportion of secondary schools than primary schools had encountered problems or barriers when implementing the subsidy: 54 per cent of secondary schools had compared with 39 per cent of primary schools.

Where schools had encountered problems or barriers in implementing the subsidy, they were asked what these were. Responses to this question are shown in table 9.1. It should be noted that this question was open ended for respondents, so the problems and barriers reported by respondents are likely to be the most 'top of mind' ones. Also, some respondents may not have repeated issues which they felt had already been covered by the questionnaire (such as staff workloads, and pupils they would like to target the subsidy at not being included in the target group).

As the table shows, the most frequently cited problem was the additional workload of organising or running the activities. Two related problems were the organisation/administration of the funding and the lack of funding for the administration of the subsidy, cited by 11 per cent and nine per cent respectively of schools that had encountered a problem. As mentioned in chapter 8, some of this extra workload and administrative burden is due to this being a pathfinder, and would not be replicated for schools involved in later roll outs of the subsidy.

Case study findings confirmed this. This comment from a cluster co-ordinator for secondary I was typical of what was found:

> *'The administrative burden has been horrendous…the forms, and costings and the financial process in schools is a burden.'*

The cluster co-ordinator for Secondary E offered the following advice:

> *'You need to make sure someone has enough time. The biggest barrier is lack if time'*

Section 8.1 showed that 78 per cent of schools found their workload increased by managing the subsidy funding, but only a minority of schools (33 per cent of those that had encountered problems, but only 14 per cent of all schools) mentioned the workload involved in organising and running activities as a particular problem.

Very few schools cited a lack of interest from pupils in the target group, but a more common problem was a lack of interest from parents in the target group. Most of the schools who said lack of interest from parents was a problem had included parents in their consultation process. Section 3.1 showed that five per cent of schools disagreed that economically

disadvantaged pupils were keen to participate in the activities that they offered, suggesting that a lack of interest from pupils was a little more widespread than just the two per cent of schools that cited lack of interest from pupils as a problem.

One of the case study schools reported:

> *'There is the apathy of parents and…some kids, it doesn't matter what is on offer, they are just not interested in doing anything…I genuinely think that some kids are not going to tap into this. You ask them what they want to do but some are just shattered at the end of the school day…**We invite parents to the clubs but they are not interested'** (teacher Primary B)

Elsewhere (Secondary E), an extended schools co-ordinator commented:

> *'The commitment of the hard to reach child is poor generally…kids don't do stuff as parents don't support them to do stuff.'*

The mapping and case study visits revealed that if parents are on board, then pupils are more likely to engage in activities, so a lack of interest from parents can be a significant barrier to the success of the subsidy.

Section 3.4 showed that 31 per cent of schools agreed there was a sense of stigma which prevents economically disadvantaged pupils from participating in activities. However, the stigma of receiving the subsidy was only cited as a particular problem by 13 per cent of schools that had encountered a problem (five per cent of all schools). Section 3.4 also looks at strategies schools were using to avoid stigmatisation.

Amongst schools that had encountered a problem, 11 per cent mentioned identifying which pupils to target the subsidy at (this was five per cent of all schools). Section 1.3 showed that 30 per cent of schools following the flexible model had found it quite or very difficult to identify which pupils should be included in their target group, but this was evidently only a 'top of mind' problem for a small minority of schools. However, it was not just schools following the flexible model that thought identifying pupils was a problem, some were schools following the defined model. Although the definition of the target group for the defined model is more straightforward (pupils eligible for free school meals and children in care), schools only know whether a pupil is eligible for free school meals if their family has applied. Previous research[23] suggests that not all eligible families do apply for free school meals (either because they do not realise they are eligible, or they choose not to apply), so school staff may suspect that other pupils are eligible for free school meals, but their families have not applied.

Four per cent of schools that had encountered problems or barriers cited pupils they would like to target the funding at not being part of the target group. Schools following the defined model had already been asked whether there were pupils they thought ought to be included in the target group that were not, 90 per cent said this was the case, as shown in section 1.4. However, the few schools that citied this issue here were all following the flexible model. Section 5.1 showed that 29 per cent of schools did not charge for any activities before the introduction of the subsidy, but only one school mentioned all activities being free before the

---

[23] 'Improving the take up of free school meals', DfEE research report No. 270, Pamela Storey and Rosemary Chamberlain, May 2001.

subsidy as being a barrier to implementation. Evidently most schools that did not charge for any activities before the introduction of the subsidy did not see this as a problem.

The case study visits identified a School (Secondary A which is piloting the flexible model) which opted to include all pupils in the eligibility criteria so not to exclude anyone. The deputy headteacher discussed her view that:

> *'Activities are meant to be universal and if we charge for one and not others it wouldn't work. We already had a policy of most activities, certainly those after school, being free,'*

Table 9.1 : Problems or barriers encountered by schools when implementing the subsidy
Base: All schools that encountered problems or barriers when implementing the subsidy (140)/ All schools (340)

	Schools that had problems %	All schools %
Additional workload of organising /running activities	33	14
Lack of interest from parents in target group	16	6
Confusion/ lack of guidance as to how subsidy should be used	16	6
Parents or pupils embarrassed to be seen as receiving funding / stigma	13	5
Identifying which pupils to target the subsidy at	11	5
Dealing with external providers / finding organisations to provide activities	11	5
Organisation/administration	11	5
Funding for extra work / administration/extra wages	9	4
Transport difficulties	6	3
Pupils you would like to target do not fall under the definition of the target group	4	2
Lack of interest from pupils in target group	4	2
Dealing with others that are unhappy about missing out/not being part of target group / not excluding the other children	4	2
Keeping activities running continuously	4	1
Children/young people do not want to take part in activities based at school	1	1
All extended schools activities were already free before the subsidy	1	*
Other Answers	11	5
Don't Know	1	1
	(n=140)	(n=340)

9.2 Other reported barriers and key issues

There were a range of other actual or potential barriers discussed during case study visits. Some of the barriers can, from case studies, be understood as a misunderstanding about the requirements of the pathfinder, in particular what was or was not allowed in terms of targeting strategy or eligible funding.

Some reported issues were context specific. For instance, poor transportation was identified as a problem in rural areas, and in those where schools had a very wide catchment or were split site schools. Poor transport was cited as a barrier to access to activities for certain pupils. To try and overcome this, some schools have used subsidy funding to help with transportation costs, others have considered paying for bus or taxi fares to enable families to travel to local providers. Others again have considered purchasing bus coupons for local transport and distributing these upon the request of families (this system would be heavily monitored). Highlighting the barrier that transportation poses and the implications of this for the subsidy was stressed by a cluster co-ordinator for primary F:

> *'We are rural and transport is an issue. Of the £300 allocated for young people, they might only get...well the rest will have to go on transport'.*

Special schools have a unique context which must be considered when implementing initiatives such as this. Issues raised earlier in the report include the inappropriateness of a defined model when some pupils are dual registered (the feeling is that funding would go to mainstream schools) and when pupils are given a free meal (and would not therefore be applying for free school meals). The flexible model, in contexts such as this, was regarded as appropriate and inclusive.

The whole issue of payment for activities when the subsidy is concerned with offering pupils the option of accessing local provision e.g. at the leisure centre, is an option. Do schools ask parents to pay in advance and claim back? Schools feel this is not a viable option as parents do not have the cash to do this. To overcome this, some schools have arranged for local providers to invoice schools or for leisure cards to be purchased, for example, through the subsidy and given to pupils.

Avoiding stigma is an important consideration for schools, A consensus is that the title 'disadvantage subsidy pathfinder' is problematic in that the word disadvantage is one that schools try and avoid. The headteacher of Special School H expressed her view:

> *'I think the title is terrible. It is dreadful and especially if children have low self-esteem. We call it enrichment.'*

And the LA lead for Schools J and I offered this advice to other LAs: **'Change the name quickly, don't use 'subsidy' or 'disadvantage.'**

To overcome this some schools, clusters and/or LAs have taken the decision to rebrand the subsidy or been particularly attentive to using alternative, more positive words such as 'entitlement' when speaking with parents and pupils.

There was some confusion as to why 'economically disadvantaged children' were targeted along with 'children and young people in care.' Whilst colleagues were not dismissing that the latter ought to benefit from subsidy funding, they wondered why the subsidy did not consider other social factors and in doing so extend the subsidy to other vulnerable children.

The purpose of targeting economically disadvantaged pupils has its merits and the benefits of this in terms of increased access and choice of provision for eligible pupils can not be overestimated. However, there are relatively widespread concerns amongst those schools implementing the defined model that the free school meals indicator is 'crude' meaning the model is 'divisive' or 'unjust.' Indeed, in one school (Primary B) the school office were dealing with objections from parents whose children did not meet the criteria and other schools anticipated this would happen as more families found out about the subsidy.

The more personalised approach to consulting with pupils and encouraging take up was regarded as a helpful strategy, but one which was difficult to achieve when large numbers of pupils are eligible, and capacity amongst staff to work at this level was extremely limited.

Some secondary schools had sixth forms and school staff believed these pupils were not eligible for the subsidy. An issue also arose in that siblings in some families were in subsidy schools, where as other siblings were in non subsidy schools (especially where older siblings go to a secondary school outside of the cluster). Schools are optimistic that this will become less of an issue as the initiative is rolled out nationally.

There were some concerns raised about the levels of monitoring and accountability required as the initiative is rolled out and about who can take on this work when colleagues in schools and LAs are already very stretched. Some LAs anticipate that as the initiative rolls out, it will become more and more apparent that some schools are not in the practice of monitoring and will struggle to be accountable for the money. One LA has retained money centrally this time but feels that they may not be in a position to do this in the future. The concern is that:

> *'What on earth will we do when this goes out to all schools. If we use the current model [holding money centrally] then lots of money will need to go on management and administration. If it [the money] goes to schools then we'll not find out what happens to it.'* (LA lead for Primary F and Secondary E)

Fears about future sustainability were expressed by some schools and LAs especially where subsidy funding has been used to pay providers to set up new activities. Whilst colleagues are happy that extended schooling remains a high profile policy agenda, they are worried that specific funding may be removed in the future. Regarding this, a LA lead (for the LA in which Secondary C is located) said:

> *'This has been a godsend and it has been superb to have the funding and to be able to do all this is just fantastic. Ministers need to hear this….ministers need to keep this going for goodness sake as it is making the world of difference.'*

In a similar vein, the LA lead for Schools J and I said:

> *'Overall, in essence, this is fantastic and long may it continue…my message to government would be 'what will happen come 2011?'*

There are also fears that schools will be forced to use other funding sources that are not ring fenced. Regarding this the cluster lead for Special School H noted:

> *'When this rolls out nationally, they'll [schools] say 'who will fund the background and underpinning work'. They may end up using the [extended schools] money for personalisation or sustainability, that isn't ring fenced'*

Some cluster co-ordinators are feeling vulnerable about the future sustainability of their posts and this may have been the reason why some LAs have lost co-ordinators and needed to go through the process of reappointing.

The time scale of the subsidy was reported as an issue for some. In particular, it was felt that schools were expected to implement very soon after the launch events. This was a particular pressure for those schools/clusters/LAs piloting the flexible model and who had to establish criteria for identifying the target group. Regarding this a LA lead (in the LA in which Secondary G is based) said:

> *'The other challenge is that we didn't have a year for it, we're sort of working on a year project in six months. That's the nature, I appreciate that some pathfinder funding is like that. '*

The issue was intensified if LAs took time to allocate funding to the various cluster schools.

A lack of appreciation of the imperative importance of the subsidy amongst the most senior officers in LAs was reported as an issue by one LA. The designated team within the LA for extended schooling valued their involvement in the initiative but were frustrated that some of the more senior colleagues did not have the same amount of enthusiasm. They were grateful that the funding was ring fenced as they felt certain members of the LA would rather the money had been spent on other strategies to raise levels of academic attainment.

A potential issue is that relating to ownership of provision, especially where the LA have provided a good deal of support and manage lots of the logistics. As one LA officer pointed out:

> *'The other thing to acknowledge is whose responsibility is it? It goes back to that ownership issue, about integrating everything, making sure that they [schools] actually see the whole picture, rather than just a certain level of the picture.'* (LA officer in LA in which Secondary G is based)

Whilst schools implementing the flexible model were not displeased to be given this opportunity, this way of working invariably meant that the £300 entitlement per pupil would be diluted. The LA lead for Schools D and A noted towards the beginning of the subsidy implementation period:

> *'We will try not to dilute the £300 but if you go on hard pressed families in reality that is what it is going to be [i.e. the reduced amount].'*

Elsewhere, (Special School H) pupils have been allocated £120each in a model which enables all pupils in school to access funding. As the LA lead for Secondary G pointed out:

> *'Unfortunately you didn't get more money that way, you just got more children.'*

Another issue for schools piloting the flexible model is whether to try for two hours of sustained involvement in activities per week for every pupil eligible or to simply give each young person the opportunity engage in activities in a more sporadic way. The LA lead for School G discussed the strategy they have adopted:

> *'…so one of the issues and challenges for us is, are we about 100 hours of activity for every single child or are we about ensuring that every single child on our database has an opportunity to actually do some activities ... we're targeting the second one.'*

Using surveys and questionnaires to consult is time effective but not necessarily a productive way of consulting with young people, according to some accounts. One secondary school in the same cluster as Primary D, received only a 25% response rate. Who to ask to administer surveys or consult with pupils is an issue. In some schools teachers were asked to so this and data collected was patchy. In other schools e.g. Special School H, staff were trained on consultation techniques and are encouraged to regularly engage in informal consultation and report back to senior management). This strategy was identified as being highly effective. The problem with a more personalised approach to consultation in other schools is the capacity of staff to undertake this. Another issue to consider when undertaking consultation is that some pupils do not know what options are available to them. As the cluster lead and deputy head for Secondary A explained: ***We can't assume that we know what they'll want…but there is no point asking kids what they want unless they know what is available.'***

One school in particular (Primary B) feel the best people to run clubs are teaching assistants as they know the children and have the enthusiasm, experience and skills to set up new activities and facilitate them. However, payment for additional work can be an issue as can providing a service that offers genuine value for money. As the teacher responsible for the subsidy in this school noted:

> ***'We can pay £7.70 an hour on the council scale [for teaching assistants] but outside providers can get £45 for an hour for say a dance teacher. By the time this second wage is taken into account it works out at about £4.50 an hour [for teaching assistants] which is just appalling…because pathfinder can't pay for wages directly then you are never going to get value for money as you have to get outside providers in… there is no serious grading in the LA for TAs and I'd like to offer them a decent wage.'***

Some schools have not spent all of their allocation but most felt they will have done by the end of the summer term, even if this means running trips towards the end of term. Special School H have, in their own words, been 'slow to use the money' but this was deemed necessary in order to ensure the right sorts of activities were on offer and all staff, pupils and families knew about and were consulted about the subsidy. Some LAs are concerned that not all pupils will have benefited. The LA lead for Secondary F and Primary E was open in his concern that:

> ***'This year we see it as a pot of money and we'll use it as constructively as we can. But we are not going to spend the £300 for all children identified. In years two and three, as it is embedded, we'll be in a much better position to do that.'***

9.3   Additional support required

All schools were asked if there was any additional support they required in order to implement the subsidy effectively. As with the question on problems and barriers this question was open ended so responses will be the most 'top of mind' ones.

Over three quarters (77 per cent) of schools did require some additional support. Table 9.2 shows the responses given by all schools.

Many of the responses given related to the problems and barriers mentioned in section 9.1. In particular, the most commonly mentioned types of additional support needed, help with administration (26 per cent) and funding or assistance for school staff for the additional workload involved (12 per cent), were the same.

The other main theme emerging from these responses is that schools would like more guidance including: guidance on what the money can be spent on (nine per cent); information from other schools about their experiences (seven per cent); lists of providers and activities that can be offered (six per cent); and case studies or guidance from someone one with experience (six per cent).

Table 9.2 : Additional support required by schools in order to implement the subsidy effectively Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	
	%
Need someone to do the admin / cover administration costs	26
Money/remuneration / assistance for school staff in time given to implementing the subsidy	12
Clearer guidelines on what the money can be spent on	9
Need more time to plan / set up	7
Support from other schools - sharing the experience	7
Lists of providers and activities that can be offered	6
Need help/money for transport	6
Need someone with experience to help guide us through it / case studies	6
More support from local authority	5
Being told whether the subsidy / funding will continue in the future	4
Training for staff	2
Other answers	13
No answer	18
Don't know	5

Key Findings

- Two in five schools had encountered problems or barriers in implementing the subsidy, and this was more common amongst secondary schools than primary schools.

- The most frequently cited problem was the additional workload of organising or running the activities and, related to this, some schools mentioned the administration of the funding, and the lack of funding for administrative time.

- Nearly eight in ten schools would have liked some additional support to implement the subsidy; the two main areas of additional support schools wanted were:

   o Help with or funding for the time spent on administration and implementation of the subsidy

   o More guidance as to what the money can be spent on

10 Summary of differences between the flexible and defined models

Throughout this report, differences between the flexible and defined models have been highlighted, and these are collated and summarised here.

Table 11.1 : Differences between the flexible and defined models Base: All schools responding to the telephone survey (340)	Flexible model	Defined model
Proportion (%) of schools that agreed "The definition of disadvantage that we use is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils"	66	47
Proportion (%) of schools that thought the target group definition they use is very or quite effective in enabling them to reach children who cannot afford to pay	74	57
Proportion (%) of schools that have consulted with pupils in the target group about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy[24]	71	53
Average number of methods used to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group	2.4	1.9
Proportion (%) of schools that have used active methods (speaking to pupils) to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group	71	59
Proportion (%) of schools that were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group	83	70
On a scale of 0 to 10, the effect the subsidy has had so far on participation rates of the target group - average score	4.0	3.5
On a scale of 0 to 10, the effect it is expected the subsidy will have in the future on participation rates of the target group - average score	7.9	7.3
Amongst schools that had charged for (some) activities before the subsidy, the proportion (%) of schools that had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy[25]	49	36
Amongst schools that were working with external providers, the proportion (%) of schools that had formed new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy[26]	55	44
Proportion (%) of schools where the subsidy had enabled the school to provide new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils	69	49
Proportion (%) of schools where the subsidy has enabled the school to increase the number of activities it offers to economically disadvantaged pupils	70	49
Proportion (%) of schools where the subsidy has enabled the school to improve the quality of its' provision for economically disadvantaged pupils	71	52
Proportion (%) of schools where managing the subsidy funding caused an increase in staff workloads	85	64
	(n=231)	(n=109)

---

[24] Defined model schools were however just as likely as flexible model schools to have consulted with parents of pupils in the target group.
[25] These figures are based on subsample (schools that were charging for (some) activities before the introduction of the subsidy), this is 164 flexible model schools and 75 defined model schools.
[26] These figures are based on subsample (schools that were working with external providers), this is 202 flexible model schools and 97 defined model schools.

These differences show that schools following the flexible model were generally further ahead than those on the defined model in terms of consulting pupils, promoting activities, tracking take up, changing their charging practices, forming new partnerships with external providers, offering new activities and improving the quality of their provision for economically disadvantaged pupils. These higher levels of progress amongst flexible model schools may well explain why flexible model schools were more likely than defined model schools to report an increase in staff workloads, and why, on average those on the flexible model thought the subsidy had had a higher impact on participation rates so far than schools on the defined model.

This could all be a matter of timing - flexible model schools have made faster progress than defined model schools. However, schools on the flexible model were generally more positive than those on the defined model about the effectiveness of the target group definition they were using, and flexible model schools, on average, gave a higher score than defined model schools about the effect they thought the subsidy would have on participation rates of economically disadvantaged pupils. So this may suggest that giving schools flexibility leads to more successful implementation of the subsidy than asking schools to follow a more tightly prescribed model.

It should be borne in mind though that fieldwork for this survey took place between December 2008 and February 2009 when implementation of the subsidy was at a relatively early stage in many schools. More definitive conclusions about the relative merits of the flexible and defined models may be drawn at a later stage in the pathfinder.

11 Conclusions and implications for policy

This report has highlighted a number of findings which have important policy implications, for example, in providing evidence about the implementation and management of the subsidy. There are also considerations for further research and these have also been summarised below:

- There seemed, from case study interviews, to be factors which could be seen as facilitating the effective implementation of the subsidy pathfinder if present in certain schools both in general and in their approach this initiative. These include: effective consultation strategies and methods to promote take up and target/refer pupils; those with good levels of partnership working; those with PSAs and designated staff to support implementation; those with a committed senior management team and those with the full backing of the LA. Some LAs had developed their own information packs to inform schools and partners about the subsidy with example invoices and clear referral procedures. Schools where such factors were found gave the impression of 'forging ahead'.

- Schools on the flexible model were more positive about the effectiveness of their target group definition as a mechanism for engaging economically disadvantaged pupils. Where schools were involved in choosing the definition, views were even more positive. This emphasises the benefits that can be gained by involving individual schools in the initial development of target groups, and allowing them to use a wider range of factors than just free school meals and children in care. In contrast, most schools following the defined model thought that there were pupils that their definition missed. This illustrates some clear limitations of the defined model.

- A significant proportion of schools struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities. Secondary schools face particular difficulties. More work is needed to unpack the key problems that schools face in getting this group to take part in activities at the levels of trying a new activity and then encouraging sustained engagement.

- The survey identified a lack of interest from some pupils, although a more common problem was a lack of interest from parents. The case studies illustrate that the most successful school employed a range of strategies to both pupils and parents to ensure take-up, and that the need for such strategies was on-going. Strategies used with parents included: individual conversations; coffee mornings; and letters. Strategies with pupils have included the use of a pass-book to encourage ownership; taster sessions to draw young people to activities; individual meetings. Effective engagement strategies need to be shared amongst schools and local authorities. More specifically, good practice needs to be shared on the ways that schools might generate intent and motivation to take part in extended schools activities. For example, the qualitative mapping visits identified a local authority parenting expert who was tasked to help engage families. If parental 'buy-in' is gained then pupils are much more likely to engage with activities.

- With both parents and pupils, schools had expressed the need to take care with language used about the scheme. For the later rollout of the subsidy it should be suggested that schools rebrand and do not use the words 'disadvantage' or 'subsidy'.

- The survey confirms that schools who consult with parents and pupils are more likely to see a greater desire from pupils to participate in activities. However, a significant proportion of schools have introduced new activities without formal consultation. The benefits of effective consultation need to be reinforced amongst schools.

- Stigmatisation is a barrier to participation for many pupils. The survey confirms that schools who struggle to engage disadvantaged pupils feel that stigma is a particular challenge.

- Whether or not schools had previously targeted disadvantaged pupils to take part in extended schools activities has an impact on the success of the subsidy implementation. Schools that had previously targeted pupils were likely to be facing fewer barriers and had established mechanisms in place for engaging disadvantaged pupils. In contrast, schools with no experience of targeting sometimes struggled to engage pupils in activities. Further research planned for the second year of the subsidy pathfinder will show whether this is an ongoing issue, or whether schools that had not previously targeted disadvantaged pupils are able to 'catch up' once the subsidy is more embedded.

- The survey and case study interviews confirm that the subsidy has led to 'additionality' in some schools, with new activities or an increased offer present. The survey of parents and pupils (planned for autumn 2009) will shed further light on these issues and help determine whether parents and pupils perceive that a greater choice of activities is now on offer. Further collection of management information will also inform the evidence base on costs and additionality.

- There is strong evidence from both survey and case study interviews to suggest that schools are forming useful partnerships with external providers. Many schools had formed new partnerships since the introduction of the subsidy.

- The subsidy impacts on staff workload in different ways. In primary schools, headteachers and administrative support staff are more likely to see an increase in workload. In secondary schools, increased work pressures were more likely to be felt by other members of the senior management team or extended services co-ordinators. Strategies for coping with additional workload also vary. For example, secondary schools are more likely to be able to reassign work between staff. Management of extended schools activities are now more likely than before the extended schools roll-out to be accepted as legitimate school work. However, it seems clear that the management load of any additional requirement to what constitutes being an extended school cannot be ignored, and many schools are desperate for either administrative support or funding for the administration of the subsidy.

- Where schools already have PSAs (Parent Support Advisers), sports co-ordinators or other staff that are involved in the provision of extended services, guidance to schools might suggest that (workloads permitting) these staff members should take an important role in the implementation process to lessen the burden on headteachers and administrative staff.

- Many schools would value additional guidance on what the money can be spent on. In particular schools require more guidance as to whether the subsidy can be spent on transportation (this is a particularly important consideration in rural schools). A handbook might usefully be produced for the subsidy roll-out that could document, amongst other things, some possible flexible models, some issues to think of with respect to charging, the kind of spending that is permitted and what is not allowed; and ideas to encourage take-up.

- Guidance to schools might also suggest ways to tailor the subsidy to the individual contexts faced by schools. For example:

    o Where schools are already working with initiatives with similar aims, the subsidy can be strategically embedded with these other initiatives (schools involved with the Children's University have done this);

    o Secondary specialist schools can tie in the subsidy with their work around that;

    o Some schools have chosen to take a whole school approach and have embedded the subsidy with school plans such as behaviour contracts for pupils and individual education plans for pupils;

    o Other schools have talked about the importance of extended services co-ordinators having regular contact with the school.

- Throughout both the survey and case studies, there are clear differences between the defined and flexible models. Schools implementing the latter seem to have made greater progress and there is more evidence of benefits and positive outcomes. However, case study interviews suggest only that schools using the defined model are at an earlier stage in implementation, not that there is necessarily going to be less impact in the future. Further research planned for the second year of the pathfinder will show whether defined model schools make more progress once the subsidy has had more time to embed.

- The survey also highlights other demographic factors that have an impact on how successfully the subsidy is being implemented. For instance, schools with higher concentrations of disadvantaged pupils are more likely to have engaged in pupil and parent consultation. They are also more likely to have been previously targeting or providing support for disadvantaged pupils prior to the subsidy. Schools with lower concentrations of disadvantage have less experience of engaging these groups and as a consequence may require some additional support.

- Most schools think that the subsidy will have a positive impact on participation rates in the future. This is an encouraging finding, although the survey confirms that schools who struggle to engage disadvantaged pupils are less optimistic about the future. This reinforces the future need to identify and support these schools further.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Case study summaries

Secondary A

Flexible (urban, specialist science college and community school with 810 pupils on roll)

Emphasis on creating a good infrastructure for delivery involving consultation at various levels and an innovative promotions strategy. All pupils to benefit from the subsidy which is being used to set up new activities and to support the existing rewards programme.

Background

School A is the secondary school in an extended schools cluster, also comprised of nine primary schools and two special schools. The school has the highest proportion of pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds in the Local Authority. Young people in the school are described as 'parochial and insular,' rarely venturing outside of the immediate areas in which they live. There was, prior to the subsidy, limited community provision which was accessed by only a fraction of the student population. That offered by the Youth Service, for instance, was only available to young people aged thirteen and above and accessed only by a cohort of this group. The school have a history of offering extra curricular activities outside of school hours, the vast majority of which was free of charge and open to all. A longstanding incentivization scheme was in place for pupils and certain rewards e.g. visits to places of interest, did incur a charge of around £30.00.

The intention in School A was to use the subsidy to increase choice of activities available to pupils outside of school hours; to offer 'enrichment' opportunities giving 'life changing experiences;' to provide 'rewards' and 'treats' as part of the schools incentivization scheme and to encourage pupils to develop hobbies.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The Local Authority and participating schools are piloting the flexible model and have defined the criteria for selecting targeted pupils and families using the Acorn (A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods) index, a geodemographic system of post code level information drawn from Census data and lifestyle surveys. The index categorizes the population and one such category is that of 'hard pressed' families. In School A, almost 80% of families fall into the 'hard pressed' category. The school also drew on aspects of the LA developed 'vulnerability audit' which considers the domestic circumstances of young people and also factors such as special educational needs, health and exclusion data to identify the most needy pupils. The upshot of this analysis at school level was that all pupils in school would benefit from the subsidy - it was deemed discriminatory to exclude a small percentage of the school population.

Consultation

Pupils were consulted both formally and informally and in a variety of ways. Questionnaires were administered to all year groups, consultation was undertaken by student council representatives with their respective tutor groups and the school also hosted what they called a 'market day' consultation event. Around 40 pupils from School A attended the event during organised slots throughout the day and many more pupils dropped in during break

and lunch times. Moreover, pupil representatives and staff were invited from cluster schools. The purpose of the day was to broaden awareness amongst pupils of local providers and to consult with them about the activities they would like to do outside of school hours. The method of consultation used on this occasion was a message board in the form of a graffiti wall. The results were subsequently analysed by pupils at School A and discussed in tutor groups. Informal methods of consultation, described as 'conversations in the context of a relationship' are ongoing and comprised of conversations between staff and pupils in the school yard or canteen, and during Physical Education lessons.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Raising awareness of the subsidy and also of local providers was regarded as an important starting point and the 'market place' event aimed primarily to do that. School A has also adopted various other approaches to ensure all pupils know about the subsidy. These have included presentations during school assembly, letters to pupils and families, discussions in tutor groups and also conversations with pupils and their families during consultation evenings. The decision was taken for all pupils to benefit from the subsidy and the school were attentive of the need to sell it in a way that they all felt fully entitled to the offer. As such, the deputy head/cluster lead, advised pupils that the DCSF had rewarded them for their contribution to the school's recent outstanding Ofsted inspection by providing money to support them to access new activities.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

Whilst much of the provision is aimed at encouraging sustained take up of activities, there are also 'one off' opportunities for young people such as trips to places of interest, family outings and so on. For example, around Christmas time the subsidy funded a trip to the local theatre for a pantomime and it is also funding the transportations costs for a number of other trips to exhibitions and other places of interest. Holiday provision was available during February half term 2009 to certain pupils e.g. year 9 pupils went ice skating during half term and year 10 and 11 pupils enjoyed a day of go-carting, as a thank you to those who had helped out at the senior citizen's Christmas Party. Discussing impact of the subsidy the deputy head/cluster lead at School A said:

'**This has made choice wider and given loads of new opportunities and choice for them to do something they really wanted to do so they can try something different, something that parents wouldn't have been able to afford…kids know that they can ask for what they want and that school will do something about it.**' And: '**They wouldn't, for instance, have been able to go to the pantomime. This is broadening experiences.**'

Prior to the subsidy, activities before and after school tended to be limited to those that staff were willing to offer and whilst there was some choice, the provision tended to be more extra-curricular and sports focused (the breakfast club being an exception). In response to consultation with pupils, School A was able to set up a much wider variety of provision outside of school hours including street dance and hip hop, Bollywood dancing, cookery, cheerleading, digital photography, art, first aid and for Y10 and 11 girls' health and beauty. Some of this provision had commenced before February half term 2009 although much of it was due to start soon after the holiday period. Pupils who had accessed provision to date spoke positively about their experience: '**I went to the pantomime and it was free but I may have still gone if it wasn't free, but the fact that it was free was good.**' '**We got to go as we had got 95% for attendance and everyone, well almost everyone from year 8 went.**' '**It was a good opportunity and shows that hard work pays off.**'

Partners

Key partners include the Council's Leisure Service and Play Service and also the Community Education Service. School A also works closely with a local organisation which helps set up and facilitate extended school activities. The school reocognises: **'We couldn't do it if it was just about what schools can provide. We need outside providers and partnership working.'** (deputy head/cluster lead). The school endeavours to develop partnerships with a range of community providers and the 'market place' event was designed to do this and was successful in attracting representation from a range of partners including the local Children's Centre, the Play Service, a local wildlife centre and staff from the city's football club outreach education centre. Some area based providers also attended, some of whom are now running extended activities after school.

Funding activities and charging policy

School A has a history of providing out of school hours provision for pupils free of charge and was reluctant, therefore, to introduce a charging policy. In the past rewards such as trips to the Clothes Show Live exhibition were available only to those pupils who were eligible for a reward e.g. 95% attendance, and if parents could cover the cost of the activity. The subsidy has made it possible for more pupils to access rewards and has enabled a raft of new activities to be set up for pupils to access without charge.

Management and workload

School staff and external providers run the activities that have been set up as a result of the subsidy. There is a culture in School A of school staff volunteering to run activities for a nominal fee and there have been no complaints about extra workload. There have, however, been implications for administration staff with some reporting it difficult to manage paper work and bookings. Management in school and LA co-ordinators have reported a 'massive workload' and to ease the burden a school based co-ordinator has been appointed in School A to help set up new activities.

Primary B

Defined (Located in a disadvantaged built up area of a more rural extended school cluster)

A model of implementation focused on setting up new activities in school and introducing a charging policy. Taster sessions were delivered to encourage take up

Background

School B, is one of 10 primary schools in a larger extended schools cluster, also consisting of two secondary schools and a special school. The cluster, described as 'very diverse both geographically and historically' has a rich heritage and a mining past connecting many of the rural villages served by the cluster. The area served by the school is deprived and the transport infrastructure is poor.

School B aimed to provide a rich and varied range of activites through a multi-agency approach and to achieve 80% of the target group accessing the subsidy in the way prescribed by the defined model.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School B is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Consultation

Consultation was carried by class registration teachers who asked questions and counted responses. Pupils were provided with a menu of 30 activities from which to choose but they were also given the opportunity to identify activities not on the list that they would like to do. Providing a menu from which to chosose was deemed important as: **'Often students will say football because they know what football is about'** (Cluster Co-ordinator). Pupils were consulted in the local youth clubs and in school via the school council, and an additional and more innovative method of consultation involved using photos of pupils and asking them to write against their name the activities they would like to do. This data was subsequently analysed by year group and activities were set up in response to this.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Letters have been sent out to families of chidlren entitled to the subsidy. This was deemed the **'quickest and most discrete way of letting the parents of FSM children know that they can access extended school activities with no additional financial burden to themselves'** (quote taken from the Cluster action plan for 2008-09). Information about the subsidy has been included in newsletters, the school website and flyers, and discussed in assembly. Meetings are also taking place with key partners including Sure Start, the Play Development Service and a local organisation specialising in family support, to encourage these organisations to promote take up. Another strategy to promote take up has involved offering taster sessions.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

The intention was to offer a **'Breadth of activities to give individuals a wide choice and broaden their horizons'** (quote taken from cluster has a action plan for 2008-09)
The activities on offer at School B, many of which have been set up since the launch of the subsidy, include: gymnastics, ICT animation, multi-sports, football, gardening, dance & drama, crafts, hockey, cookery, judo, Lego, games, dancing, basket ball. The multi-sports club has recently been extended to include provision for children from reception to year 2 (filling a genuine gap as peviously there was 'nothing for them.') The cookery club is open to families and promoted as a family activity and there is the intention to set up other activities that siblings and parents might access. Also some provision piloted at school has been set up at the local youth centre e.g. fencing and is open to children in School B and other cluster schools.

During half term the school had an ice rink on site open to all children in local schools and a summer school is being planned which will incorporate a range of activities including cookery, arts and crafts and sports. School B also promote provision available locally during the holidays at the leisure centre. Activities at the centre for young people aged 5 -13 include trampolining, multi-sports, orienteering, bouldering, and an activity named 'nature detectives.' The centre also arrange trips to other local providers for rock climbing and for arts and crafts and give young people the opportunity to do other 'chill out' activities of their choice such as watching DVDs or using the play station. For one single parent family in particular this provision over February half term was a life line as Mum had recently come out of hospital and was instructed by medical professionals that she would need to rest this week. She could not have afforded to pay for her son to attend and was thrilled to hear that he could engage in supervised activities without charge.

School is recording take up of school based provision. The teacher responsible for implementing the subsidy in school explained: **'Last year we had eight clubs and 18.5 % of children on free schools meals were attending them whereas now 58% of children [on FSM] are attending [21 clubs] and that's only in the first two terms, autumn and spring'** She added: **'We trialled charging children to go to clubs at lunchtime and unsurprisingly we had two paying children and 40 FSM.'** 20 children attend Lego club after school and up to 100 go to the lunchtime Lego club – about 30 of these are entitled to free school meals. Cookery club attracts 10-11 children, all of whom access the subsidy, and there is a waiting list for the next course. Regarding the work to target a particular cohort of disadvantaged children the same teacher said: **'All children on the child protection register are coming to at least two hours a week. There are ten families we've targeted; involving 17children and this has been really good'.** School is also recording feedback from pupils and parents who are particularly enthused and are: '…**already saying 'when is your next list of activities coming out.'**

Partners

Existing supporting projects which are built around partnership working include the area EAZ, School Sports Partnership, Community Sports Network, Play schemes, Sure Start, FE colleges, the regional development agency, and healthy schools. The school also works in partnership with a number of local providers, for example community youth clubs, the local leisure centre, sports clubs, brownie and guides etc and has links with Social Services and the Youth Service.

Funding activities and charging policy

The cluster co-ordinators deploy available funding to schools to deliver key objectives. A charging policy was introduced in the cluster so that only certain activities, and mainly those run by school staff, are free e.g. choir, 'chill out' club and some ICT after school provision. Moreover, tag-rugby club is offered free to all for a 6 week trial period.
Breakfast club is £1.50 per session; lego club £3.00 per 6 weeks (lego was purchased through the subsidy); film club £3.00 per 6 weeks; cookery club £6.00 per 6 weeks for chidlren in reception to year 2 and £9.00 per 6 weeks for chidlren in years 3-6 (an additonal cooker was purchased through the subsidy); gardening £6.00 per 6 weeks, multi-sports £4.00 per two hour session, arts and crafts £9.00 per 6 weeks; Dance £12.00 for 6 weeks, ICT club (which is additional to other ICT focused activities which are free of charge) did run at a cost of £6 for 6 weeks but school have since decided to offer this club without charge. The teacher in school with repsonsibility for the subsidy noted: **'Last time we ran the ICT club we charged and this term we've not charged and attendance has rocketed'.** Breakfast club is charged for all chidlren, regardless of whether they are entitled to subsidy funding but other activities can be access without charge for the targetted cohort. In the near future an orienteering club will be set up with the support of subsidy funding to have the school mapped and a summer school is currently being planned for which there will be a charge of £2 per day.

A local sports provider charges £1 for an hour of activites although provision is free for pupils entitled to the subsidy. Local providers generally request payment in advance for a ten week course and subsequently invoice the school. The local leisure centre provide holiday activities at a subsidised rate of around £5.00 per day and for families entitled to the subsidy there will be no charge. They can also access the fencing club at a local youth club free of charge and get financial support with their weekly subs for the centre. The local rugby club have received money from the Community Chest (funding stream) and this is being matched by extended school subsidy funding. This enables the provider to go into School B and other cluster schools to offer rugby training and also means that transport costs are covered and children entitled to the subsidy can receive financial support to purchase kits and attend rugby camp.

Management and workload

Teaching assistants run many of the activities after school and the subsidy is co-ordinated by a teacher in school who has Wednesday afternoons as non teaching time. This was deemed sufficient time to implement and co-ordinate the subsidy. The school is supported by a cluster co-ordinator appointed for the subsidy.

Secondary C

Defined (An Enterprise Trust school located in an inner city. Around 540 pupils on roll)

A model of implementation focused initially on one year group and on opening up the opportunity for pupils to go on a week long residential. These pupils are now contacted to access at least two hours of activities per week during term time. One to one meetings with this cohort of pupils, and parents, to encourage uptake.

Background

School C is a secondary school in an extended school cluster comprised of nine other schools (primary, infant or first schools). The school has approximately 540 pupils on roll including sixth form pupils and around 90 pupils are entitled to free school meals. There are 10 looked after children in school. The school is located in a disadvantaged area within one of the poorest Wards in the LA and serves multiple council housing estates. There has been an influx of families in recent years from Portugal and Poland and more recently from Afghanistan. School C is an enterprise trust school with a tradition of offering 'enrichment activities' aimed at inspiring pupils. The school aimed to build on this work during the pathfinder, encouraging more pupils to benefit from the existing programme of after school provision. Moreover, it was hoped that the subsidy could enable pupils to attend residential and other trips aimed at learning and enjoyment.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School C is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Consultation

The LA has been undertaking some consultation with pupils as part of the subsidy programme. Whilst surveys were administered to all pupils irrespective of any entitlement to the subsidy, data relating to those pupils in the criteria group was extracted and analysed. In School C pupils have also been consulted via tutor groups and the students' council so that the school has a good idea of new activities to introduce in the future. The school also sent surveys to parents to ascertain activities they felt that they children might benefit from and intends to dedicate time to consult with parents during consultation days.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

The assistant head invited all parents of year 8 pupils, and the pupils themselves, to meet with him on a one to one basis to discuss a) the residential and b) other activities that pupils might engage in outside of school hours. It was explained to pupils and parents that funding was available to cover the cost of the residential on the condition that pupils agreed to attend, over a sustained period of time, at least two hours of after school hours activities each week. The assistant head was sensitive when talking with pupils and parents, not to use any negative language but instead to use the term 'entitlement'. This approach is appreciated by parents, one of whom explained: **'The lovely thing here is that we are never made to feel like poor parents…[name of assistant head] is dealing with it so you are not going in cap in hand and feeling humiliated.'**

The assistant head also wrote to parents of pupils in other year groups and sent out flyers to advertise locally provided activities. He explained: **'We've written to all parents and said students were entitled to around £300 each. I explained they [pupils] could do anything as long as it was regular'.** Response has been poor and so one to one meetings are to be held with all eligible pupils in different year groups, and with parents.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

A key aim of the subsidy at School C was to ensure that year 8 pupils were a) not prevented due to financial reasons, from participating in a week long residential and b) were accessing at least two hours of activities after school, selected from the existing programme of provision on offer prior to the subsidy. Half of year 8 pupils went on the residential and all but two pupils entitled to the subsidy took part (one pupil was too poorly to attend and the other did not want to be away from home). During their stay, pupils took part in a range of 'lessons with a difference' e.g. one of the science sessions involved handling exotic animals; during a PE lesson pupils used a rowing machines and took part in a rowing race; and in a history lesson pupils learnt about native American Indians. Activities were staffed by the organisation learning on Location. On an evening, pupils could choose from a range of activities on offer at the camp and these included disco dancing, swimming, bowling, and pupils could also go to the on site cinema or fun fair. Feedback from pupils and parents was overwhelmingly positive and included:

'There were a wide range of activities for us. On other trips you have fun but I learnt and had fun.' (Pupil)

'[Before the residential]…She'd had some fragmented friendships and now she has friends for life…She came back all grown up and independent. There was the whole learning experience and the trip was fun…she has the memories for the rest of her life…to find the money was going to be a real struggle and so when the funding came through it was a massive relief. She came back with a real pride for the school…this really was a life changing experience. [Name of daughter] is working harder and she is much more confident. Her communication and speaking up in class has all changed' She added: **'…that trip has made up for a year of no holidays…I can't say enough about how I feel about it, about her social skills and being responsible…it's given them life skills for the rest of their lives.'** (Parent)

When asked how they got the opportunity a pupil said: **'Sir said he'd pay for it and I was happy coz I didn't need to worry as Mum doesn't get much money…If you can't afford it, it is good that they can help out.'**

All pupils who accessed subsidy funding signed up to do a minimum of two hours of activities per week at school. According to the deputy head, almost all pupils have kept to their agreement and the pupils we spoke with confirmed this, explaining that they now regularly attend a range of activities including homework and spelling club, drama, sports provision (around 50% of which is run by coaches through the sports co-ordination team), table tennis and basket ball at lunchtimes and some of the more recently established after school clubs such as street dance, rollerblading, and cheerleading.

Another element of the work at School C was to encourage pupils from other year groups to access provision locally, for which they could access using their subsidy entitlement. Despite schools' efforts to advertise local provision and encourage take up, the latter has proven difficult to establish with only a small percentage of pupils accessing funding for this e.g. swimming at the local leisure centre and electric guitar lessons.

Partners

The sports co-ordination team are identified as a main partner for School C and its feeder schools. 'Learning on Location' is the name of the company that organised activities during the year 8 residential.

The intention is for School C to engage a wide range of providers and they are working closely with the LA to identify strategies to do this. The school feel that the regional association of youth clubs will come on board to help set up and run holiday provision. The expectation is that, as the subsidy progresses, there will be scope to link strategically with the Children's University as a way to help sustain provision for younger pupils.

Funding activities and charging policy

The residential was charged at £185.00 per pupil but free for eligible pupils.
The school has a longstanding policy of not charging for the vast majaority of after school activities and the programme of free provision in place before the subsidy continues to run. The few activities that do incur a charge (e.g. £2.50 per session for street dance and £2.50 for cheerleading) are on offer to pupils entitled to the subsidy at no charge. Pupils are also encouraged to access local, community based, provision for which there is a charge and access subsidy funding to cover the cost.

Management and workload

The assistant head is leading on the subsidy at School C. In the absence of a cluster co-ordinator (who emigrated towards the beginning of the subsidy), he is supported by an operational manager from the LA who spends the majority of her time supporting cluster schools with the implementation and co-ordination of the subsidy. Teaching staff continue to run some of the activities in school which they did prior to the subsidy, and sixth formers also help facilitate some of the activities. Administrative work has been undertaken by the existing team and bursar and whilst there has been a substantial increase in workload this has been managed to date because of goodwill of staff. As the homework club in the library runs till later, the hours of the library staff have been increased to accommodate this.

Primary D

Flexible (urban and deprived school within diverse cluster. 300 pupils on roll)

> **Flexible model using a vulnerability audit and Acorn Index to define the target group. A charging policy has been introduced and a range of new term time and holiday activities in response to consultation. Some interesting approaches to partnership working.**

Background

Primary School D is located in a deprived, inner city community within a cluster of extended schools which is geographically dispersed and socio-economically diverse. The cluster in which the school is part consists of a further 6 primary schools and a secondary school. There are seven looked after children in school and a similar number of young people on the child protection register. The percentage of free school meals is around 34% and the percentage of pupils with special educational needs reaches 30% in certain year groups. Prior to the subsidy, there were some school based activities from 3.20pm until 4.00pm, three nights a week, and a youth club in the local community. School based provision was generally offered at no cost. School D had a clear objective to develop a range of new activities for pupils both before and after school, and during the holidays, to reflect what young people said they wanted. The school also planned to introduce a charging policy which they anticipated would help them to sustain extended school activities.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The LA and participating schools are piloting the flexible model and have defined the criteria for selecting targeted pupils and families using the Acorn (A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods) index, a geodemographic system of post code level information drawn from Census data and lifestyle surveys. The index categorizes the population and one such category is that of 'hard pressed' families. In School D, almost around 70% of pupils fall into the 'hard pressed' category. The school also drew on aspects of the LA developed 'vulnerability audit' which considers the domestic circumstances of young people and also factors such as special educational needs, health and exclusion data to identify the most needy pupils. Not all pupils meet the criteria to access funding, although the vast majority do.

Consultation

School D used some more traditional methods of consultation including surveys and letters to parents requesting feedback and suggestions. Pupils and parents were also asked about their preferences at opportune moments (e.g. when parents collected pupils from school).

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Once the consultation data had been analysed a menu of activities was produced and letters went out to parents explaining that the new provision on offer was set up to reflect the feedback provided by pupils and families. On the letters, the school specified both full and subsidised rates for activities, explaining that the cost was incurred as specialist external coaches were running much of the provision. The letter provided contact details and suggested that parents speak with the school business manager if they were unsure if they were eligible for the subsidised rates. School D also hosted some information sessions, for example, an induction evening was held for all parents who wanted to find out more about the Easter residential for pupils.

Another strategy to encourage take up, involved trialling a small number of activities initially (e.g. guitar lessons, 'wake up shake up' breakfast club), to see how pupils responded. Providers were bought in for the activities but costs were not passed on to pupils during the trial period.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

Holiday provision was set up for February half term for pupils in School D. This ran daily from 08.30am until 4.00pm and incorporated a good range of activities including 'junk music', gardening / environmental club, boxercise, 'mad science', street dance, 'yogasize', 'wake up shake up / dance / drama', junior first aid, rugby coaching, cheerleading, 'learn to be a magician', karate, fashion and beauty, football, cricket and American football. All activities were set up in response to consultation and the plan is for a similar programme of activities to be offered to pupils during two weeks of the summer holiday period. In addition, an Easter residential has been organised to the Scottish Borders for a week long 'activity focused' holiday. Within 2 days of advertising the residential 60 children had signed up to attend and about 70% of those were benefitting from a subsidised rate. Regarding the trip the school business manager said: **'…this is all about opportunities for young people who don't get a holiday.'**

During term time, a daily breakfast club has been set up and an after school club, running five evenings a week, has also been established in response to feedback from parents. The club runs from 3.20pm until 4.20pm and those children who usually attend the community based youth club after school, are collected by mini bus and transported to the community venue at 4.20pm. The after school club encompasses computer club, home learning, art and craft and games. Those pupils who attend other extra curricular provision (which runs until 4.00pm on Mondays - Wednesdays) can join the after school club at 4.00pm for the last 20 minutes, thus offering them the choice to attend existing provision and combine this with elements of the new offer. School D also offers a range of other (some pre-existing) after school clubs on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays including guitar, 'make and do', film, football, drawing, 'sticky kids', computer, 'design sew and make', skipping, rounders, arts and crafts, woodwork, orienteering, sewing, '8 warriers' (non contact fighting) and dance. Some activities are targetted at KS1 or KS 2 pupils and a number of activities are linked to the curriculum. In addition, School D is using some of the subsidy to host two hands-on workshops, to run after school, to which the company 'Zoo Lab' will bring a range of exotic animals. This compliments various elements of the science curriculum.

Pupils are highly enthusiastic about the activities on offer. Talking about the new 'wake up shake up' breakfast club, which attracts around 25 pupils daily, one young person said: **'It means I get up and play with my friends before school…we play games and you look to it and enjoy it and now I get up extra early.'** Other pupils explained: **'There is lots to do and we get to try out new things'** and, **'...there are loads of clubs, all for us to choose from, [listed] on a piece of paper.'** Parents are as sanguine when discussing holiday provision, one noting that she is comfortable in the knowledge that her son is in safe hands after school and during the holidays, and is accessing a range of enjoyable activities.

Partners

The school is working closely with two local organisations which specialize in running holiday provision and a local provider company which is facilitating some of the new activities which now run after school. They also draw on support from the 'bike it officer' in the LA for cycling proficiency and an external tutor comes in to school to provide guitar lessons.

School D were aware of the exisiting community based youth club which offered after school provision for local young people and they did not wish to duplicate this existing offer. After careful negotiations between the school and the youth club, an arrangement was made whereby the youth club collects pupils from the school at 4.20pm and transports them to their own base. The school, the youth club, parents and partners are reported to be happy with this arrangement.

Funding activities and charging policy

A charging policy has been introduced in school with activities on offer at a subsidised rate for those pupils entitled to the subsidy. The prices for the February 2009 half term holiday provision were: 08.30am-12.00pm £5 subsidised £3; 1.00pm-4.00pm £5 subsidised £3; Full day £12 subsidised £7; Full week £55 subsidised £30

The Easter residential has been costed at £125 per child including all activities with a reduced rate of £50 for those pupils entitled to the subsidy. Some provision at School D is free e.g. breakfast club is being trialled at no charge for all (although it is anticipated that a charge will soon be introduced) and cycling triaining for reception and KS1 incurrs no charge. There is a £1 a day charge for after school club although the activites which run as part of the traditional programme of after school provision (with clubs running until 4.00pm) are all free with the exception of guitar club, charged at £2.

Management and workload

A business manager at School D has responsibility for the subsidy. There has been an impact on the time she has spent organising activities but this is, in her view, time well spent in that pupils and families are benefitting and the school is also fulfilling an important strand of the extended schools core offer. External providers run many of the clubs after school along with teachers who also offered their time prior to the introduction of the subsidy. Those ten teachers who will accompany pupils on the Easter residential will be paid for their time.

Secondary E

Defined (an urban Science College with around 630 pupils on roll. Also a national challenge school)

The subsidy, branded 'Give it a Go' is enabling pupils to access a range of activities during 'enrichment week.' Focus also on encouraging take up of local provision with partners and PSAs (Parent Support Advisers) making referrals.

Background

School E is part of a very large cluster of 32 schools. The area served by the school has been identified by Government Office as a low super output area and within the most deprived 10% of areas in England. 95% of pupils live within walking distance of the school and around 90 pupils are entitled to free school meals.

School E has a history of offering extended school provision including an annual 'activity focused' enrichment week. There is, however, a lack of commitment from young people to engage in activities on a regular basis, largely because of the disruptive lives that many lead. The headteacher regards the subsidy as a way to encourage sustained commitment and hoped that participation in activities will become 'the norm.'

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School E is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Consultation

The school has undertaken formal and informal consultation and have drawn heavily on extensive consultation recently undertaken through the Children's University (over 1000 young people and parents were consulted across the cluster). In addition to surveys conducted in School E, pupils are also regularly consulted by staff running and co-ordinating extended activities, as are parents who access family focused provision and support in school.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

The subsidy has been branded 'Give it a go!' Carefully worded letters went out to parents informing them of the subsidy, along with a form so that they could refer their children to local provision. The in house extended schools co-ordinator also spoke to all 90 pupils by year group, either in groups or individually and she also promotes the subsidy when speaking informally with parents and pupils, and through school assembly. These strategies prompted a response of around 80% from the targetted group and the intention is to follow up those who have not accessed the subsidy with phone calls to parents and perhaps some home visits. Another method of promoting provision is offering taster sessions and the school, with the support of the LA, have commisioned certain providers to offer these in school.

Regarding this the school's extended school co-ordinator said: **'We need tasters like this as some young people just say football and they are not interested in anything else.'** School E feels strongly that some pupils need additional support to access local provision and whilst there is not the capacity currently for someone like a mentor, sports champion, or youth worker, to accompany them, this is something that they will not rule out for the future.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

School also now offer music tuition to pupils and 15 pupils are now taking music lessons that have not previously accessed them. One pupil discussed this:

'I do clarinet. I'd never done it before but I spoke to my parents and they liked the idea so we filled in the form. I've done it for a term and I'm going to keep at it. I wouldn't be able to do this otherwise.'

Another central focus of the subsidy has been funding activities for eligible pupils during enrichment week. The offer in summer term 2009 included a residential trip to a theme park, trips to London, camping and outward bound holidays, fishing trips and an 'adrenaline junkie' trip. Previously, **'All the middle class kids did all the wonderful things whilst the working class kids stayed and played rounders'** (headteacher). 20 pupils have requested funding for this purpose and one of these pupils discussed what this meant for him:

'I'm going to [residential trip to a theme park] for about four days…It's in July and I feel great I can go. If it wasn't for this I'd be at school doing juggling.' His Dad added: **'It gives him the opportunity to do things he wouldn't be able to do coz we couldn't afford it.'** Another pupil also discussed the subsidy saying:

'During activities week in the summer I'm getting to go to [residential trip to a theme park] coz this is for children in care and those getting free school meals, [name of staff member at school] told me. I spoke to my carers and said I'd always wanted to go and they think it is a good opportunity coz they don't have to pay. I would never have got to go as it is a hundred and something pound…my mate got the money also and so it's really good.'

Much emphasis has also been placed on encouraging take up of local provision through introducing a referral mechanism, whereby parents, partners and Parent Support Advisers (PSAs) can refer to local providers. This process has been facilitated by a promotion strategy involving local providers offering taster sessions in school. Pupils and families have the flexibility to choose the activities they wish to do. One family, for instance, has requested that three siblings go to an outward bound residential during the summer holidays where they get to try activities like archery and abseiling. Currently only a small number of pupils and families have asked to partake in activities that are not offered by the school but with ongoing promotion of activities the expectation is that these numbers will increase considerably.

Partners

The school are able to promote a wide range of activities provided by a good range of providers. The local sports and leisure centre offer, for instance, various sports, acrobatic and gymnastics clubs, a variety of dance classes including 'new age' and 'street and hip hop', tae kwon do classes and trampolining. For young people in years 7 and 8 and those in feeder schools, there is also an 'active kidz holiday club', cycling proficiency (2 days course during holidays for young people aged 5-16) and a Saturday morning 'active kidz' club. The school also promotes a local youth volunteering project, arts and crafts provision at the local community centre and advertises a range of local clubs and groups for young people e.g. boxing, karate, football and basketball clubs, army cadets, girl guides and scouts, dance and drama schools. Steps are in place to ensure that local providers are suitable / accredited and parents are asked to sign a disclaimer meaning they also do their own risk assessment.

The Local Authority have provided partners with an information pack including sections on safeguarding, invoicing and referral, and partners are encouraged to refer eligible pupils for subsidy funding to cover the cost of certain activities. There are very strong links in the cluster to the Children's University (CU), or 'Youth University' as it is referred to in School E. The aims of both were identifird to be largely similar as was the focus on engaging young people from deprived backgrounds. The pathfinder has benefitted from emerging partnerships with CU providers and also the commissioning process for CU.

Funding activities and charging policy

Subsidy funding is held centrally in LA and referral forms go through to the subsidy team in the Authority. In School E, pupils are encouraged to access local provision for which there will be a charge and those entitled to the subsidy will have most, if not all, costs paid for through the subsidy. Funding can also cover joining fees, insurance, equipment and transportation costs.

There is a charge for the trips offered during activity week at School E. For example, the London trip costs £260 and the 'adrenaline junkie' trip is charged at £190.00. These costs are now covered for pupils entitled to the subsidy. Certain school based activities incurr a small charge for all pupils, for example, the breakfast club is charged at 20p per day.

Management and workload

School E benefits from having an ES co-ordinator and a head committed to the initiative and they receive support from a cluster co-ordinator. Workload is deemed to be manageable.

Junior F

Defined (a three form entry denominational school for pupils aged 7 to 11 years, located in a large extended schools cluster)

Background

School F is a Church of England Junior school in a cluster comprised of 16 other schools. The town served by the school has an indigenous population of 10 thousand but there are many newcomers to the town including 'alternatives' who are drawn to the spiritual aspect of the community. Residents of the town are quite parochial and tend not to cross the road bridge to another nearby town.

There are 39 children in school eligible for free school meals and one child in care. School already offered an after school 'fun club' three evenings a week and the local infant feeder school hosts the club two evenings a week. The school aimed to build on exisiting provision and extend the choice available to pupils.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School F is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Consultation

The PSA undertook consultation in school with pupils and parents. Surveys were conducted and data has been analysed to inform new activities.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

The PSA puts letters for parents in book bags of pupils and she is contacting by telephone those families that she has not yet received a response from. She has also advertised in the school newsletter and for certain activities she has specified a booking period e.g for swimming lessons she specified that responses must be received within the week. Letters have also been sent to parents advertising local provision and parents and young people have been advised that they have a £300.00 'grant.' The PSA explained: **'I insisted on parents knowing the amount of £300…Parents are now saying they have some money left over.'**

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

The after school fun club offers pupils a range of activities including football, multi-skills (including tag rugby and gymnastics) dance and netball. A walking bus transfers children between the junior and the infant schools. School also offers music tuition for pupils eligible for the subsidy.

A focus of the implementation at School F, and in other schools in the cluster, involves promoting access to a range of activities in the locality. The school actively encourages take up of provision at the local leisure centre, located in a cluster secondary school. Here a drama club runs on Saturdays for 6-8 yr olds and another for young people aged 9-13 years. Also, on Saturday morning there is fencing at the centre for young people aged 7+ and breakdancing for those aged 6+. For older pupils in year 6 (and secondary pupils) there is a gameplaying club for players of Warhammer and 40K. In addition there are lots of evening classes e.g. judo, karate, trampolining on Mondays; gymnastics, Tae Kwon Do, Pilates and Fencing on Tuesdays; Karate on Wednesdays; Badminton on Thursdays; and Tae Kwon Do on Fridays.

School F also promotes uptake of activities run through a local sports association at two other cluster schools. This includes badminton, gymnastics, trampolining and for year 6 stduents, climbing. There are also ceramics workshops (fortnightly for 6 weeks) on Saturday mornings for pupils aged 8 and above. Moreover activities are promoted at two further leisure centres, meaning pupils have access to a wide range of sports focused activities from swimming to dodge ball.

School F also promotes local holiday provision, for example that offered by the town's Play Scheme, and activities on offer at the three leisure centes, and it also employs specialist sports coaches to offer sessions on the school site during the holiday periods.

According to the PSA at School F: **'There has been a massive increase in participation. Almost a 100% take up.'** The subsidy has removed financial barriers for many families, including the family discussed in this account:

'[prior to the subsidy]…one home time there was a Year 1 child crying bitterly that she wanted to do 'dance club.' Mum looked embarrassed and was trying to get the little girl to come with her. Mum explained that, at £3.50 a session, she just couldn't afford for her daughter to go. She had two other children and if one wants something the others will want it as well. The £3.50 suddenly becomes £10.50.' (PSA)

Partners

Partenrship working is a central component of the offer at School F. As outlined above, many of the activities promoted are delivered at the local leisure centre in conjunction with the sports association which delivers activities in various cluster schools. The local leisure centre, based at a cluster school, can refer pupils to the range of activities on offer. A wider range of other local providers are part of the wider extended schools partnership. These include, for example, a local dance company which offers breakdancing and creative dance sessions; and a theatre group which runs no obligation taster sessions and a regular Saturday afternoon club. They also have good working links with two other local leisure centres and numerous sports providers for term time and holiday provision.

PSAs are seen as vital to the success of the subsidy. Through their work with families and pupils they are key referers and have been fully briefed on the range of partners involved in the subsidy. Providers are also encouraged to refer pupils to the subsidy and each are provided with an information pack covering issues such as invoicing, referring pupils (these forms go to the LA officers who hold the budget and monitor take up of the subsidy), and safeguarding policy. The subsidy schools and partners can also work with a company specialised in ensuring local providers are accredited companies.

Funding activities and charging policy

The 'fun club' provision is charged at £3.50 from 3.15pm -4.30pm, a further £3.50 from 4.30pm -5.30pm and an additional £2.50 for the period 5.30pm-6.00pm.

Activities at the leisure centre at the local secondary school are individually priced. Drama club is charged at £33.75 for 9 weeks for 6-8 yr olds or £58.50 for 9-13 years; the gamesplaying club (Warhammer and 40K) is £5 per session. The cost of holiday provision varies, depending on provider. Provision offered through the town's Play Scheme is £12 per day (09am-3pm) Local theature and drama groups have pre-existing charging policies e.g. the local theatre school charges £150 per term. Musical instrument tuition typically costs around £6 per half hour for shared sessions and sports activities run by the county sports coaching service are on offer at £3.50 per hour term-time and £12.00 per day during school holidays.

For eligible pupils, all of these activities are on offer free of charge, providing pupils are referred through the correct procedure.

Management and workload

A PSA is co-ordinating and managing the implementation of the subsidy in School F and in a nearby infant school. She is supported by a cluster co-ordinator for the subsidy. Due to the other demands of her role, the amount of time the PSA now dedicates to the subsidy is less than half a day a week, although in the early stages of implementation she spent considerably more time liaising with partners and parents, much to the objection of the headteacher.

Secondary G

Flexible (city based non selective comprehensive school for 1000 female pupils)

Means tested benefit used as criteria for defining the target group. School promotes existing and new school based provision, offers subsidised places on school trips and also signposts to provision offered by partners.

Background

Secondary School G is an all girls school in the heart of a large city.

The cluster in which secondary School G is located is part of a Community Improvement Partnership (CIP), established three years ago, which includes 14 schools (4 secondary and 10 primary). The area served by the cluster is deprived.

School G offered a range of free activities prior to the subsidy although the initiative was regraded as an opportunity to '*extend provision and try new things … go to the next level really.'* It is anticipated that the subsidy will generate Every Child Matters outcomes and in the longer term, will lead to raised levels of achievement for the targetted cohort.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The subsidy is available to any family in receipt of a means-tested benefit. Some 'special circumstances' also include pupils experiencing bereavement, looked after children and young carers.

Consultation

The school conducts formal questionnaires every 18 months and also undertakes regular surveys of users of extended provision. More recently this has involved surveying users of the summer provision 2008 which was offered through the subsidy. For the purpose of the subsidy, School G was able to draw on existing consultation and audit data which it has supplemented with recent consultation involving surveys conducted in schools across the cluster.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

The LA compiled databases of children known to School G as 'economically disadvantaged' using measures such as Free School Meals, Looked After Children, Uniform Grants and Leisure Card holders. As the criteria for eligibility is 'receipt of means tested benefit,' staff are not always aware which families meet the criteria and have to be sensitive when making enquires with families. One strategy, when writing to parents to advise of the subsidy, and to consult with them about choice of provision, involved asking parents if they received one or more from a list of means-tested benefits.

The extended schools co-ordinator actively encourages pupils to take up provision, as does the family support worker and other extended school staff such as the school nurse, and the intention is to encourage local providers to raise awareness of the subsidy. Flyers are used to advertise activities, the school have distributed brochures advertising holiday provision and activities are promoted via the school website.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

Discussing the focus of the model adopted at School G, the LA lead for the subsidy explained:

'Obviously it is about choice and flexibility…there are some activities which weren't [previously] offered, but also it's about maximising what we've already got, getting that information out that those activities are available.'

During summer 2008 a programme of new activities was offered to pupils including pool kayaking, boxing, kite flyer and 'rock band' club for pupils aged 13-16 year olds. The club for wannabe rock stars, and the boxing club now continue as regular after-school clubs. A Friday Evening Club for 10 to 13 years olds, available to all pupils in the cluster, was also set up during the summer holidays 2008 and this is also on-going. Discussing the boxing club a parent said: **'It was brilliant though absolutely brilliant … really good with the children, getting them motivated and interested … they loved it, they couldn't wait to get up … a lot of places, when they're that age, especially for boys, everything is geared football and he doesn't seem to be…and it's nice that they're actually bringing in other things for them to do rather than just football.'** She added: **'I wouldn't have been able to afford it … being a single parent on benefits you don't have a lot and I don't actually have any family in the area so I don't have family with children for them to go to at the weekends or anything for them to do… you want your children to have good role models and the boxing people, they're so good with the children, you think well if they have a role model I'd rather it was a role model like that.'** And: **'I mean it's all down to bills comes first, food, clothes, anything the children need and activities come last and if I haven't got any money that week to go out anywhere or do anything we don't.'**

All eligible under 11s are entitled to a free twelve week course of swimming lessons and young people aged 11 and over are being offered a free six month membership to the local gym. Children can also access free music tuition and can access the subsidy for school trips e.g. recently there was a weekend 'transition' trip for year 7 pupils to the Isle of Wight. A pupil who accessed the subsidy for this purpose discussed enjoying time with friends and trying new activities, noting that she would like to go again.

Although school have employed various methods to promote activities and take up, there have been limited response from families with only a small number asking for swimming or free access to other provision.

Partners

The local swimming pool and leisure facility (with gym) are key partners, as are other local providers including brownies and guides groups and numerous external sports coaches and instructors. The LA lead for the subsidy explained:

 '… there are also a range of opportunities in the community and …one of the things we've been trying to do is work with community organisations to see what is the best way in which we can work together to support children and families and if they do these activities, then we can pay the cost of them attending these activities.'

The Children's University is another main partner and through this scheme School G work with local adventure playgrounds and playleaders and trained and trainee coaches from the local University.

Funding activities and charging policy

Funding is available for pupils for tuition fees, activities, any uniforms for activities, and sporting and school trips (e.g. Year 6/7 transition trip, football trip to America).

There is a small charge for some after-school activities, although young people entitled to the subsidy can access these without charge. The subsidy has been used to support individual children to access groups such as Brownies, Guides, music lessons and school and sporting trips, and the school has entered into an agreement with the local leisure centre so that eligible pupils can access free swimming lessons and gym membership.

Management and workload

The school has an extended schools co-ordinator who, as part of her role, has been promoting take up with parents and pupils and managing the subsidy at school level. She will soon be seconded to the LA to support other schools with the national roll out of the initiative.
She is supported by the CIP Manager for the cluster and the extended services manager for the council. There is a multi-agency steering group with representation from parents, extended schools staff, key providers and community organisations e.g. a member of a community art group sits on the Steering Board. As the funding goes directly to the cluster and the schools for activities, there is a burden of responsibility in terms of administration, promotion, monitoring and evaluation. This 'considerable amount of work' is currently being managed by school staff. The extended school team at School G are promoting activities and encouraging take up and certain members of the team have defined tasks e.g. the pupils social worker is analysing consultation data.

Special School H

Flexible (key stage 2-3 special school for pupils with educational and behavioural difficulties)

Pupils have a wide range of activities, including family activities, from which to choose and have their own pass book system so they can monitor how they spend their allocated funding. All pupils are benefitting from a diluted funding allowance.

Background

Special School H is a Key Stage 2 -3 special school for pupils with behavioural difficulties. The school is co-located on a campus with two pupil referral units (PRUs) and a 'key team' (multi-agency team supporting extremely vulnerable pupils and families) and the head at School H manages the whole campus. Pupils are bussed in to the campus from across the city although most are from the most deprived 'white' areas of the city which are characterised by high teenage pregnancy, unemployment and single parent families. The pupil population is fluid - there is a gradual intake throughout the year and currently, out of around 50 pupils on roll, there are only 4 female pupils. Many pupils have 'very damaged' lives and some have been in trouble with the police. All pupils receive a free school meal as lunch time is a taught part of the day.

There is a history of school staff delivering activities at lunchtimes although there were very few after school activities as pupils are bussed home at a set time.

The aim of the School, the PRUs and the Key team was to give pupils a wealth of opportunities. As a headteacher explained: '**This is about Every Child Matters and inclusion and lots [of pupils] don't have the life experiences our children would have so through this we give them a sense of enjoyment and wonderment…We want to offer enrichment and enjoyment and give them life time memories and experiences…this is all for students who generally miss out on a lot.**' She added: '**I think it is important to give them a big event that will stay with them forever and not just for the short term. It is important to have these events alongside the everyday activities**'.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The Child Poverty Index was analysed to identify the criteria for the flexible model. Of the wide range of indicators in the Index, 12 were selected, and if pupils hit 3 of the following 12 criteria, then they were identified as being entitled to the subsidy.

Eligibility criteria

1. FSM
2. Lone Parent Household
3. Looked after child
4. Disadvantaged community
5. Low reading age at reception
6. SEN with statement
7. SEN without statement
8. Low achievement KS 1 (a least 2 years below chronological age) NB: NEED TO CHECK CRITERIA
9. Low achievement KS * (at least 2 years below chronological age)

10. Low achievement KS * (at least 2 years below chronological age)
11. Low achievement KS * (at least 2 years below chronological age)
12. Low achievement KS * (at least 2 years below chronological age)
13. Other negative behaviour/cause for concern (e.g. young offenders)

The cluster co-ordinator discussed the implications of this: **'The government works to a formula of 60% take up. We can almost guarantee 100% take up but this means it doesn't pan out at about £300 [per pupil]. It is almost £120 but almost all are benefitting.'**

Consultation

Formal surveys were conducted followed by ongoing informal consultation. All staff are encouraged to regularly consult with pupils and have been trained in consultation techniques. All activities have been arranged as a consequence of consultation. When asked about being consulted a pupil responded: **'It feels so good and there is so much now for us to do.'**

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

School H use a pass book system and encourage pupils to take ownership over how they spend their allocation. This, according to the deputy headteacher, **'Gives them a sense of real ownership and their own budgeting of the money all links in with citizenship.'** Some pupils require frequent and gentle persuasion from staff to access funding. All staff in school have been briefed about the subsidy and all discuss it regularly with the pupils e.g. over lunch, on the school bus. The school based family liaison officer promotes the subsidy with parents and mans a stands at parents' evenings. The 'provider's day' (event attracting 18 providers) gave pupils and parents a taste of what was local provision and activities were on offer.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

Pupils are offered a varied menu of activities e.g. quad biking, climbing, horse riding, nail art, bowling, theatre trips, tickets for football matches, kick boxing, ice skating. The school will also arrange a day trip for all pupils in the summer term. A good number of pupils have accessed activities at a local outdoor adventure centres and others have visited an indoor play centre, whilst others have been bowling. Pupils reported 'enjoying' new activities, for example, a Year 9 pupils in School H spoke about their experience of quad biking, saying **'This was good and exciting, not scary,'** and a female pupil who got the opportunity to do some nail art said she felt 'great' that she had been able to try something that she had always wanted to do and was 'excited' at the prospect of horse riding. Another pupil discussed going to the football match with his Father: **'It was great to go to the football match. I went with Dad and Dad loves [name of football team] also. The school paid for my Dad also,'** while another pupil spoke enthusiastically about experiencing a range of activities during a residential, including scaling high ropes and archery. Three pupils have also been on a residential trip to an activity centre. At School H a football club is also being set up and family focused activities are also being promoted which has already seen some pupils going with a parent to see their local professional football club play, and a family gardening club and a family cookery club, are being established at the local community centre.

In a similar vein, pupils at the PRUs and those working with the Key Point Team are also given a wide range of activities from which to choose. The PRU for Key Stage 4 pupils, for example, offers activities that they can do in pairs or small groups e.g. aromatherapy massage, mud buggying, basketball, bleep music, DJing/MPing, paintballing etc There are also activities that they can do as individuals such as canoeing, driving cars (one pupil has opted to get the experience of driving a Lamborghini) pool, rock climbing, sailing, snowboarding (at a snow dome) etc. In the PRU for pupils in Key Stage 1 and 2, the young people have been able to access festive activities such as a pantomime and a 'Santa trip' and all pupils will benefit from a trip to London. Moreover some new activities have been set up in school e.g. break dancing, multi-skills, table tennis and drama. One pupil is now working with a music software service they found out about at the providers' event after negotiating the price of the programme (getting it down from £130 to £100) and making the necessary calls to arrange it etc

Partners

For enrichment activities, the school often prefer to use own staff as some providers may be unsuitable to work with pupils with severe behaviour difficulties. Moreover, it becomes expensive as the ratio of staff to pupils must remain high. The deputy head noted: **'We can't just use any old providers. They'd eat them up and spit them out…we need to use our staff.'** Nevertheless, the cluster co-ordinator realised the potential for the school and the PRUs to work with a wider range of providers and set up a providers day (like a market place) where 18 accredited providers promoted their provision and give pupils a flavour of what was on offer locally. Main providers now include a local activity centre, a local indoor play centre and the local community centre which will soon be running some family focused activities.

Funding activities and charging policy

Pupils have been allocated £120.00 which they can use for their choice of activity. Activities offered by external providers are priced individually but activities in school are offered free of charge. Some of the subsidy funding will be used to fund a school trip in the summer term (to fund this, the school will use money that some pupils have not spent from their £120 allocation). For certain activities in School H or the PRUs (e.g. table tennis in one of the PRUs) the subsidy has been used to purchase equipment and to hire a specialist coach.

Management and workload

The deputy head, which has responsibility for the accountability of expenditure and funding said: **'It is imperative we have [name of ES cluster co-ordinator. We are so snowed under. She has pulled everything together for us. We could do with her on site full time managing just this…we could almost do with somebody doing this full time.'**

Secondary I

Defined (Average sized comprehensive school, specialising in Humanities and Technology. School serves a wide and largely rural catchment)

Interesting approach to promoting take up involving a 'personal touch.' The subsidy is linking strategically with work of partners and wider initiatives. Focus on setting up holiday provision across the cluster.

Background

School I is a secondary school serving a deprived costal town. The wide catchment area served by the school is largely rural and there are issues of rural isolation and deprivation for many pupils, especially as transport links are poor. Lots of pupils are bussed into school. The town in which the school is located, described as being 'out on a limb' is not well served by many services although there are a range of providers of activities for young people. There is much apathy in the town and this has meant it is difficult to get local people, including parents, to engage in extended school provision.

School I is the only secondary school in a wider cluster comprised of 5 primary schools, an infant and a junior school. Around 107 pupils are entitled to the subsidy. Before the introduction of the subsidy, the offer of after school and holiday provision was limited and sporadic. A key aim of the subsidy was to develop holiday activities and offer pupils the opportunity to access activities of their choice during term time.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School I is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Consultation

Electronic surveys were administered in IT lessons and pupils were also consulted via their classroom teachers who conducted head counts of pupils interested in certain activities. Year tutors took the opportunity to consult with parents when meeting with them through Personal Support and Planning (PSA) meetings. A coffee morning was also held at school with the aim of consulting informally with targetted young people and their parents.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Letters and leaflets have been distributed to all pupils and parents in school. The promotional material for the activities at School I states: **'All activities provide the opportunity for children to learn new skills, be creative and more importantly have fun!'** Activities, which are booked via the extended services team in the council (often via cluster co-ordinators) and are available to all on a first come, first served basis. The documentation reads: **'We may be able to subsidise those students who are keen to join in but need financial assistance.'** School staff have also met with local partners and attended meetings for looked after children with the purpose of raising awareness of the subsidy and year heads and the co-ordinators have spoken individually to pupils. The 'personal touch' is deemed important but: '**…this involves more work especially when everyone is working their jolly hardest.'** The abovementioned coffee morning was also an opportunity to promote activities and access to subsidy funding and it is anticipated that parents and pupils attending will begin to 'spread the word.' The cluster co-ordinator noted:

'It's winning hearts and minds and developing relationships and trust…the paper format doesn't always work.'

This approach is working as, according to the deputy headteacher: **'Now parents and grandparents are proactive, approaching me and saying can they [pupils] go on this and that.'**

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

School I, and the cluster co-ordinators, have been pivotal in arranging holiday activities for children and young people from across the cluster. These activities take place either at School I, at the primary schools in the cluster or at local providers such as the Community Hall, Adult Education premises or the area based Youth Centre. Activities on offer during February 2009 half term included (those in italics were delivered at School I): *ultimate Frisbee, making music with drums and percussion*, crazy crafts (family learning activity), tri golf, Monday morning madness (provided through the youth service), designing a t shirt, *Karting, circuit training, boxercise, play rangers, rock climbing* and *soccer.*

Pupils can also opt to do activities of their choice (from a range provided locally) during term time and weekends. One pupil, for example, has asked to go cycling and the school have provided the cycle and also a helmet, whilst others have opted to play rugby, go ice skating and pony riding Another pupil requested swimming sessions which have been arranged and the same pupil is also accessing subsidy funding for a Duke of Edinburgh camping trip. This pupil explained: **'I now go swimming once or twice a week, Wednesday or Saturdays, with my Mum. They even bought my swimming costume…this is a real opportunity and it has really benefitted us as Mum has big financial issues…before we weren't going at all, well perhaps three or four times a year…when we go we do lots of challenges and I'll get healthy…I'm a bit chubby and I'd like to loose weight and this will help and when I get healthy I'll still keep going there.'**

'It [the subsidy] has also paid for Duke of Edinburgh booklets and money towards the trip [school at this point said there was money to help buy equipment for camping]…Mum couldn't afford stuff and but this meant I could go. Duke of Edinburgh supply some stuff but we couldn't afford leggings or boots…sometimes I think it can sound a bit cheeky but school said they can help and this is just a big opportunity for me. If things weren't provided then I couldn't go.' She added: **'I don't want to be a charity case but I've been told this isn't the case. It is just a great opportunity and I've not been camping before so it should be a really good experience hopefully.'**

The deputy headteacher discussed outcomes for another pupil: **'One student has benefitted enormously. He used to go home, put his PJs on and go to bed. He lives with his grandparents. Issues around his family background kick him off and there were major issues where he would abscond…now we pay termly for his scout fees and camp and his uniform. He's made strides and to think he was never out of [name of the town]. He went to scout camp and now he's going on a week long activities holiday…It has made such a difference to him in school. He is more focused, has matured significantly. He can feel isolated, especially during the holidays and so we'll support him and his sister as well who is on sticks.'**

The cluster co-ordinator added: **'He'll say he's gone from being arrested to becoming involved in the scouts and he'll say, 'this has helped change my life and helped me to help others everyday of my life.' He is brilliant.'**

Partners

Main partners include the regional Sports Development Partnership and regional Voluntary Action Service and School I has also developed good working links with a range of local providers including the local community hall, Adult Education, the town's Youth Centre, a local organisation specialising in indoor and outdoor climbing, a local voluntary organisation offering support to children and families, another voluntary agency delivering street dance, and a community based drama group. The subsidy is linking with the local trust (similar to a children's trust) so that as the pathfinder develops it might link strategically with other plans for the locality and, there are clear links with the school sports partnership and with a national social inclusion programme which uses sport and leisure to engage young people. The deputy headteacher explained: '**We already had a good grounding but this has built up levels of partnership working.**'

Funding activities and charging policy

Most activities offered during February half term 2009 were priced at £1.00 a session and with up to 4 sessions running each day, the approximate cost for activities throughout the half term holiday was £20.00. Certain activities incurred a higher fee e.g. rock climbing cost £5.00 per session, although some other activities were free for all. Depending on the activity selected, pupils eligible for the subsidy funding would receive a reduce rate or a free place.

Management and workload

There has been a considerable impact on workload. The deputy headteacher at School I has responsibility for the implementation of the subsidy in school, and she is also the cluster lead. She is supported by two LA cluster co-ordinators and described their workload as 'mammoth.' A co-ordinator confirmed this saying: '**I'm an extended schools co-ordinator but the rest of my role has been put to one side and just been about the subsidy. It is a real struggle capacity wise and we are still learning all the way.**' The co-ordinators take bookings for activities and have also set up the new holiday provision. Teachers in school undertook consultation and whilst it is acknowledged that this might not be the most appropriate model, capacity of other staff to administer surveys was limited.

Primary J

Defined (Denominational school with around 210 pupils on roll. Primary serving a wide and socio-economically mixed catchment)

One to one meetings to promote the subsidy. Class teachers involved in consultation. Good range of activities on offer during the holidays, provided by a range of partners.

Background

Primary School J is a popular Roman Catholic School serving pupils from a wide area beyond its catchment. Whilst the school's immediate catchment is above the English average in terms of percentage of high social class households, at least 20 percent of pupils travel in from less affluent areas. The school is based in a seaside town which has limited provision for young people. The cluster, of which the school is a part, is deprived and some of the cluster primary schools are located in rural villages which are not well served by public transport.

19 pupils are eligible for the subsidy including two children from the local traveller community. The school aim to 'broaden horizons' of eligible pupils and provide a varied offer of activities.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School J is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care.

Consultation

Class teachers talked through with pupils a menu of potential activities to gauge interest. They also asked pupils about their access to existing provision in school and in the local community and discussed with pupils the barriers to participation that they encountered. Pupils were also encouraged to complete an electronic survey although asking children as young as five to complete these had inherent difficulties. In School J the headteacher also met with all of the 19 pupils eligible for subsidy funding, and wherever possible, with their parents with the purpose of asking them about the kind of activities pupils would like to partake in. This was deemed necessary to identify the preferences of the targetted group.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

The promotional material for the extended activities in School J and other cluster schools reads: **'External funding has also been secured to enable children who receive free school meals the opportunity to take part for free.'** Leaflets go out to all children via schools but the cluster co-ordinator requested that school distributed them to pupils entitled to the subsidy first. Also the leaflet is posted on the community website and goes in the local newspaper

The head at School J has met with all eligible pupils and conducted some home visits to meet with parents that she had not managed to speak with in school. She said: **'I made a point of seeing them all …Parents have been very positive. I say, no one need know, just me and the bursar. This is empowering parents.'** Also older pupils have been told about the 'project' and have been encouraged to discuss it with their parents.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

As many as 20 activities are available for young people to choose from during school holidays. Activities for young people in School J, and those in other cluster schools includes: Get Crafty (family event for under 12s), soccer school (5-14 years), Basketball, Kwik Cricket, Ultimate Frisbee and Extreme Gold (all for 8-15s), skate boarding and BMX Biking (all ages); family trips to the national railway museum (0-10 years plus family), horse riding (8 years plus), paintballing (12-15years), Parts Magic (8 years plus), Teddy Bears Picnic (0-5 years), cheerleading, modern movement (5-11years), drum workshop (5-8years), Beach Sports and Play (8-15 years), skate boarding, Parts Art (8 years plus), Boxercise (8-13 years), trampolining (11-15years), wild things drama workshop (10years plus), and junk modelling. These activities take place in venues across the area including School J, the Children's Centre, the local library and other community venues. Activities located at School J during the February 09 half term break included a soccer school with Bobby Charlton's Soccer School Coach and the nearby city's FC Scout. During Easter 2009 a 'baby rave' took place at the local library and there were a series of trips for primary children and families to locations including a nearby seaside holiday destination, the nearest large city and also to other venues including Flamingo Land, 'Go Ape' and York Railway Museum. Holiday provision has also been arranged for Summer 08 and October 08 and includes a similarly wide range of activities plus some new ones e.g. comic art, jewellery making, fencing, family spanish.

Some extended provision is geared towards families. For instance, in conjunction with family learning, there were some free events organised for families to do activities including arts and crafts, cookery and mask making. The subsidy is paying for tutors, the local children's centre are holding the sessions and taking bookings. Other key strands of the subsidy in School JE involve offering free music lessons to targeted pupils and promoting take up of local provision. Co-ordinators have negotiated a reduced price monthly leisure card allowing access to the local swimming pool and leisure centre (this fee is subsidised further for the criteria group). A parent of a pupil discussed what the subsidy has meant for her son: **'He now goes to street dance on Saturday mornings… when he comes home he's full of it. It's amazing the difference it has made…I knew that there were classes and then [name of head] spoke to us both about it…everything is so expensive and winter is the most expensive time of year. It costs £2.50 and this is a lot when you have to get the shopping in and pay the bills.'** She added: **'We've been into leisure world to see about swimming and he'd also like to do karate if it is set up in school and soccer also…it is all he talks about, dancing and karate…I do take him out and try to do things but it is hard…now he loves school. It is his favourite place and now they are offering this and it is great to have it. You need money for everything and it goes and you don't have any extra for these things'.**

Of the 19 eligible pupils, most have accessed the subsidy. Three children have accessed music lessons, and almost all have accessed holiday provision. The trips, which attracted children from across the cluster took a good proportion of children who were eligible for the subsidy. Feedback from parents and young people involved in the Flamingo Land trip during October half term trip included: **'It was lovely to have a day out as a family without having to worry about the cost.'** (Parent) And: **'We have never been to Flamingo Land before it was great, can we go again next year?'** (Pupil)

Providers who offer holiday provision and also some weekend provision also spoke positively about the subsidy: (feedback collected by cluster co-ordinators)

'Thank you for advertising our sessions in your booklet again, we were booked up with new children taking part. A couple of children who receive free school meals have said they would like to join the Saturday morning club.' And:

'The activities were a real benefit for all those who took up the offer and provided them with opportunities that they would not normally have.'

Partners

The local Children's Centre is a key partner as are Social Services, Family Learning, local sports community groups, and the sports development team in the Authority. The cluster co-ordinator said: **'We try and use local providers whenever possible.'** A booklet of providers has been produced which lists local providers under categories ranging from youth clubs to fishing to yacht club. Address and contact details for all providers are given. For the February 09 half term, young people from School J accessed activities at a local church, a community based skate park and trekking centre, the Children's Centre, the community library and the local boat compound.

Funding activities and charging policy

All of the activities that ran during the February 2009 half term were free for pupils entitled to the subsidy. For other pupils certain activities were free e.g. Get Crafty (family event for under 12s) was free as was the junk modelling activity, the beach sports and play session, and the 'wild things' drama workshop, but many activities incurred a charge which ranged from £1.00 for cheerleading, modern movement, basketball, cricket, drumming, ultimate frisbee, gold, trampolining and boxercise, to £9.00 per day for soccer school and £22.00 per day for horse riding. Trips varied in price e.g. the trip to the local football ground was £30.00, the family outing to the national railway museum (0-10 years plus family) was priced at £3.00 per person or £10.00 for a family of 4. A similar range of activities will run in the summer holidayears 2009 and in the October half term and once again activities will be free for all children entitled to subsidy funding.

Management and workload

The Head at School J is managing the subsidy with the support of the cluster co-ordinators. Although she has met with all eligible pupils and most parents, she does not feel that this has impacted heavily on her existing workload as numbers of eligible pupils are low.

Appendix 2: Take up of activities before the subsidy - data from baseline management information and spring 2009 management information

Breakfast and afterschool clubs

Breakfast and afterschool clubs are not specific activities, the main purpose of these clubs is to provide childcare before and after normal school hours for working parents. It is generally primary schools that offer these, and analysis of these data has been restricted to primary schools only.

On average, 17 per cent of pupils in the target group had regularly (at least once a week) attended breakfast or afterschool clubs in summer term 2008. In a quarter (25 per cent) of primary schools no target group pupils had attended breakfast and afterschool clubs. There are various possible reasons for this:

- Such clubs were not offered in these schools (4 out of these 41 schools mentioned breakfast and afterschool clubs when asked about charging for activities, but the rest did not).

- In some clusters one of the definitions used to identify the target group is that their parent(s) are unemployed, and breakfast and afterschool clubs are generally used by families where the parent(s) do work.

- As shown in section 5 some schools charge for breakfast and afterschool clubs (on average £2.52 per day for breakfast clubs and £4.74 per day for afterschool clubs) and these charges may be prohibitive for members of the target group.

Given that only 4 of the 41 schools mentioned having breakfast and afterschool clubs it seems most likely that in most of these schools the explanation for the target group not accessing breakfast and afterschool clubs is simply that these are not offered by the school. For pupils in the target group that were accessing breakfast and afterschool clubs during the summer term 2008, they were doing so on average for 3.8 hours a week.

After the introduction of the subsidy (during the spring term 2009) the average proportion of target group pupils in primary schools regularly attending breakfast or afterschool clubs increased to 31 per cent.

Amongst primary schools that provided both baseline (summer term 2008) management information and spring term 2009 management information, the proportion of the target group regularly attending breakfast and afterschool clubs had increased since the introduction of the subsidy in 67 per cent of schools. In a further 12 per cent of schools the proportion had stayed the same, and for 22 per cent it had decreased.

Regular activities

Regular activities are specific activities that took place at least twice during the summer term 2008.

On average, 27 per cent of the target group had taken part in regular activities during the summer term 2008. This figure varied from none to 100 per cent amongst different schools.

The number of hours pupils in the target group participated in regular activities during the summer term 2008 averaged at 1.3 hours a week (for each pupil that participated). This number varied between 0.5 hours and 4.5 hours per pupil per week across different schools.

On average, secondary school pupils were spending more time participating in regular activities than primary school pupils: 1.5 hours per participating pupil in secondary schools compared with 1.2 hours per participating pupil in primary schools.

After the introduction of the subsidy, during spring term 2009, the average proportion of target group pupils participating in regular activities increased to 42 per cent.

Amongst schools that provided management information for summer term 2008 and spring term 2009, the proportion of the target group participating in regular activities had increased in 68 per cent of schools, in three per cent it had stayed the same, and in 29 per cent it had decreased.

One-off term time activities

On average, 18 per cent of pupils in the target group had taken part in one-off term time activities during the summer term 2008, but this figure varied between none and 100 per cent in different schools.

In 44 per cent of schools no pupils in the target group had taken part in one-off term time activities, and this was more common amongst primary schools: in 50 per cent of primary schools no target group pupils had taken part in one-off term time activities compared with just 18 per cent of secondary schools. This total lack of take up by the target group amongst these schools may be due to these particular schools not having offered any one-off term time activities during the summer term 2008.

The number of hours participating pupils in the target group spent participating in one-off activities during the summer term varied between 0.5 hours and 48 hours per pupil and the average was 6.1 hours.

After the introduction of the subsidy, during the spring term 2009, the average proportion of target group pupils that had participated in one-off term time activities increased to 28 per cent.

Amongst schools that provided management information for summer term 2008 and spring term 2009, the proportion of the target group participating in one-off activities had increased in 58 per cent of schools, in 15 per cent it had stayed the same, and in 27 per cent it had decreased.

Holiday activities

In around half of schools (48 per cent) no pupils in the target group had taken part in activities during the summer holidays 2008, and this was again more common amongst primary schools than secondary schools (53 per cent compared with 25 per cent). In other schools up to two-thirds of the target group (67 per cent) had taken part in activities during the summer holidays. On average, seven per cent of target group pupils had participated.

Amongst pupils that did participate in holiday activities the number of hours taken up per pupil during the summer holidays varied between 1 hour and 168 hours, and the average was 15 hours.

Appendix 3: Charging for activities before the subsidy - data from baseline management information

According to the baseline management information 53 per cent of schools charged for at least some activities. This is different to the finding from the telephone survey of schools which showed that 70 per cent of schools charged for at least some activities. Where schools responded to both the telephone survey, and the baseline management information it is possible to compare answers from the two sources. In most cases data from the two sources matched. However, there were 10 schools where the management information suggested the school did charge for activities but the telephone survey data suggested that they did not.

There are several possible explanations for this:

- These schools only charged for one or two activities which were forgotten about when responding to the telephone survey but remembered when responding to the management information (it may well have been different individuals at the school who responded to each);

- Responses to the management information took into account activities run by external providers but responses to the telephone survey did not;

- Three of these schools only charged for breakfast and afterschool childcare according to the management information, it is possible that the respondent to the telephone survey did not take these into account when asked about charging for 'activities'.

There were also 39 schools with responses to the telephone survey saying they charged for some activities, but responses to the management information saying that they did not. Again, there are several possible explanations for this:

- These schools only charged for one or two activities which were forgotten about when responding to the management information but remembered when responding to the telephone survey (it may well have been different individuals at the school who responded to each);

- Responses to the telephone survey took into account activities run by external providers but responses to the management information did not.

Schools that provided management information on charging provided data on the activities and the amounts charged.

Schools were charging for a wide range of activities, most commonly for sporting activities and (amongst primary schools) for breakfast and afterschool clubs. Table A3 below shows the average charges made (per session) and the regularity of activities for different types of activity that schools were offering. Please note that most of these averages are based on very small numbers of responses and therefore might not be representative of the charges made in most schools. The number of responses for each type of activity is shown in the column labelled 'N'.

Table A3 : Amounts charged for activities			
Activity type	**Regularity**	**Average charge**	**N**
Breakfast club	Daily	£2.52	33
Afterschool club	Daily	£4.74	25
Sports	Weekly	£2.56	57
Martial arts	Weekly	£2.76	9
Music/singing	Weekly	£6.13	13
Art/craft	Weekly	£1.21	7
Cookery	Weekly	£0.73	10
Dance	Weekly	£2.14	11
Language	Weekly	£3.37	4
Drama	Weekly	£2.63	4
Holiday club	Daily	£12.90	5
Trips[27]	One-off	£171.40	15

---

[27] Most of these were residential trips and some were trips abroad hence the high average cost.

Appendix 4: Telephone survey of schools questionnaire

Introduction

Good morning / afternoon / evening, my name is [name] and I am calling from the British Market Research Bureau, on behalf of the Department for Children, Schools and Families. We wrote to you recently about the evaluation we are conducting on the Extended Schools Disadvantage Subsidy Pathfinders.

This is a really important evaluation of the subsidy and we would like to conduct a short survey with you.

[IF NECESSARY: THIS SHOULD NOT TAKE LONGER THAN 20 MINUTES].

Is it ok to conduct the survey now?

Pre-Subsidy

Ask All

I would like to start by asking you some questions about the time before you received the subsidy funding.

1. Before you received the subsidy, did you explicitly target or support economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in extended school activities, this includes promoting activities to disadvantaged pupils?

Yes
No
Don't Know

IF YES AT Q1

2. Before you received the subsidy, did you have a clear definition of which economically disadvantaged pupils you targeted for support?

Yes
No
Don't know

3. Which groups or pupils were you targeting for support before you received the subsidy?
DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Pupils on free school meals
Children in Care
Children from low income families
Families in receipt of specific state benefit(s) (e.g. Income Support, Job Seekers Allowance, Housing Benefit, Working Tax credit)
Families from specific geographical areas
Families in temporary or poor accommodation
Disadvantaged children with special educational needs
Refugee or Asylum Seeker children
Based on our knowledge about pupils and families (non-specific)
Other (specify)

4. Before you received the subsidy, how did you promote extended services amongst economically disadvantaged pupils, for example how did you promote services and engage with parents and pupils?

PROMPT TO PRECODE AND CODE ALL THAT APPLY. PROBE: Did you do anything else?

<u>Parents</u>
Spoke to parents informally
Sent letters to parents
Telephoned parents
Questionnaire / surveys to parents
Focus group or other meeting with parents
Home Visits to parents
Parents Evenings
Open Days

<u>Pupils</u>
Spoke to pupils informally
Sent letters to pupils
Telephoned pupils
Questionnaire / surveys to pupils
Focus group or other meeting with pupils

<u>Other (general)</u>
Advertisements at school (e.g. posters)
Other (specify)

Additionality

Ask All

READ OUT: For the next questions please think about the CURRENT situation at your school, now that you have been allocated the subsidy funding.

Ask All

5. I am going to read out various ways in which the introduction of the subsidy may or may not have had an impact on your school. ROTATE STATEMENTS.

    a. So far, has the subsidy enabled the school to provide **new** activities for economically disadvantaged pupils?

    b. So far, has the subsidy enabled the school to increase the number of activities that it offers to economically disadvantaged pupils?

    c. So far, has the subsidy improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities?

    d. So far, has the subsidy enabled the school to improve the quality of its provision for economically disadvantaged pupils?

Yes
No
Don't know

If 'No' at first statement at Q5a

5b. And do you think the subsidy WILL enable the school to provide **new** activities for economically disadvantaged pupils in the future?

Yes
No
Don't know

Ask All

For many schools, use of the subsidy is still at a very early stage…

6. Thinking about the impact that the subsidy has had on participation rates of economically disadvantaged children (in your target group), how much impact do you think it has had so far? Please answer from 0-10, where 10 would be the highest impact on participation rates and 0 would be the lowest.

IF RESPONDENTS ANSWERS 'DON'T KNOW' ASK: Is this because nothing has happened with the subsidy yet? IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS 'YES' THEN CODE '0'.

Enter answer 0-10
Don't know

Ask All

6b. And thinking about the impact that the subsidy will have on participation rates of economically disadvantaged children in the future, how much impact do you think it WILL have? Please answer from 0-10, where 10 would be the highest impact on participation rates and 0 would be the lowest.

Enter answer 0-10
Don't know

Charging

Ask All

8a. Before you received the subsidy, did the school charge for extended school activities?
CODE ONE ONLY

Yes, all activities
Yes, some activities
No
Don't know

Ask All

8b. Has the school changed the way in which it charges for activities as a direct result of the subsidy?

Yes
No
Don't know

IF YES AT Q8b

9. In what ways has the school made changes to its charging policy? PROBE FULLY. PROMPT: What else?

ENTER VERBATIM
Don't Know

Tracking

Ask All

11. Do you currently track the take up of activities among the target group?

Yes
No
Don't know

IF YES TO Q11

12. Do you or any external providers take a register for each of your extended school activities?

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Yes, for all activities
Yes, for some activities
No
Don't know

Engaging the target group (Promotion)

Ask All

15. What methods have you used to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group? PROMPT TO PRECODE AND CODE ALL THAT APPLY. PROBE: What else?

Parents
Spoke to parents informally
Sent letters to parents
Telephone parents
Questionnaire / surveys to parents
Focus group or other meeting with parents
Home Visits to parents
Parents Evenings
Open Days

Pupils
Spoke to pupils informally
Sent letters to pupils
Telephoned pupils
Questionnaire / surveys to pupils
Focus group or other meeting with pupils
School Assembly
School / Student Council

Other (general)
Advertisements at school (e.g. posters)
None
Other (specify)

If None at Q15

16a. Do you have any plans in the future to promote the uptake of activities amongst economically disadvantaged pupils in your target group?

Yes
No
Don't know

If NOT None at Q15

16b. Do you have any FURTHER plans in the future to promote the uptake of activities amongst economically disadvantaged pupils in your target group?

Yes
No
Don't know

IF YES AT Q16a or Q16b

17. What methods are you planning to use to advertise or promote the uptake of extended services activities amongst the target group? PROMPT TO PRECODE AND CODE ALL THAT APPLY. PROBE: What else?

<u>Parents</u>
Speak to parents informally
Send letters to parents
Telephone parents
Questionnaire / surveys to parents
Focus group or other meeting with parents
Home Visits to parents
Parents Evenings
Open Days

<u>Pupils</u>
Speak to pupils informally
Send letters to pupils
Telephone pupils
Questionnaire / surveys to pupils
Focus group or other meeting with pupils
School Assembly
School / Student Council

<u>Other (general)</u>
Advertisements at school (e.g. posters)
Other (specify)

Ask All

18. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

ROTATE STATEMENTS.

READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY. PROMPT: Do you agree or strongly agree?

We struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities

Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that we offer

Economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended school activities

Economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma, which prevents them from participating in activities

The definition of disadvantage that we use is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't know

Ask All

19. What, if any, strategies have you used to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation for economically disadvantaged pupils? PROBE: What else?

There is no stigma (DO NOT READ OUT: SPONTANEOUS MENTION ONLY)

Other (specify)
None
Don't know

Consultation

Ask all

21. I have asked about the ways in which the school may have promoted the uptake of activities amongst the target group.

Further to this, did the school consult with parents or pupils in the target group about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy? CODE ALL THAT
APPLY.

Yes - with pupils
Yes - with parents
No
Don't know

If 'Yes - with pupils' at Q21

22. How were pupils in the target group consulted? PROMPT TO PRECODE. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Spoke to pupils informally
Sent letters to pupils
Telephoned pupils
Questionnaire / surveys to pupils
Focus group or other meeting with pupils
Discussions with a school / student council were arranged
School Assembly
Other (specify)
Don't know

If 'Yes - with parents' at Q21

23. How were parents of pupils in the target group consulted? PROMPT TO PRECODE. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Spoke to parents informally
Sent letters to parents
Telephoned parents
Questionnaire / surveys to parents
Focus group or other meeting with parents
Home Visits to parents
Parents Evenings
Open Days
Other (specify)
Don't know

External providers / partnerships

Ask all

25. Does the school work with any external organisations or individuals in order to provide extended schools activities?

READ OUT: By external organisations, I do NOT mean the school itself, any other schools or the local authority. I am referring to outside organisations, including the voluntary and community sector.

IF NECESSARY: READ OUT:

It does not include out of scope activities provided by external organisations (e.g. specialist health care). I am referring to typical extended school activities (e.g. club type activities).

Yes
No
Don't know

If Yes - work with external providers

26. Have any new partnerships with external providers been formed since the introduction of the subsidy? CODE ONE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know

Ask all

27. Do you use any schemes, other than the subsidy, that fund activities for economically disadvataged children and young people?

Yes
No
Don't know

If Yes - use other schemes at Q27

28. What are these schemes? PROBE FULLY. PROBE: What sort of activities do they fund?

ENTER VERBATIM
Don't Know

Workloads

Ask all

30. Has managing the subsidy funding caused an increase in workload for any staff at the school? Please only think about the workload at YOUR school, and not increased workload at a wider local authority cluster level.

Yes
No
Don't know

If Yes at Q30

31. For which kinds of staff members has workload increased as a result of managing the subsidy funding? DO NOT READ OUT.
CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Headteacher
Other members of the Senior Management Team (SMT)
Extended services co-ordinator
Bursar
Teaching staff
Administrative or support staff
Other (specify)
Don't know

For each type of staff member that workload has increased

32. Would you say the workload of the <TYPE OF STAFF MEMBER> has increased a little or increased a lot as a result of managing the subsidy funding? CODE ONE ONLY.

Increased a little
Increased a lot
Don't know

If workload increased for any kind of staff member

33. What has the school done to cope with this additional workload? PROMPT TO PRECODE. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Took on (temporary) new staff
School staff worked longer hours
Reassigned workload between staff
Other (specify)
Don't know

Pros and Cons of the models

If following defined model

36. How effective do you think the free school meals and children in care definition of economically disadvantaged pupils has been in enabling you to reach children who cannot afford to pay? READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY.

Very effective
Quite effective
Not very effective
Not at all effective
Don't know

If following defined model

37. Are there any pupils you think should be included in the target group but do not qualify for free schools meals and are not in care?

Yes
No
Don't know

If following flexible model

38. How effective do you think the chosen definition of economically disadvantaged pupils has been in enabling you to reach children who cannot afford to pay? READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY.

Very effective
Quite effective
Not very effective
Not at all effective
Don't know

If following flexible model

40. Did staff at the school have any involvement in choosing the definition of the target group?

Yes
No
Don't know

If flexible and Q40 = 'Yes'

41. How easy was it to come up with an effective definition of economically disadvantaged pupils? READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Very easy
Quite easy
Quite difficult
Very difficult
Don't know

41b. How easy has it been to identify which individual pupils fall under the chosen definition of economic disadvantage (i.e. which pupils are members of your target group)? READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

Very easy
Quite easy
Quite difficult
Very difficult
Don't know

43. The defined model of delivery requires that schools use the subsidy to provide around 2 hours of activities a week to the target group. How easy has the school found it to meet this requirement? READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY.

Very easy
Quite easy
Quite difficult
Very difficult
Don't know

Problems and Barriers

45. Have you experienced any problems or barriers in implementing the subsidy?

Yes
No
Don't know

46. What sort of problems or barriers have you encountered? PROMPT TO PRECODES AND CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Identifying which pupils to target the subsidy at
Pupils you would like to target do not fall under the definition of the target group
Children/young people do not want to take part in activities based at school
Lack of interest from pupils in target group
Lack of interest from parents in target group
Parents or pupils embarrassed to be seen as receiving funding / stigma
Additional workload of organising / running activities
All extended schools activities were already free before the subsidy
Confusion / lack of guidance as to how subsidy should be used
Transport difficulties
Other (specify)
Don't know

Additional Support

Ask all

47. What, if any, additional support do schools require to implement the subsidy effectively? PROBE FULLY

ENTER VERBATIM
None
Don't know

End of interview

Ask all

49. Could you tell me your job title? CODE ONE ONLY

Headteacher
Deputy / Assistant head
Bursar
Extended services co-ordinator
School secretary
Other (specify)

Ask all

50. We will be conducting another survey in about a year's time, so we can see what impact the subsidy has had after it has had more time to take effect. We will send you details of this nearer the time.

CONTINUE

DO NOT RECONTACT (SPONTANEOUS ONLY)

If DO NOT RECONTACT

51. Is there anyone else at the school we could contact instead?

Yes
No

If Yes at Q51

52. Could I take their name?

Enter full name

If Yes at Q51

53. Could I take their job title? CODE ONE ONLY

Headteacher
Deputy / Assistant Head
Bursar
Extended services co-ordinator
School secretary
Other (specify)

54. INTERVIEWER: COLLECT PHONE NUMBER?

       Enter Number

READ OUT: That is the end of the survey. Thank you very much for your help with this important research.

STANDARD CONFIDENTIALITY / MARKET RESEARCH SOCIETY REASSURANCES, AND COLLECT RESPONDENT NAME.

Appendix 5: Form for collecting baseline management information from schools

Extended schools subsidy pathfinder evaluation
Collection of baseline management information data

Enter school name:

Name of school:

Enter name of town/city/village:

Town/City/Village school is in:

Enter your name:

Name of person completing form:

Enter your job title:

Position:

1 What is the definition of the target group?   *Please summarise.*

Definition:

2 How many pupils are there in the school in the target group?

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

3 How many pupils in the target group have participated in ANY extended schools activities?

Please include pupils that had sustained attendance at activities that took place on a regular basis during the summer term (i.e. attended at least one session in every two, or once a week for Breakfast and Afterschool clubs), and pupils that have attended any one-off activities in the last term (summer term 2008) or the summer holidays.

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

Breakfast and Afterschool clubs

By Breakfast and Afterschool clubs we are referring to general clubs taking place before and after school. Specific activities such as football or a homework club should be included in the 'Regular activities' section.

4 How many pupils in the target group have participated in regular breakfast and afterschool clubs?

By regular we mean attending at least one Breakfast and/or Afterschool club per week.

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

How many pupils in the target group are regulary using breakfast and afterschool clubs for:

Note: The total of questions 5 to 9 should equal the number you have entered at question 4.

Enter numbers: *Exact/Estimate:*

5   Less than 1 hour a week (on average)?
6   Between 1 and 4 hours a week (on average)?
7   Between 5 and 9 hours a week (on average)?
8   Between 10 and 14 hours a week (on average)?
9   15 or more hours a week (on average)?

Regular activities

By regular activities we mean those that have taken place at least twice in the last term (summer term 2008). For this section on regular activities please think of all other regular activities excluding Breakfast and Afterschool clubs.

10 How many pupils in the target group have participated in regular extended schools activities?

Please only include pupils that have sustained attendance at activities (i.e. attend at least one session in every two) in the last term (summer term 2008).

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

How many pupils in the target group (who do regularly participate in activities) are using extended schools activities for:

11   Less than 1 hour a week (on average)?
12   Around 1 hour a week (on average)?
13   Around 2 hours a week (on average)?
14   Around 3 hours a week (on average)?
15   Around 4 or more hours a week (on average)?

Note: The total of questions 11 to 15 should equal the number you have entered at question 10.

Enter numbers: *Exact/Estimate:*

One-off term time activities

For example a one-off activity workshop

16 How many pupils in the target group have participated in one-off activities during the last term (summer term 2008)?

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

17 What is the total number of hours pupils in the target group have spent participating in one-off activities during the last term (summer term 2008)?

Enter number (in hours):   *Exact/Estimate:*

Holiday activities

18 How many pupils in the target group have participated in activities during the summer holidays?

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

19 What is the total number of hours pupils in the target group have spent participating in activities during the summer holidays?

Enter number (in hours):   *Exact/Estimate:*

Charging for activities

20 Does the school charge for pupils to take part in any extended schools activities?

Yes/No:

21 *If yes: please list the activities the school charges pupils for below, say how often the activity takes place, and how much the charge is per pupil.*

Please include activities that took place last term (summer term 2008) or during the summer holidays.

Activity	Regularity (e.g. Daily, weekly, termly, one-off)	Charge (per pupil, per session, in £)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

Use of external providers

22 Does the school use external providers for any activity?

By external providers we are referring to organisations or providers other than the school itself, any other schools or the Local Authority

23 *If yes: please list below the activities for which an external provider is used, and say how much the external provider charges. If possible, please give the cost per child per session, but if this is not possible, please say what the overall cost per session or per term is, and indicate what the cost relates too in the third column.*

Please state the total cost (per child per session) charged by the external provider, including any costs paid by the pupil, by the school, and from any other source of funding. Please include activities that took place last term (summer term 2008) or during the summer holidays.

Activity	Cost (in £, per child per session if possible)	Whether cost is per child, per session or per term
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

130

Appendix 6: Form for collecting second tranche of management information from schools

Extended schools subsidy pathfinder evaluation
Collection of spring term management information data

Enter school name:

Name of school:

Enter name of town/city/village:

Town/City/Village school is in:

Enter your name:

Name of person completing form:

Enter your job title:

Position:

2 How many pupils are there in the school in the target group?

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

3 How many pupils in the target group have participated in ANY extended schools activities?

Please include pupils that had sustained attendance at activities that took place on a regular basis during the spring term (i.e. attended at least one session in every two, or once a week for Breakfast and Afterschool clubs), and pupils that have attended any one-off activities in the last term (spring term 2009)

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

Breakfast and Afterschool clubs

By Breakfast and Afterschool clubs we are referring to general clubs taking place before and after school. Specific activities such as football or a homework club should be included in the 'Regular activities' section.

4 How many pupils in the target group have participated in regular breakfast and afterschool clubs?

By regular we mean attending at least one Breakfast and/or Afterschool club per week.

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

Regular activities

By regular activities we mean those that have taken place at least twice in the last term (spring term 2009). For this section on regular activities please think of all other regular activities excluding Breakfast and Afterschool clubs.

10 How many pupils in the target group have participated in regular extended schools activities?

Please only include pupils that have sustained attendance at activities (i.e. attend at least one session in every two) in the last term (spring term 2009).

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

One-off term time activities

For example a one-off activity workshop

16 How many pupils in the target group have participated in one-off activities during the last term (spring term 2009)?

Enter number: *Exact/Estimate:*

131

Appendix 7: Original DCSF guidance for the extended schools subsidy pathfinder

EXTENDED SCHOOLS SUBSIDY FUNDING FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

A guide to the 2008-09 pathfinder

"*We need to ensure that children from disadvantaged backgrounds and their parents do not miss out but have a chance to benefit from extra out-of-school tuition and after-school clubs… The £265m funding will enable all schools to offer those children two hours per week of group activities in term time, plus 30 hours of additional activities over the holidays.*"
Secretary of State, 10 July 2007

Introduction

In the Children's Plan, published in December 2007, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) set out plans to make £265.5 million in funding available to schools between 2008 and 2011. This funding will help schools provide a comprehensive range of exciting, high quality extended services, and ensure that these are accessible to all children and young people, focusing on those disadvantaged by economic circumstances and children in care.

From September 2008, the Department will be running a pathfinder to explore how best it can support schools to meet this objective. The pathfinder, which will involve schools in 18 local authorities, will be supported by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) and build on the excellent progress made to date in establishing sustainable and inclusive extended schools.

This document is intended to act as a guide to the pathfinder for schools and local authorities. It also provides some background on extended schools. It is not intended as definitive practice guidance for pathfinder schools and authorities, and should therefore be read alongside the training and support materials and update packs provided by the TDA.

Background

The Children's Plan clearly sets out the government's commitment to bringing about the system-wide transformation needed to deliver the five Every Child Matters outcomes. Every Child Matters calls for all children and young people to be given the support they need to:

- be healthy

- stay safe

- enjoy and achieve

- make a positive contribution, and

- achieve economic well-being.

132

Extended schools are at the heart of the delivery of these outcomes. By 2010, the government wants all schools to provide the core offer of extended services[28]:

- childcare (in primary and special schools)

- a varied menu of activities including study support and play

- parenting support, including family learning

- swift and easy access to targeted and specialist services, and

- community access to facilities including adult and family learning, ICT and sports facilities.

Schools are not expected to provide these services alone, or necessarily to deliver them on site. Instead, they should work in partnership with local authorities, and with other schools and agencies, including voluntary and community organisations and, where appropriate, provide signposting to existing services.

In May 2008, over 10,500 schools were already delivering the full core offer, with many more offering some extended provision. Between 2003 and 2008, the government invested over £840 million in extended schools. A further £1.3 billion has been committed in the current spending period, 2008-09 to 2010-11. This very significant investment will make a real difference to the ability of local authorities and schools to provide access to high quality extended school activities that reflect local needs and priorities.

Services for all: addressing economic disadvantage

Research shows that high quality out-of-hours activities can help improve well-being, raise standards of achievement and make a real contribution to reducing attainment gaps. In many cases, extended services will give economically disadvantaged children and young people and children in care[29] the opportunity to participate in activities that otherwise would have been denied them.

However, for extended services to be financially sustainable, schools may have to pass on charges to participating children (note that schools are expected to follow clear guidelines on charging[30]). At the same time, they must ensure that activities are open to all, not just those with the means to pay for them. Charging must not leave economically disadvantaged children and young people vulnerable to exclusion.

The government recognises that economic disadvantage may prevent children and young people from taking part in extended schools activities. It is therefore providing £265.5 million in funding over the next three years - £8.5 million in 2008-09, £40 million in 2009-10 and £217 million in 2010-11 - specifically to address this issue.

---

[28] For more information on extended schools go to **www.tda.gov.uk/extendedschools**
[29] Throughout this document, the term "economically disadvantaged children and young people" is used to mean both children and young people disadvantaged by economic circumstances, and children in care.
[30] Planning and Funding Extended Schools: A Guide for Schools, Local Authorities and their Partner Organisations (www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/resources-and-practice/IG00125/) and www.tda.gov.uk/remodelling/extendedschools/knowhow/fundingandcharging.aspx

The Children's Plan sets out a vision of how schools can use the funding to enhance their extended services offer:

> "Schools are encouraged to consult with children and young people and their parents on designing programmes of activities to help increase engagement with learning, offer new opportunities…and help stretch higher achievers – and are required by law to involve disabled children. In addition, through new support mechanisms, schools will be better able to help address individual barriers to learning.
>
> Tackling deprivation and disadvantage to reduce attainment gaps is a core focus of extended schools. We have already announced that we are making £265 million available by 2010-11 to help schools provide and commission an exciting range of activities for children and young people.
>
> This funding will help subsidise access to these opportunities by disadvantaged children, young people and children in care, who through their economic circumstances would otherwise be unable to participate. The funding will give schools the confidence to focus on providing what would most benefit children and young people, not just limited to what they can afford to pay for."

Guiding principles

The DCSF has developed a set of principles to guide how the funding is used:

Entitlement: The funding should enable children and young people from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and children in care ('the target group') to access activities from which they would otherwise be excluded due to their inability to pay.

Participation: The funding should be used to secure the target group's participation in extended schools activities.

Additionality: The funding should be used to make existing activities more accessible to the target group, and/or to commission new activities that better meet their needs.

Involvement: The target group and their parents/carers should be fully involved in choosing, designing and continuously improving the range of activities on offer.

Relevance: Activities should be attractive and relevant to the target group.

Demand: The target group and their parents/carers should be able to exercise real control of the funding identified for them, in the same way as children and young people whose participation is not excluded by inability to pay.

Open to all: Any new activities should form part of the universal extended schools offer, and be open to all children and young people.

The DCSF recognises that circumstances in every school and for every pupil are unique, and that there will be times when it is unclear how best to use the funding or whether it is appropriate to use it for a specific purpose. These principles are intended to guide schools in their decision-making.

The funding formula

In allocating the pathfinder funding to local authorities, the DCSF has used a formula for pathfinder schools which attributes equal weight to the number of pupils eligible for free school meals and local deprivation as measured by the DCSF tax credit indicator[31], a broader definition of economic disadvantage. The resulting funding is sufficient for a take-up rate of two-thirds or more of FSM pupils, as is typically found for extended services activities. The DCSF aims to use tax credit data to allocate funding to all local authorities by 2010-11.

The pathfinder

The pathfinder aims to explore two key aspects of making extended services more accessible to children and young people from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. First, it will look at how to identify those children and young people who are eligible for funding support to participate in activities:

- What factors should schools consider in defining the target group?

- How can the criteria for defining the target group be communicated in a way that is transparent and demonstrably fair?

- What support do schools and local authorities need to make these decisions?

- What other learning can be applied here?

Second, it will look at the activities schools should be offering children and young people, and how they should be delivered:

- Does a fixed number of hours of activities per week simplify the offer?

- Does a fixed hour offer place undue constraints on children, parents and schools?

- How can schools build on the momentum generated by 'one-off' activities by delivering ongoing programmes of activity?

The pathfinder will test two models, 'flexible' and 'defined', whose key characteristics are summarised in the following table.

	'Flexible' model	'Defined' model
Target group	Schools use local definitions of economic disadvantage to determine eligibility for the subsidy	Children who are eligible for free school meals and children in care
Offer	Flexible, as long as extended school activities are sustained over time	Around two hours of activities a week, and 30 hours in the holidays

All participating schools within a local authority will test the same model.

---

[31] www.teachernet.gov.uk/docbank/index.cfm?id=12225

What will be expected of pathfinder schools

The following expectations are based on established best practice in extended schools. Building on this, the DCSF expects pathfinder schools to use the funding to strengthen and improve access to a core offer of services, not to view it as a separate initiative.

Defining the target group

The purpose of the funding is to target funding at economically disadvantaged children and young people. Defining the target group will be a key challenge, and the approach taken will depend on which model is being used.

As outlined in the table above, in the 'defined' model, criteria have been set centrally and in line with public announcements. Schools using this model should ensure that funding is only available to children and young people who are eligible for free school meals and those in care.

Schools and local authorities using the 'flexible' model will develop and apply their own funding criteria. Many schools are already operating informal subsidies and the pathfinder will look to build on this experience. Schools may of course choose to include recipients of free school meals and children and young people in care within their target group, but they may also take into account other factors or indicators of economic disadvantage. This requires considering approaches which move beyond FSM, something many schools and LAs are already doing. This may mean considering direct indicators of economic disadvantage, such as parents/carers being out of work and those on low incomes or claiming benefits, including those just above the FSM threshold.

It can also mean considering other approaches to identifying economic disadvantage, using information and knowledge about children and young people which may indicate economic disadvantage. The following list, which is neither definitive nor exhaustive, sets out some potential examples of information which may be known to schools:

- Index based on child's postcode of residence - based on index of multiple deprivation or the tax credit data;

- young carers;

- families in temporary or poor accommodation;

- economically disadvantaged children with special educational needs;

- children of young parents;

- refugee or asylum seeker children;

- those children and young people experiencing difficult family issues, such as bereavement, living with family members other than parents, parents with physical or mental health problems or disability, domestic violence, and parents in custody or with debt problems.

Note that while health, social and cultural factors may also act as barriers to the uptake of extended services, they should not themselves be criteria in applying the funding.

Whatever the criteria used, they should be transparent and fair and avoid the risk of stigmatisation. We would encourage schools and clusters to work with each other to develop criteria, and local authorities to support and guide schools in their decisions.

Funding

The level of funding available is based on the assumption that around £300 will be spent on each targeted child over the course of the year. This will of course vary according to individual needs and circumstances, including the exact number of children in the target group and participation rates.

In line with established principles, funding will not be ring-fenced at school level. However, pathfinder schools will be expected to use the funding to support access to participation in extended schools activities for the target group, not to develop other aspects of the extended schools core offer, to pay for related activity such as consulting children and parents or to meet other indirect or capital costs.

For many pupils - particularly in rural schools - the cost of transport to and from activities is a major financial barrier to participation. To help address this, in both the fixed and the defined models, funding can be used to subsidise transport where appropriate.

Consultation

In line with established best practice, the DCSF expects schools to consult children, young people, parents and the wider community when developing their menu of extended services activities. Evidence shows that extended services have the most impact on confidence, engagement with learning and attainment where children and young people are given a real say in the kind of activities provided.

Many schools will already be familiar with using questionnaires, running focus groups and using input from school councils. Indeed, some may be experiencing "consultation overload". However, experience suggests that different techniques are needed to successfully engage with economically disadvantaged groups. Where necessary, the TDA will help schools identify appropriate and targeted consultation techniques and tools.

Ownership

Involving children and young people and their parents/carers in choosing, designing and continuously improving the activities on offer will help create a sense of ownership. This will help ensure that activities are valued, and drive increased and sustained participation. This is a difficult objective, but the potential benefits are significant.

Encouraging participation

There are many barriers to participation in extended schools activities, including financial, health, social and cultural factors and low motivation. Subsidy funding can only be used to tackle financial barriers to participation, with schools and LAs expected to build on existing activity to address these other barriers so as to maximise the positive impact of extended services on all pupils, including those in the target group.

Additionality

The DCSF's intention is that the funding should result in real 'additionality'; that is, it should provide additional access to activities rather than replace existing services. In some cases this might mean running or commissioning new activities; in others it might mean opening up access to existing activities to the target group. Effective consultation with children and families will help guide these decisions. Schools will be expected to provide evidence of additionality through tracking and management information.

Working in clusters

Clusters of schools should agree how they will work together to use the subsidy funding to best effect. Where schools within a cluster are using the 'flexible' model, the DCSF recommends that the same definition of the target group is applied across the cluster to avoid any perceptions of unfairness.

A cluster approach to using external providers can also be valuable, enabling schools to more easily commission and sign-post collectively. This enables clusters to share the activity involved in managing relations with other providers, as well as identifying potential providers of services to meet identified needs or offer new opportunities. It can also be easier for providers to engage at a cluster level rather than at an individual school level. The role of the cluster coordinator is critical here.

Sustained interest and participation

Research shows that children and young people benefit from regular and sustained participation in extended services activities. For schools using the 'defined' model, this will be achieved through the regular provision of around two hours of activity a week. For schools following the flexible model, there will be some freedom as to the frequency and regularity of sustained provision: for example, funding could be used to pay for more expensive but less frequent activity, such as taster or one-off sessions, school trips or other 'transformative experiences'. However, if outcomes are to be sustained over time, schools will need to complement such 'one-offs' with regular activity.

Partnership working

Commissioning activities from external providers, especially the voluntary and community sector, can bring real benefits, including enabling schools to offer a far wider range of activities. These organisations will also often have considerable experience and expertise in engaging with disadvantaged children and young people and breaking the cycle of disaffection and lack of engagement in learning.

School improvement planning

A recent Ofsted report on extended schools found that the schools with the most effective services had integrated the development of extended provision within their school improvement plans, with a clear focus on improving positive outcomes for children and young people. Ofsted also commented that since their previous report schools have become more aware of the need to evaluate the impact of their services on the outcomes for children, young people and their families, although very few had begun to measure this systematically.

The DCSF expects schools to think strategically about engaging the target group, encouraging participation and to manage the process effectively by planning ahead and establishing clear measures of success from the outset. Making extended school activities part of a whole school improvement strategy will maximise their impact on attainment and ensure that participation enabled by subsidy funding is seen as part of the school's wider extended services offer, avoiding any stigma. The TDA's School Improvement Planning Framework[1] helps schools to focus on outcomes and demonstrate impact.

What will be expected of pathfinder local authorities

Activities will be delivered through the extended schools programme and funding used at school level. All funding must be devolved to schools taking part in the pathfinder, as clearly stated in the funding condition of grant. Funding has already been calculated by the DCSF at an individual school level, and local authorities are encouraged to allocate it on this basis.

Local authorities and, in particular, extended schools remodelling advisers (ESRAs), are expected to support schools through the pathfinder and to ensure that activities paid for through the subsidy are incorporated into their wider extended schools activities and any other relevant strategies. Local authorities also have an important role to play in sharing learning and best practice with other local schools. The DCSF encourages local authorities to consult local social partnerships to discuss the pathfinder and potential workload implications.

Evaluation

The DCSF plans to look at a range of evidence during the pathfinder. Lessons learned will then be applied to the full roll-out of funding (see below under 'Future plans'). Some of this learning will come from the TDA, and some from a systematic evaluation of the work being done by pathfinder schools and local authorities.

The pathfinder is intended to provide answers to the following key questions:

- How can schools best identify the most economically disadvantaged children and target funding at them in a simple, transparent and fair way, while avoiding stigmatisation?

- How can schools best engage the target population in activities? Is a fixed-hour offer the most effective approach?

- How best can children, young people and their parents be consulted about the sort of activities they would like to participate in?

- How can the impact on the workloads of teachers, school leaders and support staff be minimised?

- How can schools be encouraged and supported to engage with outside organisations to commission a varied range of activities?

- How can this funding help secure additional activities, including through links to existing funding and extended schools charging policies?

- How can schools measuring the impact of the subsidy funding?

- How can schools and clusters best be supported by local authorities?

- How can the subsidy best secure activities for disadvantaged children and young people?

The DCSF has commissioned the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) and Newcastle University to produce an independent evaluation of the pathfinder. An initial report to be delivered in April 2009 will inform the scaling up of the project in 2009-10, and full findings will be made available in April 2010. To produce a high quality evaluation, the research team will need the input of all those involved in the pathfinder. The local authorities and schools involved have committed to sharing information and engaging in the process of evaluation. DCSF thanks them in advance for their support and assistance

Future plans

The pathfinder will run from September 2008, scaling up in funding from £8.5m in 2008-9 to £40m in 2009-10. The DCSF will use this period to gather both evidence of good practice and information about any barriers and problems faced by the participating schools and authorities. This learning will help shape policy development and influence the delivery of subsequent funding. The TDA will play a key role in this, including by sharing best practice and emerging solutions with other pathfinder schools as they are identified. The DCSF is keen that evaluation findings are shared with pathfinder schools, both through the interim report expected in spring 2009 and also through the informal sharing of feedback on an ongoing basis.

The DCSF, working with the TDA, plans to develop proposals for making additional funding available to further local authorities from April 2009, ahead of the roll-out of full national funding in 2010-11.