



Department
for Education

TBAP Residence Evaluation

Interim research report

March 2017

**Sarah Knibbs, Claudia Mollidor, Catherine Crick,
Nicholas Moore, Raynette Bierman - Ipsos MORI**

Professor David Berridge - University of Bristol

Contents

List of tables	3
Executive summary	4
Overview of project	7
Overview of the evaluation	14
Key findings	16
Evidence of the innovation's impact on the Innovation Programme's objectives and areas of focus	29
Barriers to this innovation	33
Facilitators to this innovation	36
Limitations of the evaluation and future evaluation	41
Implications and recommendations for policy and practice	43
Appendix 1: References for literature review	46

List of tables

Table 1: Residence delivery model by term

11

Executive summary

The Tri-borough Alternative Provision (TBAP) Multi Academy Trust is a provider of alternative education for young people who have been excluded from mainstream schools. The Trust developed an innovative intervention in a residential educational setting outside London (“the Residence”). This intervention was intended to support young people who attended one of its Academies and who were in, or on the edge of, care, and/or involved in the youth justice system. The aims of the innovation were to enable improved behaviour, educational achievement and family relationships, reduce youth offending, and reduce the number of young people entering care.

Since its opening in January 2016, a total of 15 learners have stayed at the Residence for varying periods of time, typically between one and 3 half-terms. These learners were all male, aged between 12 and 16, from diverse ethnic backgrounds and receiving SEN support at school. Baseline assessments show that average Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) scores¹ for Residence learners indicated a high or very high level of difficulty in most areas.

Throughout its operation, the Residence implemented a variety of models with regard to 7-day provision, the selection of cohorts of learners, the length of their stay and the number of staff members. This model may continue to be flexible, being adapted to suit the particular needs of each cohort.

The evaluation planned to use a mixed methods approach. Initially, the evaluation team conducted interviews with learners and their parents at the Bridge AP Academy exploring attitudes towards the introduction of the Residence. In addition, to date, a total of 22 interviews have taken place with 12 young people staying at the Residence; 8 of these young people have been interviewed more than once to understand changes over time. Staff at the Residence were interviewed at each termly visit. The evaluation team also analysed SDQ scores for learners and records from the TBAP database on learners’ behaviour, achievement and attendance. However, a very small sample size means that findings should be considered with great caution.

Overall, analysis of TBAP learner data indicates that the Residence had a positive effect on behaviour, as approximated by achievement points, and in comparison with a group of Academy learners who had been referred to the Residence but not yet attended. Those who had attended the Residence at least once experienced an overall increase in average net achievement during the year, in comparison with a decrease in net achievement shown by the learners who did not attend. Those in years 8 or 9 who attended the Residence experienced a higher positive change than learners of the same

¹ The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a behavioural questionnaire for children aged between 4 and 17 and is widely used to measure behavioural difficulties and emotional well-being.

age who did not attend. The same pattern was not found for learners in years 10 or 11: there was no observable effect of attendance on achievement for learners of this age.

Average SDQ scores for the cohort of learners in terms 3 and 4 show improvement in all domains of the SDQ except for emotional difficulty; however, average scores for learners who attended in terms 1 and 2 show little change over time.

Staff, parents and learners themselves provided examples of learners' improved behaviour, including attending and participating in lessons, helpful behaviour, and being more polite and more respectful to parents and staff. Staff observed learners being more willing to try new things at the Residence, and some learners reported that their engagement with learning had increased. However, some learners expressed concern about the absence of academic work at the Residence, feeling that this might affect their GCSE studies. Residence staff have recently introduced more tutoring in academic subjects based on the needs of individual learners.

It is clear that learners' return home needs to be well-managed if the progress observed at the Residence is to be maintained. Staff and learners expressed concern that once learners move on from the Residence, the presence of negative influences in a challenging home, neighbourhood and school environment could make it difficult for learners to maintain the positive changes they had achieved.

The experiences of learners moving on from the Residence have been mixed. Some learners had made sufficient progress to move on to mainstream school, which had not initially been anticipated as an outcome from the Residence. Another learner was being supported on an apprenticeship. Some learners were excluded or showed a deterioration in their behaviour on leaving the Residence.

The facilitators to the innovation which are apparent at this stage relate to staff, young people's relationships, the location and activities of the Residence, and the support offered to learners' families. Staff formed a skilled and cohesive team and, importantly, were liked by the young people attending the Residence. This helped staff engage learners in activities they would have otherwise refused or been reluctant to engage in. Offering family therapy to parents during learners' time at the Residence helped to develop improved family relationships and supported reintegration for the families who took up this offer.

Barriers to the innovation were predominantly related to the short lead-in time from grant receipt to opening and evaluating the Residence. There were particular challenges in securing a building and making it appropriate for use within this time frame. Should other Academy Trusts or local authorities consider a similar approach, the evaluation team recommends that adequate time be allocated to set-up activity, and that this time frame allow for contingencies and delays.

Other potential barriers to the innovation include under-developed working relationships with other schools, both within TBAP and outside it, to support learners moving on from the Residence. Staffing was also reported to be challenging, with many Residence staff reporting working during rest periods or on days off, which is unlikely to be viable in the longer term.

In order to be sustainable, the Residence will need to demonstrate a positive impact on outcomes and life chances for some of the most vulnerable children in the Tri-borough area. The evaluation team have made some initial recommendations to support this objective:

- develop and implement a robust strategy for re-integrating learners to school and to their homes following a stay at the Residence, in particular by continuing to work with learners' families
- develop effective working relationships with other schools, both within TBAP Academies and outside, to improve transition for learners moving on from the Residence
- ensure that the curriculum at the Residence is sufficiently challenging for all learners, including those working towards GCSEs
- retain an effective and motivated staff team
- continue working to engage staff at TBAP Academies and further develop links with Tri-borough children's services

The evaluation will continue until August 2017 to follow up these initial indicators over the medium-term, and to enable a more robust analysis of outcomes.

Overview of project

Local context

The TBAP Multi-Academy Trust was established in 2013. It has a contract to deliver and coordinate alternative educational provision for all young people aged 11 to 16 who have been excluded, or moved, from mainstream schools in the boroughs of Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, and Westminster (the Tri-borough area). The Trust also manages an Academy for young people aged 16 to 19.

The Tri-borough area has a population of around 560,000 and a significantly smaller proportion of children and young people than the average for England. It contains both some of the most deprived and some of the most affluent areas in England². Since 2011, the 3 boroughs have combined their children's social care provision into a single service.

TBAP manages 5 AP academies in the Tri-borough area, as well as another 4 in Haringey and Cambridgeshire, and works with over 300 young people at any one time. Of the 3 Academies that have had an Ofsted inspection since joining TBAP, one was judged to be Good and 2 were Outstanding. The Trust also provides a Commissioning and School Support service to support challenging learners within their existing schools, and manages a Teaching Schools Alliance to support other alternative-provision educators. In 2015, TBAP successfully applied for funding to DfE's Innovation Programme, as part of the Programme's strand of funding for innovations to rethink support for adolescents in and on the edge of care.

Intended outcomes of the project

In its application to the Innovation Programme, TBAP proposed an intervention to support young people who attended one of its Academies and were in care, on the edge of care, and/or involved in the youth justice system. This residential intervention would have a focus on education and therapy, and was intended to achieve:

- improved achievement and better academic outcomes for the young people attending the Residence
- improved behaviour, better life-skills and a reduction in offending among young people attending
- improved family relationships and parenting skills for the families of young people attending
- a reduction in the number of young offenders, and in the number of learners in care entering the secure estate, in the Tri-borough area

² Tri-borough Public Health Report 2013-14

- a reduction in the number of looked-after children and in the number of residential care weeks required, in the Tri-borough area³

The intervention would be offered to young people whose education was at risk of being disrupted by difficult home circumstances and who were in need of a respite package or crisis placement. Young people would stay at the Residence for up to 12 weeks, with up to 7 young people being able to stay at any one time. These young people would be identified by TBAP's internal networks in collaboration with social workers, as well as from local groups such as Family Early Help and the Family Recovery Project⁴.

The Residence would provide continuity of schooling for young people from TBAP Academies, and combine this with psychotherapeutic support for the young person and their family, the acquisition of life skills, and leisure activities including outdoor pursuits. During the day, young people would take part in learning, therapeutic and outdoor activities personalised to their abilities and needs. During evenings and weekends, leisure activities would take place in a family-like atmosphere: for example, learners and staff would visit leisure centres, and cook meals and eat together.

This continuity of education was intended to support engagement with education and improvements in behaviour. The therapeutic support provided to learners was intended to increase young people's self-management skills, resilience and ability to make positive choices, and the support provided to families during a learner's stay at the Residence was intended to increase parenting skills and parental engagement in young people's education.

Relevant existing research relating to this innovation

Since the TBAP Residence is a new type of intervention, there is little existing research pertaining specifically to this approach for this group of young people. In particular, there are few sources of evidence which focus on the alternative education of children on the edge of care. However, the evaluation team conducted a review of literature relating to the education of children in care and on the edge of care to explore whether the rationale for the TBAP Residence was supported by this body of research. The references used for this literature review are listed in Appendix 1.

The literature review identified a number of findings:

- stability of school placement is seen as an important factor for young people's educational achievement, as is the presence of staff and carers (in residential care) who demonstrably value and prioritise education
- the structure and routine of residential placements, and the opportunity to develop positive peer relationships, are welcomed by some young people whose home lives are chaotic

³ TBAP Residence Proposal, 2014

- there is limited evidence of the effectiveness of outdoor education for vulnerable young people
- residential care or education may provide more of an opportunity for improving family relationships than a placement in foster care, and there is evidence to suggest that involving family members with young people's therapeutic treatment and care produces more positive outcomes
- the TBAP Residence seeks to avoid young people's entry to care. However, a recent study which compared the educational progress of children in care with children in need found that children who had been in longer-term care showed better outcomes than children in need (but not in care) and children in short-term care. This suggests that over time, care may serve as a protective factor in children's education⁴

Changes to the project

Delays in securing planning permission meant that the Residence opened in January 2016, rather than in September 2015 as intended. In December 2015, prior to the Residence opening, a trial cohort of 4 learners took part in a week-long Drama project that included staying at the Residence for 3 nights. Fewer learners have stayed at the Residence during the evaluation period than originally anticipated, partly as a result of these delays. In total, as of November 2016, 15 learners⁵ had attended the Residence since its opening, some attending for more than one half-term. Although the Residence was initially designed to target young people in or on the edge of care, none of the learners that have attended so far have been looked-after-children. However, some were classified under child protection (CP) or children in need (CiN). Investigation of the learners' referral reasons indicates that the Residence has still targeted a complex population.

Moreover, the Residence delivery model developed over time. Initially, the Residence was intended to offer 7-day provision and to provide continuity with the curriculum offered at TBAP Academies, with the intention of returning learners to their home Academy following their stay. In the initial proposal for the Residence, the model suggested that learners would access shorter or longer-term stays depending on their needs; further to this, when the Residence opened it was proposed that learners attend for between 6 and 12 weeks, in other words 1 or 2 half-terms. However, since its opening, the following changes were made to the Residence model:

⁴ Sebba et al. (2015) *The Educational Progress of Looked-After Children In England: Linking Care and Educational Data*. Rees Centre/University of Bristol

⁵ This includes two that only stayed for several nights at the start of the autumn term 2016, after which they were excluded from the Residence.

- for some terms, as a result of staff shortages, the Residence closed at weekends (Saturday nights and Sundays) and learners returned home to their families, being picked up by Residence staff and returned to the Residence on Monday mornings
- it was initially anticipated that the Residence would provide continuity and consistency with the TBAP academic curriculum. However, in practice, some young people who attended the Residence were highly disengaged with education, including that provided at TBAP Academies. As a result, Residence education staff chose to offer an alternative curriculum which was focused on music, drama and creative activities and, particularly in later cohorts, adapted to each individual's learning needs
- the delivery model implied that, following a stay at the Residence, learners would return to their home Academy. However, in practice, some learners moved into mainstream schools or other non-TBAP placements

Throughout its operation, the TBAP Residence implemented a variety of models with regard to 7-day provision, the selection of cohorts of learners, the length of their stay and the number of staff members. This was partly in response to particular challenges such as staffing, as described below, but also in order to test and learn which models worked best for learners. Initially, staff wanted to determine the optimal model for the Residence to use for future terms. However, the model could also continue to be flexible, being adapted to suit the particular needs of each cohort.

The table below shows the development of the Residence delivery model over its first year of operation.

Table 1: Residence delivery model by term

Term	Spring half-term 1 2016	Spring half-term 2 2016	Summer half-term 1 2016	Summer half-term 2 2016	Autumn half-term 1 2016	Autumn half-term 2 2016
Total number of learners (including emergency placements)	3	5	6	6	7	6
Total number of staff	10	10	12	16	13	13
Facilities	Downstairs rooms used for both education and care facilities	Downstairs rooms used for both education and care facilities	Shared bedrooms and living space upstairs; classrooms downstairs	Shared bedrooms and living space upstairs; classrooms downstairs	Individual bedrooms and living space upstairs; classrooms downstairs	Individual bedrooms and living space upstairs; classrooms downstairs
Timetable	Operating 7 days a week	Closed on Saturday nights and Sundays	Closed on Saturday nights and Sundays	Operating 7 days a week	Closed every other weekend: Thursday afternoon, Friday, Saturday and Sunday	Closed every weekend: Friday afternoon, Saturday and Sunday morning
Data collection⁶	SIMS not available	SIMS available	SIMS available	SIMS available	SIMS available	SIMS available

Seven-day provision

The Residence was initially intended to operate 7 days a week throughout term-time. However, due to staff shortages, in particular of night staff, during its second half-term (Spring term 2, 2016) the Residence closed on Saturday nights and Sundays and this continued until sufficient overnight staff were recruited.

In the autumn term 1, the Residence closed every other weekend from Friday to Sunday (learners returning on Monday morning); this was to allow the staff team to meet for continuing professional development (CPD) activities. Staff welcomed this opportunity to share information and discuss issues that affected each other, such as the importance of having a consistent policy on learners' use of mobile phones. This was seen as especially useful for night staff who would otherwise have little interaction with other Residence staff. In the autumn term 2, the Residence closed every weekend.

The idea behind it is that we all have an opportunity to meet together and discuss everything and reflect which we haven't done before. Just basic information-sharing. Sometimes I'm here and then I don't come in for days. I always read the

⁶ SIMS refers to the School Information Management System, an IT system which TBAP uses to record information about learners' behaviour, achievement and attendance (see p. 19).

minutes but you could just miss something... so in the meeting you can find out – forward planning and better structure. – Residence staff

Learners reported a range of views on returning home at weekends. Some learners appreciated being able to visit family and friends, as well as to collect belongings and pocket money. However, others preferred staying at the Residence full-time and reported that they were bored or got into trouble when going home at the weekend. Staff suggested that, in the future, learners' families could come to visit them at the Residence at the weekend, rather than the other way around.

Staff also had mixed views on the most appropriate model. Some had found it challenging to work with learners following their return, as they appeared unsettled and there was not enough opportunity to discuss the events of the weekend before commencing lessons. However, others pointed out that going home for the weekend was an opportunity to experience the reintegration process on a smaller scale and helped prepare learners for the end of their time at the Residence; it was also reported to increase engagement from some parents. Moreover, staff considered that the opportunity to reflect and develop afforded by fortnightly CPD sessions would improve the quality of provision overall.

Length of stay

When the Residence opened it was proposed that learners attend for between 6 and 12 weeks, i.e. one or 2 half-terms. However, staff considered that it was more effective for learners to stay for 2 half-terms. Relationship-building between learners and staff could take a number of weeks before learners trusted staff sufficiently to start working with them and making changes to their attitude and behaviours, so coming back for a second term allowed learners enough time to achieve and embed more of these changes. This will be even more pertinent in future since Residence staff will be less likely to have pre-existing relationships with new cohorts of learners⁷.

Residence staff described changes in the curriculum over the 2 half-terms, with the first term more focused on creative activities and work on learners' attitudes and self-management, and the second term using a more traditional curriculum, in line with what learners would experience on their return to school.

Residence staff considered learners' length of stay, and the appropriate point for learners to move on from the Residence, on an individual basis. However, most staff agreed that 2 or 3 half-terms was an optimal length of stay. This has implications for the per-learner cost of the Residence intervention, and means that the Residence may be able to support fewer young people than initially anticipated.

⁷ When the Residence first opened, most staff had previously worked in TBAP Academies and so had often met learners in their previous role. However, over time, as Residence staff will have been in their posts for longer, it will become less likely that they will have previously met learners referred from other TBAP academies.

Selection of cohort of young people

Residence learners have all been male, aged between 12 and 16, from diverse ethnic backgrounds, and receiving SEN support at school (although not all learners had a statement of SEN or Education, Health and Care plan). As previously mentioned, the majority of these young people had CP or CiN status, were referred for reasons of youth offending, low school attendance and disengagement, neglect or family breakdown, and were often seen as on the edge of care.

Although staff had initially been reluctant to mix key stages, most cohorts in fact included learners from both key stages 3 and 4. In the first few half-terms, due to limited space, some learners shared bedrooms with others of a similar age group. Mixing between different age groups is more common in alternative provision, and staff reported that, in the absence of a larger peer group, learners were less embarrassed to spend time with younger pupils. Furthermore, both groups were able to learn positive behaviours from each other.

The younger ones are more open to trying things out, the older ones have different ways with us as adults and the younger ones can learn from that, so it works really well to have different age groups that can learn from each other and bounce off each other. – Residence staff

However, having too large an age range was also felt to cause hierarchies within the group. Problems also arose in providing a curriculum suitable for a broad age range, although this challenge is likely to arise regardless of age differences, since there may be a wide range of ability within age groups as well as between them.

Some terms at the Residence featured a combination of new and returning learners, and some learners had arrived at the Residence part-way through a term. This was seen as a positive, as existing Residence learners were able to help newer ones settle in and strengthen their positive relationships with staff. However, some staff felt there could be advantages in a cohort of learners starting and ending their experience together. In practice, whether or not cohorts overlap is likely to be determined by the needs of the individual learners within them.

Overview of the evaluation

The aim of the evaluation was to ascertain and provide evidence regarding the effectiveness of the TBAP Residence model in improving the educational and behavioural outcomes and life chances of the young people who attended, and their families/carers.

The evaluation questions were as follows:

- to what extent are the behavioural outcomes for young people attending the TBAP Residence improved?
- to what extent are the educational outcomes for young people attending the TBAP Residence improved?
- to what extent are the parenting skills and family relationships of parents or carers of learners attending the Residence improved?
- how does the Residence differ from other forms of residential care?
- how cost-effective is the TBAP Residence model?
- how could the longer-term impacts of the TBAP Residence be monitored and evaluated beyond the timeframes for the current evaluation?

The evaluation was designed as a mixed-methods approach, with both qualitative⁸ and quantitative components. The evaluation team proposed to conduct:

- semi-structured interviews with 7 learners and their parents/carers at TBAP Academies, who were not from the intended Residence target group, to ascertain their understanding of, and attitudes towards, the Residence
- semi-structured interviews with young people during their initial period at the Residence and shortly after they returned to the TBAP Academy
- focus groups with staff at the Residence once a term
- observations at the Bridge Academy and at the Residence
- a literature review on research into residential care
- analysis of achievement, behaviour and attendance information recorded in SIMS and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) assessments. In both instances, baseline measures of learners at the Residence would be compared

⁸ The interviews completed produced qualitative findings that provide an insight into the perceptions, feelings and behaviours of the interviewee groups rather than a set of quantifiable conclusions from a statistically representative sample. Owing to the small sample size, findings from interviews should not be considered in isolation or assumed to represent the views of all sub-groups.

with learners in a comparison group of learners who are believed to have a similar set of characteristics.

Summary of any significant changes to evaluation methodology from the original design

The changes from the originally proposed evaluation methodology design are detailed below. These changes result from delays in preparing the site and opening the Residence, smaller cohorts of young people than expected, and difficulties encountered by TBAP staff in recording data about the progress of the young people at the Residence. The schedule of interviews is as follows:

- instead of interviews regarding attitudes towards the Residence with 7 learners and parents/carers at TBAP Academies (not from the target group), we interviewed 4 'Residence trial week' learners, 4 learners at the Academy and 2 parents/carers. The evaluation team made attempts to interview the trial week learners again following their stay, but were only able to arrange an interview with one of these learners, who had subsequently returned to the Residence
- a total of 24 interviews took place with 12 young people staying at the Residence; 9 of these young people also took part in a follow-up interview later in their stay to understand changes over time
- the evaluation team interviewed one learner who had returned to his home Academy. The evaluation team encountered difficulties in conducting follow-up interviews with learners who had moved on from the Residence. The majority of these learners are no longer on roll at TBAP Academies, and some have moved away from the area.
- the evaluation team interviewed 3 teachers from the TBAP Academies to which 2 young people had returned. Two of these teachers had worked with the young people both before and after their stay, and were able to comment on any changes they observed.
- the evaluation team also interviewed one social worker working with a young person who had moved on from the Residence, and one family therapist working with parents of learners who attend the Residence
- due to shift patterns, instead of conducting focus groups with Residence staff, the evaluation team conducted a total of 31 individual interviews with 14 members of staff at the Residence over the course of its first year of operation
- analysis of SDQ scores took place, but was limited by missing data; the evaluation team was reliant on TBAP staff to complete SDQ assessments and this did not take place consistently

Key findings

How far the innovation has achieved its intended outcomes

Below, we present an overview of findings on the intended outcomes of the Residence, as described on pages 7 and 8.

Staff, learners, and learners' families reported that young people's behaviour and self-awareness improved during their stay at the Residence. Some young people reduced or ceased offending, however others have showed a deterioration in behaviour since moving on from the Residence.

The curriculum provided at the Residence was different to a typical school curriculum and focused on creative activities and developing skills such as self-management and resilience. This was intended to support disengaged learners back into education. Some learners and staff were concerned that the absence of academic learning on offer at the Residence could cause learners to fall further behind in their education. However, improved engagement with learning was reported for several learners and some Residence learners moved to mainstream schools or college.

There were some indications that learners' relationships with their families improved. The family therapy offered to learners' families in London was thought to be a major facilitator of this; however, only a minority of learners' families were willing to engage with it. Residence staff created a programme of activities for learners' families to participate in during their child's time at the Residence, and this was reported to have increased parental engagement in their child's education.

At this stage, given the small number of learners that have stayed at the Residence, it is not possible to observe an impact on the number of young offenders or looked-after children in the Tri-borough area.

Behaviour

The behaviour of young people at the Residence improved over the course of their stay. Interviews with Residence staff suggested that learners were calmer at the Residence, indicated through fewer angry outbursts, and less frequent physical restraint required. Both learners and staff attributed this partly to the absence of other young people distracting or agitating them, and to learners at the Residence no longer being under pressure to assert themselves over other young people, for example through fighting.

Having a small group of young people also meant that learners could have one-to-one time with staff to help them manage their anger. Staff commented that some learners became increasingly able to control themselves and refrain from acting violently towards others.

I've learnt to respect my work, not get angry with myself or others. My ability to work [has improved]. - Learner at the Residence

They can control their anger. They stand with fists clenched rather than hitting out. I'm not saying they never will, but there's been a decrease, especially towards female members of staff. The guys have done a lot of work with them about female members of staff and respect and how you speak to them. - Staff at the Residence

Staff commented that learners were more polite and better at mixing with other people, for example, when they went out on trips. They were impressed that learners reacted calmly when rudely confronted by a stranger for making noise in the park.

Learners also indicated that these positive behaviour changes were due to the development of a strong rapport with staff, improved confidence and an increased ability to think about, and rationalise, potential conflict situations. This was further helped by the introduction of a 'boys to men' class, stemming from some learners' difficulties with respecting female members of staff.

Before I personally would say, my bro is going to get f****d up cause he's chatting to my girl, but what I would do now is hear both sides of the story... and see what the evidence is. – Learner at the Residence

Despite these improvements, young people continued to display challenging behaviour. Some learners were found to be using illegal substances (albeit less than they would in London). Doors and windows in the Residence building were frequently broken by learners.

Attendance

Staff felt that learners coped well with a full school day while at the Residence.. Learners participated well in lessons that could be 90 minutes long or more, which was considered especially promising in light of their very poor lesson attendance and participation at the Academy.

I would always come in at 1 or 2 at [Academy], just after lunch. Here we start at 9.15.
- Learner at the Residence

Learners explained that this was due to the absence of other young people who would have distracted them at the Academy.

In the lessons when you go to [Academy] you cannot get on with your work...You step into your classroom, a million people knock on your door, 'come out, come out' ... Here it's really quiet, nice work, easy work, you can get help if you need it. - Learner at the Residence

Staff also commented that the absence of a clock in the Residence classroom encouraged concentration and attendance, since learners were not aware of how long they had spent in lessons.

I asked him last term, how long would you stay in a lesson – a lesson you really liked?
He said probably 10 minutes. I said “Do you realise you’ve been here for 3 hours?” -
Residence staff

However, both staff and learners also reported that these examples of improved attendance could partly be attributed to the lack of alternative spaces to go to.

Behaviour and Achievement points

Across the TBAP Academies, teachers record incidents of learners’ behaviour using a points system comprised of behaviour points (awarded for negative behaviour) and achievement points (positive behaviour). Each record has a points value attached, with increasingly positive achievement or negative behaviour associated with a higher number of positive or negative points respectively. An assessment of the average difference in achievement points and behaviour points (net achievement) in the 2015/16 academic year was used to provide an indication of the effect the Residence might have had on behaviour. The achievement and behaviour scores of Residence learners were compared with the scores of a group of TBAP Academy learners who were referred to the Residence, but have not yet attended.

Given the low number of behaviour and achievement observations available for analysis, and the potential biases that could exist in recorded observations, these findings should be taken cautiously and used only in association with qualitative findings. The evaluation team is keen to continually refine the approach used as more data is accumulated, permitting an analysis over a greater period and an assessment of incident counts as well as associated points. It might be the case that the Residence intervention alters the distribution of certain types of learner behaviour.

Overall, analysis indicates that the Residence had a positive effect on behaviour, as approximated by net achievement. On average, net achievement was consistently higher for those that attended the Residence at least once during the year, except for in half term 1; in half terms 4 and 6 achievement was 5 times higher for learners who attended compared with those who did not. Those that attended the Residence at least once also experienced an overall increase in average net achievement during the year, in comparison to a decrease shown by those that did not attend the Residence.⁹

When looking at the relationship between net achievement and the number of half terms a learner spent at the Residence, the results were mixed. Learners who attended the Residence once experienced positive but decreasing average net achievement

⁹ Average net achievement for the comparison group decreased from 5.9 to -5.25 during the 2015/16 academic year, whereas average net achievement rose from -9.8 to 21.6 in the treatment group.

throughout the year. Those that attended the Residence twice finished with negative average net achievement, despite recording positive average net achievement in half terms 2-4. Learners who stayed for 3 or 4 terms experienced the largest increase in average net achievement. These results are based on extremely small sample sizes and should be taken with caution.¹⁰

When looking at net achievement by age group, analysis indicates that the Residence may be more useful for younger learners in generating more positive behaviour outcomes. Those in years 8 or 9 who attended the Residence experienced a positive change in net achievement higher than that of learners of the same age that did not attend.¹¹ Net achievement for learners in years 10 or 11 seems to be unrelated to attending the Residence: the difference between learners that did and did not attend was negligible.

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)

The SDQ is a behavioural questionnaire for children aged between 4 and 17 and is widely used to measure behavioural difficulties and emotional well-being¹². The questionnaire is scored in 5 areas: emotional distress, behavioural difficulties, hyperactivity and concentration difficulties, and difficulties getting on with other children (where a raised score represents higher stress levels or difficulty); and kind and helpful behaviour (where a low score represents less kind and helpful behaviour).

SDQ scores for learners in terms 3 and 4 showed improvement during their stay at the Residence. Average scores of learners in the first 2 cohorts and in a comparison group showed little change. However, there are significant limitations to these findings, as they are based on very small numbers of learners. Moreover, assessments were completed by different staff members. These findings should therefore be seen as indicative only.

SDQ assessments were completed by staff for all learners at the Residence in the first 4 cohorts, and also for 6 learners who had been initially put forward to attend the Residence but who had not yet attended (a comparison group). These learners were of similar ages and had similar issues with their learning and in their home environment, as reported by TBAP staff.

The baseline assessments showed that average SDQ scores for Residence learners were similar to those of the comparison group, and overall indicated a high, or very high,

¹⁰ Average net achievement decreased from 34 to 10 for learners who attended the Residence once. Those that attended twice saw average net achievement increase from 22 to 26.5 in half term 4, only to decrease to -31.5 at the end of the period. Learners that attended for 3 or 4 half terms experienced increases from 0 to 90 and -112 to 94 respectively.

¹¹ Those in the treatment in years 8-9 see their average net achievement rise to 16 from -19 in contrast to the slight increase from -18 to -14 for the comparison group.

¹² See e.g.:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/253566/ssda903_sdq_guidance_2012-13_version1-0.pdf

level of difficulty in most areas, although ability to get along with other children appeared to be of least concern for both groups.

SDQ assessments were completed for the 6 learners in the comparison group in January, March and July 2016. On average, this group's SDQ scores remained very high and showed little change in any of the domains, with the exception of emotional distress, where the group's average score moved from slightly raised to high.

Assessments were completed for the 2 learners in cohort 1 and 2 for their first 2 terms at the Residence. A follow-up assessment was also completed in the third term, when one of these students was still at the Residence and the other had returned to school. On average, this group's SDQ scores remained very high and showed little change in any of the domains, with the exception of hyperactivity and concentration difficulties, where the group's average score moved from slightly raised to high.

Assessments were completed for the 4 learners in cohorts 3 and 4 in the term before attending the Residence and for the 2 terms at the Residence. On average, this group's scores moved from very high to high, and positive changes were observed in all domains of the SDQ with the exception of emotional difficulties, which remained high.

Engagement with learning

Conventional education was not the core component of the Residence. The extent to which classroom-based teaching was delivered depended on the requirements of each learner: some learners were seen to be ready to engage in maths and literacy whereas others required more alternative and tailored approaches to enable learning.

Learners engaged well with visiting professionals such as a graffiti artist and spoken-word artists. In particular, most learners, especially younger cohorts, engaged well with army-style outdoor pursuits provided by a visiting instructor, although some young people took part in other physical activities such as football instead. Learners also engaged well with a drama programme delivered by students from the BRIT school with similar socio-economic backgrounds.

One learner explained the different things they have learnt since staying at the Residence:

I've learnt a lot here. I've learnt a lot about respect here, and self-respect as well. I've learnt about the different muscles in the body, I've learnt how to ride a horse, how to do street art... I like to think that I'm smart, but here I show my ability more than in school. I can see that I'm doing good work and the teachers tell me I'm doing good work. - Learner at the Residence

Learners found it helpful to have more staff available to support them during lessons, so that they could get help as soon as they asked for it.

I've been learning how to say long words, I've been spelling good. It feels like I don't have dyslexia anymore. I kept asking people how to spell this, how to spell that, now I can spell it out in my head and I can do it. The teachers helped me. - Learner at the Residence

Staff interviews indicated that the majority of learners were initially uncertain and afraid of trying new things, especially given limited learner exposure to success and praise. Staff often introduced education in a disguised format. When learners realised they had achieved something without being aware of it during the process, staff reported that they were more receptive to future learning.

I think [the learners] are really proud after they have achieved something. When you're telling them what they will do they don't care, but if you tell them after they've done it it's really powerful. – Staff at the Residence

Staff reported that learners also became more self-reflective in assessing their own progress, and more able to identify areas in which they needed to develop. In later cohorts, staff made attempts to build in individual learner requirements through workshops with learners.

However, although progress had been made in terms of engagement with learning and behaviour, some staff felt that it was likely to be too early for this to result in improved predicted grades, particularly because much of the learning was not in academic subjects. Some learners expressed concern about the absence of academic work at the Residence, feeling that this might cause them to become further behind or affect their GCSE studies.

Since I've been here I haven't even done proper work, proper written work, English and Maths, sitting down subtracting and stuff. It's been mostly drama, watching stuff. It is more laid back when it comes to the working. In a way that's not even good because we're meant to be working. - Learner at the Residence

A number of TBAP staff, both within and outside the Residence, echoed these concerns. However, Residence staff reported that the Residence had increased its provision of appropriate academic support by engaging teachers from other TBAP academies to provide learners with one-to-one or small group tutoring in literacy and maths.

Lessons and activities

Staff explained that lessons at the Residence involved more creative activities, games and discussion and less working with pen and paper than at the Academy. Learners engaged well with real-life stories and with physical activities, and incorporating these elements into lessons made them more successful. For example, learners were taught about angles by means of an obstacle course, and followed a treasure hunt based on

maths questions. Literacy activities often took the form of writing song lyrics or film scripts.

The teachers make it a fun experience, so you can have fun and read. You don't even know that you're doing a lot of work and you're doing really good. - Learner at the Residence

Learners spoke positively about the opportunities the Residence had given them to try new things. Several learners were particularly enthusiastic about the lessons in DJing and music production. Another learner had enjoyed visiting the seaside for the first time.

That was one of my best experiences because I'd never been to the seaside before. I stared out at the sea and it was like, stress free. I'm so used to London and the city and over there it was different. - Learner at the Residence

The army-style outdoor activities were popular with most learners; they enjoyed the physical activities offered in these sessions and respected the instructor, who set clear boundaries with them. Learners responded well to the discipline of these sessions: the instructor explained that their eagerness to learn skills such as camouflage helped them overcome their resistance to being told what to do. When asked about his term so far, one learner said that it had been "exhausting and fun", mainly due to the army-style activities, boxing, swimming and football.

Location

Learners felt that the location of the Residence had helped them focus on their learning. Learners were impressed by the building and grounds and appreciated the opportunity to stay in a peaceful, new environment.

I think it's really nice cause you get fresh air, it's not crowded like in the city, you get freedom and space, there's a lake there. It's not really dirty like the city, it's clean round here. – Learner at the Residence

Being away from London also allowed learners to get away from negative influences such as fighting, gangs and drug dealing. Learners explained that the location provided them with a space to think that was relatively free of distraction.

I think it's better because if I was in London I'd be out on the street, buy more weed, smoking, selling, getting in trouble with the police, stuff like that. - Learner at the Residence

There are no perceived threats, so they can just be themselves. – Residence staff

Family relationships

Overall, there were some indications that relationships had improved between young people and their families. One learner's parent reported that the young person had improved anger management and was more respectful and polite when speaking to her. This parent felt that the learner had become less challenging during his stay at the Residence.

Staff had informal discussions with learners about their relationships and attitudes outside school, and encouraged them to consider situations from different points of view to understand the value of making the right decision.

I ask them – imagine you're a dad and you're out with your son. Would you behave like that? And then you hear a totally different answer. I'm glad to hear that answer because it means they can differentiate right and wrong. - Residence staff

During their time at the Residence, young people were offered a range of therapeutic sessions provided by a full-time music therapist. These included both group and one-to-one sessions, as well as music therapy. Staff commented that the small group and the fact that learners were in a similar situation to each other helped to reduce the stigma of attending therapy, and that good relationships between learners and staff created an atmosphere of openness and honesty. Moreover, the intensive nature of the Residence meant that therapeutic work could progress more rapidly.

Learners' families were also offered a 6 week course of family therapy. Staff reported that working with the family therapist improved their parenting skills, confidence, and ability to manage their own emotional difficulties as well as their children's challenging behaviour, so that learners could return to an improved and more stable home environment with improved parent-child relationships.

[Learner's parent] said in the first session that when her stress levels and anger gets too great [his parent] just doesn't want to engage with him, and so part of our work is to help [the parent] reduce their anger, so [the parent] can begin to speak to him, and the next step would be to express an interest in getting to know him. – TBAP family therapist

Staff felt that it was important to young people's motivation to see their parents committing to make changes at the same time as themselves, and that this made learners more open to changing their own behaviour. Failure of parents to engage fully could be detrimental to their progress as a family. This raises concerns as parents' engagement had been somewhat inconsistent to date; TBAP staff reported that parents often miss therapy sessions or refuse to engage. Several learners also indicated that they were unaware that their parents were in communication with Residence staff, even when such communication was taking place. Strategies were put in place to improve engagement, such as providing transport for parents to appointments and working

together with social work teams to give parents of learners with CiN or CP plans extra encouragement to attend. These had a small positive impact on engagement.

Residence staff increased the formality of the process through which parents interact with the intervention. Staff ensured parents were fully aware from the start about the number and types of interaction they would have with their children and when these would take place. Interactions included an initial introduction meeting with Residence staff, opportunities to go out for an evening activity, and end of term shows where learners presented a project they had worked on. Staff indicated that these actions increased parental engagement with the intervention and supported an understanding of the benefits of their involvement. One parent became increasingly engaged in the therapy sessions and staff noticed a positive improvement in the relationship with their child:

His relationship with his [parent] has improved tenfold. [The parent has] grown in confidence [and] completed 6 weeks of counselling... Now he's more positive and you can see it when [the parent] visits, and there's a bit more hope there. –
Residence staff

Residence staff tested the introduction of homework tasks on weekends to make families more accountable for learner progress and to provide an opportunity to put their learning from therapy sessions into practice. These were low-key and informal tasks such as cooking a family meal and compiling a music playlist, intended to familiarise learners with the idea of being set an assignment to complete outside of school. Staff hoped to informally check learners' work on their return and incorporate it into that week's scheduled lessons. However, staff indicated that completion rates were low and it was difficult to understand the reasons behind this, with one staff member suggesting it was hard to keep track of learner progress whilst they were at home.

There were also some indications of an improvement in relationships between TBAP staff and learners' parents. Staff described how, when dealing with behaviour incidents, some parents agreed with Residence staff for the first time about the need for their child to follow set expectations, and supported them in setting boundaries for their child, rather than disputing the rules set by staff and defending the young person's behaviour.

Parents were eager for their child to successfully complete their stay at the Residence, and it was seen as a positive sign by staff that most learners willingly returned to the Residence after weekend and half-term breaks.

Sustaining positive change and reintegration

In order for the potential impacts of the Residence to be realised, the progress described above must be sustainable once young people move on.

While the intervention was intended to provide continuity of schooling, learners' experience at the Residence was likely to have been significantly different to their experience at home and at their previous learning environments:

- the activities offered at the Residence during the day, such as graffiti art and outdoor pursuits, were designed to encourage participation from learners who have not engaged with lessons at the Academy. As such, they were, almost by definition, more appealing than a typical day at the Academy, following a school curriculum. To increase participation, traditional subjects were taught in a manner that resembles a recreational activity or game. Examples included writing raps in literacy or completing treasure hunts with cryptic numerical clues in numeracy.
- the stability and routine offered at the Residence, as well as the on-going, one-on-one positive attention learners receive from adults, was likely to stand in contrast to some learners' difficult home circumstances, and the larger classroom sizes (which means less one-to-one attention) at the Academy and other schools

It is clear that learners' return home needs to be well-managed if the progress observed at the Residence is to be maintained in a very different environment. Indeed, this is crucial to the Residence intervention achieving its intended outcomes. Staff and learners expressed concern that once learners return home and to the Academy, the presence of negative influences could make it difficult for learners to maintain the positive changes they have achieved.

All this work, the confidence, the way you perceive yourself ... that's going to be influenced by other kids [at the AP] and potentially that's all going to be lost. – Residence staff

I can't go to mainstream because there's too many kids and I'll get in a fight, be angry. If I go back to [the Academy] I'll get back in trouble, being arrested and stuff like that. Here I'm calm. – Learner at the Residence

Staff at the Residence approached this issue in a number of ways: working with young people during their time at the Residence to prepare them for the transition; re-thinking the length of stay at the Residence for each learner and expanding the range of destinations for young people, including mainstream school; and working with schools and young people to support them during the transition.

Preparing for reintegration

Learners were aware of the short-term nature of the Residence intervention and, while no formal reintegration plan was developed for each learner, staff made attempts to help learners consider how to maintain their progress following their stay. For example, staff would discuss with learners how they could relate the skills they learnt to a new environment and encouraged them to use them when they left the Residence.

We say, “Next time you go to [Academy teacher]’s class, make sure you show her what you can do, how you can use [music production software] now. Make that be the first thing you do.” – Residence staff

Reintegration was also supported by the therapeutic work undertaken with parents. Moreover, the Residence family therapist developed links with social work and youth offending teams in the Tri-borough area. This was intended to provide a consistent message for young people and families, and to help organise appropriate support for families following the young person’s stay at the Residence.

However, since learners’ home environment is still potentially challenging, staff worked with learners to improve their resilience and independence: teaching them self-care skills such as cooking, and discussing ways to manage difficult situations. Staff also normalised these teaching situations, for example by deliberately bringing clothes to wash from home, to do their laundry at the same time as the young person.

We’ve been really conscious of that and open and honest about what life is going to be like. When [parent]’s drunk and is abusive – what are you going to do? Working with young people, contextualising, getting them to think about what they will do in this situation. - Residence staff

Staff suggested that learners and parents spending time together during the term could allow parents to test and practice the behaviour management skills and coping strategies they learnt in therapy sessions. It would also allow learners to reflect on changes they have made to their attitudes and behaviour.

We’ve had a couple of occasions where young people have gone back home and done things they would have done in the past, and have come back and felt really remorseful about it, and allowed themselves to feel that. It’s a new feeling to let in – that you could have made a different decision. - Residence staff

Moving on from the Residence – destinations and outcomes

As described above (p.12) Residence management decided to extend the expected length of stay for young people at the Residence from one half-term (6 weeks) to 2 half-terms (12 weeks) in order to allow learners to develop further and consolidate their progress. The significant progress made by some learners over this longer period led staff to consider alternative destinations for young people following their stay, since the risk of learners reverting to their old behaviour was thought to be too great were they to return to their previous TBAP Academy.

At the time of writing, while some learners have returned into their previous TBAP academies, others have been placed in mainstream schools.

The experiences of learners moving on from the Residence have been mixed. Moreover, staff from more than one TBAP Academy reported that some learners returning from the Residence were challenging to work with since they had an over-confident attitude, less respect for authority and the boundaries of the school environment. These staff suggested that this behaviour could partly be a reaction to a perceived rejection from their home Academy.

He felt a bit like he was being sent away so we didn't have to deal with him and he found that difficult, so coming back he was like "I'm going to show you". – TBAP Academy staff

Some learners have been accepted by mainstream schools, demonstrating the significant progress they have made. However, Residence staff were sometimes disappointed by a lack of investment from mainstream schools in supporting learners to settle in. Staff felt that it had been more challenging to work with mainstream schools due to the lack of pre-existing relationships between the staff and these schools. Mainstream schools also had less experience of working with challenging learners than TBAP academies. As a result, Residence staff reported that staff at mainstream schools could sometimes lack understanding of learners' needs; for instance, that learners may be unfamiliar with being assigned homework. Staff observed that these misunderstandings could lead to learners disengaging with their new school, putting them at risk of returning to alternative provision.

Others had maintained their placements in mainstream schools and were doing well at the time of writing.

Moving on from the Residence – supporting the transition

Staff explained that learners needed someone to continue supporting them after their stay at the Residence to ensure these misunderstandings do not cause the learner to disengage from their new or home school. They created plans to support learners in person throughout their first week of reintegration, with support gradually being withdrawn as the young person settles in.

However, accompanied reintegration was not always possible in practice: for example, due to staffing constraints and some non-TBAP academies declining the offer of support. Academy staff felt this process had been valuable where it took place, and perceived it as a missed opportunity when staff have not been available:

It showed him that we do communicate and we do talk, he's not just being thrown back in here ... we are monitoring it and we are aware of what's happening. – TBAP Academy staff

We did feel he needed a sounding-board, he needed a mentor, just somebody to bring him back into the routine of the school. – TBAP Academy staff

TBAP Academy staff suggested that they would have benefited from a presentation about the young people returning from the Residence, in order to understand what happened during their time at the Residence; their progress and achievements, and how they could continue to develop these; and what staff had learnt about working with that young person.

We need a whole presentation that shows this is where they're at, what they're working towards, this is what we've found that works, strategies if the child starts to melt down, talk to them in this way, what language to use. If we had more of those skills it would be much easier to do that transition back to here. – TBAP Academy staff

For the first cohort returning from the Residence, this does not appear to have taken place. However, for the second cohort, Residence staff went into schools for handover meetings and presentations alongside the young people. These presentations were adapted from an end-of-term performance young people worked on entitled "My life at the Residence". Staff felt that carrying this presentation over into their new school or home school would help young people perceive a degree of continuity in their journey. Staff also planned to make arrangements for learners to keep up activities they have enjoyed at the Residence, such as playing an instrument, or joining cadets to maintain an interest in outdoor pursuits. From autumn 2016 Residence learners were assigned homework tasks to complete during their weekends at home in order to prepare them for the transition back to a TBAP Academy or to a mainstream school.

Although Residence staff worked to prepare learners for the transition, some staff were concerned that this commitment to making reintegration successful was not sufficiently shared by mainstream schools.

They know that if doesn't work, they just send them back, so there's no investment from their side... If you take this kid, you have to meet us half way to make it work. – Residence staff

Staff planned to visit former Residence learners from time to time in order to remind them of the progress they made during their time at the Residence, and stated that they would be available to speak to former learners if needed. However, staff also acknowledged that the staffing demands of each cohort would make it difficult to find time to support the reintegration of previous cohorts.

Evidence of the innovation's impact on the Innovation Programme's objectives and areas of focus

Better life chances for children receiving help from the social care system

The strand of the Innovation Programme relevant to the TBAP Residence is that concerning adolescents in or on the edge of care. At this stage none of the learners at the Residence have been looked-after children; however, some were classified under a child protection order (CP) or as children in need (CiN).

Some learners at the Residence had a designated social worker, and TBAP staff reported good relationships with these social workers, all of whom visited the Residence. Children's social work teams were involved in the referral process through inclusion panels at the TBAP Academies, and relationship-building took place with Locality teams¹³ to encourage greater involvement of children's social services with the referral process in future.

As described above, some of the young people who stayed at the Residence saw improvements in behaviour and engagement with learning, and there were also some improvements in family relationships. However, at this stage it is too early to comment on whether these short-term changes are sustainable in the medium term, or will result in improved life chances for these young people.

Value for money across children's social care

One of the aims of the TBAP Residence was to provide greater value for money across children's social care. It was intended to do this by reducing the risk of young people being taken into local authority care, thus reducing the costs associated with this; and where young people are taken into care, reducing the costs associated with sourcing school places out-of-borough¹⁴.

The Residence was also intended to represent value for money by improving young people's life chances, through improved educational attainment and reduced risk of offending and anti-social behaviour, thereby reducing costs to the welfare and criminal justice systems and increasing economic productivity in the long term.

¹³ Locality teams in the Tri-borough area (known as Early Help services in Kensington and Chelsea) bring together a range of professionals (such as social workers, education welfare officers, parenting workers, young people's practitioners and children's centre workers) to provide targeted early help to vulnerable children, young people and families who feel in need of additional support to prevent issues from escalating.

¹⁴ TBAP Residence Proposal, (2014)

Costs of the Residence

The ongoing operating costs of the Residence were estimated to be around £859,500 per year¹⁵. Deducting the cost of educating the equivalent number of young people in Alternative Provision¹⁶ gives the additional cost of the Residence intervention over and above existing provision: £733,700 annually. This is equal to £104,800 for each of the 7 places, or £2,690 per place per week for a 39-week year.

A place at the Residence for one half-term would therefore cost around £17,500, or £20,500 if education costs are included. These costs are calculated on the basis of the Residence being fully occupied by 7 learners; should there be empty places at the Residence, costs per place will be higher¹⁷. On average, there were 4 learners staying at the Residence each term with 2 additional learners for part of the term.

In addition to operating costs, the set-up costs of the Residence were calculated to be approximately £877,600¹⁸. The property used for the Residence was already owned by Department for Education, having formerly been the site of a free school. TBAP were able to use the property for a peppercorn rent; however, significant costs were incurred in refurbishing this property and these are reflected in this figure.

As a comparison, the cost of a local authority care home for young people is between £150,000-£160,000 per place per year on average, although these costs increase to around £175,000 in London¹⁹. However, a direct comparison between the Residence and a care home for young people may be misleading for a number of reasons, including that the Residence will be able to support more young people over the course of a year than a typical children's home.

Reducing the costs of young people being taken into care

Curtis (2014) estimates the cost of making a decision to take a child or young person into care as around £1,120²⁰, not including the cost of the care itself, which in London is £1,038 per week in foster care and £3,352 per week in a children's home. There are therefore significant savings to be made if entry to care can be prevented through improved family relationships and behaviour following a stay at the Residence.

However, at this stage, it is not possible to establish the extent to which a stay at the Residence affects the likelihood of a young person entering care, and so it is also difficult

¹⁵ TBAP Budget information, supplied on 18th March 2016. More recent budget information has been requested, but not yet received.

¹⁶ This cost is £17,980 per child per year (2015-16 figures). It is deducted here since it would be incurred by the local authority whether or not a TBAP learner attends the Residence and therefore should be excluded when seeking to understand the additional cost of the Residence.

¹⁷ E.g. costs per learner for one half-term would be £32,815 (£35,813 including education) if only 4 learners attend on average.

¹⁸ TBAP Budget information, supplied on 18th March 2016

¹⁹ Harker and Heath (2014); Curtis (2014)

²⁰ Curtis (2014), p.153.

to establish whether the Residence has been able to save money on out-of-borough school placements.

Value for money through improved life chances

The literature review carried out for TBAP by the evaluation team included estimates of the potential economic gains and savings created by improved life chances for young people. This included improved earnings and productivity through improved qualifications. Moving on to mainstream schools is likely to create value for money since the costs of education at a mainstream school in the Tri-borough area are lower, by around £10,000 per child per year, than education in alternative provision²¹.

A 2014 research report for DfE²² states that having 5 or more good GCSEs improves lifetime productivity for men by £73,000 compared with 3 or 4 GCSEs, around £100,000 compared with lower-level qualifications, and around £283,000 compared with no qualifications at all. For women, the equivalent figures are £55,000, £100,000 and £232,000 respectively. This represents the economic benefit to society overall, rather than just additional individual earnings.

The perception of children, young people and families of service quality

It was anticipated that the Residence would enhance the existing opportunities offered by TBAP by introducing an additional and innovative way to support vulnerable young people²³. In order to explore whether the Residence was perceived as adding value to TBAP provision in this way, the evaluation team spoke to 3 young people who were attending TBAP Academies, and 2 parents, to understand their attitudes towards the Residence. These interviews took place in October 2015 and views of the Residence may have changed since that time. However, staff at TBAP Academies reported that TBAP learners have gained only a limited understanding of the Residence since its opening.

There appeared to be some divergence of views as to the purpose of the Residence and its eligibility criteria, but in general, both learners and parents were supportive of the idea and felt that spending time in a new environment would be of benefit to those young people attending, and their families. However, it should be noted that interviewees were selected by TBAP and therefore may not provide a sufficient selection of views.

²¹ Direct Schools Grant 2015-16 for the boroughs comprising the Tri-borough area was £7,213 per pupil on average. The cost of an AP place in the area is £17,980 per child per year (2015-16 figures supplied by TBAP staff).

²² Hayward, H., Hunt, E., Lord, A., Vernoit, J., North, C., & Donnelly, E. (2014). The economic value of key intermediate qualifications: estimating the returns and lifetime productivity gains to GCSEs, A levels and apprenticeships. Department for Education, 2014: DFE-RR398A

²³ TBAP Residence Proposal, 2014

TBAP learners' perception of the Residence

Learners believed that staying at the Residence would support educational progress by providing an opportunity for young people to focus on their work, away from the distractions of other learners and in a calm environment. However, learners had different ideas about which young people the Residence would be for. Some learners understood that it would be for young people in challenging home circumstances to have a break away from their families; others thought it would be for learners hoping to be reintegrated to mainstream school but struggling to focus on their school work in the Academy environment.

Learners had mixed views when asked how they would feel about staying at the Residence themselves. Learners thought it would be a good opportunity for them to make progress with their learning, and that they would enjoy the evening and weekend activities. Some were also excited at the prospect of staying somewhere new. However, learners expressed concerns about the length of the school day; being away from their families and missing them; or that they might not get on well with the other young people and that this could become difficult to manage with a small group of young people and limited space.

Once the Residence was established, staff from TBAP academies reported that learners at other TBAP academies perceived it as a fun residential or "holiday camp" and were not aware of its educational aspects. Despite this perception, few learners had expressed a wish to attend the Residence. This was attributed to learners' unwillingness to be separated from their family and friends.

TBAP academy Parents' perception of the Residence

Overall, both parents and learners welcomed the addition of the Residence to TBAP provision. The learners and parents we spoke to felt that it would not currently be appropriate for them personally or for their child, but that learners in other circumstances would benefit from it, and that this in turn might benefit the TBAP Academies as a whole by reducing the most disruptive and challenging behaviour.

Parents of TBAP learners agreed that having a break away from home and the Academy environment could be beneficial for young people's education, as well as for their family relationships: it helped learners to think for themselves and become more independent. Some parents considered the TBAP Academies to be a challenging environment for learning due to peer pressure and were unhappy about the 4-day week used by some Academies. These parents thought that a break from this environment would improve their child's behaviour and relationships with staff.

Parents were enthusiastic about the physical and outdoor activities that would be offered at the Residence. They also approved of young people being taught life skills such as cooking and doing their laundry.

Parents felt that 6 weeks might be too long for their child to be away from home. However, others felt that the time apart would give young people a greater appreciation of their parents. Parents, like learners, had some concerns about the other young people that would be staying at the Residence, and whether this would be a barrier to their child's education.

Barriers to this innovation

Time pressure

Many of the barriers to this innovation were related to lead-in time. Staff at the Residence were in agreement that there had been insufficient time between having their application to the Innovation Programme accepted in early 2015 and the deadline for the first evaluation report on the project in March 2016. The project was required to refine the concept of the Residence; implement this concept, including securing and preparing a suitable site, going through planning permission and other legal processes, recruiting staff, agreeing policies and procedures, and selecting learners; and have the Residence operating for a sufficient length of time to allow evaluation, in just over a year. The opening of the Residence was delayed from September 2015 to January 2016 and many staff felt that the Residence would have benefited from opening later than this.

This time pressure on the project had a number of adverse impacts:

- at the time of opening in January, timetables were not prepared and basic equipment was lacking, such as electronic door locks and a printer
- staff commented that learners picked up on the unsettled atmosphere of a school that was not yet fully ready to open. Moreover, while most rules and procedures were consistent with those at the Academy, some rules had not yet been consistently agreed (e.g. about mobile phone use) and this led to learners testing boundaries with their behaviour, rather than staff having consistent rules to enforce
- the connection to the internet and to the TBAP computer network was poor. This meant that staff were unable to access TBAP systems to update learners' behaviour and achievement records. Inadequate internet access also created other problems, such as difficulties in ordering equipment
- the Residence Senior Leadership Team experienced difficulties in recruiting staff for on-call waking night shifts. Vacancies for night staff were advertised both internally and externally, but no applications were received. This meant that Residence learning support staff were required to work waking night shifts. This led to fatigue, which in turn made it more difficult for staff to manage learners' difficult behaviours. Complicated and variable shift patterns also reduced opportunities for staff to meet as a team, debrief and fully plan ahead. As

described above, this shortage of staff ultimately led to the decision to close the Residence on Saturday nights and Sundays, and send learners home over this time

- renovations to the upper floor of the Residence were not completed, and therefore this floor was off-limits to learners. This restricted the space available, and meant that learners had to both live and study in the same areas of the building. This made it more difficult for learners to focus during the day and increased the temptation for them to attempt to return to their bedrooms during school hours. Once completed, the upper floor of the Residence was designated as a “home” environment, while the ground floor was used for daytime educational activities. Both staff and learners welcomed this development; as well as affording more space overall, it allowed learners to differentiate between the purpose of different rooms

Engagement of other TBAP academies

Both Residence staff and staff at other TBAP Academies identified a need for improved communications between them. Limited communications were initially a result of limited lead-in time to raise awareness among all the TBAP Academies as to the purpose and potential benefits of the Residence to learners, and this problem then persisted due to ongoing staffing and time constraints.

Staff at other TBAP academies reported that they wanted to know more about the work taking place with learners at the Residence. Teachers and teaching assistants were keen to learn about the work Residence staff had done with individual learners, what had happened during their time at the Residence, strategies that had been found to work for them and the particular challenges they faced, so that they could use a consistent and well-informed approach with learners returning to their school.

Moreover, TBAP staff wanted to know more about the Residence in general. Some staff felt that the nature and purpose of the Residence was only understood by senior management and that this information had not been passed on to other staff. The misperception of the Residence as a fun residential trip, rather than as an educational intervention, was reported to be shared by some staff as well as students. This was partly attributed to the use of Twitter to share pictures and videos of activities at the Residence.

At the same time, Residence staff reported disappointment that other TBAP staff did not engage more with learners while they were staying at the Residence, and were concerned that young people would feel forgotten by their previous teachers. Residence staff felt it was important that TBAP staff visited the Residence in order to understand the work taking place, and to be able to describe the Residence to learners who had been offered a place. TBAP staff who had been invited by Residence staff agreed that visiting the Residence would be beneficial, but felt they did not have time to do so.

Poor communications between the Residence and TBAP academies had led to some reluctance among Academies to allow their learners to attend, which resulted in the first cohort of learners being smaller than intended.

Communication difficulties may also have affected the appropriateness of referrals. While the Residence was intended for young people who would otherwise be looked-after or on the edge of care, the first cohorts included young people with less severe needs, who might not have been included by the Residence's eligibility criteria as originally set out. Good communications and understanding around referral and eligibility will become even more important in future, as TBAP Residence staff will be less likely to be familiar with new students attending TBAP Academies and subsequently those being referred.

Engagement of non-TBAP academies

As discussed in the findings, some learners have moved to mainstream schools following their placement at the Residence, which was not originally anticipated in the Residence model. This was welcomed by staff and learners as a demonstration of learners' success. However, it also created unforeseen challenges in relation to the engagement of non-TBAP academies in the reintegration process due to:

- the lack of pre-existing relationships between staff and mainstream schools
- mainstream schools having less experience working with challenging learners compared to TBAP academies, which resulted in poor understanding of the learners' needs
- mainstream schools having a poor understanding of the learners' previous experience in AP and a lack of sensitivity around this

Staff observed that these misunderstandings could lead to learners disengaging with their new school, putting them at risk of returning to alternative provision, and have employed a number of strategies to prepare and reintegrate the learners successfully (p.26-28).

Recruitment and staffing

At the time of writing, the Residence had 13 members of staff comprising Head, Lead Teacher, Therapeutic Lead, Assistant Manager, teachers and support professionals. Other TBAP teaching staff regularly visited the Residence to teach particular subjects such as literacy and numeracy.

However, staff still felt that it was under-staffed for dealing with the very challenging nature of the learners. The Residence relied on the goodwill and commitment of staff to work additional hours or on their days off; for instance, staff were called to deal with incidents during their sleeping hours. Working at the Residence is a demanding job, with

few opportunities for breaks, and a reliance on staff to put in overtime is likely to become unsustainable.

You can't not work. You can't just have a weekend because a phone call could come any time. All the staff – everybody is always working. – Residence staff

I'm worried about staff burn-out now. Everyone is really supportive of each other, but that's all... We don't have time for staff well-being. – Residence staff

Moreover, the Residence's operating model, in terms of weekend provision, was determined partly by staffing availability, rather than the needs of learners.

The demands of managing the current cohort of learners meant there was little time for Residence staff to support reintegration or find out how previous cohorts of learners were progressing. Demand for therapeutic support from learners was also high, resulting in a need for additional therapeutic support. The Residence therapist was working with TBAP colleagues to meet this need, with more therapists available across TBAP Academies.

Residence premises

The Residence was situated in a listed building and some staff questioned whether this was fit for purpose. Staff reported that learners appreciated the attractive house and grounds and were able to take a sense of pride in their surroundings. However, the age of the building and its listed status meant that the work to install necessary facilities (e.g. new windows, door frames and locks) or repair damage was costlier and more time-consuming than it would be for a newer building. Further, the building was rented from DfE at a discounted rate, which reduced operating costs compared with those if a market rate was paid.

Facilitators to this innovation

Staff team

Staff at the Residence felt very well-supported by their colleagues and reported being part of a cohesive and highly motivated team. Moreover, the staff team had a considerable body of skills and experience to draw on, which they shared with each other. One staff member commented that the Residence team included the strongest staff members from each of the TBAP sites.

As well as experience of working in relevant settings, some staff reported that they came from similar backgrounds to the learners or had had similar experiences, and were therefore more credible to learners and well-placed to act as role models for them. This was corroborated by learners.

They understand how it feels to be in a PRU²⁴, how it feels when you're angry. –
Learner at the Residence

However, some staff felt they would have benefited from more training in parenting skills in order to prepare them for this new aspect of their roles, particularly the 24-hour nature of their work.

Relationships between staff and learners

All of the young people at the Residence liked the staff, and reported that they had developed good relationships with them. Many learners displayed an awareness that Residence staff worked hard and were committed to their development and welfare.

The teachers are funny. I never used to get up, I used to moan, get angry and push the teachers. Now they wake me up in a funny manner...they'll come in with a big music box and play music and dance so I'll wake up laughing. When I was little I thought, imagine getting locked up in a school with your teachers for 24 hours and I thought that would be a nightmare. But it happened, and it's been over 24 hours and it's a laugh. - Learner at the Residence

Many staff members were already known to the learners, having previously worked at TBAP Academies, and this was also seen as conducive to good relationships. However, over time it will become less likely that learners will have been taught by staff in their previous roles.

Both learners and staff reported that Residence staff adopted a different approach to behaviour management than used at previous schools, which they felt was more effective for this group of young people. Rather than picking up on problem behaviour immediately in front of the group, staff would find an opportunity to discuss it later, for example with a one-to-one conversation or a discussion at the dinner table. Learners explained that this approach caused them less embarrassment, and staff felt that the approach reduced confrontation and meant that learners were more receptive and willing to think about their behaviour.

Learners described the relationship with staff in terms of mutual respect and acknowledged the effect of their own behaviour in creating a positive or negative dynamic. Learners felt that this relationship dynamic was akin to that which they might have with family members, and reported that it made them feel valued.

Staff observed that young people began to talk about their issues more openly with them, and learners consistently reported that 'you can talk to [staff] no matter what' and that staff were easier to talk to than at other schools. Moreover, these positive relationships contributed to improved behaviour, since staff were able to influence learners by

²⁴ Pupil Referral Unit, a type of alternative education provision

modelling positive behaviour and through their responses to learners' positive or negative behaviour.

Family-like atmosphere

Staff explained the routines they had put in place to create a home-like atmosphere at the Residence and to encourage stability and routine. Learners reported cooking meals and eating together as being enjoyable. Learners were also expected and supported to keep their rooms tidy and wash their own clothes. In the most recent term, learners were allowed to personalise their bedrooms.

Learners were pleasantly surprised by the relatively relaxed atmosphere at the Residence, having expected it to have a more institutional, boarding-school feel.

We can all sit together like a family and no-one gets left out. It doesn't really bother me that I miss my family cause we're like a family here. The adults are like our parents and we're like the children. – Learner at the Residence

Staff felt that a family-like environment benefited learners in 2 ways: it helped learners to feel safe and secure at the Residence, and it enabled learners to become more independent and to develop life skills and routines which they could use once they returned home. This was intended to teach learners how to look after themselves at home should their parents be unable to.

It can recreate a safe family environment, that's the ultimate idea. Showing respect for each other, speaking to each other in a nice way, and having routine. Routine can provide stability and containment, consistent boundaries. - Residence staff

In the evening we all eat dinner together and... you bring out the dinner, and you get praise or they say it's crap! And when there's downtime you might just sit and talk, and it's very free and natural. There are times when it does feel like a family, upstairs playing PlayStation. - Residence staff

It'll be good for their parents and siblings to see them doing things and be surprised. I hope they take back a lot of the home skills. It'll be good if we can strengthen that, and how they see home life, and that should reflect back into school. - Residence staff

Several learners commented that Residence staff take on a parental role, which was viewed positively (see section above). However, staff explained the need to be mindful of keeping within their role as staff in a school rather than parents or friends. The family-like atmosphere was one example of how the Residence model benefited from being away from London and an overnight provision. The same intensive work with learners would not be possible in daytime only provision.

Family support and therapy

As discussed above, the 6-week course of family therapy offered to learners' parents was reported by staff to improve parents' confidence and ability to manage their children's behaviour, and therefore support a more stable home life once learners return home. Moreover, staff felt that it was motivating for young people to see their parents committing to make changes, and that this made learners more open to changing their own behaviour. In order to facilitate attendance and engagement with family therapy, the Residence started providing transport for parents to appointments, and working together with social work teams to give parents extra encouragement to attend. This had a small positive impact on engagement. Many parents engaged well with other family activities organised by Residence staff, such as family evening meals and end-of-term presentations by learners.

Peer relationships

When selecting young people to make up cohorts at the Residence, careful attention was given to how well learners would work together and get on with each other. Learners often knew each other before attending the Residence, and this was a major factor motivating them to attend.

Staff and learners were in agreement that the learners generally worked well together and were respectful to each other, in spite of restricted space, and staff felt that the tolerance learners developed in this way would be a valuable life skill. These positive peer relationships facilitated the innovation, and were encouraged by Residence staff:

- staff described using peer influences positively – for instance, asking one learner to help or encourage another – and reported that learners have offered each other help without being prompted
- the system of rewards and sanctions for behaviour was operated collectively, with the result that young people were motivated to influence each other's behaviour positively

Nevertheless, peer influences were not always positive. One member of staff described this as a learning opportunity as it illustrated the need for young people to make choices between different kinds of behaviour.

Location

Learners felt that the location of the Residence helped them focus on their learning. Learners were impressed by the building and grounds and appreciated the opportunity to stay in a peaceful, new environment. Being away from London also allowed learners to get away from negative influences such as fighting, gangs and drug dealing.

Lessons and activities

The lessons at the Residence were designed to meet the developing emotional needs of the participants and included flexibility to tailor them as necessary outside the typical requirements of a traditional academic curriculum. Although the Residence taught literacy and numeracy, the unconventional nature of these lessons and activities was reported to improve the learners' engagement with learning. Incorporating more creative or physical activities, or using real-life stories and discussions, was welcomed by learners who struggled to engage in a traditional school setting. This approach may have facilitated other positive behaviours observed, including learners being more willing to try new activities.

Limitations of the evaluation and future evaluation

Limitations of the evaluation and key findings

At the time of writing, the Residence has been open for 6 half-terms. As outlined in Table 1, a different regime was applied each term, based on an emerging understanding of learners' and staff needs. The lack of consistency through the life of the evaluation has limited the ability to carry out certain evaluation tasks: for example, follow-up interviews with learners who moved on to non-TBAP academies; and the robustness of findings so far. The limitations of the evaluation are as follows:

- the evaluation of the TBAP Residence has been taking place concurrently with the set-up and initial cohorts of the Residence. This has resulted in a reduced amount of data being available for the evaluation. It is important to bear in mind that due to the small number of learners that have attended the Residence to date, both qualitative and quantitative evidence is based on a very small number of individuals.
- some learners have now returned to their home Academy, while others have been re-integrated into different (residential) alternative provision or mainstream schools. It remains difficult to observe outcomes for learners who stayed at the Residence, even in the short-term, beyond those changes observed during the stay itself.
- interviews were arranged by TBAP staff and, in the case of interviews with Academy learners and parents only, interviewees were also selected by TBAP staff. There is a possibility that this resulted in a selection in which chosen interviewees were more likely to comment positively on the Residence, potentially leading to a risk that the evaluation would overstate positive aspects of the provision. The evaluation team sought to minimise this risk by emphasising to participants the voluntary and anonymous nature of interviews, and encouraging participants to comment honestly about their experience.
- while TBAP staff record a wealth of learner data into SIMS, the small number of observations for learners attending the Residence has prevented any statistical analysis beyond identifying descriptive trends in achievement, behaviour and attendance. A number of issues exist that relate to the quality of SIMS data. For example, TBAP staff may not enter all behaviour incidents or achievements into the system or particular members of staff may be more inclined to enter certain types of activity, resulting in potentially incomplete and skewed data.
- limited observations can be made at this stage on the Residence's impact on the intervention's aims, as highlighted throughout the report.
- further, it has not been possible to provide a full assessment of cost-effectiveness beyond the hypotheses suggested at the outset of the project.

Appropriateness of the evaluation approach for this innovation

A mixed-methods approach to collecting both quantitative and qualitative data for analysis was proposed. Given the limited SIMS and SDQ data available, quantitative analysis in this instance should only be taken as indicative and used to support or reaffirm qualitative findings; a qualitative approach has been more appropriate for the evaluation to date. As well as observing the progress made by learners over the course of their stay, this qualitative approach sought to understand the reasons for the progress observed, and how, and to what extent, this could be made sustainable once learners return home. A qualitative approach also allowed us to gather views from learners and staff on the experience of staying at the Residence, and the most challenging and most successful aspects of implementing this innovative concept.

Plans for further evaluation activity

This interim report is an extension of the initial evaluation (which ended in March 2016), and this extension will continue until August 2017. The extension has permitted further fieldwork visits which will support a greater understanding of how the intervention has evolved over time and any medium-term outcomes for learners that may be emerging. Further attempts will be made to interview former Residence learners in the remaining 7 months of the extended evaluation. The extension will increase the sample sizes of treatment and comparison learners for any quantitative work completed, which will likely increase the representativeness and validity of this strand of work. It is also intended to undertake cost-effectiveness case studies to allow a longer-term assessment of outcomes for learners. The final report in August 2017 should be able to provide a fuller assessment of:

- sustainability of changes observed in behaviour, family relationships, attendance and engagement
- placement stability for young people in care
- young people on the edge of care becoming looked-after or having their case stepped-down
- number of crisis incidents
- youth offending
- being on track to achieve 5 GCSEs

Implications and recommendations for policy and practice

Evaluative evidence, or lack of, for capacity and sustainability of the innovation

Findings so far have been limited, but evidence suggests the Residence has potential to improve behaviour and engagement among young people who are on the edge of care, or very disengaged with learning: there are some examples of learners who have moved on from alternative provision into a mainstream school, and others who have made smaller positive changes. However, it is not yet known whether these changes will be sustained. Furthermore, some young people who have attended the Residence have not experienced positive outcomes. This means that it is not possible at this stage to comment on the impact of this innovation, since it will need to demonstrate longer-term outcomes for a majority of the young people attending in order for it to be considered sustainable.

Analysis of findings also provide some early indication that the realised early outcomes have been produced as a result of the interaction between the residential setting and the social care and education package provided. Therefore, the intervention should not be considered in a non-residential setting, although this view is subject to change as data collection continues.

Consideration of future development of the innovation

Should further evaluation indicate the Residence has a positive impact on longer-term outcomes, the following conditions will be necessary for the innovation to be embedded.

Financial viability

The Residence is an expensive intervention, which costs more per place than the average costs of residential care for young people, or of a secure youth facility. In order to continue to be financially viable, it is likely that TBAP will need to demonstrate to commissioners that the Residence is having impacts as set out in its Value for Money annex to the Residence proposal: fewer temporary placements and fewer placement breakdowns for young people in care, fewer young people considered to be on the edge of care, and reduced youth offending. Moreover, it will be necessary to allow sufficient time to evaluate whether the Residence provides better value for money for vulnerable young people attending AP in the Tri-borough area than alternative uses of the resources within AP provision. Specification clarity about which young people are considered eligible for the Residence will need to take this requirement for outcomes into account, in

balance with other considerations relating to which young people are most likely to benefit from this approach and when.

Strong reintegration strategy

In order to achieve the longer-term outcomes anticipated, it is essential that learners are well-supported on leaving the Residence and that a robust plan is in place as early as possible to help their reintegration to school and home, utilising the Residence staff, where possible, to practically support transition. Maintaining positive changes in behaviour and engagement upon reintegration is likely to be a challenge, as young people tend to be influenced by their current environment and adapt their behaviour accordingly. The challenges for reintegration are acknowledged by staff as outlined in this report, indicating the following areas for improvement:

- a higher allocation of Residence staff resource involved in facilitating successful integration
- more intensive work with learners' families, perhaps with support from other agencies, so that learners' progress at the Residence is complemented by substantial positive changes in their family
- strong collaboration with mainstream schools, and other alternative provisions, will need to be ensured to enable a better transition for learners.

Staff retention

The staff at the Residence are key to the positive outcomes observed so far. Staff are experienced at working with challenging young people, supportive of each other, skilled at de-escalating incidents, and liked by young people. Staff are also credible to learners due to their own life experiences, and their honesty and openness. Retention and motivation of a team of high-quality staff is crucial to the future success of the innovation. The current regime of closing the Residence on weekends may enable staff retention and improve staff planning, preparation and de-briefing. However, reliance on staff to work additional hours is likely to become unviable in the longer term, and consideration should be given to how staffing needs can more adequately be met. TBAP may wish to consider separating education and support staff further, as has been introduced during the past year, in order for education staff to focus on their roles as educators rather than fulfilling support staff functions.

TBAP may also wish to consider rotating staff between the Residence and the Academies. This would mean that Residence staff could remain in contact with other TBAP teachers, which is important for re-integration; it would also facilitate the transition for learners to the Residence, since they would already be familiar with members of staff there.

Curriculum

Lessons at the Residence are designed with the primary objective of engaging learners who have not been participating at school. As such, they take a different approach to lessons at the Academies, and are based around drama, games and physical activities. However, in order to provide continuity of education, and ensure that learners are on track to achieve 5 GCSEs or equivalent, it is important that the curriculum is academically challenging enough for all learners. In the most recent terms, the Residence curriculum has introduced a stronger focus on numeracy and literacy.

Communication and support from stakeholders

As described in the section on barriers to the TBAP Residence innovation, it is vital for staff from TBAP Academies to understand and appreciate the vision and objectives of the Residence, in order to make appropriate referrals and improve reintegration following any learner's stay at the Residence. This is equally important when engaging with Tri-borough children's services to identify any young people who stand to benefit most from the intervention, particularly adolescents in, or on the edge of, care. A carefully structured and executed communications plan may help with this.

In order to develop the residential aspect of the Residence further, it may be beneficial for the TBAP Residence team to collaborate with a good, or outstanding, residential children's home to learn from best practice elsewhere.

Wider application

Should the Residence be able to demonstrate success at achieving long-term outcomes, other Academy Trusts or local authorities may wish to consider implementing a similar approach. In this case, the evaluation team would strongly recommend a longer period of set-up time, as described in the 'Barriers to this Innovation' section of this report.

Appendix 1: References for literature review

Anglin JP. 'Creating "well-functioning" residential care and defining its place in a system of care' Canada: Child and Youth Care Forum 2004, 33(3), pages 175-192

Berridge D, Biehal N and Henry L (2012) '[Living in children's residential homes](#)' Department for Education Research Report 201, 2012. Accessed 13th February 2017

Boddy J, Statham J, Danielsen I, Geurts E, Join-Lambert H, and Euillet S. 'Beyond Contact? Policy approaches to work with families of looked after children in four European countries' Children and Society 2014, 28(2), pages 152-161.

Buchbinder E, and Bareqet-Moshe O. 'Hope and siege: The experiences of parents whose children were placed in residential care'. Israel: Residential Treatment for Children and Youth 2011, 28(2), pages 120-139.

Who Cares? Trust. [The views and recommendations of children and young people involved in the Care Inquiry](#). 2013. Accessed 13th February 2017

Curtis L. '[Unit costs of health and social care 2014](#)' PSSRU, 2014. Accessed 13th February 2017

Denecheau B. 'Children in residential care and school engagement or school 'dropout': what makes the difference in terms of policies and practices in England and France?' Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties 2011, 16:3, pages 277-287

Department for Education (2015a). '[The Children's Homes \(England\) Regulations 2015](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2015b). '[Boarding schools: national minimum standards](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2015c). '[Residential special schools: national minimum standards](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2014a). '[Children's homes data pack: December 2014](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2014b). '[Statistical First Release: Children looked after in England \(including adoption and care leavers\) year ending 31 March 2014: additional tables](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2014c). '[Rethinking support for adolescents in or on the edge of care](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2014d). '[Boarding schools: an opportunity to improve outcomes for vulnerable children](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017

Department for Education (2014e). '[Statutory guidance on children who run away or go missing from home or care](#)'. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Department for Education. 'Support and Aspiration: A New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability' The Stationery Office 2011.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). '[Special educational needs code of practice](#)'. DfES, 2011. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Dixon J, and Biehal N. '[Young People on the Edge of Care: The Use of Respite Placements](#)'. University of York 2007, Social Work Research and Development Unit. Accessed 13th February 2017

Fischer RL, and Attah EB. 'City kids in the wilderness: A pilot-test of Outward Bound for foster care group home youth' USA: Journal of Experiential Education 2001, 24(2), pages 109-117.

Forrester D, Goodman K, Cocker C, Binnie C, and Jensch G. (2009). 'What is the impact of public care on children's welfare? A review of research findings from England and Wales and their policy implications' Journal of Social Policy 2009, 38(03), pages 439-456.

Gallagher B, Brannan C, Jones R and Westwood S. 'Good practice in the education of children in residential care'. British Journal of Social Work 2004, 34, pages 1133-1160.

Hannon C, Wood C, and Bazalgette L. '[In loco parentis](#)' Demos, 2010. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Harker R and Heath S. '[Children in Care in England: Statistics](#)' House of Commons Library 2014. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Hart D and La Valle I. '[Residential care in the English child welfare system](#)'. Department for Education research report, 2015.

Hayward H, Hunt E, Lord A, Vernoit J, North C and Donnelly E. '[The economic value of key intermediate qualifications: estimating the returns and lifetime productivity gains to GCSEs, A levels and apprenticeships](#)' Department for Education, 2014: DFE-RR398A. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Holmes L, McDermid S, Soper J, Sempik J and Ward H. '[Extension of the cost calculator to include cost calculations for all children in need](#)' DfE research brief, 2010: DFE-RB056. Accessed 13th February 2017.

James S, Roesch S and Zhang J. 'Characteristics and Behavioral Outcomes for Youth in Group Care and Family-Based Care: A Propensity Score Matching Approach Using National Data' USA: Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Disorders 2012, 20(3), pages 144-156

Lawlor E. 'A false economy: How failing to invest in the care system for children will cost us all' New Economics Foundation, 2008.

Lindsay M and Foley T. 'Getting them back to school: touchstones of good practice in the residential care of young people' *Children and Society* 1999, 13, pages 192-202

Lombard D. '[Can boarding schools help prevent children being taken into care?](#)' *Community Care*, 2011. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Martin PY and Jackson S. 'Educational success for children in public care: advice from a group of high achievers' *Child and Family Social Work* 2002, 7, pages 121–130

Maxwell C, Chase E, Statham J, and Jackson S. 'Boarding school provision for vulnerable children: pathfinder evaluation' *Department for Children, Schools and Families* 2009.

Mota CP and Matos PM. 'Peer attachment, coping, and self-esteem in institutionalized adolescents: The mediating role of social skills' *Portugal: European Journal of Psychology of Education* 2013, 28(1), pages 87-100.

National Audit Office. '[The cost of a cohort of young offenders to the criminal justice system: technical report](#)' 2011. Accessed 13th February 2017.

O'Higgins A, Sebba J and Luke N. '[What is the relationship between being in care and the educational outcomes of children? An international systematic review](#)' *Rees Centre, University of Oxford*, 2015. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Ofsted. '[Children's social care data in England 2015: key findings](#)' 2015. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Pritchard C, and Williams R. 'Does Social Work Make a Difference? A controlled study of former 'looked-after-children' and 'excluded-from-school' adolescents now men aged 16–24 subsequent offences, being victims of crime and suicide' *Journal of Social Work* 2009, 9(3), pages 285–307

Rahilly T and Hendry E. '[Promoting the wellbeing of children in care: messages from research](#)' *NSPCC*, 2014. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Romi S and Kohan E. 'Wilderness programs: Principles, possibilities and opportunities for intervention with dropout adolescents' *Israel: Child and Youth Care Forum* 2014, Vol. 33, No. 2, pages 115-136.

Royal National Children's Foundation. '[Impact Report](#)' 2015. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Scholte EM and Van Der Ploeg JD. 'Exploring Factors Governing Successful Residential Treatment of Youngsters with Serious Behavioural Difficulties Findings from a Longitudinal Study in Holland' *Netherlands: Childhood* 2000, 7(2), pages 129-153.

Sebba J, Berridge D, Luke N, and Fletcher J. '[The educational progress of looked after children in England: Linking care and educational data](#)' *Rees Centre, University of Oxford*, 2015. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Selwyn, J. '[Children and young people's views on being in care: a literature review](#)' Coram Voice and University of Bristol, 2015. Accessed 13th February 2017.

Sinclair I and Gibbs I. 'Children's homes: a study in diversity' Wiley 1998.

Thomson L, McArthur M and Winkworth G. 'What works in residential care? A review of the literature' Australia: Institute of Child Protection Studies, ACU, 2005

Williams, P., and Fostering Network Wales. '[Support care: The preventative face of foster care : a report to disseminate the findings of the Fostering Network Wales Support Care Project 2005-2008](#)' Fostering Network Wales 2008.

White, R. 'A sociocultural investigation of the efficacy of outdoor education to improve learner engagement' Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties 2012, 17(1), pages 13-23.



Department
for Education

© Department for Education

Reference: DFE-RR525

ISBN: 978-1-78105-582-3

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

richard.white@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications