

Extended services subsidy pathfinder in schools: evaluation

Hannah Carpenter, Mark Peters and
Oliver Norden, TNS-BMRB
Colleen Cummings, Ian Hall,
Karen Laing and Liz Todd, Newcastle
University
Peter Davies, Staffordshire University

This research report was commissioned before the new UK Government took office on 11 May 2010. As a result the content may not reflect current Government policy and may make reference to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) which has now been replaced by the Department for Education (DFE).

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

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	7
The profile of schools involved in the pathfinder	8
Pathfinder guidance	8
Research objectives.....	9
Managing the funding	10
Identifying and reaching the target group	10
Designing the offer.....	10
Additionality	10
Staff workload.....	11
Tracking	11
Summary of research components (Methodology)	11
Mapping visits	11
Quantitative telephone surveys of pathfinder schools.....	12
Quantitative face to face survey of parents and pupils	12
Management information	13
Case Studies.....	13
Timings.....	14
Report Layout.....	15
1. The defined and flexible models	16
1.1 Definition of the target group	16
1.2 Ease of identifying pupils in the target group	18
1.3 Effectiveness of definition.....	19
1.4 Delivery of the defined model requirements	25
2. Consultation.....	28
2.1 Whether schools have employed consultation	29
2.2 Methods of consultation employed.....	32
2.3 Whether parents feel consulted.....	36
2.4 Whether pupils feel consulted	38
3. Promotion of activities.....	41
3.1 Engaging the target group.....	42
3.2 Methods used to promote activities.....	44

3.3	Parents' views on the promotion of activities	48
3.4	Future plans for promoting activities	50
3.5	Stigmatisation	51
4.	Participation in activities	56
4.1	Tracking take up	56
4.2	Take up before and after the subsidy	57
4.3	Effects of the subsidy on take up	61
4.4	Activities pupils are doing during term time	66
4.5	Activities pupils are doing during school holidays	69
4.6	Activities not provided by the school	69
5.	Charging for activities	71
5.1	Whether parents struggle to afford activities	71
5.2	Charging practices before the subsidy	75
5.3	Current charging practices	75
5.4	Changes made to charging practices as a result of the subsidy	77
5.5	Whether parents currently pay for activities	79
5.6	Whether parents report changes in charging since the introduction of the subsidy	81
5.7	Awareness of funding to help pay for activities	82
6.	Use of external providers	83
7.	Benefits of the subsidy (additionality)	87
7.1	Support for economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy	87
7.2	Other schemes for funding activities for economically disadvantaged pupils 88	
7.3	Whether schools have increased the number of activities on offer	90
7.4	Whether schools have improved access to activities	92
7.5	Whether schools have improved the quality of their provision	93
7.6	Whether schools are providing new activities	94
7.7	Schools that had not made any improvements to their offer of activities as a result of the subsidy	97
7.8	Whether pupils are able to go to the activities parents would like them to	97
8.	Parents' and pupils' views on activities	99
8.1	Availability of activities in the area	101
8.2	Parents views on activities offered by school	102
8.3	Pupils views on activities offered by the school	103
8.4	Benefits of activities	106
8.5	Whether activities need to be improved	109

8.6	What prevents pupils from taking part in activities	110
9.	Staff workload	115
9.1	Whether managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in staff workload.....	116
9.2	Types of staff members whose workload has increased.....	118
9.3	What schools have done to cope with additional workload	119
9.4	Funding additional workloads	121
10.	Identifying and overcoming challenges.....	123
10.1	Challenges faced.....	123
10.2	How challenges have been overcome	127
10.3	Additional support required	128
11.	Cost of provision	130
11.1	Method	131
11.2	Results	133
12.	Summary of differences between the flexible and defined models.....	144
13.	Conclusions and implications for policy	146
	Appendices	153
	Appendix 1: Case study summaries.....	154
	Secondary A.....	154
	Primary B	158
	Secondary C	162
	Primary D	166
	Junior F	172
	Secondary G	176
	Special School H.....	180
	Secondary I	185
	Primary J	191
	Appendix 2: Case study summaries for schools interviewed about costs.....	203
	Appendix 3: Whether pupils are attending activities at the target level.....	218
	Appendix 4: Original guidance for the extended schools subsidy pathfinder from the then DCSF	222

Executive Summary

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

Findings are based on:

- Two quantitative surveys of schools (the first in December 2008 – February 2009, the second in October – December 2009)
- Collections of management information from schools (relating to summer term 2008, spring term 2009, and summer term 2009)
- A quantitative survey of parents and pupils (in September – November 2009)
- Qualitative case studies amongst pathfinder schools (between November 2008 and January 2010)

As such, all findings are self-reported.

Findings relating to schools in this summary are taken from the second survey of schools (unless otherwise stated) and, as such, refer to a time period around a year after the introduction of the subsidy. Findings from parents and pupils also relate to a similar time period.

The defined and flexible models (chapter 1)

Schools following the flexible model were free to choose how they defined economic disadvantage, but the definition of the target group was generally set at cluster level¹, with the input of some schools in the cluster (although schools took decisions on how to interpret the definition). The definitions used included those eligible for free school meals and children in care (the defined model eligibility criteria), but also included a wide range of other criteria.

Most schools on the flexible model found it easy to identify who was in the target group but around a fifth found it difficult, mostly because families do not always share information about their financial situation with the school.

¹ All schools involved in the subsidy pathfinder were part of an extended services cluster – there were 37 clusters involved in the pathfinder, each containing between 3 and 33 schools (on average, there were 12 schools in a cluster). Each cluster had a cluster lead (who was sometimes based in the local authority, and sometimes based at one of the schools) who was responsible for guiding the schools in their cluster in the implementation and use of the subsidy.

Schools following the flexible model were much more likely than schools following the defined model to think the definition of economic disadvantage they were using was effective, especially if the school had been involved in choosing the definition.

Many schools following the defined model found it difficult to meet the fixed hours requirements of the model: 54 per cent found it difficult to provide two hours of activities a week to the target group and 66 per cent found it difficult to provide 30 hours of activities during school holidays.

Consultation (chapter 2)

The vast majority (86 per cent) of schools had engaged in consultation with parents, pupils or both, and most saw consultation as an ongoing process.

Speaking to parents and pupils informally and asking them to complete questionnaires or surveys were the two most commonly used methods of consulting, and also the two methods deemed most effective by schools.

Parents did not tend to recall being consulted – only 22 per cent recalled being asked for their opinion on the kinds of activities the school should be offering. However, around half of parents thought their child's school took at least 'a fair amount' of notice of parents' views on extended services.

When asked how they would like to be consulted, the most common answers given by parents were being given questionnaires to complete, and through letters and leaflets. However, qualitative evidence suggested face to face consultation was more effective in reaching parents.

Half of pupils recalled being consulted about activities – mostly by filling in questionnaires or through discussions with teachers (in classes, assemblies or at other times).

Promotion of activities (chapter 3)

A quarter of schools said they struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities. However, nearly nine in ten schools thought that economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that they offer.

All schools involved in the pathfinder had used some methods to promote the uptake of activities to the target group, with letters to parents being the most common promotion method used, followed by speaking informally to parents and pupils. In line with this, most parents said their child's school let them know about activities by letter – either letters given to their child to bring home, or letters sent directly to them.

Most parents felt at least quite well informed about the activities on offer at their child's school, but 24 per cent of parents did not feel very well informed, and a further 12 per cent did not feel at all informed.

A quarter of schools agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma which prevents them participating in activities. Strategies used by schools to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation were: general discretion in approaching parents and pupils; approaching parents so pupils do not know who is being subsidised; having activities open to all or free to all; and organising the funding so that pupils do not know they are being subsidised or do not know they are in the target group.

Participation in activities (chapter 4)

Management information collected from schools showed that 35 per cent of the target group had taken part in any activities in the summer term or summer holidays 2008 (pre-subsidy), and this had risen to 71 per cent in the summer term or summer holidays 2009 (post-subsidy).

On average, respondents to the schools survey rated the impact of the subsidy on participation rates of the target group as 6.9 on a scale from 0 to 10 (where 10 is the highest impact). Schools following the flexible model gave higher scores on average than those following the defined model.

According to data from parents and pupils, three quarters of pupils had taken part in term time activities in the last year (since the introduction of the subsidy), with by far the most commonly undertaken activity being sports. On average, pupils were doing 2.5 hours of activities a week during term time.

Around one in five pupils had taken part in holiday activities in the last year (mostly during the summer holidays 2009) and, again, sports were the most commonly undertaken type of activity.

Just under half of pupils were taking part in activities in their local area that were not provided (or signposted to) by their school.

Charging for activities (chapter 5)

In three quarters of schools respondents agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended schools activities, demonstrating the need for the subsidy. And just under a third of parents said they found it difficult to meet the costs of activities offered by their child's school.

Before the introduction of the subsidy, seven in ten schools were charging for at least some activities. A year or so after the introduction of the subsidy 82 per cent of schools were not charging pupils in the target group for any activities, and where schools did charge the target group this was usually only for certain activities, and often they were charged a reduced rate.

Around half of schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy, with the most common changes made being to stop charging (the target group) for activities, and to reduce the price of activities (for the target group).

Data from parents showed that, with the exception of day trips and holidays away, most of the activities that target group pupils were attending did not have to be paid for. Most parents who had paid for activities considered the amount they had to pay to be reasonable, but around one in five thought charges were unreasonable.

Three in ten parents thought their child's school was offering more activities for free than it had been before the subsidy.

Use of external providers (chapter 6)

Nearly all schools were working with external providers to provide extended schools activities. Around three-quarters of schools had formed new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy.

School staff acknowledged the benefits of working with external providers but found making links to be a challenge. Vital ingredients for engaging with external providers were found to be the development of good relationships, understanding differing working patterns and cultures, and providers having an understanding of the needs of the children in specific schools.

Benefits of the subsidy (chapter 7)

Two in five schools were targeting or providing support for economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in extended schools activities before the introduction of the subsidy.

Just over a third of schools were using schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils, and this had actually increased slightly since schools had been using the subsidy.

Nine in ten schools said the subsidy had enabled them to increase the number of activities on offer, although only four in ten parents and seven in ten pupils thought their school had increased the number of activities on offer.

Almost all schools (96 per cent) said the subsidy had improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities.

86 per cent of schools said the subsidy had enabled them to improve the quality of their provision for economically disadvantaged pupils. However, only 37 per cent of parents and 61 per cent of pupils thought the quality of provision at their school had improved.

Most parents said their child was able to go to all or most of the activities they would like them to. However, 19 per cent said they could only go to some activities, and five per cent said they could go to none.

Parents and pupils' views on activities (chapter 8)

Half of parents were satisfied with the availability of clubs and activities (not necessarily related to school) suitable for their child in the area where they live, but just over a third were dissatisfied. Eight in ten parents and pupils thought there needed to be more or better things for young people to do in the area where they live when they are not at school. Two-thirds of parents said they would like such activities to be provided at or near their child's school.

Three quarters of parents thought the activities their child attended at school were very or fairly good, and less than one in ten thought they were poor. Similarly, around three quarters of parents said activities met their needs very or quite well. Pupils also mostly had positive views on activities with seven in ten thinking they were very or fairly good overall.

The vast majority (86 per cent) of parents of primary school pupils said their child enjoys term time activities all or most of the time, and 73 per cent said their child enjoys holiday activities all or most of the time. Enjoyment was slightly lower amongst secondary school pupils: 71 per cent said they enjoy term time activities all or most of the time and 68 per cent said they enjoy holiday activities all or most of the time.

Parents tended to see the main benefits of activities as their child having fun, making friends, getting exercise, and learning new things, and four in ten parents thought that going to activities helped their child do better in school.

Amongst secondary school pupils, those taking part in term time activities for an hour a week or more were more likely to say they enjoyed school all or most of the time than those who did less than an hour a week (or no) activities (70 per cent compared with 40 per cent).

Three quarters (76 per cent) of parents and 81 per cent of pupils thought their school needed to improve the activities it offers. Both groups were particularly likely to think that activities during the summer holidays needed to be improved.

Where pupils had not taken part in any activities, the most common reason given by parents was that the activities on offer did not interest their child. Various barriers were also mentioned such as costs, lack of transport, and lack of time/other commitments.

Staff workload (chapter 9)

In 83 per cent of schools, managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in workload for staff at the school. For both primary and secondary schools, workloads had most commonly increased amongst administrative or support staff. In primary schools headteachers were likely to see an increase in workload, and in secondary schools it tended to be other members of the senior management team and extended services co-ordinators whose workload had increased.

A minority of schools had taken measures to increase their resources in order to cope with the additional workload, but most had coped using existing resources: by staff working longer hours or reassigning workloads between staff. Findings from the case studies showed that, in some cases where staff worked longer hours to implement the subsidy, they did this on a voluntary basis and were not compensated for it. In other schools, some extra funding was used to pay staff for their time.

Identifying and overcoming challenges (chapter 10)

A little under half (43 per cent) of schools reported encountering problems or barriers in implementing or using the subsidy funding. The most frequently cited problem was the additional workload of organising and running activities.

Lack of interest from parents; confusion or lack of guidance as to how the subsidy should be used; and pupils schools would like to target not falling under the definition of the target group were also mentioned by notable minorities of schools.

Cost of provision (chapter 11)

According to analysis of management information provided by schools, the average hourly cost per pupil of activities was slightly more than average private sector child care costs but less than average private sector 'specialist activities' (e.g. sports coaching, drama)

There were big differences between schools in average hourly costs but these were only systematically related to the proportion of 'one-off' and summer activities, which were, on average, more expensive. Case study interview data suggested that the willingness of schools to partially fund activities from other budgets and 'voluntary labour' from staff may also have contributed to cost variations.

Roughly one fifth of the subsidy was recorded as 'unspent'. Case study evidence suggest this was due in part to 'teething problems' as schools learned how to use the money effectively. In addition, 'unspent subsidy' was eleven percentage points higher for schools whose subsidy was mediated by a local authority.

There was some evidence from the case study interviews that schools were becoming increasingly conscious of cost variations and were taking these into account in their current decisions.

Introduction

The policy understanding underlying the subsidy pathfinder is that schools can make an important contribution to the development and life chances of disadvantaged children and young people, by offering them improved access to a range of extra-curricular services and activities.

The Department's expectation had been that all schools would provide access to the core offer of extended services by 2010 (DfES, 2005)². The core offer, to which schools had been expected to provide access, consists of:

- Childcare (in primary schools, a safe place to be in secondary schools);
- A varied menu of activities;
- Parenting support;
- Swift and easy access (to other agencies and providers);
- Community access to ICT and other facilities.

Schools had not been expected to provide these services alone, or to deliver them on site. Instead, they were expected to work in partnership with local authorities, in clusters with other schools and agencies (including voluntary and community organisations) and, where appropriate, signpost to existing services.

The Government committed over £1bn in extended services over the years 2008-9 to 2010-11. This funding was to enable every school to provide access to high-quality services, accessible to all, especially the most disadvantaged. This included over £200 million to enable schools to subsidise the participation of economically disadvantaged children in extended services activities.

The overarching purpose of the subsidy funding is to ensure that children and young people disadvantaged by economic circumstances, and children in care, are financially supported to take part in extended services activities so that they are able to benefit from the activities in the same way as those who can pay for services. As part of schools' wider strategy of implementing extended services activities which are sustainable in the long term, this means encouraging those who can afford to pay to do so, while using the subsidy to make particular efforts to encourage those who are unable to pay. To find the most effective method of delivering the subsidy funding to children and young people, the DfE ran a pathfinder, which started in September 2008. The pathfinder tested two different levels of flexibility regarding eligibility and use of the funding:

² DfES (2005) Extended schools: access to opportunities and services for all. A prospectus (London, DfES)

- The first model (the ‘defined’ model) defined eligibility tightly as those eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) and Children in Care (CiC), and required the funding to be spent on a regular 2 hours a week of activity during term time and 30 hours during school holidays.
- The second model (the ‘flexible’ model) gave schools more flexibility in defining disadvantage, and allowed greater flexibility in terms of frequency and cost of activities as long as the impact of activities could be sustained.

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

The profile of schools involved in the pathfinder

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

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

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

Pathfinder guidance

Local Authorities and schools involved in the pathfinder were provided with guidance by TDA and DfE about how the subsidy should be used. A full guidance document is included in appendix 4 of this report, but the guiding principles are included below:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Research objectives

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

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

There are a range of detailed research questions to be answered by the evaluation:

- How best to target the funding at those disadvantaged pupils who would most benefit from the funding (including the advantages & disadvantages of a strict free school meals definition of eligibility)?
- How to build in consultation with pupils and the use of funding in the light of schools' experience in the pathfinder?
- Whether the defined model commitment (fixed hours per week and during school holidays) is more or less advantageous than giving schools and pupils flexibility to choose?
- What are the practical implications of giving schools this flexibility?
- In addition to comparing the two pathfinder models, the evaluation will also shed light on:
 - Current practice on charging for activities, as well as any changes brought about by making funding available specifically for the most disadvantaged children and young people.

- Whether the subsidy pathfinders create real additional benefits and avoid overlap with other schemes funding activities for disadvantaged children and young people.
- In order to answer the main research questions above, the following detailed information will be provided as part of the evaluation:

Managing the funding

- What is the average cost of provision per hour per pupil, and how much variation is there in the cost?
- For schools with flexible entitlement: What is the average number of hours taken up per pupil in the target group and how much variation is there in this number?
- Does the subsidy funding affect charging policy (for activities) in schools? If so, how?

Identifying and reaching the target group

- For schools with set eligibility criteria: do schools experience problems in applying a centrally defined basis for targeting children and young people?
- For schools with flexible eligibility criteria: what eligibility criteria for the subsidy do schools use and what rationale and evidence are these based on?
- How do schools promote the uptake of the subsidy among the target group?
- How do schools create a sense of entitlement in children and families to secure real consumer power that might generate interest and motivation in taking part in activities?
- What effect has the subsidy funding had on participation rates of disadvantaged children and young people?

Designing the offer

- How do schools consult with disadvantaged pupils and their parents about what activities they would like to see provided?
- Are schools offering greater choice to their pupils and parents in terms of the activities provided or signposted to?

Additionality

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

Staff workload

- How do schools manage the transactional impact on staff workloads (heads, teachers and others) of administering the funding?
- What are seen to be the most successful ways of managing workloads?

Tracking

- How do schools track take up of the offer among the target group?
- How do schools track the amount spent / number of hours of activity taken up per pupil?

Outputs from this research were used to guide policy decisions in broadening the reach of the subsidy in 2010, as well as providing examples of best practice.

Summary of research components (Methodology)

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

- Mapping research
- Two waves of quantitative surveys with pathfinder schools
- Analysis of three tranches of management information
- Quantitative survey of disadvantaged pupils and families in pathfinder schools
- Two waves of case studies in pathfinder schools
- Interviews with senior managers in schools about costs

This report draws on data and research from all parts of the evaluation. A brief explanation of each strand conducted is included below.

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

Mapping visits

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

the defined model. Within each LA interviews were conducted with primary schools and secondary schools.

Quantitative telephone surveys of pathfinder schools

All schools involved in the pathfinder (442 schools) were sampled for inclusion in the first telephone survey with the exception of 29 schools that were used for piloting the questionnaire. Interviews were conducted with head teachers or those with responsibility for the extended schools subsidy funding at their school. The survey fieldwork took place between December 2008 and February 2009 during which time 340 schools were interviewed resulting in an 82 per cent response rate. The questionnaire used for this survey is included as annex 2 of the technical annex to this report.

This initial school survey sought to establish how the schools stood pre-subsidy, their experiences of early implementation and plans for the future.

Fieldwork for the second telephone survey of schools took place between October and December 2009. Interviews were again conducted with head teachers or those with responsibility for the extended schools subsidy funding at their school. All schools involved in the pathfinder were included in the survey sample, and interviews were achieved with 373 schools representing an 85 per cent response rate.

The questionnaire for the second survey of schools repeated many of the same questions included in the first survey, to assess how schools had progressed as they had had more time to use the subsidy. The questionnaire is included as annex 3 of the technical annex to this report.

Quantitative face to face survey of parents and pupils

A sample of pupils was selected using a two stage cluster sample where 32 schools were selected with probability proportional to size (where the size measure was the number of economically disadvantaged pupils at the school), and then around 32 pupils were selected from each school. For schools following the defined model, economically disadvantaged pupils were defined as those eligible for free school meals and those in care, and for flexible model schools economically disadvantaged pupils were defined as those eligible for free school meals, those in care, and those with an IDACI score of 0.5 or higher³. The sample of pupils was selected from the National Pupil Database, using school census data within NPD to define eligibility for the survey. Further details of how the sample was selected are included in annex 1 of the technical annex to this report.

Households where selected pupils lived were then contacted, and if the selected pupil was aged 11 or more both a parent (or guardian) and the selected pupil were

³ 'IDACI' is an area-based index of deprivation affecting children. A score of 0.5 or higher means that the individual lives in an area where at least 50% of children live in households that are defined as income deprived.

interviewed. If the selected pupil was aged under 11 then just a parent (or guardian) was interviewed.

Fieldwork took place between September and November 2009. In total, 562 interviews were achieved, but there were 4 cases where only the pupil was interviewed and not the parent, and 9 cases where only the parent was interviewed and not the pupil (where the pupil was aged 11 or more). This equates to a 60 per cent response rate.

The questionnaire examined take up of activities, opinions of activities, consultation and promotion of activities and more general opinions of school. The questionnaire can be found in annex 4 of the technical annex to this report.

Management information

A short form was sent out to all schools to establish a baseline measure of the numbers of economically disadvantaged pupils attending extended schools activities prior to the subsidy funding (in the summer term and summer holidays 2008). The form also requested the definition of the target group of economically disadvantaged pupils from each school. A copy of this form is included as annex 5 of the technical annex to this report.

A total of 226 forms were returned giving a response rate of 51 per cent. This first set of management information creates a baseline against which future management information can be measured.

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

The third and final collection of management information related to the take up of extended schools activities during the summer term and summer holidays 2009, and repeated the questions on take up on the baseline form to allow for direct comparisons to be drawn with the baseline management information. This final collection also asked for information around how much subsidy money schools had received, and how it had been spent. A copy of this form is included as annex 6 of the technical annex to this report. Forms were returned by 210 schools, giving a response rate of 48 per cent.

Case Studies

Qualitative data on the implementation of the subsidy pathfinders were collected through 12 case studies, six focused on secondary schools, five on primary or infant schools and one key stage 2 and 3 special school located on the same campus as two Pupil Referral Units. These case study schools were located in nine different

Local Authorities (LAs). Six of the case study schools were piloting the flexible model and six were piloting the defined model. Visits to 10 case study schools are reported upon in this final report (five secondary, four primary and one special school). Face to face in-depth interviews were carried out with key extended services personnel including, in schools, the person(s) responsible for the implementation of the subsidy (this might be a member of the senior management team, a school based extended schools co-ordinator, a parent and family support advisor, for example) and also with cluster leads and LA leads. Parents and pupils were interviewed where this was possible. During the second round of case study interviews in the 10 schools, in nine schools it was possible to interview pupils. In the second round interviews, in four of the schools it was possible to interview parents. In the remaining six schools where this was not possible, the evaluation team were able to draw on feedback collected from parents and pupils by the schools and/or cluster co-ordinators. Interviews were conducted with five providers across two of the clusters. Interviews with staff, providers, parents and pupils were face to face and were either conducted one to one or in small groups. Thematic analysis of the case study data aimed to triangulate the quantitative survey. The case studies, written as small vignettes provide a picture of the ways different schools and clusters were implementing the subsidy. These can be found in appendix 1.

In addition, interviews were carried out with senior managers in 12 schools to explore reasons for variation in the cost data. Vignettes of these case studies can be found in appendix 2.

Timings

Timings for the evaluation and for the launch of the pathfinder were as follows:

Pathfinder launched amongst local authorities	June 2008
Schools begin using subsidy money ⁴	Sept 2008
1 st collection of management information from schools (relating to summer term and summer holidays 2008)	Sept – Dec 2008
1 st telephone survey of schools	Dec 2008 – Feb 2009
1 st round of case study visits	Nov 2008 – Mar 2009
2 nd collection of management information from schools (relating to Spring term 2009)	March – May 2009

⁴ A minority of schools began using the subsidy sooner (to fund activities during the summer holidays 2008) and some schools did not start using subsidy money until later due to delays at either local authority, cluster or school level.

3 rd collection of management information from schools (relating to summer term and summer holidays 2009)	July – Nov 2009
Face to face survey of parents and pupils	Sept – Nov 2009
2 nd telephone survey of schools	Oct – Dec 2009
2 nd round of case study visits	Oct 2009 – March 2010

Report Layout

The report is structured around 11 topics in relation to the implementation, management and use of the disadvantage subsidy:

- The defined and flexible models
- Consultation
- Promotion of activities
- Participation in activities
- Charging for activities
- Use of external providers
- Benefits of the subsidy (additionality)
- Parents and pupils views on activities
- Staff workload
- Identifying and overcoming challenges
- Cost of provision

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

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

1. The defined and flexible models

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

This chapter examines how the target group is defined for schools on the flexible model, how effective schools believe their definition of economic disadvantage to be, and the ease of delivering the defined model requirement.

Key findings:

- For schools following the flexible model the definition of the target group was generally set at cluster level, with the input of some schools in the cluster. Nevertheless schools often took decisions themselves on how to interpret the definition. The definitions used included those eligible for free school meals and children in care, but also included a wide range of other criteria.
- Most schools on the flexible model found it easy to identify who was in the target group but around a fifth found it difficult, mostly because families do not always share information about their financial situation with the school.
- Schools following the flexible model were much more likely than schools following the defined model to think the definition of economic disadvantage they were using was effective, especially if the school had been involved in choosing the definition.
- Many schools following the defined model found it difficult to meet the requirements of the model: 54 per cent found it difficult to provide two hours of activities a week to the target group and 66 per cent found it difficult to provide 30 hours of activities during school holidays.

1.1 Definition of the target group

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

Schools on the flexible model had some freedom in how they choose to define economic disadvantage. It appears that the definition of the target group was generally set at cluster level, rather than individual schools choosing their own definitions. However, in all clusters following the flexible model at least some schools had been involved in the decision of how to define the target group for that cluster. Where schools had been involved in defining the target group, just over half had

found it at least quite easy to come up with an effective definition of economically disadvantaged pupils and the remainder found it quite difficult or very difficult.

The actual definitions of economic disadvantage used for clusters following the flexible model included the defined model criteria of those eligible for free school meals and children in care, but also included a wide range of other criteria such as:

- Unemployment, receipt of benefits, low incomes and debt problems
- Postcode or area based data such as IMD, IDACI or ACORN⁵
- Special educational needs or disabilities
- Recent immigrants, travellers and people for whom English was an additional language
- Children considered vulnerable and families with social services involvement or where a child protection plan was in place.

Many other specific criteria were used also. Further detail on this and school involvement in choosing the definition of the target group can be found in the interim report from this evaluation.⁶

The responses in case study interviews largely confirmed the quantitative findings. Schools using the flexible model had an additional piece of work to do around defining the criteria for eligibility for the subsidy. These criteria were usually set at Local Authority or cluster level, and funding allocated on the basis of these decisions, but we found examples of these criteria being modified at school level. In Primary D, for example, the plan in year one was to target the subsidy at those families identified by the ACORN index of hard pressed families, as agreed by the cluster. In year two, the school decided that the data were not responsive enough, and were sometimes out of date, so that they did not effectively reflect need. The school, therefore, did not use this data in order to target families in the second year of operating the subsidy. Using the flexible model seemed to enable schools to adapt their methods of defining disadvantage to suit local circumstances.

Schools using the flexible model were able to recognise that disadvantage for many children is not just economic, and they were able to include criteria that related to their understanding of vulnerability in their population. Some schools included 'catch all' subjective criteria which meant that they could use their discretion when defining who was eligible for the subsidy, and help to ensure that needy children did not fall

⁵ These are measures (mostly based on ONS Census data) that give a measure of how affluent or how deprived a particular area is, based on Census Output Area (or postcode). The areas are small (averaging around 300 households) and so can predict with a high degree of accuracy the affluence of the people living within them.

⁶ The interim report is published on DfE's website and can be found at the following link: <http://www.education.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR132.pdf>

through the net. In Secondary K these subjective criteria had been used to provide activities for children suffering a crisis situation such as bereavement. The same subjective criteria were also used to overcome situations where eligible parents would not apply for the subsidy, perhaps due to stigma.

'If a school is aware that this family meets the criteria and the child could really benefit from it, but actually there's no way that parent is going to come in and show that, either because of stigma or because of lack of understanding of the scheme, or the place that they're in, organisation etc, they were able to put that child in under the subjective data.' (Cluster Co-ordinator)

Devising inclusion criteria, where the flexible model is used, was identified as a complex and time consuming process by other schools too. An Extended Services Project Coordinator in Primary School J, said:

'The two new clusters that started up in September 2009 had set their own target groups and one of the clusters found it really hard to exclude children because they were in an area of high deprivation and they wanted to include as many categories as possible and then realised that they'd got so little money per child they couldn't make any effect'. They've come full circle and have gone back to just FSM but with a certain number (outside the criteria) made eligible at the Head Teacher's discretion.'

1.2 Ease of identifying pupils in the target group

Once the definition of economic disadvantage had been chosen, schools following the flexible model needed to identify which pupils met the conditions of their definition. Most schools found this easy to do: 32 per cent very easy and 45 per cent quite easy. This is an increase since the first survey of schools⁷ (22 per cent very easy and 43 per cent quite easy), suggesting that some initial difficulties with identifying which pupils should be included within the target group were overcome as schools became more familiar with applying the definitions.

However, there were still 20 per cent of flexible model schools finding it quite difficult, and two per cent finding it very difficult to identify which pupils were included in the target group. Amongst these schools, the reasons why they found this difficult mostly related to not having sufficient information about pupils and families to know whether they were economically disadvantaged:

- 33 per cent said that financially disadvantaged families don't always want to share this information with the school

⁷ Fieldwork for the first survey of schools took place between December 2008 and February 2009

- 20 per cent said some children are not identified because they don't take up free school meals (even though the school suspects they would be eligible)
- Seven per cent said they were relying on parents or pupils to come forward and say they need help.

Other answers related to pupils being just above borderline so the definition did not allow for their inclusion in the target group (28 per cent); difficulties in approaching people (13 per cent); and family circumstances changing (nine per cent).

1.3 Effectiveness of definition

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

Amongst schools on the flexible model, primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to agree their definition was effective: 74 per cent of primary schools compared with 60 per cent of secondary schools.

The gap in perceived effectiveness between the two models has widened slightly since the first survey of schools. Results for flexible model schools are very similar across the two surveys, but for defined model schools agreement with this statement has reduced slightly since the first survey (when 47 per cent agreed and 32 per cent disagreed).

The first schools survey showed that schools on the flexible model who had been involved in choosing the definition of economic disadvantage tended to have higher opinions of the effectiveness of that definition than schools on the flexible model who had not been involved in choosing the definition.

Table 1.1

Agreement with statement “the definition of disadvantage that we use is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils”

	1 st survey of schools		2 nd survey of schools	
	Flexible model (n=231)	Defined model (n=109)	Flexible model (n=250) %	Defined model (n=123) %
Strongly agree	11	6	14	5
Agree	55	41	57	34
Neither agree nor disagree	17	18	7	14
Disagree	13	26	12	32
Strongly agree	3	6	3	8
Don't know	2	3	8	7

Base: All schools responding to telephone surveys

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

For both the defined and flexible models, higher proportions of schools thought the definition was effective in enabling them to reach children who cannot afford to pay at the second survey than at the first survey. For flexible model schools 74 per cent thought their definition was very or quite effective at the first survey rising to 84 per cent at the second survey, and for defined model schools 57 per cent thought the definition was very or quite effective at the first survey rising to 66 per cent at the second survey. The first survey of schools took place when most schools were at a fairly early stage in implementing the subsidy, so it seems likely that this increase in perceived effectiveness at the second survey is a result of schools having spent more time working with the subsidy and seeing that the definition they use can enable them to reach those that cannot afford to pay.

Amongst schools on the defined model there was a small but notable number of schools (19 per cent) who were very negative about the defined model definition of economic disadvantage. Respondents from these schools both disagreed that the defined model definition of economic disadvantage was an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils, and thought that it did not enable them to reach children who cannot afford to pay.

Table 1.2

Effectiveness of target group definition in enabling schools to reach children who cannot afford to pay

	1 st survey of schools		2 nd survey of schools	
	Flexible model (n=231)	Defined model (n=109)	Flexible model (n=250)	Defined model (n=123)
	%	%	%	%
Very effective	19	10	34	17
Quite effective	55	47	50	49
Not very effective	16	28	8	23
Not at all effective	4	9	3	7
Don't know	7	6	6	4

Base: All schools responding to telephone surveys

The overwhelming response from case study schools, regardless of the model they were following, is that while the use of FSM as an eligibility criterion was desirable, it did not go far enough of itself to ensure that the subsidy reached all those children whose parents were unable to pay.

The Cluster Co-ordinator of Secondary K explained:

'You need to have that, I think you need to have your FSM and LAC and really those quite vulnerable children, families automatically put on to the scheme because otherwise you would get a lot of children who wouldn't be given the opportunity when they should be.'

Nevertheless, it was recognised by schools that some parents did not always apply for FSM, and other parents, who were not eligible for FSM because they were working, were still suffering hardship:

'Free school meals are about filling in a form and parents don't like filling them in. We provide a free lunch anyway. But, well, even parents who do work are not on much money and it could be that this model would actually exclude children.' (Family Liaison Officer, Special School H)

Some concern was expressed about the reliability and timeliness of FSM data in identifying the correct young people:

'I've always worked in schools with a high level of disadvantage and FSM although people often use it as an indicator, it's not a very good indicator because it assumes that that is a definite list and it's not, because some kids are on FSM one week and they're off it the next week and then dad loses his job, you know, when their parents are

casual workers and things'. (Cluster Co-ordinator and Deputy Head, Secondary A)

Those schools who were using the flexible model were appreciative of the flexibility it gave them to recognise economic hardship, and enabled them to facilitate participation through the subsidy. Primary D invited parents to talk to them if they had any financial difficulties, and as a result the school had been able to help out in situations where children had not originally been defined as entitled for the subsidy but who would have been excluded from activities due to economic circumstances, as the following example illustrates:

'A good example is I had two single women parents who were actually working getting working tax credit, but obviously they couldn't claim income support or FSM. But, obviously, they had limited income on their own trying to run a house, you know the typical example who contacted me about the holiday and said 'I'd love to send my son but I'm not in the criteria'. But clearly to me she is a disadvantaged parent because she's in that, sort of stuck in the middle, and we offered to help her out of the disadvantage subsidy half way which she thought was brilliant.' (Business Manager)

In order for the identification to be effective, the Business Manager went on to say:

'I think we've got to be careful that we do listen and that they are all made very aware that if you have any financial difficulties please come and talk to the business manager and we always put that on the letters, we wouldn't want your child to not be included in the activity.'

In the second year of operation, Secondary K had extended their criteria meaning that children did not receive automatic entitlement to the subsidy. In order to prevent children slipping through the net, staff could use their discretion to include children whose parents did not apply, but felt that the application process was necessary in order to invoke a sense of responsibility and ownership by parents:

'With the criterion of FSM children would go on to the scheme and there would be no ownership from parents about it, as in, they could be on the scheme and not even know, and once you send those letters out, that's not always enough. By promoting the scheme and asking parents to come and sign up for it, it's actually meant from the offset that parents are looking out for it, taking an element of responsibility, coming into school, showing their evidence and waiting for the next thing really' (Cluster Co-ordinator)

Although the flexible model seemed to be most effective in reaching children who could not pay for activities, it often resulted in a dilution of spend per child, as budgets were stretched to include a bigger proportion of children than were included using defined model criteria. This was exacerbated in schools which had managed to

achieve a good participation rate:

‘The government works to a formula of 60% take up. We can almost guarantee 100% take up but this means it doesn’t pan out at about £300. It is almost £120 but almost all are benefiting.’ (Cluster Co-ordinator, Special School H)

There is also potential for over- or under-spend on budgets if the population of an area is transitory or likely to change through, for example, local housing strategies.

Although schools operating the flexible model were confident of identifying economically deprived children, they stressed that engaging those children was not just a matter of economics.

‘For me having worked with kids like this for a long time, it’s fantastic to be able to do it because you know if they’re not coming, it’s for reasons other than that, which obviously may be reasons you can’t do anything about, but the economics thing you can’ (Cluster Co-ordinator/Deputy Head, Secondary A)

They recognised that multiple barriers exist for these children that need to be overcome, but that tackling economic disadvantage using the flexible model had allowed them to focus on targeting strategies. It had also enabled staff to start to identify and work on how to overcome those barriers.

‘When you are talking about overarching agendas and Every Child Matters, sometimes it’s difficult to understand that extended services are part of the Every Child Matters. The Pathfinder firms up that belief in extended services - ‘yes I can see the way we need to target’ - not only was it looking at the economic barriers of disadvantage, it was looking at barriers of motivation, parent and child, self confidence, that kind of thing as well’ (Extended Services Manager, Primary L)

Amongst schools that were following the defined model, 93 per cent of respondents thought there were pupils in the school who ought to be included in the target group but did not qualify for free school meals and were not in care and therefore were not included in the defined model definition of economic disadvantage. This is a similar proportion to the first survey of schools.

The defined model clearly limits entitlement meaning that parents who may be in low paid employment but, nevertheless, exceeding the FSM threshold, are excluded perhaps in many cases by a hairs breadth. Respondents in our case study interviews related the negative feelings this caused especially among non-eligible parents and children, and the pressure this placed on the ES Coordinators in their decision-

making processes. A staff member at Primary B explained:

'[Staff member] put on all the leaflets that if you are on free school meals, you get these activities for nothing. Some of the parents are then up in arms about that because some families just get enough money to make ends meet but they don't qualify for this Pathfinder Subsidy.'

These negative feelings were not just a result of the defined model. Young people at Secondary K had experienced jealousy from their peers who were not eligible for the subsidy:

'All my friends want it. They are a bit annoyed that they didn't get to do it and I did. They are annoyed that I got money taken off of it [trip] 'cause if they had that then they'd probably be allowed to go too as it would be cheaper, cause it was too expensive.' (female pupil)

In another sense, having defined criteria meant that it was a simple matter, in technical terms, to explain why a parent was not eligible for the subsidy.

'From my point of view the defined model made it simple, made it clear and otherwise you'd probably never stop. You've got to have a line somewhere that you just can't go over otherwise you'll keep stretching it.' (Community Learning Partnership Co-ordinator, Junior F)

It seems, though, that in sites where the defined model has been applied, coordination staff do not rigidly apply the criteria and will extend the subsidy, at their own discretion, to those parents and children they deem borderline cases. This was certainly the case in Primary B. In some situations, extending the criteria may be unavoidable, especially in schools with a large number claiming FSM leaving small numbers of children not eligible for the subsidy and therefore in a state of artificially induced exclusion.

The flexible model, by contrast, seemed to have the potential for greater inclusivity since in the case study schools, parents exceeding the FSM threshold could still qualify for the subsidy on the grounds that they met other criteria i.e. were claiming other benefits. Nevertheless, the flexible model may result in more work for Co-ordinators and related staff since they have a wider range of factors to consider in deciding who is eligible for the subsidy. In addition, using multiple criteria to define eligibility for the subsidy sometimes meant that school staff found it difficult to understand how to target children, and more training and/or support was needed for these staff.

Special School H provided free school meals to all its pupils, and so would not have been able to define disadvantage based solely on the defined model. Several Local Authorities are piloting, or being invited to bid for, universal free school meals. If government were to pursue the provision of free school meals for all as a future strategy, then using eligibility for free school meals as an indicator of deprivation may

become increasingly problematic.

1.4 Delivery of the defined model requirements

The defined model required that schools should use the subsidy funding to provide pupils in the target group with two hours of activities a week during term time, and 30 hours of activities during school holidays.

Over half of schools following the defined model found it difficult to meet the two hours a week during term time requirement of the defined model: 42 per cent found it quite difficult and 12 per cent very difficult. This compares with 29 per cent of defined model schools that found it quite easy and 13 per cent very easy to meet this requirement. If 'don't know' answers are excluded⁸ then these results are similar to what was found at the first survey of schools.

Defined model schools were also asked how many of the pupils in their target group were taking part in two hours of activities a week or more. Answers to this question were mixed with some schools (18 per cent) saying that most or all of their target group were doing this, and a similar proportion (15 per cent) saying that very few or none of their target group were doing this. The full range of answers is shown in table 1.3.

Table 1.3

Number of target group pupils taking part in two hours of activities a week or more

	Defined model
	(n=123)
	%
None	4
Very few	11
Less than half	31
Around half or more	33
Most	15
All	2
Don't know	2

Base: All schools following the defined model (123)

Meeting the 30 hours during school holidays requirement of the defined model seems to have presented schools with more difficulty than the term time requirement: 36 per

⁸ A relatively high proportion of schools answered 'don't know' at this question at the first survey of schools, this was probably due to these schools being at a very early stage in the implementation of the subsidy at the time of the survey.

cent of schools found this very difficult and 30 per cent found it quite difficult while 19 per cent found this quite easy, and six per cent very easy.

Larger primary schools (200 pupils or more) were more likely than smaller ones to have found this easy: 37 per cent found it very or quite easy compared with just 14 per cent of primary schools with less than 200 pupils.

Schools following the defined model were also asked how many target group pupils had taken part in 30 hours or more of activities during the school holidays. Answers to this question showed that schools had had far less success fulfilling this requirement of the defined model than the term time requirement: for 59 per cent of defined model schools very few or none of the target group had taken part in 30 hours of holiday activities. The full range of answers is shown in table 1.4.

Again, there were significant differences between larger and smaller primary schools. In 43 per cent of larger primary schools (200 pupils or more) very few or none of the target group had taken part in 30 hours or more of holiday activities. This compares with 78 per cent of primary schools with less than 200 pupils.

Table 1.4

Number of target group pupils that have taken part in 30 hours of activities or more during school holidays

	Defined model (n=123) %
None	16
Very few	43
Less than half	15
Around half or more	13
Most	4
All	0
Don't know	8

Base: All schools following the defined model (123)

Schools using the flexible model felt that they could not have reached the level of delivery that they had if they had used the defined model. For one school, Secondary A, a new build programme hampered extended services development and without the ability to be flexible with the subsidy, they would not have been able to provide transition support for any of their children. The Cluster Co-ordinator at Special School H said:

'If the delivery model was defined, even if we had the flexibility to identify our own criteria for disadvantage, we'd be on our knees. Defined delivery would mean that schools could not have done half as

much as they have done...they would be constrained to do it in my cluster had we been given the defined model.'

Regardless of the model of targeting adopted, staff in our case study schools felt that the expectations as to hours of activities children should engage in during term time and holiday periods laid down by the DfE were very rigid and difficult to meet especially where children lived in complex and often chaotic situations not to mention other barriers to participation that often exist. We found in our case study interviews that children and young people had numerous reasons for not participating in activities, including childcare responsibilities; transport difficulties; lack of commitment from parents; and having too little time. These children were sometimes participating in activities outside of school already.

A regression analysis was undertaken to assess the factors that affect whether young people were taking up two hours a week during term time and 30 hours during school holidays (the defined model requirement). This analysis was done using parents and pupils data and looked at all pupils, not just those at defined model schools.

Pupils from schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to be meeting both the term time and holiday hours targets. Children who attended activities outside school were also more likely to be fulfilling the targets for activities provided by the school, as were young people who enjoyed school. Full details of this analysis are included in appendix 3.

2. Consultation

Consulting economically disadvantaged pupils and parents about the sort of activities they would like to be offered using the subsidy is an important part of the pathfinder. Economically disadvantaged pupils are more likely to engage with activities if the activities on offer are ones that appeal to them. Previous research⁹ has shown that more needs to be done to align services to what parents and pupils actually want.

Key findings:

- 86 per cent of schools had engaged in consultation (76 per cent had consulted pupils and 71 per cent had consulted parents) and most saw consultation as an ongoing process.
- Speaking to pupils informally and asking pupils to complete questionnaires or surveys were the two most commonly used methods of consulting pupils, and also the two methods deemed most effective by schools in consulting pupils.
- Speaking to parents informally and asking them to complete questionnaires or surveys were also common methods of consulting parents and, again, the two methods considered most effective by schools.
- Parents were less likely to feel consulted – only 22 per cent recalled being asked for their opinion on the kinds of activities the school should be offering. However, around half of parents thought their child’s school took at least ‘a fair amount’ of notice of parents’ views on extended services.
- When asked how they would like to be consulted, the most common answers given by parents were being given questionnaires to complete, and through letters and leaflets. However, qualitative evidence suggested face to face consultation was more effective in reaching parents.
- Half of pupils recalled being consulted about activities – mostly by filling in questionnaires or through discussions with teachers (in classes, assemblies or at other times).

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

Highlighting the importance of consultation, one of the schools involved in the case studies relating to costs (school 1.4) was offering a selection of afterschool clubs with external providers and these were free to pupils in the target group. The school had not consulted with parents or pupils about the kinds of activities they would like to be offered, and admitted that take up of the activities by the target group ***'has not been particularly good'***.

2.1 Whether schools have employed consultation

Over eight in ten schools (86 per cent) had employed some consultation with either parents or pupils in their target group about the kinds of activities they would like to be offered using the subsidy. At the first survey of schools, 74 per cent of schools had engaged in consultation with parents or pupils, so it is encouraging to see that this has increased over time. Of schools that had not engaged in consultation by the time of the first survey of schools, 76 per cent had consulted by the time of the second survey.

Consulting pupils was slightly more common than consulting parents: 76 per cent of schools had engaged in consultation with pupils and 71 per cent had consulted parents (60 per cent had consulted both).

Schools following the flexible model were slightly more likely than those following the defined model to have consulted with either parents or pupils (88 per cent compared with 82 per cent). Schools with higher proportions of pupils eligible for FSM were also more likely to have engaged in consultation: 91 per cent of schools where 20 per cent of pupils or more were eligible for FSM had consulted parents or pupils compared with 83 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were eligible for FSM. Table 2.1 shows in more detail whether schools had consulted parents or pupils, broken down by these subgroups.

As might be expected, there were differences between primary and secondary schools in who they had consulted, with secondary schools being more likely to consult pupils (86 per cent, compared with 74 per cent of primary schools), but overall both were equally likely to have engaged in some kind of consultation.

Where schools had been interviewed for the first survey of schools, if they said they had consulted parents or pupils at the second survey they were asked whether any of this consultation had happened since they had previously been interviewed. Nine in ten schools (90 per cent) said they had consulted since their previous interview, showing that most schools understand that consultation should be ongoing, not just something they do once.

Table 2.1

Whether schools consulted with pupils and parents about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy

	All schools	Flexible model	Defined model	< 20% eligible for FSM	< 20% eligible for FSM
	(n=373)	(n=250)	(n=123)	(n=219)	(148)
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes – pupils	76	79	70	70	85
Yes - parents	71	73	66	69	74
No	13	11	17	16	10
Don't know	1	1	1	1	0

Base: All schools responding to the second telephone survey of schools

Whilst most schools had engaged in consultation, it is useful to look in more detail at the minority (13 per cent) of schools that had not, and whether these schools had introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy. Two thirds (67 per cent) of these schools had introduced new activities, which is lower than the 90 per cent of all schools that had introduced new activities, but still shows that a notable minority of schools had introduced new activities without engaging in consultation.

These 13 per cent of schools that had not engaged in any consultation were asked why they had not done so. Answers given can be grouped into themes:

- Some schools were intending to consult, or had already started the process:
 - Intend to in the future – 16 per cent
 - In the process of doing it – 14 per cent
 - Have done *some* consultation – six per cent
- Other schools had reasons why they had difficulties in engaging in consultation:
 - Time constraints – 12 per cent
 - Staffing issues/lack of funding – eight per cent
 - Lack of interest from parents – six per cent
 - Do not want to draw attention to/stigmatise parents – six per cent
 - Have only just received funding – four per cent
 - Do not want to raise expectations in case we cannot provide the activities they want – four per cent
- While some schools did not seem to see a need for consultation:
 - Already offer a variety of activities – 18 per cent

- Don't feel there is any need – 16 per cent
- Waiting for them to come up with suggestions for what to provide – six per cent.

Although the qualitative case study findings confirm that most schools have engaged in consultation with parents and young people to some degree, the findings have helped us to identify the difficulties some schools face in consultation. Some schools have expressed reluctance to consult too widely due to the fear that children and parents will ask for **'any kind of crazy thing'** (Parent and Family Support Advisor, Junior F). Schools also recognised that children often find it difficult to express the kinds of opportunities that they would like to have, when they are unaware of what is possible, or available, to them:

'You don't know what you don't know. You wouldn't get anybody going paragliding because they wouldn't know what paragliding was!' (Cluster Co-ordinator/ Deputy Head, Secondary A.

The Cluster Coordinator in Special School H said: **'Unless you give them wider choices they don't know what to ask for'**.

Secondary A had held a successful marketplace day in school where children could meet activity providers, and find out about the options open to them in advance of more detailed consultation about which activities they would like to take part in.

Special School H organizes an annual provider fair which gives providers the opportunity to showcase their services.

In addition, consultation often takes up inordinate amounts of time if it is done properly, and for many schools, consultation has been an ongoing process, informing not just set-up, but also development. This places great demands on staff. Staff are also not always convinced that consultation will result in better engagement or involvement in activities:

'I hate to say it but for all the consultancy that you can do with parents in surveys and everything, it doesn't necessarily mean you're going to hit the mark which I was really surprised at. I did all the consultancy I did loads of surveys, got parents in and I still wasn't getting the numbers for the things that came out so I think you've got to be prepared for that.'
(Business Manager, Primary D)

Traditional methods have sometimes failed to appeal to parents and/or children, meaning that more innovative, or time consuming methods need to be adopted. Small schools, particularly primaries, have sometimes found it easier to consult parents, as they have a greater knowledge of parents and pupils and can engage in more frequent, informal conversations with them especially in the mornings when they drop their children off at school and in the afternoons when they collect them at

the end of the school day.

2.2 Methods of consultation employed

As well as being asked how they had consulted with pupils, schools were asked which of the methods of consultation they had used they deemed to be the most successful. Table 2.2 shows the proportions of schools who had used each method, as well as the proportion who deemed each method to be most effective.

As the table shows, the most commonly used methods of consulting pupils were speaking to pupils informally and asking pupils to complete questionnaires or surveys. Using focus groups or meetings with pupils and discussions with student councils were also widely used methods of consultation. These results differ from the first survey of schools when using questionnaires or surveys was by far the most common form of consultation used (46 per cent) and only 27 per cent of schools had used informal conversations to consult with pupils. This suggests that there has been a shift as schools have grown more accustomed to using the subsidy, both for schools to engage in more methods of consultation, and towards wider use of methods that involve face to face conversations with pupils.

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to speak to pupils informally (64 per cent compared with 51 per cent), and to use focus groups or other meetings with pupils (57 per cent compared with 30 per cent). Larger primary schools (those with 200 pupils or more) were more likely than smaller ones to have used surveys of pupils (61 per cent compared with 42 per cent).

The methods deemed most effective were the same as those that were being most widely used: speaking to pupils informally; surveys of pupils; focus groups or other meetings with pupils; and discussions with a school or student council.

Table 2.2

Methods used to consult with pupils, and method considered most effective

	Used this method	Method most effective
	(n=283)	(n=283)
	%	%
Spoke to pupils informally	54	30
Questionnaire / surveys to pupils	51	27
Focus group or other meeting with pupils	33	16
Discussions with a school/ student council were arranged	29	12
School Assembly	19	1
Sent letters to pupils	14	1
Using other school practitioners (e.g. Parent Support Advisers)	5	1
Through activities list/presentation	4	0
Market place events/taster sessions	3	0
Through advertising	1	0
Through Website	1	0
Other Answers	10	8
Mixture of all	n/a	1
Don't know	*	4

Base: All schools that had consulted with pupils (283)

Table 2.3 shows the methods schools had used to consult parents, and also the method considered most effective. As with pupils, speaking to parents informally was the most widely used method of consultation, and also considered to be most effective by the highest proportion of schools. Using questionnaires or surveys of parents was also a common method of consultation, and a quarter of schools thought this was the most effective method to use. Over half of schools sent letters to parents to consult them, but a lower proportion of schools considered this to be the most effective method of consultation (15 per cent).

The proportion of schools using informal conversations with parents as a form of consultation had increased dramatically from 24 per cent at the first survey of schools to 60 per cent, showing that schools had started to consult more actively with parents as they had been using the subsidy funding for longer.

Primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to have spoken to parents informally (61 per cent compared with 49 per cent), whilst secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to have sent letters to parents (70 per cent compared with 52 per cent). This may relate to the number of parents that need to be consulted: secondary schools, being much larger, may find it is not practically possible to have informal conversations with all the parents they would like to consult. Equally, opportunities for informal conversations at the school gate when parents drop off or collect pupils are far less likely to arise at secondary schools than at primary schools.

As tables 2.2 and 2.3 suggest, most schools were using more than one method to consult parents and pupils, suggesting that perhaps the most successful way of consulting is to use a variety of different methods to try to engage as many people as possible in the consultation process.

Table 2.3

Methods used to consult with parents, and method considered most effective

	Used this method	Method most effective
	(n=263)	(n=263)
	%	%
Spoke to parents informally	60	33
Questionnaire / surveys to parents	49	24
Sent letters to parents	56	15
Focus group or other meeting with parents	21	5
Telephoned parents	10	3
Using other school practitioners (e.g. Parent Support Advisers)	6	3
Parents Evenings	8	*
Through events (market days/roadshows etc.)	4	0
Website	1	0
Word of mouth	*	0
Through advertising	*	0
Suggestion box	*	0
Other Answers	8	8
Mixture of all	n/a	3
Don't know	0	5

Base: All schools that had consulted with parents (263)

All of the sites visited as part of the case studies used a variety of approaches to consult with the target population. These included discrete initial communications using methods such as:

- In school consultations with eligible pupils via surveys and interviews
- Letters directly to parents
- Letters to parents via pupils (placed in pupils' school bags)

Most of the sites employed a range of continuous communication methods to sustain awareness of the subsidy among the target population. These methods included:

- School newsletters (disseminated inside and outside the school)
- Subsidy awareness raising events
- Using school based parent coordinators to target particular families to talk to
- Home visits

It appears that all of these methods have been effective to varying degrees. One of the most effective methods may be word of mouth from school based coordinators to parents and then from parents to parents. Involving parents in consulting with other parents was a method used extensively by Primary D as the Business Manager explains:

'There are a number of parents that I have in a focus group that have been really good and instrumental in trying to find out what parents want, there's also the governors, the parent helpers are absolutely brilliant, you ask them what they think and they'll go out and take their clipboard and ask 70 parents at the school gates what they think, they are fab.'

Primary D also involved the school council in peer consultation exercises:

'Sometimes we go on the yard with our sheet and you ask people what kind of clubs they want'. (year 3 boy)

There was a growing awareness that traditional approaches to communicating with parents and pupils e.g. letters or questionnaires, are often inadequate and either fail to reach all those eligible for the subsidy or are ignored due to a variety of reasons that may include poor literacy, apathy or other social/psychological problems. There were mixed opinions among the young people we spoke to about which methods they liked best, perhaps suggesting that using a wide portfolio of consultation methods might be most effective in reaching different ages and groups of children.

All of the case study sites are, near the end of the Pathfinder stage, looking at ways to engage with parents in more direct, face to face, ways, for example, through parent network facilitators, social workers etc. While the communication strategies outlined above have successfully, to varying degrees, reached the targeted population, there remain in some sites small pockets of groups and individuals who for whatever reason feel unwilling or unable to come forward and claim their entitlement. Interviews with staff, parents and providers in School G, for instance, suggested that take up among ethnic groups may be low due to language difficulties and lack of familiarity with the bureaucratic procedures that need to be followed in order to access the subsidy i.e. filling out forms.

2.3 Whether parents feel consulted

All respondents to the survey of parents were asked whether, as far as they were aware, the school had asked parents about what they think about the additional services it offers in the last year. Half of parents (50 per cent) said they were not aware of any consultation, and a further four per cent did not know. The remaining 46 per cent were aware of the school consulting parents and the methods of consultation used were:

- Questionnaires to fill in – 21 per cent
- Parents evenings – 21 per cent
- Through letters and leaflets – 19 per cent
- Open days – seven per cent
- Informal chats with school staff – five per cent
- Focus groups or meetings with other parents and school staff – four per cent
- Telephone conversations with school staff – two per cent.

These results show that relatively few parents were aware of consultation being undertaken compared with the proportion of schools that said they had consulted parents (71 per cent). There are several possible reasons for this:

- While schools had consulted parents, they had not consulted all parents and so some parents in the survey were not aware of consultation even though their school had consulted other parents of pupils at the school;
- Parents had been consulted but did not see it as being formally asked their opinion on additional services and so discounted this – this would explain particularly the discrepancy between the 42 per cent of all schools that said they had consulted parents by speaking to them informally, and the five per cent of parents who were aware of the school staff consulting parents by having informal chats.

- Parents had been consulted in the last year, but had forgotten about this.

As well as asking about their awareness of consultation, parents were also asked if they themselves had been asked for their opinion on the kinds of activities the school should be offering. Just under a quarter of parents (22 per cent) said they had been asked, 75 per cent had not and two per cent could not recall.

Parents of pupils at primary schools were more likely to recall being asked for their opinions than parents of pupils at secondary schools (27 per cent compared with 16 per cent).

Parents' opinions on how much their school takes parents' views into account on the additional services it offers were quite mixed: 14 per cent said the school took parents' views into account 'a great deal'; 34 per cent said 'a fair amount'; 26 per cent said 'not very much'; and 11 per cent said 'not at all'.

Opinions on how much the school takes parents' views into account were far more positive amongst parents who were aware of the school taking measures to consult parents, and even more positive amongst parents who had themselves been asked for their opinions. These results are shown in table 2.4.

Table 2.4

Parents' opinions on how much their school takes into account parents' views on the additional services it offers

	All parents	Parents who were aware of consultation	Parents who recalled being consulted
	(n=555)	(n=243)	(n=120)
	%	%	%
A great deal	14	23	39
A fair amount	34	47	41
Not very much	26	19	12
Not at all	11	3	2
Don't know	14	8	6

Base: All parents taking part in the survey of parents (555)

Finally, parents were asked how they would like to be consulted about what they think about activities. The most popular choices were being given questionnaires to complete (52 per cent), through letters and leaflets (49 per cent), at parents evenings (40 per cent), and at open days (28 per cent). Other answers given were:

- Informal chats with school staff – 14 per cent
- Focus groups or meetings with other parents and school staff – 14 per cent
- Telephone conversations with school staff – 13 per cent

- School staff visiting parents at home – six per cent
- Using the internet or emails – two per cent

In addition, two per cent of parents said they did not want to be consulted, and two per cent could not say how they would like to be consulted.

It is interesting to note that only 14 per cent of parents said they wanted to be asked their opinions during informal chats, when this was both the most common method schools were using to consult parents, and also the method deemed most effective.

The parents spoken to during the case study interviews all remembered being consulted. This consultation was not always in relation to the subsidy pathfinder, however, but usually related to the additional activities that the subsidy was able to provide.

These parents felt that they were listened to and that the school would always try and help. However, it should also be noted that while the consultation methods outlined above did communicate the existence of the disadvantage subsidy to parents, it was also the case that some parents found out about it via more serendipitous channels i.e. an informal chat with a teacher or other member of staff or even their next door neighbour. As one parent in Secondary G said it was sometimes a case of being in the '**Right place at the right time**'. Another said: '**My next door neighbour mentioned her son had got it**'.

2.4 Whether pupils feel consulted

Pupils were asked whether they had done anything in the last year to tell staff at their school what they thought about the activities offered outside of lesson time. Around half (52 per cent) of pupils recalled being consulted about extended schools activities, while 42 per cent said they had not been consulted and six per cent did not know. The actual methods of consultation used were:

- Filled in a questionnaire – 23 per cent
- Discussed in a class or tutor group – 19 per cent
- Been to an assembly where teachers discussed activities – 14 per cent
- Talked to teachers or staff at other times – 14 per cent
- Received letters or leaflets about activities – 14 per cent
- Been asked during activities themselves – 11 per cent
- Reported to a school or year group council – ten per cent
- Had a telephone conversation with school staff – one per cent.

Pupils' opinions on how much their school listens to young peoples' views on the activities offered outside lessons were also quite mixed, as shown in table 2.5,

although most pupils (56 per cent) thought the school took at least ‘a fair amount’ of notice of their views. As shown in table 2.5, pupils who recalled being consulted tended to have more positive views on how much the school took young peoples’ views into account: 69 per cent thought their school listened to their views at least ‘a fair amount’.

Table 2.5
Pupils’ opinions on how much their school takes into account young peoples’ views on the additional services it offers

	All pupils (n=553) %	Pupils who recalled being consulted (n=278) %
A great deal	15	18
A fair amount	41	51
Not very much	20	18
Not at all	8	5
Don’t know	16	8

Base: All pupils taking part in the survey of pupils (553)

We spoke to pupils who had participated in activities and pupils who had not. At some schools, regardless of whether children had participated, all children were able to recall being consulted, whereas at others, recall was more patchy, even where staff assured us that all children had been consulted. This seemed to reflect the efforts of the school, for example in Secondary A, consultation with children was seen as extremely important and part of the culture of the school:

‘Our kids are very astute and our kids have had a lot of opportunity to do that. We ask their opinions on all sorts of things. Sometimes they give you their opinion even when you don’t want them!’

All of the young people at secondary A spoke confidently about their involvement in consultations, and about their ability to influence decision making.

Children who could remember being consulted were appreciative of the chance to offer their views, and those who were not consulted, stressed that they should have been:

‘I reckon it would be better if they consulted us, we’re the people that are going to be using it a lot more, and more regularly, so they could improve it, I know it’s quite a new scheme so obviously there’s going to be little hiccups here and there, but if they were to talk to other people about the sorts of things that they want to do and the sorts of things that they do already then they can sort out stuff like that rather than

creating a list of stuff in the area.' (male pupil).

In many schools a culture of consultation existed prior to the arrival of the subsidy and was utilised to inform pupils about the subsidised activities. Primary B, for instance, regularly consults pupils about other school issues through questionnaires, interviews and the School Council and had no problem using these approaches in conjunction with other perhaps more innovative approaches to consult with pupils.

3. Promotion of activities

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

Key findings:

- A quarter of schools said they struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities. However, nearly nine in ten schools thought that economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that they offer.
- All schools involved in the pathfinder had used some methods to promote the uptake of activities to the target group, with letters to parents being the most common promotion method used, followed by speaking informally to parents and pupils.
- Most parents said their child's school let them know about activities by letter – either letters given to their child to bring home, or letters sent directly to them.
- Most parents felt at least quite well informed about the activities on offer at their child's school, but 24 per cent of parents did not feel very well informed, and a further 12 per cent did not feel at all informed.
- A quarter of schools agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma which prevents them participating in activities.
- Strategies used by schools to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation were: general discretion in approaching parents and pupils; approaching parents so pupils do not know who is being subsidised; having activities open to all or free to all; and organising the funding so that pupils do not know they are being subsidised or do not know they are in the target group.

Quantitative findings from schools in this chapter are from the second survey of schools, unless otherwise stated. Fieldwork for this second survey took place in October to December 2009 when schools had been using the subsidy for around a year. These findings are sometimes contrasted with those from the first survey of schools for which fieldwork took place between December 2008 and February 2009 when many schools were still at an early stage in implementing the subsidy.

3.1 Engaging the target group

All respondents to the telephone survey of schools were asked how much they agreed with the statement “We struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities”. The majority (60 per cent) of respondents disagreed with this statement, but around a quarter of schools (27 per cent) did struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils.

Overall, a similar proportion of schools agreed they were struggling to engage economically disadvantaged pupils at both the first and second survey of schools, but a higher proportion of schools disagreed with the statement at the second survey (fewer said they neither agreed nor disagreed). These results are shown in table 3.1.

At the first survey of schools¹⁰ there had been a marked difference between primary and secondary schools with secondary schools more likely to agree with the statement: 50 per cent did compared with 27 per cent of primary schools. This difference was no longer evident at the second survey when 26 per cent of primary schools and 24 per cent of secondary schools agreed with the statement.

At the second survey, schools following the defined model were more likely to be struggling to engage economically disadvantaged pupils than schools following the flexible model (33 per cent compared with 24 per cent).

Table 3.1

Agreement with the statement: “We struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities”

	1st survey of schools (n=340)	2nd survey of schools (n=373)
	%	%
Strongly agree	6	4
Agree	24	23
Neither agree nor disagree	18	11
Disagree	42	46
Strongly disagree	8	14
Don't know	1	2

Base: All schools responding to telephone surveys

Where schools were struggling to engage economically disadvantaged pupils, they were asked whether they struggled more with generating initial interest or with maintaining interest after pupils had been to one or two activities. Answers were fairly mixed:

¹⁰ Fieldwork for the first survey of schools took place between December 2008 and February 2009, fieldwork for the second survey of schools took place between October and December 2009.

- 46 per cent said they struggled more with generating initial interest in extended schools activities amongst economically disadvantaged pupils;
- 31 per cent said they struggled more with maintaining interest amongst economically disadvantaged pupils once they had attended one or two activities;
- 20 per cent said they struggled with both equally.

All respondents to the telephone survey were also asked how much they agreed with the statement “Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that we offer”. Overall 87 per cent of respondents agreed with this statement, suggesting that there is generally a great deal of enthusiasm amongst economically disadvantaged pupils for taking part in extended school activities.

This result seems slightly contradictory to the earlier finding that 27 per cent of schools struggled to engage economically disadvantaged pupils. Overall 20 per cent of schools agreed *both* that economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate *and* that they struggle to engage these pupils in extended schools activities. There are possible reasons why respondents may have answered in this way:

- Some economically disadvantaged pupils at the school are keen to participate, but the school struggles to engage others;
- Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate, but there are barriers preventing them from taking part (such as the cost of activities, or transport to get to activities) which makes it hard for the school to engage them. Section 8.6 looks at barriers that prevent pupils from taking part in activities.

Agreement with the statement “Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that we offer” had increased since the first survey of schools from 79 per cent to 87 per cent showing that by the second survey, even more schools were confident that they had activities that appealed to pupils in the target group. Table 3.2 shows full results for both the first and second survey of schools.

At the first survey of schools there was a large gap in agreement with this statement between primary and secondary schools: 83 per cent of primary schools agreed compared with 58 per cent of secondary schools. At the second survey of schools this gap had narrowed, but was still evident: 90 per cent of primary schools agreed with the statement compared with 73 per cent of secondary schools.

Table 3.2

Agreement with the statement: “Economically disadvantaged pupils are keen to participate in the activities that we offer”

	1st survey of schools (n=340)	2nd survey of schools (n=373)
	%	%
Strongly agree	29	34
Agree	51	53
Neither agree nor disagree	14	8
Disagree	5	4
Strongly disagree	*	1
Don't know	2	1

Base: All schools responding to telephone surveys

3.2 Methods used to promote activities

All schools involved in the pathfinder had used some methods to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group. This was a change since the first survey of schools when seven per cent of schools had not done anything to promote the uptake of activities specifically amongst the target group. This shows that, at the first survey of schools, some schools were simply at an early stage in the implementation of the subsidy and had not yet started promoting activities to the target group, but these schools have since started to promote the uptake of activities.

Table 3.3 shows the methods of promoting activities that schools had used at both the first and second surveys of schools. As the table shows, the relative popularity of each method was similar across both surveys, but at the second survey most methods were being used by more schools than they had been at the first survey.

Table 3.3

Methods used by schools to promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group

	1st survey of schools (n=340)	2nd survey of schools (n=373)
	%	%
Letters to parents	55	75
Speaking to parents informally	31	46
Speaking to pupils informally	25	34
Advertisements (such as posters) at school	24	28
School assemblies	15	20
Focus groups or other meetings with pupils	12	19
Focus groups or other meetings with parents	5	14
Using a website, email or text messaging	5	14
Telephoning parents	5	12
Questionnaires or surveys to parents	7	9
Questionnaires or surveys to pupils	7	9
Using the school or student council	5	8
Letters to pupils	7	5
Parents evenings	4	4
External agencies or individuals (such as health visitors or family workers) coming to talk at the school	2	4
Using other school practitioners (e.g. parent support advisers)	0	4
Taster sessions	1	2
Circulate lists or booklet of activities	0	2
Open days	2	1
Home visits to parents	1	1
Pupils speaking to other pupils	*	1
Co-ordinated help with other organisations (such as Children's Centres)	1	*
Using local media or press	1	*
Other methods	9	9
None used	7	0

Base: All schools responding to telephone surveys

The majority of the children interviewed during case study visits were aware of the activities that were available to them. They had heard about these activities in a variety of ways, through friends, letters, and staff.

The methods used to promote activities can be classed as active (talking to parents or pupils) or passive (sending letters, questionnaires, websites, advertisements etc). Eight in ten schools (82 per cent) had used active methods to promote the uptake of activities, the remaining 18 per cent had only used passive methods. At the first survey 67 per cent of schools had been using active methods, so this had increased as schools had been using the subsidy for longer.

Schools with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils tended to have used more methods of promotion than those with lower levels. They were also more likely to have used active methods of promotion: 89 per cent of schools where 20 per cent of pupils or more were eligible for free school meals had used active methods of promotion compared with 78 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were eligible for free school meals.

Secondary schools tended to have used more promotion methods than primary schools, possibly as a result of their larger size and perhaps more diverse group of pupils to be reached. There were also some differences between primary and secondary schools in the types of promotion used, with primary schools being more likely to aim their promotion of activities at parents (speaking to parents informally and sending letters to parents), and secondary schools being more likely to use a variety of methods aimed at pupils: focus groups with pupils; school assemblies; school or student councils; advertisements such as posters at school; and websites, emails or text messaging.

A wide variety of methods were being used in case study schools in order to encourage the uptake of extended schools activities. Strategies to encourage uptake by all children tended to be more passive, and included sending letters, and using marketing material such as posters, flyers, or website information.

Letters were used in nearly every school and were deemed the:

'quickest and most discreet way of letting the parents of FSM children know that they can access extended school activities with no additional financial burden to themselves' (Primary B, Cluster Action Plan)

Some schools also used assembly time to advertise what was on offer to children. Where schools wanted to target those eligible for the subsidy more specifically, they tended to use more active methods, such as telephone calls and home visits.

Other methods were used on occasion. Several schools briefed teachers and other staff, in order for them to be able to encourage children to participate in the activities on offer. Others had held taster sessions. Secondary K had held a series of seminars with key practitioners to brainstorm ways in which they could encourage uptake, and start to deal with the non-economic barriers that were emerging. During the seminars, the cluster co-ordinator stated that:

'nothing came as a shock actually, going into this anybody would say 'its not just money'. For some families it is, but for some families there are other bigger barriers so it is constantly that one to one approach to try and find out what they are'.

Some schools also considered how the type of activities that they provided could influence uptake. In Primary D, for example, they found that holiday provision was mainly suited to working parents who needed childcare and so those who were not eligible for the subsidy were not participating. In this respect, a Cluster Coordinator in School B was concerned that holiday provision may be viewed by some parents as somewhere to dump the kids in order to give themselves a break for the day

The Business Manager decided that the funding was more effective when used for activities such as trips, which tended to have a higher uptake of children entitled to the subsidy:

'we tried holiday clubs which were subsidised, for example. Now parents who generally tend to use holiday clubs are parents who are working and would not usually be eligible anyway, so that's why I've stopped that because I didn't feel that the money was going to the right people. So we started at looking at things like a school organised day trip'.

Some schools had an awareness that uptake could only be increased if there was an accompanying change in the culture of the school, that enabled children and parents to see schools, not just as a place of learning, but as a place to have fun:

'And it's about developing a culture as well. You see in the past when we ever did anything in the evening, you could never charge for it because the children, the families just couldn't afford to pay for it so we had quite a limited range of things on offer, and it's developing that culture for them to attend things after school and we're slowly picking away at that. We seem to have cracked it in terms of study support in a sense but it's now getting into the idea that there are fun things that you can do in school'. (Cluster Co-ordinator/ Deputy Head, Secondary A).

This school used a reward scheme to encourage pupils to attend activities. By collecting raffle tickets each time they attended an activity, young people would have the chance to win a prize each half term, or had an automatic right to attend an

organised trip:

'If you ever join a sports club, and you commit, like if you're over there ten times out of the whole thing, 'cause like it's only on for a term, you go to Wet and Wild'. (Secondary A girl, year 10)

Staff prizes were also used to provide an incentive to school staff to encourage young people to participate.

Secondary C uses residential holidays as a carrot to encourage pupils to participate regularly in at least two hours of extra-curricular activities a week. If pupils participate regularly, the school pays for places on residential holidays.

3.3 Parents' views on the promotion of activities

Table 3.4 shows how well informed parents felt about the additional activities offered by their child's school. The majority of parents (63 per cent) felt at least quite well informed about the activities on offer, but there were still 24 per cent of parents who did not feel very informed, and 12 per cent who were not at all informed. This shows that, despite all the promotion activities being undertaken by schools, there are still some parents who have not been reached.

Table 3.4 also shows answers to this question broken down by whether the respondent was the parent of a primary school pupil or a secondary school pupil. As the table shows, parents of primary school pupils tended to feel much better informed about additional activities than parents of secondary school pupils. This is perhaps unsurprising as (as shown in section 3.2) primary schools tended to aim their promotion of activities at parents and secondary schools were more likely to concentrate on promoting activities to pupils.

Table 3.4

How informed parents feel about the additional activities offered by their child's school

	All parents	Parents of primary school pupils	Parents of secondary school pupils
	(n=555)	(n=294)	(n=209)
	%	%	%
Very well informed	24	30	13
Quite well informed	39	42	34
Not very informed	24	20	30
Not at all informed	12	6	21
Don't know	2	1	2

Base: All parents taking part in the survey of parents (555)

Parents were also asked how the school advertised or let them know about the activities on offer. Mostly this was done with letters: 71 per cent said they got letters that had been given to their children to take home and 34 per cent had received letters sent to them directly. This concurs with the survey of schools which showed that 75 per cent of schools were using letters to parents to promote activities.

Other methods parents were aware of being used were:

- Through parents evenings or open days – 16 per cent
- Adverts such as posters at the school – 16 per cent
- Speaking to pupils informally – 14 per cent
- Through school assembly – 12 per cent
- Speaking to parents informally – nine per cent
- Telephoning parents – seven per cent
- Sending letters to pupils directly – seven per cent
- Text messages – seven per cent
- Through a school or student council – two per cent
- Using internet or email – one per cent.

There were also five per cent of parents who said their child's school had not used any methods to let them know about the activities on offer, and one per cent who could not recall.

At the second schools survey, 46 per cent of schools said they were speaking to parents informally to promote activities, but only nine per cent of parents recalled being told about activities in this way. This does not necessarily mean that informally

talking to parents is a bad way of promoting activities – it may be very effective as a short term measure in encouraging parents to send their children to activities – however it does suggest that parents do not tend to recall such conversations for a long time after they have occurred.

3.4 Future plans for promoting activities

All the case schools visited have ongoing promotion activities designed to engage those children entering primary school and those moving up to secondary school.

All schools were asked whether they had any further plans in the future to promote the uptake of activities amongst their target group: 43 per cent said they did, 52 per cent did not and six per cent did not know.

Where schools were planning on doing further promotion of activities, 21 per cent were planning on continuing using the same methods they were already using, 30 per cent were planning on using some new methods and some of the same ones and the remaining 50 per cent were planning to use all new methods to further promote the uptake of activities amongst the target group.

The actual methods schools were planning to use to promote activities in the future were similar to those already being used:

- Send letters to parents – 34 per cent
- Speak to parents informally – 24 per cent
- Websites, emails or text messaging – 19 per cent
- Advertisements (such as posters) at school – 18 per cent
- Focus groups or other meetings with parents – 11 per cent
- Speak to pupils informally – nine per cent
- Telephone parents – eight per cent
- Focus groups or other meetings with pupils – five per cent
- School assembly – four per cent
- Taster session – four per cent
- Parents evening – three per cent
- Send letters to pupils – three per cent
- Questionnaires or surveys to pupils – three per cent
- External agencies or individuals (such as health visitors or family workers) coming to talk at the school – three per cent

- School or student council – three per cent
- Word of mouth – two per cent
- Co-ordinated help with other organisations (such as Children’s Centres) – one per cent
- Promotion within current activities – one per cent
- Local media/press – one per cent
- Open days – one per cent
- Using other school practitioners (e.g. parent support advisers) – one per cent
- Other answers – 15 per cent

3.5 Stigmatisation

All respondents to the telephone survey of schools were asked how much they agreed with the statement “Economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma, which prevents them from participating in activities”. Overall, a quarter (25 per cent) of schools agreed with this statement and 64 per cent disagreed. These results are a little different from the first survey of schools when 31 per cent agreed and 57 per cent disagreed. This decrease in agreement with this statement over time may suggest that the way schools have been using the subsidy has helped reduce stigma for economically disadvantaged pupils in some schools. Table 3.5 shows full answers for both the first and second survey of schools.

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

Table 3.5

Agreement with the statement: “Economically disadvantaged pupils face a sense of stigma, which prevents them from participating in activities”

	1st survey of schools (n=340)	2nd survey of schools (n=373)
	%	%
Strongly agree	4	5
Agree	27	20
Neither agree nor disagree	11	8
Disagree	42	48
Strongly disagree	15	16
Don’t know	2	3

Base: All schools responding to telephone surveys

All schools were also asked about the strategies they had used to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation to economically disadvantaged pupils. A third of schools (33 per cent) said there was no stigma, but the remaining two thirds had used strategies to avoid stigmatisation.

A full list of strategies used is shown in table 3.6, but the strategies can be grouped into four themes:

1. General discretion in approaching parents and pupils;
2. Approaching parents so pupils do not know who is being subsidised;
3. Not discriminating, having activities open to all or free to all;
4. Organising the funding so that pupils do not know they are being subsidised or do not know they are in the target group;

Table 3.6

Strategies used to make the subsidy available to the target group without causing stigmatisation

	All schools
	(n=373)
	%
There is no stigma	33
We use personal and private approaches towards the parents	20
Everything is very confidential/discreet/not publicly announced	15
Send direct letters to the parents	12
Send out blanket letter/advertise to everyone	11
By approaching parents rather than pupils (through meetings, telephone etc)	10
We use personal and private approaches towards the children	6
Activities are offered/open to everyone	6
Ensure information is distributed regarding funding and support available	6
Activities free to all/don't charge anyone	5
We make sure the target group don't know they're in the target group	4
Encourage parents to contact the school/discuss issues/ funding	4
Know our pupils/parents and their background	4
Private targeting/discussion	3
Slips returned from questionnaires/letters	3
Calling it an enrichment grant/support not a subsidy	2
Private/individual letters sent to parents/pupils in the target group	2
By not subsidising the individuals directly/clever payment systems	1
We don't call them the target group/economically disadvantaged/ don't use that terminology	1
Use very subtle marketing	1
By promoting the right sort of activity for the right sort of groups	1
Speak to children in a year group/mixed group	1
Make up reasons for receiving the subsidy (i.e. they've won a raffle or something)	*
Other answers	15
Don't know	*

Base: All schools responding to telephone survey (373)

There seemed to be little evidence of stigma in the case study schools visited, but staff, parents and pupils were often very aware of the potential for stigmatisation to occur. All of the case study schools told us about how they were attempting to prevent or reduce any stigmatisation resulting from the disadvantage subsidy. Often, reducing stigma had been built into the delivery plan, so that how the subsidy was

administered directly contributed to reducing stigma. Secondary C, and Primary L, for example, deliberately advertised the subsidy by personal contact with children and parents, thus ensuring that it was discreet, and that no-one would know who was in receipt of the subsidy and who wasn't. Junior F, similarly, only sent letters to those eligible for the subsidy at first, before advertising more widely:

'What we did initially when we sent out our feeler letters to find out what activities people might be interested in, we only addressed it to people who were eligible and we didn't make it widely known. The idea is though that it's universal services and anyone can attend them. It's quite hard to advertise and not say at the bottom by the way if you get FSM you are entitled to this'.

Another strategy that some schools used was to keep entitlement hidden from children. Although parents at Secondary K had to apply for entitlement to the subsidy for their children, the decision was made not to tell children why they were entitled:

'We asked the students when they were getting these [packs], and some of them didn't even know why they were there. Their parents hadn't said 'this is for us because we don't earn great amounts of money', so they would come...and they would say, 'why are we getting this?'. So we had to make a choice - do we tell them why they are part of this or not, and we chose not to categorically say. What we said is 'this is to ensure that all children in the school can, you know, access clubs and activities that they want to do' and just left it like that. Now if their parents chose to say, that's fine but we never did.' (Cluster Co-ordinator)

It is debatable whether this strategy worked to prevent stigma. Several young people we spoke to had experienced jealousy or questioning from their peers about the subsidy. Nevertheless, the Head of this school felt that, because of the cultural ethos of the school, stigmatisation would be unlikely:

'We work very hard on anti bullying and all that kind of stuff so that children feel more accepted regardless of what they are, who they are, how fat they are, how thin they are, what colour they are, so I think it does come back to how it fits into the overall culture of the school.'

Other schools stressed that the culture of their school and or the community meant that stigmatisation was unlikely, especially those schools situated in deprived areas, such as Secondary A, and Primary D.

'I've never heard of one comment and I think maybe it might be the community ethos round here that 'if it's free then great, if I can take advantage, I'm a single parent and I'm not working then that's brilliant' (Business Manager, Primary D)

There was also a realisation in schools of the need for non-target group pupils to take

part in activities as pupils in the target group would be more likely to take part if their friends (who were not in the target group) were also doing the activity. There was therefore a need to ensure non-target group members were not stigmatised by having to pay, as well as ensuring those in the target group did not face a sense of stigma by being subsidised.

The special school in our sample felt that stigma was an issue that they were particularly attune to, and that their staff were in a good position to deal with given their professional backgrounds and training. Only two children at this school were not entitled to the subsidy, so in order not to stigmatise them, activities were provided for all. Providing activities that were free for all was considered to be a key way of avoiding stigma for several schools, including Secondary A, who took the view that all of their children were deprived anyway in some form or another. Where some activities were charged for, but universally available, discreet methods were adopted for subsidising disadvantaged children. One cluster co-ordinator (at Primary B) related one incident where a child who qualified for FSM nevertheless still brought in his money for an activity. She still accepted the money since the child was in full view of his peers. The young people we spoke to agreed that disadvantaged children should be helped financially in order to participate in activities, but some felt that some activities should be free for all to ensure participation:

‘some parents may not come into the school. I don’t know maybe they’ll feel ashamed or something and they’ve got too much pride. I think some parents may not want to share the problems they have with money, so I think they should be free the little trips like the cinema and that.’ (young person, Secondary A).

Few schools used the phrase ‘disadvantage subsidy’. In virtually all case study schools the subsidy was rebranded in order to make it more acceptable for eligible families and easier to advertise. They preferred to use phrases such as ‘entitlement’ or ‘grant’. As the Cluster Co-ordinator of Secondary A explained:

‘People are proud, that’s why we’ve never used the phrase disadvantage subsidy, people are proud they don’t want to be seen in receipt of charity and things’

4. Participation in activities

The aims of the subsidy are to increase the number of economically disadvantaged pupils taking part in extended schools activities, and also to increase the number of hours economically disadvantaged pupils spend participating in activities. This chapter examines how schools track take up of activities and compares take up before the subsidy to take up after the subsidy, as well as gauging schools' opinions on how the subsidy has affected participation. This chapter also examines what activities pupils (and their parents) say they are doing, and whether they were doing these activities before the subsidy was introduced.

Key findings:

- Almost all schools were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group (around a year after the subsidy had been introduced).
- Management information collected from schools showed that 35 per cent of the target group had taken part in any activities in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (pre-subsidy), and this had risen to 71 per cent in the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (post-subsidy).
- On average, respondents to the schools survey rated the impact of the subsidy (so far) on participation rates of the target group as 6.9 on a scale from 0 to 10 (where 10 is the highest impact). Schools following the flexible model gave higher scores on average than those following the defined model.
- According to data from parents and pupils, three quarters of pupils had taken part in term time activities in the last year, with by far the most commonly undertaken activity being sports. On average, pupils were doing 2.5 hours of activities a week.
- Around one in five pupils had taken part in holiday activities in the last year (mostly during the summer holidays 2009) and, again, sports were the most commonly undertaken type of activity.
- Just under half of pupils were taking part in activities in their local area that were not provided (or signposted to) by their school.

4.1 Tracking take up

The vast majority of schools (94 per cent) were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group. This is an increase since the first survey of schools when 79 per cent were tracking take up.

Amongst schools that were tracking take up, 82 per cent said registers were taken for all activities, and a further 15 per cent said registers were taken for some activities. Primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to be taking registers at all activities (88 per cent compared with 62 per cent); this could be due to secondary schools offering a wider range of activities than primary schools.

A minority of schools that were tracking take up said registers were not taken at any activities (two per cent). This minority were asked how they tracked take up of the target group if they did not take registers at activities: most suggested that the target group was very small so their participation in activities could be monitored without the need to take registers for all pupils attending activities.

4.2 Take up before and after the subsidy

Management information collected from schools relating to the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy), and the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the introduction of the subsidy) included information on both the number of pupils in the target group participating in activities, and the number of hours pupils in the target group were taking up. The information requested from schools was fairly detailed, and not all schools had tracked take up of activities among economically disadvantaged pupils before the introduction of the subsidy. As a result schools found this information quite difficult to complete accurately and, where schools provided them, answers were sometimes estimates. However, analysis of the data for schools that were able to respond can provide useful estimates of the levels of take up before and after the introduction of the subsidy.

In total, 227 schools (51 per cent) returned management information relating to the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy), and 210 schools (48 per cent) returned management information relating to the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the introduction of the subsidy). Not all schools that returned management information completed every question though, so some of the findings provided below are based on fewer responses than this.

Overall take up

On average, 35 per cent of the target group were taking part in any activities in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy). In the summer term and summer holidays 2009 this figure had risen to 71 per cent, demonstrating that the introduction of the subsidy had led to a strong improvement in the number of economically disadvantaged pupils engaging with extended schools activities. However, these average figures hide enormous variation between schools where none of the target group were taking part in any activities, and schools where all of them were. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of the proportion of pupils in the target group taking part in any activities.

After the introduction of the subsidy, there was a tendency for primary schools to have engaged a higher proportion of the target group than secondary schools.

Amongst primary schools an average of 74 per cent of the target group had taken part in any activities, compared with an average of 61 per cent amongst secondary schools. However, this result, while statistically significant, should be treated with caution due to the small number of secondary schools (27) that returned management information for the summer term and summer holidays 2009.

Table 4.1

Proportion of the target group taking part in any activities during the summer term and summer holidays 2008 and 2009

	2008 (pre-subsidy) (n=221) %	2009 (post-subsidy) (n=190) %
Less than 10%	13	5
10% up to 20%	20	3
20% up to 30%	19	2
30% up to 40%	13	7
40% up to 50%	10	5
50% up to 60%	8	9
60% up to 70%	5	10
70% up to 80%	3	13
80% up to 90%	4	13
90% or more	6	35
Average proportion	35	71

Base: All schools responding to collections of management information

Comparing the data another way, across the 116 schools that provided both sets of management information, during the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the introduction of the subsidy) 4352 economically disadvantaged pupils had taken part in any extended schools activities, while during the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the introduction of the subsidy) 9813 economically disadvantaged pupils had taken part in any extended schools activities.

The total number of hours taken up by the target group in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 and 2009 could also be calculated from management information for schools that were able to provide sufficient detail.

Amongst those who had participated in any activities, the target group had on average taken up:

- 43 hours of extended schools activities per pupil across the whole of the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the subsidy). This breaks down as 2.5 hours during the summer holidays, and 40.5 hours (or 3.1 hours a week) during the summer term.

- 45 hours of extended schools activities per pupil across the whole of the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the subsidy). This breaks down as 4 hours during the summer holidays, and 41 hours (or 3.2 hours a week) during the summer term.

Looking at the whole of the target group, including those who had not taken part in any extended school activities, the average take up was:

- 17 hours of extended schools activities per pupil across the whole of the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the subsidy). This breaks down as one hour during the summer holidays, and 16 hours (or 1.2 hours a week) during the summer term.
- 35 hours of extended schools activities per pupil across the whole of the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the subsidy). This breaks down as 3.5 hours during the summer holidays, and 31.5 hours (or 2.4 hours a week) during the summer term.

These findings suggest that, amongst those economically disadvantaged pupils who were already taking part in activities before the subsidy, the number of hours they are taking up has not increased significantly since the introduction of the subsidy, but that the total number of hours economically disadvantaged pupils are taking up has increased since the introduction of the subsidy due to much higher proportions of these pupils participating in activities.

Take up of different types of activities

From management information provided by schools we can also look at participation and hours taken up in various different types of activities.

Firstly, table 4.2 shows the average proportion of the target group that had regularly participated in breakfast and afterschool clubs (attended at least once a week) or regular activities (attended at least one session in every two) and the proportion that had attended one-off term time activities and activities during the holidays. These results are shown for the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the subsidy), and the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the subsidy).

As the table shows, participation of economically disadvantaged pupils in all types of activities had increased since the introduction of the subsidy.

Table 4.2

Average proportion of the target group taking part in different types of activities during the summer term and summer holidays 2008 and 2009

	2008 (pre-subsidy) (n=220)	2009 (post-subsidy) (n=173)
	%	%
Breakfast and afterschool clubs	18	29
Regular activities	27	46
One-off term time activities	18	38
Holiday activities	7	21

Base: All schools responding to collections of management information

Table 4.3 shows the average number of hours taken up per participating pupil in each of the different types of activities. There had been slight increases in attendance volumes across all the different types of activities, but a large increase for one-off term time activities. This may be an indication that schools were providing more one-off activities with the aid of the subsidy.

It may be the case that taster sessions, classed as one off activities, have been offered in the case study schools as a means to broaden the horizons of families as to the range of possibilities available. Some of these activities may develop no further than one-off status as sustained interest may not be present in the target population. The philosophy in Primary F, for instance, appears to be, according to the Community Learning Partnership Coordinator, to develop sustained forms of engagement rather than one off activities although they have no problem setting up taster courses of activities to let people experience new things. Whether this philosophy is the same across the other case schools is difficult to assess.

Table 4.3

Average number of hours per participating pupil taken up in different types of activities during the summer term and summer holidays 2008 and 2009

	2008 (pre-subsidy) (n=156) Hours	2009 (post-subsidy) (n=161) Hours
Breakfast and afterschool clubs (hours per week)	3.7	4.2
Regular activities (hours per week)	1.3	1.7
One-off term time activities (total hours during summer term)	6.1	11.0
Holiday activities (total hours during summer holidays)	15	17.5

Base: All schools responding to collections of management information

4.3 Effects of the subsidy on take up

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

At both telephone surveys of schools, respondents were asked to say, on a scale of 0 to 10 (where 10 is the highest impact and 0 is no impact) how much impact they thought the subsidy had had on the participation rates of the target group. Table 4.4 shows the answer distributions, and also the average answer, for both surveys of schools.

The first survey of schools took place when many schools were still at a fairly early stage in the implementation of the subsidy, so it is not surprising that answers were generally quite low at this point. By the time of the second survey of schools, most schools had been using the subsidy for around a year or more, and it is clear from these findings that, once schools had had more time to implement the subsidy, the effect on participation rates has been highly positive in most schools.

Schools on the flexible model tended to think the subsidy had had a greater impact than schools following the defined model: an average score of 7.2 was obtained for flexible model schools compared with 6.2 for defined model schools. This trend was also observed at the first survey of schools.

There was also a difference between schools with higher and lower levels of economically disadvantaged pupils. For schools with at least 20 per cent of pupils

eligible for free school meals the average answer was 7.2, compared with an average answer of 6.6 for schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were eligible for FSM.

Table 4.4

Impact the subsidy has had on participation rates (using a 0 to 10 scale)

	1st survey of schools (n=340)	2nd survey of schools (n=373)
	%	%
0 (no impact)	21	2
1	2	0
2	7	1
3	12	2
4	12	5
5	12	12
6	8	12
7	13	24
8	6	23
9	1	10
10 (highest impact)	2	8
Don't know	4	2
Average answer	3.9	6.9

Base: All schools responding to collections of management information

Respondents to both telephone surveys were also asked to say, using the same 0 to 10 scale, how much impact they thought the subsidy would have on participation rates of economically disadvantaged pupils in the future. Results to this question were similar for both surveys, with an average answer of 7.7 at the first survey, and 8.0 at the second survey.

Comparing the expected impact on future participation (average score of 8.0) and impact on participation so far (average score of 6.9) for the second survey of schools suggests that, at least for some schools, respondents believed the use of the subsidy had still not quite reached its full potential a year or so after it was first introduced.

Again, there was a difference between the flexible and defined models, with schools on the flexible model a little more positive about the impact the subsidy is likely to have on participation rates in the future: flexible model schools gave an average score of 8.3 compared with an average of 7.4 for defined model schools.

Data from parents

Another measure of the effects of the subsidy on participation rates is to look at the activities parents said their children were doing after the introduction of the subsidy, and whether they had done these before the subsidy was introduced. Table 4.5 shows:

- The proportion of parents who said their child was doing each activity type (1st column)
- Of those doing each activity, the proportion who said it was free (2nd column)
- Of those who said the activity was free, the proportion that were doing this last year, before the subsidy (3rd column)
- Of those that were doing the activity before the subsidy, the proportion who said it was also free then (4th column).

The table shows that, with the exception of day trips and holidays away, other holiday clubs, and breakfast and afterschool clubs, most of the activities that economically disadvantaged pupils were taking part in were free.

The table also shows that, again with the exception of day trips and holidays away and other holiday clubs, where pupils were doing activities before the introduction of the subsidy these activities were also free then, before the subsidy was introduced.

Section 5.4 shows that around half of schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy, with stopping charging (the target group) for activities being the most common change made. This information, along with the data in the table below, suggest that where activities were not free before the subsidy economically disadvantaged pupils were less likely to have taken part in these activities. It can therefore be surmised that the introduction of the subsidy allowing schools to offer free activities to economically disadvantaged pupils has had a notable effect on the participation of economically disadvantaged pupils in extended schools activities.

As can be seen from table 4.5, 78 per cent of the economically disadvantaged young people whose parents took part in the survey had taken part in at least one type of activity since the subsidy had been introduced. The most commonly attended activities were sports (47 per cent) and day trips and holidays away (40 per cent).

Table 4.5

Activities parents said their children were doing before and after the subsidy, and whether these activities were free

	Done since subsidy	Free since subsidy	Did before subsidy	Free before subsidy
	(n=555)	(n=variable)	(n=variable)	(n=variable)
	%	%	%	%
Day trips and holidays away for children/young people	40	24	70	43
Summer school to do extra lessons	4	86	21	75
Other holiday clubs	4	75	33	40
Homework/study club/ revision classes run by teachers	14	99	28	90
Sports	47	87	59	96
Dance	12	96	45	90
Music	12	77	56	93
Drama/performing arts	8	93	43	100
Art and craft	9	94	44	95
Cookery	9	83	33	85
Computer/IT	10	100	45	100
Other clubs/youth clubs	5	93	40	100
Outdoor space such as park play area with adult staff to help keep children safe	6	100	55	100
Religious groups	2	100	75	100
Breakfast/before school club (this may include doing various activities mentioned above)	12	65	43	89
After school club (this may include doing various activities mentioned above)	15	67	46	69
Other clubs/activities/place to go	2	89	38	67
None	20	-	-	-
Don't know	2	-	-	-

Base: All parents taking part in the survey of parents (555)

The case study findings show that in most schools, impact on participation rates has been positive. In Primary F, for example, the PSA (Parent Support Advisor) reported that:

‘There has been a massive increase in participation. Almost 100% take up’

Special School H reported a similar effect, with nearly all of their pupils participating in activities. In Primary H, a teacher explained:

‘Last year we had eight clubs and 18.5 % of children on free schools meals were attending them whereas now 58% of children [on FSM] are attending [21 clubs] and that’s only in the first two terms, autumn and spring’

Some schools attributed the rises in take up to the availability of more choice. The disadvantage subsidy funding had enabled Primary D and Primary L, for example, to be experimental and provide a greater range of activities in response to the wishes of families, activities that had never been tried before. In addition, Primary D was able to help children to participate in residential holidays, and showed an awareness that disadvantaged children would not have participated in the past:

‘The holiday was really, really clear cut, because it was very obvious straight away that all these parents who would never normally send their children who obviously couldn’t afford it because it was £125, signed up for it and took advantage of the subsidy, so I think out of everything that’s definitely been the most prominent and successful way’ (Business Manager)

The subsidy has also enabled provision to be tailored to meet the needs of specific groups of eligible children. In Primary L, a special club was set up for those children who had difficulty in engaging with existing clubs due to the special needs they had. The club:

‘needed to be something all the children could access easily, who wouldn’t worry about if they had made a mistake – a few children had tried to join in clubs that we’ve had, but they can’t keep going because they can’t keep up, they can’t remember – with the Go Club they haven’t got to remember what they did last week. It’s different every week.’ (Teaching Assistant)

The school believes that the children who attended this club would not have been accessing anything else after school if that club was not available. Those children with special needs who were eligible for the subsidy at this school, were also given extra assistance to participate in school trips, which they could not normally have

participated in:

‘We’ve found it’s been hugely beneficial to be able to offer children who wouldn’t normally be able to go [on trips] because they might need one to one, but because we’ve got this money, we’ve been able to say ‘yes, you can go’, because we’ve been able to pay extra hours to a TA, or we can get a supply teacher in to cover or whatever.’ (Administrator).

Secondary C also gave financial assistance to those eligible for the subsidy in order for them to attend a residential school trip, and all but two eligible pupils took part.

The increased focus on targeting that the subsidy has engendered seems to also have had an impact on take up. In Junior F, the heightened input of the Headteacher at the school has enabled uptake to increase from 60 per cent to 80 per cent over the course of the scheme. The Family Liaison Officer at Special School H felt that uptake had increased because, before the subsidy, parents would not have known how to access the various activities that children wanted to participate in, and the school has been able to act as a broker to arrange the activities requested.

Some sites had noticed an increase in take up of FSM and attributed this to a wish to gain eligibility for the subsidy and thus take part in activities. Disadvantage Subsidy staff working with Secondary C noted that there had been a 25% increase in the take up of FSM and attributed this to parents’ desire to gain access to the Disadvantage Subsidy for their children.

At Secondary A, the Cluster Co-ordinator was able to explain how paying for trips from the subsidy had impacted on the uptake of trips organised as part of the reward scheme for attendance:

‘We always used to run awards for attendance but what really used to get my goat, kids achieve 95% attendance, that’s great, ‘you’re now eligible to go to the pantomime. You can go to the pantomime next Thursday but we need 15 pounds off you’. So we were able to say ‘right, you’re eligible to go to the pantomime because of your good behaviour and attendance, great you’re going next week’. When we did that there was only one dropped out.’

4.4 Activities pupils are doing during term time

Three quarters (76 per cent) of pupils had taken part in term time activities in the last year (since the introduction of the subsidy), with by far the most commonly undertaken activity types being sports: 49 per cent of pupils had taken part in sporting activities. Table 4.6 shows the proportion of pupils that had taken part in each activity type and also the average number of hours a week pupils were doing these activities for during term time. There are two columns for average hours per week in the table: the first is the average number of hours a week just amongst those

that were doing this type of activity, and the second is average hours per week across all pupils.

It is also possible to calculate the average number of hours per week that pupils were participating in any activities during term time. The average number of hours of activities economically disadvantaged pupils were taking up was 2.5 hours per week, although there was considerable variation in the number from pupils that were not doing any activities (24 per cent) to pupils that were doing up to 15 hours of activities each week.

There were no differences between male and female pupils in the average number of hours of activities taken up, but older pupils tended to be doing more hours of activities than younger pupils.

Other significant differences were:

- Pupils from families where the chief income earner was in employment tended to do more hours a week of activities than pupils from households where no one was employed (2.9 hours per week on average compared with 2.2 hours a week);
- Pupils with special educational needs tended to do fewer hours of activities during term time than those without special educational needs (2.0 hours per week on average compared with 2.6 hours per week);
- Pupils with a long term illness or disability tended to do fewer hours of activities during term time than those without (1.7 hours per week on average compared with 2.6 hours per week).

Table 4.6

Term time activities pupils had taken part in, and the number of hours of these activities pupils were taking up

	Proportion of pupils taking part in activity type	Average number of hours of activity type participating pupils were taking up per week	Average number of hours of activity type all pupils were taking up per week
	(n=553) %	(n=variable) hours	(n=553) hours
Sports	49	1.9	0.9
After school club (this may include doing various activities mentioned above)	12	1.9	0.2
Revision classes run by teachers	13	1.7	0.2
Homework/study club	12	1.8	0.2
Breakfast/before school club (this may include doing various activities mentioned above)	11	1.7	0.2
Outdoor space such as park play area with adult staff to help keep children safe	4	4.5	0.2
Computer/IT	11	1.6	0.2
Other clubs/youth clubs	7	2.4	0.2
Music	12	1.5	0.2
Art and craft	10	1.6	0.2
Dance	14	1.1	0.1
Drama/performing arts	7	1.6	0.1
Cookery	9	0.7	0.1
Other clubs/activities/place to go	3	1.2	0.0
Indoor meeting place such as youth cafe, club or centre with adult staff to keep children safe	2	1	0.0
Religious groups	1	1.3	0.0
None	23	-	-
Don't know	*	-	-

Base: All taking part in the survey of pupils - question answered by the pupil if they were aged 11 or older, and by the parent otherwise (553)

4.5 Activities pupils are doing during school holidays

Far fewer pupils - just 18 per cent - had taken part in holiday activities during the last year (since the introduction of the subsidy):

- 12 per cent had taken part in activities during the summer holidays
- Five per cent had taken part in activities during the Easter holidays
- Five per cent had taken part in activities during half term holidays
- One per cent had taken part in activities during the Christmas holidays

Where pupils were taking part in holiday activities, they were most likely to take part in:

- Sports – 45 per cent
- Day trips and holidays away – 33 per cent
- Holiday play schemes offering activities – 13 per cent
- Arts and crafts – 13 per cent.

The total number of hours during the school holidays that pupils were taking part in activities was 5.8 hours on average during the year across all pupils.

4.6 Activities not provided by the school

Just under half (45 per cent) of pupils were taking part in activities in their local area that were not provided (or signposted to) by their school. Boys were more likely than girls to be doing activities that were not provided by the school (50 per cent compared with 40 per cent).

The kinds of activities that pupils were doing that were not provided by the school are shown in table 4.7. There are some differences in the relative commonness of pupils doing activities provided by the school, and pupils doing activities not provided by the school. Sporting activities were very popular both as school and non-school activities. Youth clubs and religious groups were more commonly attended as non-school related activities. Revision classes, music, drama and computing were more commonly undertaken as school activities.

Table 4.7

Activities pupils have taken part in that are not provided by the school

	Pupils that do take part in non-school activities
	(n=235)
	%
Private revision classes	4
Sports	61
Dance	12
Music	5
Drama/performing arts	4
Art and craft	8
Cookery	4
Computer/IT	5
Other clubs/youth clubs	26
Indoor meeting place such as youth cafe, club or centre with adult staff to keep children safe	5
Outdoor space such as park play area with adult staff to help keep children safe	7
Religious groups	10

Base: All pupils doing activities not provided by the school (235)

5. Charging for activities

This chapter examines schools practices in relation to charging for activities, and how these have changed as a result of the subsidy. This chapter also includes evidence from parents about whether they pay for activities, and whether they consider the charges to be reasonable.

Key findings:

- In three quarters of schools respondents agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended schools activities, demonstrating the need for the subsidy.
- Just under a third of parents said they found it difficult to meet the costs of activities offered by their child's school.
- Before the introduction of the subsidy, seven in ten schools were charging for at least some activities.
- A year or so after the introduction of the subsidy 82 per cent of schools were not charging pupils in the target group for any activities. Where schools did charge the target group this was usually only for certain activities, and often they were charged a reduced rate.
- Around half of schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy, with the most common changes made being to stop charging (the target group) for activities, and to reduce the price of activities (for the target group).
- Data from parents showed that, with the exception of day trips and holidays away, most of the activities that target group pupils were attending did not have to be paid for.
- Most parents who had paid for activities considered the amount they had to pay to be reasonable, but around one in five thought charges were unreasonable.
- Three in ten parents thought their child's school was offering more activities for free than it had been before the subsidy.

5.1 Whether parents struggle to afford activities

In around three-quarters of schools respondents agreed that “economically disadvantaged pupils struggle to afford extended schools activities” (30 per cent

strongly agreed with this statement and 47 per cent agreed), while 17 per cent of schools disagreed.

Parents were asked how easy they found it to meet the costs of the activities offered by the school. Answers were mixed, but for most parents meeting the costs of activities was not a particular difficulty: 21 per cent of parents said it was very easy, 26 per cent said it was fairly easy and 23 per cent said neither easy nor difficult. There were a significant proportion of parents though who did find it difficult to meet the costs of activities: 19 per cent found it fairly difficult, and nine per cent found it very difficult.

The relative ease of meeting costs varied, with more disadvantaged parents citing greater levels of difficulty:

- 34 per cent of parents of pupils eligible for free school meals found it difficult to meet the costs of activities compared with 10 per cent of parents of pupils who were not eligible for free school meals;
- 36 per cent of parents who were single, divorced, widowed or separated found it difficult to afford activities compared with 20 per cent of parents who were married or living with a partner;
- 38 per cent of parents with net annual household incomes of up to £10,000 had difficulty affording activities compared with 26 per cent of those with incomes of £10,001 to £20,000 and 22 per cent of those with incomes of £20,001 or more;
- 31 per cent of parents in households where no one was employed struggled to afford activities compared with 25 per cent of households where the chief income earner was in employment;
- 35 per cent of parents with a long term illness or disability found it difficult to meet the cost of activities compared with 26 per cent of parents who did not have a long term illness or disability.

It is also possible to look at parents' answers broken down by whether the school their child attends said they charged for activities or not. As shown in section 5.3, most schools were not charging the target group for any activities, and amongst these schools, 51 per cent of parents found it easy to meet the costs of activities and 25 per cent found it difficult. Amongst the few parents in the survey whose children were at schools that did charge the target group for some activities, 41 per cent found it easy to meet the costs of activities and 44 per cent found it difficult.

It may seem contradictory that 25 per cent of parents said they found it difficult to meet the costs of activities when the school their child attends does not charge for activities. However, there are some possible explanations:

- The school may have only stopped charging for activities fairly recently, and the respondent was thinking about the costs of activities before charging was stopped;
- The school may not charge for activities generally, but might charge for some one-off events or trips and the respondent was thinking about these when answering.

Parents we spoke to were generally supportive of their children taking part in Extended Services activities. Some parents stressed that, even without help from the subsidy, they would have tried to afford to pay for their children to take part in at least some activities as this parent from Secondary G stated:

'I was actually paying for activities before the subsidy came because I didn't want them to sit in watching TV, playing video games or walking the streets. It is very expensive paying for 3-4 kids. All the fees, insurance, equipment etc. It has set financial resources free for a family life.'

Nevertheless, there were situations where parents found it difficult to do this, as parents from Junior F explained:

'We couldn't afford it beforehand but this extra money has helped'.

'You felt bad because their friends went away on trips or were taking part in various activities. And this is because we couldn't afford to pay for these activities'.

'If the money wasn't there they'd have to stop a lot of it because we just couldn't afford it'.

Parents with more than one child found that costs could become prohibitive and certain crisis points, such as separating from a partner, meant that budgets had to be re-evaluated and 'extras' such as leisure activities, strictly rationed. A parent from Primary L pointed out the compounding difficulties of providing activities for more than one child, and had made use of the subsidy grant when she separated from her husband in order to send two of her children to a football club:

'The first letter I had, it said something like £12.50, and I was like, what? I can't afford 24 quid! One wants to go and I can't say no to the other one so I have to make sure both can go.'

Parents and children also mentioned that the quantity and range of clubs and activities that children participated in might not have been possible to afford without the subsidy. Children often claimed that their parents would have paid for activities even without the subsidy, but some were aware that, by having the subsidy, they did not need to ask parents for money, or feel guilty about taking money away from an

already tight family budget. The children we spoke to were often acutely aware of the financial circumstances of their families, and were appreciative of ways in which their parents could be spared the burden of contributing to their activities.

Parents and children showed evidence of budgeting, in that they could afford cheaper activities, but more expensive activities such as residential trips or music lessons, were less affordable. This budgeting was evident in schools where children were allocated a set amount. Children needed to choose which activities they took part in, and budget accordingly. A pupil from Secondary K stated:

'I'd like to do art, but I've only got £65 left and I'm not sure how much it costs'.

Some children had 'saved' their allocation, so that they could afford to go on a residential trip, rather than spend it on weekly activities. One girl was continuing to pay £2 weekly for a football club, as she was saving her subsidy allocation to pay for a cadet summer camp:

'I've got to go on camp and it costs like 100 pounds so I'll pay out of that [the subsidy]'. (pupil, Secondary K)

Nevertheless, where children had received an allocation to spend, they raised issues about having participated and enjoyed an activity, only to then run out of money, and risk having to give up that activity. One boy from Secondary K whose parents were unemployed explained that he had been taking part in Judo lessons paid for from the subsidy, and had developed a talent for it. He needed to take grades in order to progress but:

'Unfortunately at the moment I think my funding has run out for this year. I'm a bit worried because I want to go on and do my black belt but I don't know how I'm going to afford it at the moment'.

The fear of running out of money had put some children off from using the subsidy:

'What's the point if you're spent up or anything, and then you can't do the club anyway?' (pupil, Secondary K)

In schools that subsidised trips instead of offering them for free, parents would assess how reasonable they thought the trip was before considering whether to pay the discounted rate. In Primary D, for instance, a trip had been organised to a local beach, and the costs were subsidised. Nevertheless, the trip was not well attended. The costs of hiring a coach meant that the trip did not work out much cheaper than if parents had gone themselves using public transport, and parents were aware of that, and did not see it as good value for money:

'There was one [trip] to the beach I think and I think that was a little bit too much money, where you could sort of get the bus and the metro and halve the price... and I think that's why that one never took off and also

there was a picnic in the park...and I think the charge on that was a bit steep...you were paying for the coach really whereas you could just get public transport'. (parent)

Some case study schools offered flexible payment options for parents especially for more expensive residential or holiday trips. The whole allocation for a child can be used as a partial payment toward the residential or holiday trip with the rest being paid over a number of months before the trip takes place. Secondary G has a school bank for this purpose. Secondary C is flexible in this respect. Primary F has a payment plan where it is possible for parents to pay various amounts online (they get their own password). The subsidy can be used to pay for part of the total amount. Parents can contribute so much toward it as long as their contribution is paid by the time stated.

5.2 Charging practices before the subsidy

Before the subsidy was introduced, five per cent of schools were charging for all activities, 65 per cent were charging for some activities and 29 per cent were not charging for any activities. Not charging for activities before the subsidy was more common amongst:

- Secondary schools
- Pupil referral units
- Schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils

Further detail on charging practices before the subsidy can be found in the interim report from this evaluation¹¹.

5.3 Current charging practices

At the time of the second survey of schools¹², the majority of schools (82 per cent) were not charging pupils in the target group for any activities. This includes 33 per cent of schools where no pupils were being charged for any activities. However, in 17 per cent of schools members of the target group were being charged for some activities, and in one per cent they were being charged for all activities.

Charging practices varied between primary and secondary schools. In primary schools it was most common for all activities to be free for the target group (but not other pupils), whilst secondary schools were more likely to make activities free for all

¹¹ The interim report is published on DfE's website and can be found at the following link: <http://www.education.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR132.pdf>

¹² Fieldwork for the second survey of schools was October – December 2009, over a year after the introduction of the subsidy.

pupils, and also more likely than primary schools to charge the target group for some activities.

There were also differences based on the proportions of pupils in the school who were eligible for free school meals: schools with higher proportions of FSM pupils were more likely to make all activities free for all pupils, while those with lower proportions of FSM pupils were more likely to have all activities free for the target group, but not for other pupils. These results are shown in table 5.1.

Table 5.1

Schools' practices on charging for extended schools activities

	All schools	Primary schools	Secondary schools	< 20% eligible for FSM	20% + eligible for FSM
	(n=373)	(n=299)	(n=51)	(n=219)	(n=148)
	%	%	%	%	%
Target group (and others) charged for all activities	1	2	0	1	1
Target group (and others) charged for some activities	17	15	26	16	18
Target group not charged for any activities (but others are)	49	54	31	61	31
No pupils charged for any activities	33	29	43	22	47

Base: All schools responding to the second telephone survey (373)

Amongst schools that were charging pupils in the target group for any activities, 18 per cent charged them a reduced rate for all activities, and 45 per cent did so for some activities. The remaining 37 per cent said pupils in the target group were not charged a reduced rate (this was six per cent of all schools).

Many case study schools did not see themselves as having a particular charging policy. Some activities were provided free of charge (most usually in-school clubs), and other, more expensive, activities were sometimes charged for, but discounted for those entitled to the subsidy. Some schools, such as Secondary A, Primary D and Primary L, had provided some activities that were universally free but funded from the subsidy, either because they saw all of their children as disadvantaged in some way, or that the subsidy had allowed them to develop activities that would not be there otherwise, and so had, by default, enabled disadvantaged pupils to take part. Primary L believe that some parents and children are hard to engage as there is fear around being on a list, and they will not accept services if they are specifically targeted, but if you can subsidise a group for everyone, then parents feel better about

it and keep their self respect. In this way, provision is opened up for people who would not normally engage.

Other schools, such as Primary L and Primary B, had a policy of charging for everything, even if the charge was very low, in order to place value on the activities, and encourage parents to take responsibility for providing for their children:

'I think the other thing is we do actually make a charge for every single club that we run, but the theory behind that is that if they [parents] had to pay something then it makes them aware that they do need to send their child, whereas if you offer it free, because you can subsidise it wholly by the disadvantage subsidy, then they might not always turn up which means that somebody else might have got that place. They treat it with more respect if they've got to make some contribution even if it's only a pound a session'. (Administrator, Primary L)

'I think that everybody should pay a charge even if they are on free school meals or not. So there are some schools who sort of are coming onto that now especially when you say to them that there might not always be funding from other places and I think they should start charging, they should be, there should be that sort of instance where people appreciate they've got to pay for something , but they don't...yet.' (Cluster Co-ordinator, Primary B)

In schools where a 'cheque book' or voucher scheme was used, such as Secondary K and Special School H, activities were predominantly encouraged through external providers, meaning that the cost of activities was governed by local market prices and met according to the needs of individual pupils. These were often more expensive than group provision might have been. Secondary I top slices 25% of their subsidy allocation for holiday activities.

5.4 Changes made to charging practices as a result of the subsidy

Around half (53 per cent) of schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy. This had increased since the first survey of schools¹³ when 39 per cent of schools had changed their charging practices.

Whether or not schools had changed their charging practices was related to whether or not they had charged for activities before the introduction of the subsidy. Amongst schools that had charged before the subsidy 58 per cent had since changed their charging practices compared with 38 per cent of schools that did not charge for activities before the subsidy was introduced.

¹³ Fieldwork for the first survey of schools took place between December 2008 and February 2009

Looking just at schools that had charged for activities before the subsidy, those following the flexible model were more likely to have made changes to their charging practices than those following the defined model (65 per cent compared with 43 per cent). Also, schools with higher levels of pupils eligible for free school meals were more likely to have changed their charging practices than those with lower levels: 65 per cent of schools with 20 per cent or higher FSM eligibility had done so compared with 55 per cent of schools with less than 20 per cent of pupils eligible for FSM.

Amongst schools that had made changes to their charging practices, the most frequent change made was to stop charging pupils in the target group for activities (33 per cent), and a further 13 per cent had stopped charging any pupils for activities.

Reducing the price of activities specifically for the target group was a change made by 14 per cent of schools and a further 12 per cent had reduced the price for all pupils.

Other changes were: making some activities free (14 per cent); asking for voluntary contributions rather than charging (seven per cent); and consistently charging the same amount for all activities (four per cent).

In addition, five per cent of schools who had changed their charging policy had *started* charging for activities since the introduction of the subsidy (this was only ten schools). All these ten schools had introduced new activities since the introduction of the subsidy, and all ten only charged for some activities. In eight of them the target group were not charged for any activities, and in the remaining two schools the target group were charged a reduced rate.

All case study schools were starting to think about the sustainability of their provision, in the event that subsidy funding ceased. This had led them to think of new ways of ensuring that their current levels of provision could continue, and inevitably led to them considering changes in charging practices. Primary D, for example, had offered its clubs free of charge to all in the first year, in order to experiment with and establish choice. Nevertheless, during the second year, they had introduced a charge for those not eligible for the subsidy, in the hope that when funding ceased, they would still be able to offer places to disadvantaged children for free. The Business Manager explained the thinking behind the change:

'At the moment disadvantaged people do not pay, they are still entitled to take part free of charge but obviously we will have to make the clubs and the staffing and the resources sustainable once the funding ends so in order to do that what I'm trying to do is charge the pupils' parents who are working, for example, to see whether we can actually sustain it after the subsidy finishes to still offer it at a lower cost or free to disadvantaged pupils to make sure they don't lose out.'

The worry for this school, is that participation will drop if a charge is introduced for

disadvantaged pupils, and this is something they want to avoid.

5.5 Whether parents currently pay for activities

Table 5.2 shows:

- The proportion of parents who said their child was doing each activity type (1st column)
- The proportion of those whose child was doing each type of activity who said they had to pay for the activity (2nd column)
- The proportion of those who had to pay for each type of activity who paid a subsidised rate for that activity (3rd column)¹⁴
- The proportion of those who had to pay for each type of activity who paid the full amount for that activity (4th column).

As the table shows, with the exception of day trips and holidays away, most activities did not have to be paid for by parents, although around a third of parents whose children attended breakfast clubs and afterschool clubs said they had to pay for these.

Activity types that were particularly unlikely to be charged for were: homework or study clubs and revision classes; dance; computing/IT; outdoor spaces with adult staff to help keep children safe; and religious groups.

Where parents did report paying for activities there was a mix of paying subsidised rates and paying the full amount, although slightly more parents said they had to pay the full amount. However, it is worth noting that (as shown in section 3.5) some schools tried to avoid stigma when using the subsidy by not telling people that they were being subsidised, so it is feasible that parents would not necessarily know if they were paying a subsidised rate.

Across all activity types, half (51 per cent) of parents said they had paid for at least one of the activities that their child had attended, and half (49 per cent) had not paid for any. Of those who had paid for any activities, 41 per cent had paid a subsidised rate for at least some of the activities they had paid for, and 54 per cent said they had paid the full amount for all activities they had paid for (the remaining five per cent did not know).

¹⁴ Data for whether parents paid a subsidised rate or the full amount is only shown for activity types for which at least 20 parents said they had to pay.

Table 5.2

Activities parents said their children were doing, whether they paid for these, and whether they paid a subsidised rate or the full amount

	Done since subsidy	Pay for this activity	Pay a subsidised rate	Pay the full amount
	(n=555)	(n=variable)	(n=variable)	(n=variable)
	%	%	%	%
Day trips and holidays away for children/young people	40	76	38	56
Summer school to do extra lessons	4	14		
Other holiday clubs	4	30		
Homework/study club/ revision classes run by teachers	14	1		
Sports	47	13	34	69
Dance	12	4		
Music	12	22		
Drama/performing arts	8	7		
Art and craft	9	6		
Cookery	9	17		
Computer/IT	10	0		
Other clubs/youth clubs	5	7		
Outdoor space such as park play area with adult staff to help keep children safe	6	0		
Religious groups	2	0		
Breakfast/before school club (this may include doing various activities mentioned above)	12	35	38	54
After school club (this may include doing various activities mentioned above)	15	31	46	54
Other clubs/activities/place to go	2	33		
None	20			
Don't know	2			

Base: All parents taking part in the survey of parents (555)

Parents who had had to pay for any activities were asked if they thought the amount they had to pay was reasonable. Most parents did consider charges to be reasonable (24 per cent *very* reasonable, and a further 56 per cent *fairly* reasonable), but a

minority of parents thought otherwise: 13 per cent said the charges were fairly unreasonable and five per cent said they were very unreasonable.

Most parents in the case study schools thought that any charges that they had to pay were reasonable.

‘What’s a pound nowadays? Absolutely nothing – the kids’ comics cost £2.50 or something.’ (parent, Primary D)

There was an awareness that similar activities run out of school are often much more expensive, **‘costing an arm and a leg’** (Parent, Primary L) and they appreciated the added bonus of convenience and knowing their children were safe when activities were run on the schools site. Children and young people demonstrated a similar awareness of value for money:

‘I think it’s good because they are kind of cheap. At the shops you would probably pay a pound for a bag of popcorn but instead you are watching the film and getting popcorn’ (pupil, Primary D)

In some schools, such as Secondary C, Secondary A and Primary D, parents were able to make payments in instalments or when they could afford it, for larger expenses such as residential trips:

‘People who don’t get a lot of money actually do get to go because I’ve been and my mam hasn’t got a lot of money, and how much I’ve done! The school actually helps pay bonds, they help. I went to camp in year 8 and it’s £60 to go, I only had to pay £40, but then when I went to the clothes show I didn’t have to pay for that and everybody else had to pay who could afford it. But me mam just came in and said ‘can I pay it later’, and the teachers have said ‘look don’t worry about it ‘cause [teacher] gets special bonds for people who haven’t got a lot of money’.
(pupil Secondary A)

5.6 Whether parents report changes in charging since the introduction of the subsidy

Where parents reported not having to pay for activities, they were asked whether their child attended this activity the previous year (before the introduction of the subsidy), and if they had they were asked whether they paid for the activity the previous year. Overall, 82 per cent of parents said none of the activities that were now free (and that their child attended the previous year) had been paid for previously, and just 17 per cent said they had previously been paying for (at least some of) these activities. This does not mean that the subsidy has not made much difference in whether or not economically disadvantaged families are charged for activities. As it was only parents whose children had previously attended the same

activities who were asked whether they had had to pay for them the previous year, it is possible that in cases where children had not previously attended activities, these activities did used to be charged for. This could potentially be the reason why these economically disadvantaged pupils had not previously attended the activities they have attended since the introduction of the subsidy.

Perhaps more useful measures of parents' perceptions of whether schools had changed their charging practices are whether parents thought the school had reduced the price of any activities over the last year, and whether parents thought the school had increased the number of activities that it offers for free.

Nine per cent of parents said the school had reduced the price of any of its activities, but a further 22 per cent said all activities were free (and so prices could not be reduced). There was a high level of 'don't know' answers at this question (28 per cent), leaving 42 per cent of parents who said the school had not reduced the price of any activities.

Views on whether schools were offering more activities for free were a little more positive: 28 per cent of parents thought their child's school was offering more free activities than before the subsidy was introduced. There was also a high level of 'don't know' answers at this question (35 per cent), while 38 per cent of parents did not think their child's school was offering more free activities.

These findings are in line with findings from schools in section 5.4 which showed that around half of schools had made a change to their charging practices and, of these, around 26 per cent had reduced the price of activities, and around 60 per cent had made (some) activities free.

5.7 Awareness of funding to help pay for activities

All parents were asked whether they were aware of any sources of funding at their child's school that help pay for activities for children from families that are less able to pay: 37 per cent of parents were aware of such funding and 63 per cent were not. Parents of pupils at primary schools were more likely than parents of pupils at secondary schools to be aware of funding (42 per cent compared with 29 per cent).

Where parents were aware of funding, this is not necessarily the subsidy. The interim report showed that 31 per cent of schools used schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for disadvantaged pupils, these included local authority funding; charity funding; schemes funded by private companies; and money supplied by the school from sources such as the school fund.

6. Use of external providers

External providers¹⁵ can be used to give pupils access to extended services that schools themselves do not have the resources to provide. This chapter looks at schools' use of external providers, and whether new partnerships have been formed since the introduction of the subsidy.

Key findings:

- Nearly all schools were working with external providers to provide extended schools activities.
- Around three-quarters of schools had formed new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy.
- School staff acknowledged the benefits of working with external providers but found making links to be a challenge. Vital ingredients for engaging with external providers were found to be the development of good relationships, understanding differing working patterns and cultures, and providers having an understanding of the needs of the children in specific schools.

The vast majority of schools (94 per cent) were working with external providers in order to provide extended schools activities. This was a slight increase since the first survey of schools when 88 per cent were working with external providers.

The proportion of schools working with external providers was similar for primary and secondary schools, and across all clusters, but schools following the flexible model were a little more likely to be working with external providers than those following the defined model (96 per cent compared with 90 per cent).

Where schools were working with external providers, 78 per cent had made new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy. This is a notable increase since the first survey of schools when 51 per cent had made new partnerships.

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to have formed new partnerships with external providers since the introduction of the subsidy (92 per cent compared with 76 per cent), and schools following the flexible model were more likely than defined model schools to have done so (83 per cent compared with 67 per cent).

¹⁵ External providers are outside organisations, including those in the voluntary and community sector. This excludes the school, other schools and the Local Authority.

Case study findings led to an understanding of the different ways in which schools work with partners, and the complexities that this involves.

Many schools adopted a multi-agency partnership approach, which some schools were able to develop to assist in identification (e.g. Primary L), development (e.g. Secondary K) or delivery (e.g. Secondary G) of the disadvantage subsidy. Primary L, for example, formed a partnership with the local Children's Services Team, in order to be able to identify vulnerable children in their school who might benefit from the subsidy. Secondary K involved multi-agency partners on their steering group so that they were able to learn about the wider issues affecting the children in their school, and how these could be tackled. Secondary G fostered a closer relationship with the local police, who sat on their steering group and were keen to set up a session in the school youth club, so that they could get to know young people in a non-official way.

In addition, all of the schools had worked with external providers of services to some extent in order to provide the scope and choice of activity for their young people. In most cases, there had been benefits to both the school, and the providers in fostering these relationships. Local providers were able to expand their services in some cases (e.g. Secondary K, Junior F and Primary B) and schools were able to offer greater choice to their pupils:

'They have reached the stage now with the national rollout [of the subsidy] where they are actually thinking of appointing somebody in [LA name] to take on the additional admin it creates. But it's 50/50 isn't it, because it takes on additional admin but they have had to up their swimming classes by 20% since the Free Time subsidy has come in because the uptake is so high, you know their gym memberships, their junior gym membership, has literally doubled, so you know, they're getting income from it' (Cluster Manager, Secondary K)

In some cases, using these external providers would have been prohibitively expensive without the disadvantage subsidy to draw on, although some schools who used a commissioning model had managed to negotiate lower prices on a group basis (e.g. Primary B). The ES Coordinator at Primary B is able to negotiate with her service providers in order to get lower charges where children sign up for extended courses of activities. Secondary I, while not able to negotiate charges with providers noted that one provider who offers horse riding sessions nevertheless offers an 11th week free if 10 weeks are booked. Providers have become aware that there is a market for their services in schools and are consequently keen to get onto provider lists. It is unknown at this time whether the disadvantage subsidy may have contributed directly and indirectly to the generation of business in the catchment areas of case study schools.

The key ingredients for schools in developing mutually beneficial arrangements with external providers were having good relationships; both staff and pupils being able to trust the provider; understanding each other's differing working patterns and cultures;

and providers having an understanding of the needs of the children in specific schools. The Headteacher of Secondary K stated:

'I work on the basis that most of what we achieve, we achieve through relationships. There's trust, there's friendship, there's a desire, the old cliché to make a difference. There's also a humility which is to do with accepting that it's not perfect.'

Primary D found that providers needed to be made more aware of the school's ethos:

'It's culture as well – they might think it's acceptable to speak to the children in one way, but it's not acceptable in our school how we operate, and it's things like that, a bit of different culture going on. They might think it's alright to raise their voice but we don't do that in this school and it's little things like that that you've really got to watch out for.' (Business Manager)

Some schools had found engaging with external providers to be a steep learning curve and often used trial and error when trying new providers:

'In the beginning it was a bit of trial and error to a degree but the two companies that I tried ...one was moving into the extended schools market and I had a good relationship with them, and the other one...another school recommended to me. Now I have to say I tried them both ... but one company's let me down on a number of occasions, or I haven't been happy with the standards so I've ended up using one provider who's more sports based which actually are brilliant. That's for our more permanent week to week provision.' (Business Manager, Primary D)

Working with external providers had also often caused more work for school staff as providers could be difficult to get hold of, needed to be supervised if they were on the school site or alternative arrangements needed to be put in place if providers did not arrive:

'You need somebody there to see that they're turning up. The amount of work that it generates if you've got an outside provider coming in...but then they phone at quarter to three saying they can't get a tutor so they're not sending anybody ... whereas if it's your own staff in school it's not such a problem because if somebody's off in the morning you know that and you make provision' (Cluster Co-ordinator/Deputy Head, Secondary A)

Schools have had to be aware of safeguarding issues:

'We certainly wouldn't let anyone go off for private piano lessons at a provider's house but there's no problem sending them off to the

Brownies.' (Junior F)

The special school we visited were particularly careful with the outside providers they used, recognising that they needed the skills to be able to work with children with challenging behaviour. The Deputy Head noted:

'we can't just use any old providers. They'd eat them up and spit them out...we need to use our staff.'

Other schools also noted that they preferred to use 'tried and tested' providers, or their own staff, as children were more likely to engage with providers they were familiar with and trusted.

7. Benefits of the subsidy (additionality)

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

Key findings:

- Two in five schools were targeting or providing support for economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in extended schools activities before the introduction of the subsidy.
- Just over a third of schools were using schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils, and this had actually increased slightly since schools had been using the subsidy.
- Nine in ten schools said the subsidy had enabled them to increase the number of activities on offer, although only four in ten parents and seven in ten pupils thought their school had increased the number of activities on offer.
- Almost all schools (96 per cent) said the subsidy had improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities.
- 86 per cent of schools said the subsidy had enabled them to improve the quality of their provision for economically disadvantaged pupils. However, only 37 per cent of parents and 61 per cent of pupils thought the quality of provision at their school had improved.
- Nine in ten schools had introduced new activities as a result of the subsidy, but only four in ten parents and five in ten pupils said their school had introduced new activities.
- Most parents said their child was able to go to all or most of the activities they would like them to. However, 19 per cent said they could only go to some activities, and five per cent said they could go to none.

7.1 Support for economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy

The first survey of schools asked whether schools were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the introduction of the subsidy, whether they had a clear definition of who they were targeting and who this was, and how extended schools activities were promoted to economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy.

Full findings can be found in the interim report¹⁶, but the responses to these questions are summarised here.

- Two in five schools (41 per cent) were explicitly targeting or providing support for economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in extended schools activities before the introduction of the subsidy.
- Amongst schools that were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the subsidy, two thirds (67 per cent) had a clear definition of who they were targeting.
- In most cases (59%) the targeted group were those eligible for free school meals, but other criteria were used also: pupils from low income families (32 per cent); families in receipt of specific state benefits (30 per cent); children in care (15 per cent), and others.
- Where schools were targeting economically disadvantaged pupils before the introduction of the subsidy, the most common methods of promoting activities to those pupils were: sending letters to parents (51 per cent); speaking to parents informally (30 per cent); using advertisements such as posters at school (19 per cent); and speaking to pupils informally (14 per cent).

7.2 Other schemes for funding activities for economically disadvantaged pupils

Just over a third of schools (36 per cent) were using schemes other than the subsidy to fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils. This was a slight increase since the first survey of schools when 31 per cent of schools were. This would suggest that the subsidy was certainly not being used to replace existing schemes, and could be interpreted as the use of the subsidy giving schools more of a focus on helping economically disadvantaged pupils engage with extended schools activities, therefore leading them to seek out other sources of funding to further this objective. There was evidence to support this from the case studies, as demonstrated in the box below.

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to be using schemes other than the subsidy for funding activities for economically disadvantaged pupils (51 per cent compared with 31 per cent).

At the first survey of schools, those that were using other schemes were asked what kind of schemes or funding they were using:

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

¹⁶ The interim report is published on DfE's website and can be found at the following link: <http://www.education.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR132.pdf>

- 39 per cent were using funding from the voluntary sector/charities such as the big lottery fund, local charities and churches;
- 22 per cent were using schemes that were funded privately or by commercial organisations such as local businesses or sports clubs;
- Six per cent were using money supplied by the school from sources such as the school fund.

Case study schools were active in seeking out sources of funding. Some schools, such as Secondary A and Primary B, had made extensive use of match funding, using budgets such as hardship funds, gifted and talented grants, community funds, Aim Higher grants and Science College grants:

'We tried to make the best of the money that we've had, we've match funded it with things, because a lot of our children do come from backgrounds with high levels of disadvantage, you know?' (Cluster Co-ordinator/Deputy Head, Secondary A)

Schools situated in deprived areas with higher numbers of disadvantaged children sometimes had access to more sources of funding than other schools which often rely on fundraising for any extra cash. Nevertheless, schools such as Secondary K and Primary L appreciated the extra focus that the subsidy had given them, so that they were able to think about targeting specific groups of pupils, and were in a better position to be able to apply for extra funding. The Headteacher at Secondary K had, for the first time, been able to dedicate time to encouraging participation by hard to reach groups, and has made an application for funding to assist him in this. He does not think that he would have done this, were it not for the subsidy:

'Certainly having the money there has been a wonderful, wonderful thing. A small example is that I got a list of the year 10s and 11s who haven't accessed the funding and we are working at the moment to get one to one coaching after school because little surprise here that many of those students are your C/D borderline type children. They're borderline in terms of engagement but they are also borderline in terms of achievement – there must be a direct correlation somehow between those two things. If the money wasn't there I probably wouldn't have had that thought' (AP).

7.3 Whether schools have increased the number of activities on offer

Data from schools

Around nine in ten schools (88 per cent) said the subsidy had enabled them to increase the number of activities that they offer to economically disadvantaged pupils. This is an increase since the first survey of schools when 63 per cent of schools had increased the number of activities on offer.

Schools following the flexible model were more likely to have increased the number of activities on offer to economically disadvantaged pupils than schools following the defined model (94 per cent compared with 76 per cent). Also, schools with higher levels of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely to have done this: 93 per cent of schools where 20 per cent of pupils or more were eligible for FSM had increased the number of activities on offer compared with 85 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were eligible for FSM.

Data from parents

Only 39 per cent of parents thought that their child's school had increased the number of activities it offers over the past year, while 36 per cent did not think the number of activities had increased and 25 per cent did not know.

As section 3.3 showed, many parents did not feel very well informed about the kinds of activities offered by the school, so if we look at answers to this question just for parents who felt at least quite well informed about the activities on offer then the proportion of parents who thought their school had increased the number of activities on offer increased to 48 per cent. However, this is still far lower than the 88 per cent of schools that said they had increased the number of activities on offer. There are several reasons why this may be:

- Parents were asked whether the school had increased the number of activities it offers for pupils like their son or daughter – it could be that the school had increased the number of activities on offer to some pupils (for example, certain year groups), but that the additional activities were not available to the respondent's child;
- Similarly, the additional activities may have been available to the respondent's child, but may have been activities that the parent did not deem suitable or that their child was not interested in, and so the respondent discounted these and did not answer that the number of activities had increased;
- Parents were not sufficiently aware of the activities offered before and after the subsidy to know that the number of activities on offer had increased (even

if they did consider themselves well informed about the activities on offer at the school).

Data from pupils

Only pupils aged 11 or older (i.e. those at secondary schools) were interviewed for the survey, and amongst these pupils, 68 per cent thought their school had increased the number of activities on offer, 23 per cent thought it had not, and nine per cent could not say.

Data from pupils is more closely aligned to schools data than the data from parents, but there is still a gap between the 68 per cent of pupils who thought their school had increased the number of activities on offer, and the 88 per cent of schools who said they had done this. As with the parents' data a potential explanation is that pupils were asked whether their school had increased the number of activities it offers for pupils such as themselves. It could be therefore that additional activities offered by the school were not available to all pupils, or that the additional activities on offer were not ones that the respondent was interested in and so the respondent discounted these and did not answer that the number of activities had increased.

Case study findings support the data that the number of activities have increased and that there is more choice for pupils. Schools have been able to experiment with additional provision, and offer taster sessions. Some schools, such as Primary D and Primary L, stated that without the disadvantage subsidy, they would not have been able to expand extended services to the level of provision they currently have. Schools have also been able to assist young people to participate in activities that they would not have been able to try previously, thus opening up the opportunities available to them and giving them more choice, through providing, for example, equipment, travel expenses or tailored provision.

'Students are able to choose from a menu and this has enabled them to do things they wouldn't have been able to do...the majority of students have been able to benefit in one way or another.' (Headteacher, Special School H)

'The subsidy has helped us build and provide a vibrant range of activities.' (Assistant Head, Secondary C)

Parents and children also perceived that there was more choice available than previously. One pupil from Secondary A talked about the first year of the subsidy:

'Last year there was absolutely millions of after school things, there was games clubs, first aid, stuff like that, loads of things but this term I think it's just the ones that got loads of people, I think they've carried those ones on and the ones that weren't liked too much fell into the background, they just run every so often'.

Parents were happy with the amount of provision:

'Given the variety of activities covered there is practically something for everyone to do.' (parent, Junior F)

Case study data has also shown examples of how schools open their activities to pupils from other schools in their cluster in order to increase choice for all pupils. In Secondary A for example, activities with a transition focus were on offer to all students from across the feeder primaries (In this LA the decision was taken that due to widespread deprivation all students were eligible for the subsidy).

In Primary B the school had an ice rink on site during half term which was open to all children from cluster schools. This model of providing holiday provision from one site and opening it up to students from cluster schools also operated elsewhere e.g. Secondary I and Secondary G, where holiday provision takes place at the cluster high school, one of the cluster primaries or a local provider. In other LAs (e.g. the ones in which Junior F and Secondary K are located), after school provision was open to eligible students from across their clusters.

7.4 Whether schools have improved access to activities

Almost all schools (96 per cent) said that the subsidy had improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities. This is an increase since the first survey of schools when this had only been the case for 69 per cent of schools. There were no differences by subgroups at this question.

It is clear that all the case study schools aimed to individualize activities as much as possible. However, it may be the case that individualizing activities add to administrative workloads in terms of more paperwork. It appears that where there are a number of pupils all wanting to take part in a specific activity this makes administration simpler. A member of staff at Secondary I, for instance, noted:

'It's all been done individually but what we did with the consultation before Christmas we got like 80 forms back and 14 wanted horseriding, 11 wanted ice-skating. So, then we decided we can do this as a group then because it's going to be more cost effective to send a group out than it is an individual particularly if you have to pay for transport as well. The consultation has worked out better because rather than last year when we were dealing with people individually and sending one person off horse riding on a Monday and another off on a Wednesday we've been a little bit, well, not hard, but right 14 horseriders, it's on a Monday night.'

At Special School H individual pupils requested particular activities, such as horse riding, and were then sent off to do this. The activity was paid for out of their

individual subsidy allocation and their parents took them.

The DH at Special School H gave an example where the costs for an individual activity were unsustainable (one pupil wanted to do kickboxing which worked out at £38 per session). She went on to say that

'We did try doing things individually but it would eat the money up so quickly so what we did we started to group them and that's been much more successful'.

It is unknown at this time whether cost effectiveness and administrative issues may impact on the the capacity of schools to fully individualize activities for their pupils.

7.5 Whether schools have improved the quality of their provision

Data from schools

A high proportion of schools (86 per cent) said the subsidy had enabled them to improve the quality of their provision for economically disadvantaged pupils. This is an increase since the first survey of schools when 65 per cent of schools had improved the quality of their provision with the subsidy.

Again, there were differences in responses by model type and proportion of economically disadvantaged pupils at the school: amongst schools following the flexible model 90 per cent reported improving the quality of their provision compared with 76 per cent of schools on the defined model; and 91 per cent of schools with higher levels of pupils eligible for FSM (20 per cent or more) had improved the quality of their provision compared with 82 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were eligible for FSM.

Data from parents

A third (33 per cent) of parents did not know whether their child's school had improved the quality of activities that it offered and 30 per cent thought the quality had not improved. The remaining 37 per cent of parents thought the quality of activities provided by their child's school had increased over the past year.

Again, if analysis is restricted to just those parents who felt they were at least quite well informed about the activities at their child's school the proportion who thought the quality had improved increased to 46 per cent, although still 28 per cent of these parents did not know whether the quality had improved or not.

Where parents did think there had been an improvement in the quality of activities, 47 per cent thought there had been a large improvement, and 53 per cent thought there had been a small improvement.

Data from pupils

Pupils (aged 11 or more) were more likely than parents to think the quality of activities at their school had increased over the past year: 61 per cent thought that the quality had increased, 24 per cent thought it had not, and 15 per cent did not know.

Even if those answering 'don't know' are excluded from analysis, there is still a gap between schools' and pupils' opinions of whether the quality of activities offered by the school has increased since the introduction of the subsidy.

Case study schools often made reference to an increase in the quality of the provision. Sometimes this quality had come about over time, as schools had experimented with providers and were able to commission those who they felt were able to provide the best service. In addition, schools sometimes felt that because they were able to invest more in in-house activities, they were able to improve the provision by providing equipment or adding elements such as trips. The subsidy has been able to enrich experience for those children attending the clubs:

'We can say to clubs, do you realise you have 15 children accessing of our most vulnerable group in the school, now we can give you some funding towards you as a club to really make a difference for those children and a difference to your club.' (Extended Services Manager, Primary L).

The result of extra resourcing means that clubs can offer trips ***'so what they are getting is a higher quality of service and a higher quality of experience'*** (Extended Services Manager, Primary L).

In relation to this issue, staff in Local Authorities and schools interviewed for the case studies were often at a loss as to how to identify quality providers. There are no websites or databases of providers to refer to and it has been necessary to develop links and experiment with different providers. It also seems that speaking to other users of service providers is another approach adopted. It may be that, initially anyway, Local Authority providers already have CRBs in place and the quality of their provision is known making it easier to engage them in disadvantage subsidy work. External providers may require some initial groundwork to set up CRB and establish quality.

7.6 Whether schools are providing new activities

Data from schools

Nine in ten schools (90 per cent) said the subsidy had enabled them to introduce new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils. This is an increase since the first

survey of schools when 63 per cent of schools had been able to introduce new activities with the aid of the subsidy.

Flexible model schools were more likely to have introduced new activities: 94 per cent had compared with 81 per cent of schools following the defined model.

Amongst the few schools that had not yet introduced new activities with the help of the subsidy, most thought that the subsidy would enable them to introduce new activities in the future. This left two schools that did not know whether the subsidy would enable them to introduce new activities, and ten schools that said it would not.

Data from parents

Parents were asked whether their child's school had introduced any new activities for their child. Only 38 per cent of parents said this had happened, whilst 41 per cent said no new activities had been introduced for their child and 21 per cent did not know.

Limiting analysis to just those parents who said they were at least quite well informed about the activities offered by the school, 48 per cent said new activities had been introduced for their child, 37 per cent said they had not, and 16 per cent did not know.

As with the data on whether the number of activities on offer had been increased (section 7.3), there are potential reasons for the discrepancy between data from schools and data from parents because the parents' questionnaire asked specifically if new activities had been introduced for the respondent's child. So the school may have introduced new activities, but they may not have been available to the respondent's child (for example, if they were only available to certain year groups), or the respondent may not have deemed these activities suitable for or of interest to their child, and so discounted them.

Data from pupils

Around half of pupils (48 per cent) said their school had introduced new activities for pupils such as themselves over the last year, while 41 per cent said no new activities had been introduced for them, and 11 per cent could not say.

Schools data showed that 90 per cent of schools had introduced new activities with the help of the subsidy so there is a significant gap between what schools say they have done and whether pupils think new activities have been introduced. There are several potential reasons for the difference:

- The new activities introduced were not available to all pupils (for example, they were only available to certain year groups);
- Where new activities have been introduced that were of no interest to the respondent, respondents have either discounted them or not recalled them

(this is particularly likely if the new activities introduced were one-off activities that did not interest the respondent);

- New activities that have been introduced were sufficiently similar to activities that the school was already running so as to not register as *new* activities with pupils;
- New activities have not been promoted sufficiently so some pupils are not aware of them;
- Pupils' recall of activities offered before and after the subsidy is not sufficient for them to be able to say whether new activities had been introduced or not.

7.7 Schools that had not made any improvements to their offer of activities as a result of the subsidy

As the previous sections show, very high proportions of schools said they had increased the number of activities on offer, improved access to activities, improved the quality of their provision, or introduced new activities. It is therefore of interest to see if there are any schools that had done none of these things. Of the 373 schools that took part in the second survey of schools, nine schools (two per cent) had not made any of these improvements as a result of the subsidy.

Whilst this is too small a number to do any meaningful quantitative analysis with, it is possible to look at the profile of these nine schools that do not appear to have made any improvements to the activities they offer as a result of the subsidy. However, aside from all but one of the schools having experienced problems or barriers when implementing the subsidy¹⁷ (overall 43 per cent of schools reported this), there is nothing about this small group of schools that makes them unusual:

- Seven were primary schools, one was a secondary school and one was a special school;
- Six were following the defined model and three were following the flexible model;
- Six had consulted with parents or pupils about the kinds of activities they would like to be offered using the subsidy (three had not);
- Six agreed that economically disadvantaged pupils were keen to participate in the activities that they offered, two disagreed and one neither agreed nor disagreed.

As might be expected, these schools gave low scores on a scale of 0 to 10 for how much impact the subsidy had had on participation rates of economically disadvantaged pupils: six schools said the subsidy had had zero impact, one school gave a score of three, one gave a score of five and one did not know.

7.8 Whether pupils are able to go to the activities parents would like them to

Parents were asked whether their child was generally able to go to the activities offered by the school that they would like them to go to. In most cases responses were positive: 46 per cent of parents said their child was able to go to all of the activities they wanted them to, and a further 27 per cent said they could go to most of them. However, 19 per cent of parents said their child could only go to some of the

¹⁷ The particular problems or barriers these nine schools faced were a mixture, and similar to barriers faced by other schools.

activities they would like them to and five per cent said they could not go to any. Section 8.6 examines the barriers that prevent pupils from going to activities.

Parents whose children attended at least one activity were also asked whether their child was able to go to more or less of the activities they would like them to over the past year. A quarter (24 per cent) of parents said their child was now able to attend more activities, but 64 per cent said there had been no change and 12 per cent said their child was now able to go to less activities than before the subsidy was introduced.

8. Parents' and pupils' views on activities

Key findings:

- Amongst secondary school pupils, those taking part in term time activities for an hour a week or more were more likely to enjoy school than those who did less than an hour a week (or no) activities.
- Half of parents were satisfied with the availability of clubs and activities (not necessarily related to school) suitable for their child in the area where they live, but just over a third were dissatisfied.
- Eight in ten parents and pupils thought there needed to be more or better things for young people to do in the area where they live when they are not at school. Two-thirds of parents said they would like such activities to be provided at or near their child's school.
- Three quarters of parents thought the activities their child attended at school were very or fairly good, and less than one in ten thought they were poor. Similarly, around three quarters of parents said activities met their needs very or quite well.
- Pupils also mostly had positive views on activities with seven in ten thinking they were very or fairly good overall.
- 86 per cent of parents of primary school pupils said their child enjoys term time activities all or most of the time, and 73 per cent said their child enjoys holiday activities all or most of the time.
- 71 per cent of secondary school pupils said they enjoy term time activities all or most of the time, and 68 per cent said they enjoy holiday activities all or most of the time.
- Parents tended to see the main benefits of activities as their child having fun, making friends, getting exercise, and learning new things, but four in ten parents thought that going to activities helped their child do better in school.
- 76 per cent of parents and 81 per cent of pupils thought their school needed to improve the activities it offers. Both groups were particularly likely to think that activities during the summer holidays needed to be improved.
- Where pupils had not taken part in any activities, the most common reason given by parents was that the activities on offer did not interest their child. Various barriers were also mentioned such as costs, lack of transport, and lack of time/other commitments.

Taking part in activities outside of normal lessons can increase pupils' enjoyment of school in general. Table 8.1 shows the responses to a question about how much pupils enjoy going to school overall. The table also shows responses broken down by whether the pupil was at primary school or secondary school. As the table shows, responses were much more positive for pupils at primary schools. However, it is not necessarily the case that pupils enjoy primary school more than secondary school. This question was answered by pupils themselves for secondary school pupils, but for primary school pupils, parents were asked how much their child enjoys school. So the difference could be due to parents overestimating their child's enjoyment of school.

Amongst secondary school pupils, those who were taking part in term time activities for an hour a week or more gave more positive answers than pupils who were doing less than an hour a week of activities (including those doing no activities): 16 per cent of pupils doing an hour or more of activities a week said they enjoyed school 'all of the time' and 55 per cent enjoyed it 'most of the time', while amongst those spending little or no time in activities nine per cent said they enjoyed school 'all of the time' and 31 per cent enjoyed it 'most of the time'. It is important to note though that this does not imply causation: it is possible that either pupils who enjoy school are more likely to take part in activities (for an hour or more per week), or that pupils who take part in activities (for an hour or more per week) are more likely to enjoy school, but we cannot say from this data that taking part in activities *causes* pupils to enjoy school more, or that enjoying school more *causes* pupils to take part in activities.

Table 8.1

How much pupils enjoy going to school overall

	All respondents (n=553) %	Pupils at primary schools (question answered by parent) (n=293) %	Pupils at secondary schools (n=210) %
All the time	38	53	14
Most of the time	35	29	46
Sometimes	21	16	29
Never	5	2	10
Don't know	1	0	1

Base: All respondents to the survey of parents and pupils (553)

Where pupils themselves were interviewed for the survey¹⁸, they were asked what two or three things they most like doing in their spare time. Answers are shown below. Some, but not all, of the most popular things for young people to do in their spare time are the kinds of things that can be incorporated into school based activities.

- Playing on the computer/Internet - 50 per cent
- Listening to music - 44 per cent
- Hanging out e.g. with friends/brothers/sisters at home or in the street - 44 per cent
- Watching TV - 38 per cent
- Shopping - 26 per cent
- Doing sports/dancing/going to the gym - 20 per cent
- Swimming - 20 per cent
- Going to football games/sports events - 18 per cent
- Reading - 15 per cent
- Going to the cinema or theatre - 15 per cent
- Doing arts/crafts, drama, film/video-making, music/playing musical instruments - 13 per cent
- Going to the park - 11 per cent
- Going to after-school or breakfast clubs - five per cent
- Hanging out at informal youth centres/clubs - three per cent
- Going to music concerts or gigs - three per cent

8.1 Availability of activities in the area

Half (49 per cent) of parents were satisfied with the availability of clubs and activities (not necessarily related to the school) suitable for their child in the area where they live, but just over a third (36 per cent) were dissatisfied. This suggests that a significant minority of parents think there is a gap in what is available for their children, and this gap could perhaps be filled by extended services. Full results are shown in table 8.2.

Parents of primary school pupils were more likely to be satisfied than parents of secondary school pupils (55 per cent compared with 41 per cent). Parents of pupils with special educational needs were less likely to be satisfied: 33 per cent compared with 53 per cent of parents of pupils that do not have special educational needs.

¹⁸ Pupils were interviewed if they were aged 11 or more, otherwise just their parents were interviewed.

Table 8.2

Parents' satisfaction with the availability of clubs and activities suitable for their child in the area where they live

	All respondents (n=555) %	Parents of pupils at primary schools (n=294) %	Parents of pupils at secondary schools (n=209) %
Very satisfied	17	21	9
Fairly satisfied	33	34	31
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10	8	14
Fairly dissatisfied	20	19	22
Very dissatisfied	15	12	19
Don't know	5	5	5

Base: All parents taking part in the survey of parents (555)

Parents and pupils were also asked whether they thought there were enough activities and things to do for children in the area when they are not in school. Only 18 per cent thought the activities and things to do outside school on offer in their area were good enough; 32 per cent said they needed a little more or better things to do; and 46 per cent said they needed a lot more or better things to do.

Parents' thoughts on where they would like additional clubs and activities to be provided, were they to be made available, show that many parents are keen on the idea of their children taking part in activities based at their school: 64 per cent of parents said they would like this provision to be based at or near their child's school. The same proportion (64 per cent) said they would like activities near their home, 27 per cent said at some other local community facility and one per cent wanted activities to be provided at or near their place of work.

Parents of primary school pupils were more likely to want activities to be provided at their child's school (72 per cent compared with 53 per cent of parents of secondary school pupils), while parents of secondary school pupils were more likely to want activities to be near home (72 per cent compared with 58 per cent of parents of primary school pupils). Parents with a long term illness or disability were also more likely than those without to want activities to take place near their home (76 per cent compared with 61 per cent).

8.2 Parents views on activities offered by school

Parents whose children had taken part in at least one activity were asked how good or poor they thought the activities offered by their child's school were overall. Views were mostly positive with a quarter (27 per cent) of parents saying activities were very good and half (50 per cent) saying they were fairly good. There were a minority

of parents though that thought activities were fairly poor (five per cent) or very poor (two per cent).

Parents of pupils at schools on the flexible model were a little more positive than parents of pupils at schools on the defined model: 80 per cent of parents thought activities at flexible model schools were good, compared with 69 per cent of parents whose child attended a defined model school.

Where pupils had taken part in at least one activity, parents were also asked how well the activities and childcare services offered by the school met their needs. Answers were similarly mostly positive with 22 per cent of parents saying activities met their needs very well and 50 per cent saying they met them quite well. Around one in five parents had more negative views though: 15 per cent said activities did not meet their needs very well, and six per cent said they did not meet their needs at all well.

As before, parents of pupils at schools on the flexible model tended to be more positive: 75 per cent of parents of pupils at schools on the flexible model said the activities offered by the school met their needs very or fairly well compared with 61 per cent of parents of pupils at schools on the defined model.

The parents we spoke to in the case study schools were very positive about the activities on offer for their children and found it easy to recount the benefits for themselves and their children.

8.3 Pupils views on activities offered by the school

Rating how good activities are

For each activity type pupils took part in, they were asked to say how good or poor that activity was¹⁹. Table 8.3 shows responses for all activity types that at least 50 pupils had taken part in. As the table shows, for all types of activity, opinions were mostly positive.

¹⁹ Where pupils were aged 11 or more they were interviewed themselves, for younger pupils parents answered on their behalf.

Table 8.3

Pupils' views on how good or poor each type of activity is

	Homework/ study club	Revision classes run by teachers	Sports	Dance	Music
	(n=67)	(n=63)	(n=256)	(n=74)	(n=67)
	%	%	%	%	%
Very good	39	29	54	51	48
Fairly good	47	58	40	38	45
Neither good nor poor	10	9	4	6	4
Fairly poor	0	3	2	*	1
Very poor	0	0	1	5	0
Don't know	4	1	*	0	3

Base: All pupils that had taken part in each type of activity (variable)

Table 8.3 continued

Pupils' views on how good or poor each type of activity is

	Art and craft	Computer /IT	Breakfast club	Afterschool club
	(n=61)	(n=61)	(n=64)	(n=64)
	%	%	%	%
Very good	45	56	31	51
Fairly good	52	31	56	28
Neither good nor poor	2	11	10	14
Fairly poor	0	0	3	2
Very poor	*	3	0	2
Don't know	2	0	1	4

Base: All pupils that had taken part in each type of activity (variable)

Pupils aged 11 or more who had taken part in any activities were also asked to give an overall rating of how good or poor activities provided by the school were: 20 per cent said activities were very good overall; 51 per cent said fairly good; 14 per cent thought activities were neither good nor poor; four per cent thought they were fairly poor; two per cent thought they were very poor; and the remaining 10 per cent could not answer.

Enjoyment of activities

Table 8.4 shows how much pupils enjoyed activities that took place in term time and activities that took place during the school holidays. Answers are broken down by whether pupils were at primary or secondary school as those aged 11 or more (and

so at secondary school) were asked this question themselves, whereas for pupils aged under 11, parents were asked to answer on their behalf. As the table shows, responses regarding primary school pupils are more positive than those regarding secondary school pupils, but this may be due to parents overestimating how much their children enjoy activities, rather than being a genuine difference.

Table 8.4

How much pupils enjoy activities during term time and during school holidays

	Term time activities – primary school pupils (n=251) %	Term time activities – secondary school pupils (n=167) %	Holiday activities – primary school pupils (n=92) %	Holiday activities – secondary school pupils (n=71) %
Always enjoy them	54	28	47	31
Enjoy them most of the time	32	43	26	27
Sometimes enjoy them	12	24	20	35
Never enjoy them	1	5	7	7

Base: All pupils that had ever taken part in term time/holiday activities (variable)

Children and young people showed enthusiasm for the opportunities they had to participate in activities. Some young people had taken part in experiences that they would never have been able to anticipate, and had enjoyed them:

‘Last year I went to Strasbourg to the European parliament and we got to meet this woman, I can’t remember her name but she’s really important and we went to talk to her and ask her questions about it, and you know that big vote what was on the news? We got to sit on this platform thing and watch everybody vote so I thought that was canny good.’ (Pupil, Secondary A)

The young people at Secondary C had also been on a residential trip, and all apart from one rated it as a ten on a scale of one to ten. The young people had tried a variety of activities including archery, zip wire, air rifle shooting and raft building and recounted the fun they had had. Other young people told us about the clubs they took part in, and how much they enjoyed them:

‘Normally I wouldn’t have done anything. I would have just gone home and been bored. Now I’m in the basketball team, it gives me something to do and I’m excited and happy’. (Pupil, Secondary C)

‘It was great to go to the football match. I went with dad and dad loves [name of football team] also. The school paid for my dad also.’ (Pupil,

Special School H)

'I think they're good, like film club, people like film club and there's different clubs for different people, like their personality.' (Pupil Primary D)

Whether want to do more activities in the future

All parents of pupils aged under 11 were asked whether they would like their child to take part in activities offered by the school in the future, whether they had taken part in any so far or not: 95 per cent of parents said they did and just three per cent did not. Pupils aged 11 or more were asked themselves: 69 per cent of pupils said they did want to take part in activities offered by their school in the future, but 23 per cent did not. This suggests there is a group of pupils who schools will find difficult to engage in activities.

8.4 Benefits of activities

Parents whose child went to at least one activity were asked what they thought were the main benefits for themselves and their child of going to these activities. Parents were most likely to cite benefits for their child such as having fun (72 per cent), making friends (69 per cent), getting exercise or keeping fit (68 per cent), and learning new things (65 per cent). Four in ten parents thought that going to activities helped their child to do better in school.

Half (50 per cent) of parents thought a benefit of activities was that they provided a safe place for their child to be, 21 per cent said it allowed them to do other things and 16 per cent said it gave them a break from caring for their child. Seven per cent of parents said their child attending activities allowed them to work - although this is a small proportion, this benefit of extended schools activities could bring about a significant improvement in the economic wellbeing of these families.

Pupils aged 11 or more who had taken part in any activities were asked what they liked about the activities they attended. Some pupils liked that they got to learn new things (46 per cent) or meet new people (38 per cent). Pupils also found activities enjoyable (65 per cent), interesting (40 per cent) and relaxing (16 per cent), whilst over half of pupils liked that they saw their friends when taking part in activities (55 per cent). A minority of pupils were pleased about some of the more practical aspects of activities: 22 per cent said they like the adults that run activities, and 19 per cent appreciated that activities were near to either home or school.

The parents and children interviewed as part of case study visits spoke at length about the benefits they perceived from participation in extended services activities. Parents said that they were extremely grateful that their children were able to take part in activities as they knew they were safe and staying out of trouble, and they were able to meet new people, keep fit, and learn new skills which all contributed to

giving their children more confidence. The following parents explain:

'He's a chubby little lad so I like him to be at school and not stuck in the house, because in this weather you cant get out so for me it's to keep him active but for [him] he just loves being with other kids. It's keeping [him] doing things that he wants to do and it's keeping him in school safe and he's socialising because there's different people in different clubs from different classes that he hasn't met so he's also meeting new people which he loves.' (parent, Primary D).

'My son thinks he's a super chef now because he's made buns! He's saying to his grandma, 'Ill give you the recipe'. I think that for all it's school, it's not school in the learning sort of way, even though he is learning but it's not that sort of classroom environment and it's a mixture of people that he's never sort of mixed with before from different classes, and he's made quite a few different friends actually from the clubs, even in different year groups. They all sort of interact with different ages and it widens their friendship circle and I think that's what he got out of it – he enjoyed it. The kids, it's just different experiences, different interesting things, different chat and everything, it's different from their learning time at school, it's relaxed.' (parent, Primary D).

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

'In this day and age if you think your kids are doing something that is supervised, safe and they like it, they're not out on the street in the dark wearing dark clothes and you cant see them and getting into bother, they're doing something constructive aren't they, in a place that you know is safe.' (Parent, Primary L)

'My daughter would never have had this opportunity without the subsidy. She is mixing with different types of people and training with Team GB. Our kids have now got that stepping stone and they are ahead of the game' (Parent, Secondary G)

Some parents also found that their children slept better and were calmer. Parents could also identify benefits for themselves due to their children participating in activities. Some parents enjoyed the respite that they got when children were occupied, particularly when their children had special needs. Parents acknowledged that it is often difficult to give children as much time and attention as they would like, especially during holiday times, and that having activities available took the pressure off them in terms of childcare:

'I have to admit that I use the activities for respite from my child because he has high needs. If all of it stopped I'd have no hair left'.
(Parent, Junior F)

'It gives parents that bit of breathing space and parents that are having to return back to work know the clubs are there before they even start looking for jobs so they know that from 8 o'clock in the morning till twenty past four, half past four they can then say well this is the time I can work. I just think it's a massive benefit and I think without them parents would really, really struggle'. (parent, Primary D).

'Parents are just desperate for something, they come here, they know their kid's safe, that's it they are in for the day, they're not being pillared about back and forwards, they get something to eat and I just think it's a huge benefit to parents.' (parent, Primary D).

Children and young people echoed their parents' views and told us about a multitude of benefits that they had experienced from taking part in activities. They had enjoyed meeting new people, and making new friends, learning new skills, doing things that they were good at, keeping fit and having fun as the following pupils told us:

'It's keeping fit, having fun with my friends and to do something I'm good at.' (Pupil, Primary L)

'It was better because I didn't know anyone when I went and after I came back I had loads of mates.' (pupil, Secondary A).

'I now go swimming once or twice a week, Wednesday or Saturdays, with my Mum. They even bought my swimming costume...this is a real opportunity and it has really benefitted us as Mum has big financial issues...before we weren't going at all, well perhaps three or four times a year...when we go we do lots of challenges and I'll get healthy...I'm a bit chubby and I'd like to lose weight and this will help and when I get healthy I'll still keep going there.' (Pupil, Secondary I)

'I used to be quite shy but now like since I've been going horse riding I'm like more confident'. (Pupil, Secondary I)

'It's a time when you can meet people in other years and get to know

them a bit better instead of just knowing the people in your year. (Pupil, Primary D).

Older young people also thought that taking part in activities had kept them out of trouble, and could stop youngsters from hanging about on the streets.

'If everyone had stuff like this it would be easier because they're always saying they don't want kids hanging round on the streets but that's because they haven't got nothing else to do. Like on a Friday night, there's nothing like this on, on a Friday.' (Pupil, Secondary K)

'I think it stops people getting into trouble 'cause once you get home and you've been to a club you just think 'oh I'm tired' and you just want to watch the telly and chill out.' (Pupil, Secondary A)

8.5 Whether activities need to be improved

Most parents (76 per cent) and most pupils aged 11 or more (81 per cent) thought their school needed to improve the activities it offers. Both parents and pupils were most likely to think that their school needed to improve the activities on offer during the summer holidays. Both parents and pupils were also quite likely to think that activities after school, and activities during half term holidays needed to be improved. These results are shown in table 8.5.

Table 8.5

Activities that parents and pupils think their school needs to improve

	Parents (n=428)	Pupils (n=288)
	%	%
Before school activities	9	13
After school activities	29	29
Activities at weekends	29	20
Half-term holiday activities	43	30
Easter holiday activities	28	18
Summer holiday activities	54	45
Christmas holiday activities	22	18
None	19	12
Don't know	6	6

Base: All cases where the pupil had taken part in at least one activity

Parents who thought improvements needed to be made were asked in what ways the school needed to make improvements.

Answers can be grouped into themes. Firstly, some parents mentioned the types of activities they would like to see the school provide more of:

- Provide more sport clubs - 12 per cent
- Provide more homework clubs and educational activities - nine per cent
- Provide more art, craft, drama, music and dance activities - five per cent
- Provide more day trips - three per cent
- Provide more computer/internet sessions - two per cent

Another theme was to say more activities needed to be provided. Around half (47 per cent) wanted more activities during school holidays, eight per cent wanted more breakfast and afterschool clubs and 10 per cent said the school just generally needed to provide more activities as there were not enough.

A minority mentioned the times of day activities should be provided (three per cent) and two per cent said that activities needed to be timed to cover the whole working day.

Cost was another theme: seven per cent said activities should cost less and two per cent said they should be free.

Some parents thought a wider range of activities needed to be introduced: eight per cent said there needed to be more choice; six per cent said ages of children needed to be considered so that activities for all age ranges could be provided; and two per cent said their children were not catered for (in some cases due to disability or religion).

Other answers were the need to give parents more information about what is available (three per cent); to make more spaces available at activities (two per cent); and to provide transport if necessary (one per cent).

8.6 What prevents pupils from taking part in activities

Table 8.6 shows the reasons given by parents why their child does not take part in more activities²⁰ (1st column, for cases where their child has taken part in activities), and the reasons given by parents why their child does not take part in any activities (2nd column, for cases where their child has not taken part in any activities).

As the table shows, for pupils who had not taken part in any activities, the most common reason for this given by parents was that the types of activity on offer were not the sort of thing their child wants to do (34 per cent).

For parents whose child had taken part in activities, reasons why they did not do more activities were more mixed, although the most common answer was that there

²⁰ This data was collected in September to November 2009, around a year after the introduction of the subsidy.

were no reasons (39 per cent). Notable minorities of these parents also cited activities not being what their child wants to do (18 per cent), cost (17 per cent) and lack of time (12 per cent).

Table 8.6

Reasons given by parents why pupils do not do any/more activities

	Reasons don't do more activities (n=432)	Reasons don't do any activities (n=120)
	%	%
Cost	17	9
The types of activity/not things child wants to do	18	34
The types of activity/not things I want child to do	4	4
Activities not suitable for children with disabilities/SEN	2	5
Don't like the providers	1	1
Don't like the other children/worried about bullying	3	3
Lack of transport	9	9
Transport not safe	1	1
Transport problems for children with disabilities/SEN	1	1
Inconvenient location	3	4
Lack of time	12	7
Too much schoolwork	7	4
Parental concerns about Health and Safety	3	5
Activities are over-subscribed	8	0
Activities only take place for some of the term	2	3
Other (family) commitments	1	8
Parents working hours	1	0
Activities not suitable for age of child	1	0
No activities offered	1	8
Partakes in activities not offered by the school	0	6
Other answer	2	5
Nothing/no answer	39	17
Don't know	*	2

Base: All parents taking part in the survey of parents (552)

Pupils aged 11 or more were also asked for the reasons why they did not do more or any activities. Responses are shown in table 8.7. Again, the first column shows reasons why pupils who have done some activities do not do more, and the second column shows reasons why pupils who have not done any activities do not do them.

Similarly to the answers given by their parents, for pupils that had not taken part in any activities, the most common reason given was that there are no activities or clubs that they like (31 per cent). Other relatively common answers for this group

were that they do not want to spend any more time at school than they have to (22 per cent), that they are too tired to do activities before or after school (14 per cent), that they do not have enough time or have too much schoolwork (12 per cent), and that transport to activities is not available (12 per cent).

For pupils who had taken part in some activities, 39 per cent said there were no reasons why they did not go to more activities. Other answers given by notable minorities of this group were: there are not clubs or activities that they like (19 per cent); they are too tired before or after school (14 per cent); and they do not have enough time or have too much schoolwork (10 per cent).

Table 8.7

Reasons given by pupils why they do not do any/more activities

	Reasons don't do more activities (n=220)	Reasons don't do any activities (n=68)
	%	%
There are no clubs or activities I like	19	31
There are no clubs or activities for young people like me	4	7
I don't want to spend any more time at schools than I have to	6	22
I do not like/feel happy with the other children who go there	9	7
I do not like/feel happy with the people who run them	1	*
My parents don't let me go	3	4
I don't have enough time/too much school work	10	12
They cost too much	8	3
I can't get there/ get home afterwards	5	6
Transport not available	5	12
Transport not safe	1	2
Too tired before/ after school	14	14
Don't know anyone who goes to activities	6	6
Take part in activities not provided by the school	0	5
Other answer	2	7
Nothing/no answer	39	0
Don't know	2	2

Base: All pupils taking part in the survey of parents (288)

On the whole, most of the young people we spoke to were proud of their school and thought it was 'the best' because of all the activities on offer. Nevertheless, we did speak to some young people who did not participate and there was some indication of reasons from interviews. In some schools, transport was a major issue. Children were bussed in and out of school, or the school was not on a bus route, meaning that after school activities presented a logistical problem for them. In addition, we spoke to one disabled boy who found it difficult to participate in as many clubs as he would

like, because of the inflexibility of the taxi contract the school had for him:

'I don't really go to the after school clubs, because my taxi comes for quarter past three and because it's on contract you can't rearrange it so to get me to go to after school things, someone would have to pay for that. I did when it was wheelchair basketball, but I haven't really asked for much more.' (Secondary A pupil)

Many children spoke of the lack of time that they had. Some young people were already participating in activities that were not provided through extended services. For older young people, the pressure of upcoming exams meant that they had to spend any spare time doing coursework. Parents also echoed this concern, and one parent of a primary school pupil explained that younger children often get tired after a long day at school, and the demands of homework:

'It gets a bit much for [my son], sometimes when he's been to a club and he's hungry he wants his tea, and you say well have your tea first then do your home learning because if you don't do your home learning then the clubs will stop.' (Primary D parent)

Having said this, it may also be the case that after school activities are seen as a 'break' or 'timeout' for parents and their children especially in cases where children appear to have boundless energy, perhaps as a result of a disorder such as ADHD or the like. Such parents view after school activities, especially where these result in expenditures of excess energy, as beneficial. One parent in Secondary G said of her son: ***'He's never at home. I love the evenings now'***.

A boy at Special School H said, in reference to fishing trips: ***'It's tiring but when you've got it [the fish] on the hook it gives you that good feeling. I like to get away from my parents for a bit of peace.'***

Extended services staff were often very knowledgeable about the barriers that pupils faced in their schools. They mentioned issues such as pupil and parent culture and attitudes, childcare responsibilities, lack of commitment by parents, children not having the right equipment needed to participate, the design of school buildings and the timing of clubs. One Head told us:

'The hardest group to get on board seem to be the secondary school students. I think it's a number of factors. One is that it's kind of been 'there they are in school', and all of a sudden they have something offered to them that is almost unbelievable when you think about it. Somebody is saying to me that I've got the equivalent of about £200 to spend on me, and I don't have to do anything for it. So I think there's that kind of 'this can't be true' almost. I think that the cultural issues, the social issues, the economic issues that are to do with the whole thing, the deprivation, I think deprivation is a massive barrier to engagement. It's not just about the children having to look after the younger children

at home while mum or dad's out at work or whatever, it's actually to do with the hearts and minds and I think it's also to do with... it's been introduced at a time when student pupil culture and socialising and all that is very much on screens and passivity.' (Secondary K)

Many staff were careful to explain to us that it takes time to encourage uptake. Staff need to raise awareness, and then work on addressing the barriers to participation. Some schools had worked on trying to get parents and children to have ownership and responsibility for the subsidy scheme, and others have worked with external agencies to ensure a consistent message to parents and children.

9. Staff workload

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

Key findings:

- In 83 per cent of schools, managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in workload for staff at the school.
- For both primary and secondary schools, workloads had most commonly increased amongst administrative or support staff. In primary schools headteachers were likely to see an increase in workload, and in secondary schools it tended to be other members of the senior management team and extended services co-ordinators whose workload had increased.
- A minority of schools had taken measures to increase their resources in order to cope with the additional workload, but most had coped using existing resources: by staff working longer hours or reassigning workloads between staff.

The findings in this chapter show that, for many schools, the additional workload of managing and administering the subsidy has been an issue. However, it should be noted that some of the impacts on workload may be a direct result of this being a pathfinder. Schools involved in the pathfinder were 'starting from scratch' when implementing the subsidy, but schools involved in later roll out of the subsidy will have far more guidance (based on learnings from the pathfinder) on how the subsidy can be used. Also, it is possible that some of the additional workload relates to the evaluation itself, as taking part in the evaluation (particularly the collection of management information) has taken up some time. The evaluation is only being undertaken amongst pathfinder schools and so will not affect schools involved in later roll out of the subsidy.

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

DfE guidance states that disadvantage subsidy funding should be used to directly support economically disadvantaged children and young people and children in care to access extended services activities, and therefore this funding should not be used to fund the salary of a coordinator or the costs of administration. However, the extended services sustainability funding can be used to support this.

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

In 83 per cent of schools, managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in workload for staff at the school, and workload increases were more common amongst schools following the flexible model than schools following the defined model (88 per cent compared with 73 per cent). This may be due to extra time needed for flexible model schools to identify their target group (section 1.2 showed that some flexible model schools found this difficult) as the flexible definitions of economic disadvantage, usually chosen at cluster level, were less simple than the defined model definition of children in care and those eligible for free school meals. Another possible explanation is that schools following the flexible model had simply done more with the subsidy; sections 7.3 and 7.6 showed that flexible model schools were more likely to have introduced new activities and increased the number of activities on offer than defined model schools.

Larger primary schools (200 pupils or more) were also more likely to report an increase in workload: 87 per cent compared with 79 per cent of smaller primary schools.

Schools that had taken part in the first survey of schools, and who reported that workloads had increased as a result of the subsidy, were asked (at the second survey) whether the increase in workload resulting from the subsidy had become easier or more difficult to manage since the time they were first surveyed²¹: 28 per cent said it had become easier, and a similar proportion (29 per cent) said it had become more difficult, while for 39 per cent there had been no change.

Flexible model schools were a little more likely than those following the defined model to say managing workloads had become easier since they were first surveyed (30 per cent compared with 20 per cent) lending weight to the theory that some of the increase in workload for flexible model schools lay in defining and identifying the target group.

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to say workloads had become more difficult to manage since they were first surveyed (43 per cent compared with 27 per cent).

Most case study schools had experienced an increase in workload for key staff²². The kinds of tasks that had had to be undertaken had varied over the lifetime of the pilot and all but three case study sites had found that workload had decreased somewhat by the second year of operation.

²¹ Fieldwork for the first survey of schools took place in December 2008 to February 2009, and fieldwork for the second survey of schools took place between October and December 2009.

²² Key staff whose workloads had increased included ESRAs, teaching assistants (who ran some of the activities), administrative staff, headteachers and cluster co-ordinators.

Case study school ESRA's found themselves devoting a lot of time to get the subsidy pathfinder up and running, thereby diverting time from other ES activities. Key tasks that had taken up time during the first year had included identifying the target group (particularly time consuming for flexible model sites), awareness raising and consultation on how to run the subsidy with professionals, parents and pupils, and setting up administrative systems for monitoring and accountability of spend. These tasks normally fell to either cluster co-ordinators or those responsible for taking the lead in extended services within schools. The Extended Services Manager for Primary L told us:

'There's more work at the beginning, there's definitely more work I would say in the first year, because I had to be on the ball and making sure that they [schools] were all at the next stage [of implementation] by a certain point... that was the project plan... keeping track of all of that as well as everything else was huge. In future, it wont be as much but you have to keep going in to make sure it's actually happening, and supporting them to develop it.'

Consultation and monitoring had continued to be needed during the second year, and these are tasks that would need to be undertaken on a continuous basis.

Those staff involved in the day to day administration of the subsidy, found that their work did not decrease to any great extent over time, as a number of tasks were ongoing. These tasks included:

- Being available for pupils during the school day, and beyond;
- Making arrangements to contact parents if a session was cancelled;
- Data entry regarding who participated in activities;
- Responding to invoices and ensuring providers were paid;
- Liaising with external providers about systems for payment and safeguarding issues.

Very often, these were not tasks that could be performed during set hours, but needed somebody to be available at all times. The administrator of Secondary K explained that it was hard for her to work out how many hours she devoted to the subsidy:

'It's hard to monitor it properly in a way because obviously dealing with kids, they come down at their breaktime, they come down at their lunchtime, they come down at the end of their day, so it's hard to monitor. You can't allot half an hour at this certain time to do it, it's just throughout the day they're coming to you.'

The ESPC at Secondary I said in relation to workload that:

'It's really time consuming. It's a lack of recognition about how long it takes to actually administer this project in that schools have had to think on their feet if you like and make it the most efficient way to administer. There isn't any chance of being able to tailor everything for everybody because schools don't have the resources to do that. It's not acknowledged in the project (how much it takes to administer)'.

The ES Coordinator in Secondary I agreed when she said about workload:

'The workload has actually got greater because initially, last year, some of the schools did take on doing the activities, organizing them for the children, but they didn't have the capacity in the school office to actually administer all the administration and organize all the activities. So they got to the stage where they said we don't actually want all the money. So, that's when I said, foolishly, I'll take it on. Consequently, our job is pretty much just the subsidy and our jobs as ES Coordinators hasn't totally slipped by the wayside but we are not doing as much as we should for the rest of our normal day jobs'.

ESPC Secondary I:

'As a local authority what we are trying to do for September and also to recognize that whenever you start a project you know it's going to take massive amounts of time, we are actually looking to, we won't ever be able to pay the full amount, but contribute to some of the admin costs in each school. So, we are looking for some money for that. The buy-in from schools, if a school with 70 pupils turned around and said we don't want the money, that would mean 70 children miss out so if we can contribute toward the admin costs then that is going to help with the 'buy-in' from the schools. Then, hopefully, when it's there we'll know what the future holds for the project'.

Administrative costs should not be underestimated. If they are treated as an 'externality', that is, not included in the full costs of managing the disadvantage subsidy, there may be an impact on the quality of provision or as the ESPC suggested above a lack of buy-in from schools which may feel that the disadvantages of running the subsidy outweigh the advantages.

9.2 Types of staff members whose workload has increased

Workloads had most commonly increased amongst administrative or support staff (54 per cent) and headteachers (38 per cent). Table 9.1 shows, for each type of staff member, whether there had been any increase in workload, and whether workloads had increased a lot or a little. In 28 per cent of schools the workload of administrative

or support staff had increased a lot as a result of managing the subsidy funding, and in 17 per cent of schools the workload of the headteacher had increased a lot. For other types of staff it was rarer for there to be a large increase in workloads as a result of managing the subsidy funding.

The types of staff for whom workloads increased varied between primary and secondary schools. In primary schools it was common for the headteachers workload to have increased (44 per cent compared with 16 per cent in secondary schools), whilst in secondary schools increases in workload were more common amongst other members of the senior management team (39 per cent compared with 15 per cent in primary schools) and extended services co-ordinators (26 per cent compared with 10 per cent in primary schools). However, in both primary and secondary schools it was most common for workloads to have increased amongst administrative or support staff, this was the case in 57 per cent of primary schools and 45 per cent of secondary schools.

Table 9.1

Staff members for whom workload has increased as a result of managing the subsidy funding

	Any increase (n=373) %	Increased a lot (n=373) %	Increased a little (n=373) %
Headteacher	38	17	21
Other members of the senior management team	19	10	7
Administrative or support staff	54	28	24
Extended services co-ordinator	12	11	1
Bursar	12	5	6
Teaching staff	9	3	6
Other staff members	12	8	5

Base: All schools responding to the second telephone survey (373)

9.3 What schools have done to cope with additional workload

Where workloads for any staff member had increased, schools were asked what they had done to cope with the additional workload. Some schools had taken measures to increase their resources in order to manage the additional workload:

- Ten per cent had taken on new (temporary) staff.
- Five per cent of schools had sourced extra funding to pay staff for additional workloads.

- Four per cent of schools had enlisted support from an extended services team or appointed an extended services co-ordinator.

However, most schools had coped using existing resources: 45 per cent said staff worked longer hours; 30 per cent re-assigned the workload between staff; and 11 per cent said they 'just got on with it'.

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to re-assign workloads between staff (44 per cent compared with 27 per cent). Whereas respondents at primary schools were more likely to say that staff worked longer hours (48 per cent compared with 33 per cent of secondary schools). One might expect re-allocation of tasks to be more practical in secondary schools due to the larger pool of staff available.

Most case study schools were aware that they could not use the subsidy funding to pay for the administration or organisation of the scheme. The Cluster Co-ordinator of Secondary A appreciated this as all the money was able to be directly aimed at children, and Headteachers did not feel guilty about taking money away from curriculum based activities, and the money could not be diverted to pay for other things:

'I'm all for the idea that the money that came in you weren't allowed to use for admin or anything like that, because that to me was great, and it's one of the best things about it because nobody could pinch it and use it for other things, but that doesn't get away from the fact that somebody's got to do the organisation. They [heads] felt ok about spending it because they didn't feel they were denying elements of the curriculum, but also they knew they'd had money through the clusters for coordination.'

Schools had found a number of ways to cope with the extra work that running the scheme entailed. Some clusters had allocated extra funding from the main Extended Services budget to schools in order to ensure staff could be given extra hours in which to do the work or redirected resources from other projects. Many of the schools had found that by sharing tasks, they were able to limit the load on any one staff member, such as Special School H:

'Initially it was a bit of a nightmare setting it up. It was trial and error. It was making sure the money was accountable and now we've got procedures in place, you know with [HLTA] working and monitoring that side of it. [Teacher] organises the Friday afternoon clubs and ask them what they want, which staff are going where, she does that side of it. [Home/school Liaison Agency Manager] has always done the parenting part of it but that links in very nicely with all this work. And I oversee all the different bits and liaise with [Cluster Coordinator] and the other cluster group members and do the overseeing of the providers' event and that side of things. So now, I think it's great. We've now got it to a

level where we've delegated the various bits and we're now managing quite well. We are now moving forward with the holiday clubs'. (Deputy Head)

Despite the extra work that the subsidy had created, some staff did not mind this, as they felt that the subsidy was a worthwhile project, and fitted in well with the ethos of their school. The Headteacher of Secondary K told us:

'for me it hasn't been like having extra work, it's been something which has energised me, something I can wholeheartedly, 100% believe in as being correct.'

The administrator echoed this view:

'I must admit to be honest with you, it's been lovely to be able to help people who haven't realised the help's there. They haven't realised that they can have this and then they realise that's fabulous, they can send their children on a residential trip or they can do activities that they didn't realise were there, even though you can communicate to the children, you can communicate to the parents as much as you like, but it still sometimes doesn't register with them that they're entitled to that and I must admit it gives you a good buzz.'

9.4 Funding additional workloads

Findings from the case studies showed that, in some cases where staff worked longer hours to implement the subsidy, they did this on a voluntary basis and were not compensated for it. In other schools, some extra funding was used to pay staff for their time.

For example, in Secondary I the sustainability grant for ES was used to cover the cost of additional administration:

'From our point of view we did the launch with the headteachers in the authority, the point we made was well yes, there will be administrative tasks, it will be organisation but you've had the money for that through the sustainability grant for extended services which was money that all the schools got'. (LA)

In Primary D, administrative support was funded from mainstream budgets. In Secondary G and Secondary K, extra hours were given to existing administrative staff and funds redirected from other projects.

In Secondary G, ES leadership staff worked unpaid overtime during the set up phase. In Secondary C also, the additional work was often taken on 'as a gesture of

goodwill' and was unfunded.

In Primary L, TAs were given time off in lieu when running after school clubs, but in practice, rarely took this up due to difficulties in getting away from school.

There was also a heavy impact on workload of Es cluster co-ordinators and ESRAs who incorporated this work into their existing role and duties (issue raised in Primary B, Primary L, Secondary I and Secondary K).

10. Identifying and overcoming challenges

The pathfinder is intended to test the effectiveness of the subsidy, but also to provide learning on the implementation process. It is therefore important to identify any problems or barriers schools involved in the pathfinder faced, and any additional support they required so that these can be addressed for the 'scale-up' of the subsidy. The interim report²³ identified challenges faced by schools in the early stages of the implementation of the subsidy, this chapter looks at the challenges faced by, and additional support needs of schools over the first year or so of using the subsidy funding.

Key findings:

- 43 per cent of schools reported encountering problems or barriers in implementing or using the subsidy funding.
- The most frequently cited problem was the additional workload of organising and running activities.
- Lack of interest from parents; confusion or lack of guidance as to how the subsidy should be used; and pupils schools would like to target not falling under the definition of the target group were also mentioned by notable minorities of schools.

10.1 Challenges faced

Just over two in five schools (43 per cent) reported encountering problems or barriers in implementing or using the subsidy, and this is similar to the proportion reporting this at the first survey of schools.

Schools following the defined model were much more likely than those following the flexible model to have encountered problems or barriers when using the subsidy: 57 per cent of defined model schools had compared with 36 per cent of flexible model schools.

Schools with lower levels of economically disadvantaged pupils were more likely than those with higher levels to have encountered problems or barriers: 48 per cent of schools where less than 20 per cent of pupils were eligible for free school meals, compared with 37 per cent of schools where 20 per cent of pupils or more were eligible for FSM. This may suggest that schools with greater experience of dealing

²³ The interim report is published on DfE's website and can be found at the following link: <http://www.education.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR132.pdf>

with economically disadvantaged pupils found the implementation and use of the subsidy easier.

Where schools had encountered problems or barriers in implementing or using the subsidy, they were asked what these were. Responses to this question are shown in table 10.1. It should be noted that this question was open ended for respondents, so the problems and barriers reported by respondents are likely to be the most 'top of mind' ones. Also, some respondents may not have repeated issues which they felt had already been covered by the questionnaire (such as staff workloads, and pupils they would like to target the subsidy at not being part of the target group).

As the table shows, the most frequently cited problem was the additional workload of organising or running the activities (29 per cent of schools that had encountered problems). There were several other answers that were closely related to this: time; resources; funding for extra work; organisation; and keeping activities running continuously. In total, 39 per cent of schools that had encountered problems, and 17 per cent of all schools mentioned one or more of these as having been a problem.

Section 9.1 showed that 83 per cent of schools found their workload increased by managing the subsidy funding, but only a minority of schools (17 per cent of all schools) mentioned time or resource issues as a particular problem.

Very few schools cited a lack of interest from pupils in the target group, but a lack of interest from parents in the target group was a more common problem. Two-thirds of the schools that found lack of interest from parents was a problem had included parents in their consultation process. Section 3.1 showed that four per cent of schools disagreed that economically disadvantaged pupils were keen to participate in the activities that they offered, suggesting that a lack of interest from pupils was a little more widespread than the one per cent of schools that cited this as a problem.

Section 3.5 showed that 25 per cent of schools agreed there was a sense of stigma which prevents economically disadvantaged pupils from participating in activities. However, the stigma of receiving the subsidy was only cited as a particular problem by nine per cent of schools that had encountered problems (four per cent of all schools). Section 3.5 also looks at strategies used to avoid stigmatisation.

Amongst schools that had encountered problems or barriers, 14 per cent cited pupils they would like to target not falling under the definition of the target group. This is an increase since the first survey of schools when four per cent of schools that had encountered problems mentioned this. Schools following the defined model had already been asked whether there were pupils they thought ought to be included in the target group that were not, 93 per cent said this was the case, as shown in section 1.3. However, some of the schools that cited this issue here were following the flexible model.

Identifying which pupils to target the subsidy at was a problem for nine per cent of schools that had encountered a problem (four per cent of all schools). Section 1.2

showed that 22 per cent of schools following the flexible model had found it quite or very difficult to identify which pupils should be included in their target group, but this was evidently only a 'top of mind' problem for a small minority of schools. However, it was not just schools following the flexible model that thought identifying pupils was a problem, some were following the defined model. Although the definition of the target group for the defined model is more straightforward (pupils eligible for free school meals and children in care), schools only know whether a pupil is eligible for free school meals if their family has applied. Previous research²⁴ suggests that not all eligible families do apply for free school meals (either because they do not realise they are eligible, or they choose not to apply), so school staff may suspect that other pupils are eligible for free school meals, but their families have not applied.

Schools involved in the case studies had reported an increase in the number of families applying for free school meals which they directly attributed to the subsidy. These schools thought that when parents realised that if their child was eligible for free school meals, they would also be eligible for free or discounted activities and trips, this gave parents the additional motivation needed to come forward and apply for free school meals.

Another problem was confusion or lack of guidance as to how the subsidy should be used (17 per cent of schools that had encountered problems, eight per cent of all schools). It is likely that this issue stems from this being a pathfinder - additional guidance and learnings from the pathfinder have been developed to help schools involved in later stages of the rollout of the subsidy.

²⁴ 'Improving the take up of free school meals', DfEE research report No. 270, Pamela Storey and Rosemary Chamberlain, May 2001.

Table 10.1

Problems or barriers encountered by schools when implementing and using the subsidy

	Schools that had problems	All schools
	(n=161) %	(n=373) %
Additional workload of organising /running activities	29	12
Lack of interest from parents in target group	20	9
Confusion/ lack of guidance as to how subsidy should be used	17	8
Pupils you would like to target do not fall under the definition of the target group	14	6
Identifying which pupils to target the subsidy at	9	4
Parents or pupils embarrassed to be seen as receiving funding /stigma	9	4
Dealing with external providers/finding organisations to provide activities	8	3
Transport difficulties	7	3
Dealing with others that are unhappy about missing out/not being part of target group/not excluding the other children	7	3
Time	6	2
Resources	4	2
Lack of interest from pupils in target group	3	1
Getting information across to staff and/or parents	2	1
Children/young people do not want to take part in activities based at school	2	1
All extended schools activities were already free before the subsidy	2	1
Problems working with other schools	2	1
Funding for extra work /administration/extra wages	2	1
Organisation	2	1
Keeping activities running continuously/quality	1	1
Other Answers	14	6
Don't know	1	*

Base: All schools that encountered problems or barriers when implementing the subsidy (161)/All schools (373)

10.2 How challenges have been overcome

Schools who had encountered problems were asked how the problems had been overcome. As might be expected, the ways in which schools had overcome challenges were closely related to the challenges they had faced, and can be grouped into themes. The first theme related to ways in which schools had overcome challenges with resourcing and workloads:

- Staff working harder/longer hours - 11 per cent
- Just working through it/determination/hard work etc - 10 per cent
- Appoint a person/extra member of staff to deal with it - six per cent
- Get more people involved and delegate tasks - six per cent
- Consult/help from LEA - six per cent
- We use an Extended Schools coordinator - five per cent
- Worked in partnership with other schools - four per cent
- Have used existing staff but at the expense of something else - two per cent
- Use of Family Support Worker - two per cent

Another theme that emerged was around communicating with parents and pupils and promoting activities:

- By talking to parents - 11 per cent
- Good communication/relationship with families - six per cent
- Awareness of families situations/who needs help - six per cent
- Make sure information gets to those who need it - four per cent
- Personal contact/informal chats/one to ones - three per cent
- Empathy/some parents embarrassed to receive subsidiaries - two per cent
- Showing the benefits for the children - two per cent
- By talking to the children - two per cent
- Newsletters - two per cent
- Have taster sessions - one per cent

A third theme related to the use of the money itself (and using additional funding):

- Absorbed costs/paid for ourselves/subsidised where possible - six per cent
- More awareness of how funding can be used/for whom/flexibility - five per cent
- Looked at (different) ways of using the money - four per cent
- Negotiation with providers - three per cent

Other answers given were:

- Still working on it - eight per cent
- Working through any problems with transport - four per cent
- Had discussions with the Cluster Manager - three per cent
- Widened the provisions available - one per cent
- Offer clubs before school/lunch time - one per cent

Percentages shown above are the proportions of schools who had encountered problems that had given each answer.

10.3 Additional support required

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

Overall 78 per cent of schools did require some additional support, and this is the same as the proportion of schools that said additional support was required at the first survey of schools.

Many of the responses given related to the problems and barriers mentioned in section 10.1. In particular, the most commonly mentioned types of additional support needed, help with administration (28 per cent), funding or assistance for school staff for the additional workload (10 per cent) and someone to co-ordinate the whole thing (five per cent).

The other main theme emerging from these responses is that schools would like more guidance including: lists of providers and activities that could be offered (five per cent), sharing experiences with other schools (five per cent), clearer guidelines on what the money can be spent on (four per cent), and case studies/someone with experience to guide them through it (three per cent).

Table 10.2

Additional support required by schools in order to implement and use the subsidy effectively

	All schools
	(n=373)
	%
Need someone to do the admin/ cover administration costs	28
More flexibility on how to use money/to be able to target/include children who are on the borderline/look into eligibility criteria	13
Money/ remuneration/ assistance for school staff in time given to implementing the subsidy	10
Being told whether the subsidy/ funding will continue in the future	7
Need more time to set up activities	6
For funding to continue	6
Lists of providers and activities that can be offered	5
A (local/external) co-ordinator/need someone to co-ordinate the whole thing/cover co-ordinating costs	5
Support from other schools, sharing the experience	5
Need help/money for transport	5
Clearer guidelines on what the money can be spent on	4
Less bureaucracy/less paperwork	3
More support from LA	3
Need someone with experience to help guide us through it/ case studies	3
More funding/more money	3
Training for staff	1
Other Answers	16
None required/no answer	19
Don't know	3

Base: All schools (373)

11. Cost of provision

Key findings:

- The average hourly cost per pupil of activities was slightly more than average private sector child care costs but less than average private sector 'specialist activities' (e.g. sports coaching, drama)
- There were big differences between schools in average hourly costs but these were only systematically related to the proportion of 'one-off' and summer activities, which were, on average, more expensive.
- The interview data suggested that the willingness of schools to partially fund activities from other budgets and 'voluntary labour' from staff may also have contributed to cost variations.
- Roughly one fifth of the subsidy was recorded as 'unspent'. The interview evidence suggest this was due in part to 'teething problems' as schools learned how to use the money effectively. In addition, 'unspent subsidy' was eleven percentage points higher for schools whose subsidy was mediated by a local authority.
- There was some evidence from the interviews that schools were becoming increasingly conscious of cost variations and were taking these into account in their current decisions.

The telephone survey of schools was not considered an appropriate vehicle for gathering detailed information on costs. Questions on how the subsidy money had been spent for the 2008/2009 academic year were therefore included in the final collection of management information from schools. Initial analysis of this quantitative data was used to help identify 12 schools that were then followed up with qualitative interviews focusing on how subsidy money had been spent. This chapter includes findings from both the analysis of management information on costs, and the qualitative interviews.

The two data sources are complementary: initial analysis of the quantitative data helped with the creation of a topic guide for the qualitative interviews (as well as helping to identify which schools to include in the qualitative stage); and qualitative data has been used to help interpret and explain quantitative findings, as well as suggesting hypotheses to be examined in the quantitative data.

Written case studies on each of the 12 schools included in the qualitative interviews can be found in appendix 2.

11.1 Method

The quantitative evidence used in this evaluation allows investigation of variation in the cost of providing each per pupil hour of subsidised activity in the context of extended schooling. It does not, however, allow investigation of variation in the value to pupils, parents and schools of this activity. Participation in one kind of activity might yield more benefit per hour than participation in another activity. Headteachers and others interviewed in the course of this evaluation referred to a range of benefits which they believed had occurred or hoped would occur. However, schools did not report that they were gathering measurable evidence to check these beliefs and expectations. Nor were they systematically matching evidence they did have (such as attendance, exclusion and achievement data) to children's levels of participation in subsidised activities. So it is possible that variation in hourly cost of activities reflects differences between high and low benefit activities. However, both the quantitative and the qualitative evidence tend to suggest otherwise.

This part of the evaluation addresses four questions:

- [1] What affects the amount of the subsidy that was unspent?
- [2] What affects the kind of activities that schools choose to organise?
- [3] What affects the kind of resources that are bought with the subsidy?
- [4] What affects the overall hourly cost of the activities organised?

The quantitative data were provided by schools participating in the pathfinder. Each school was asked to provide 'management information' which recorded how many children had participated for how many hours in different kinds of activity. Schools were also asked to report how much of the subsidy had been used in each of five different ways: on external providers, transport, equipment, venue hire and 'other'. The extent of incomplete returns substantially reduced the sample sizes in the analysis.

The quantitative data were also only available at school level. Therefore, it is not possible to check the extent to which hours of activity are multiple hours for a particular child or hours spread more thinly across several children. Also, it is not possible to relate costs to benefits since these are largely expected to accrue to individual children. A minority of schools referred in the interviews to ways in which they were (or were considering) measuring outcomes through, for example, attendance, exclusion and achievement data. There is considerable potential for relating costs and benefits through such data which are collected in schools.

The management data did enable analysis of costs per hour of pupil activity and variation in the way that schools used the subsidy.

Estimates of total participation hours per school were calculated by:

- (i) Total hours of participation in *breakfast clubs* = $39 \times (P_{n1} \times 0.5 + P_{n2} \times 2.5 + P_{n3} \times 7 + P_{n4} \times 12 + P_{n5} \times 16)$ (where P_{n1} = number of pupils participating for between 0 and 1 hours, P_{n2} = number of pupils participating for between 1

and 4 hours, P_{n3} =number of pupils participating for between 5 and 9 hours, P_{n4} =number of pupils participating for between 10 and 14 hours, P_{n5} =number of pupils participating for 15 or more hours).

- (ii) Total hours of participation in *regular activities* = $39*(P_{m1} *0.5 + P_{m2} *1+ P_{m3} *2+ P_{m4} *3+ P_{m5} *4.5)$ (where P_{m1} =number of pupils participating for between 0 and 1 hours, P_{m2} =number of pupils participating for about hour, P_{m3} =number of pupils participating for about 2 hours, P_{m4} =number of pupils participating for about 3 hours, P_{m5} =number of pupils participating for 4 or more hours).
- (iii) Total hours of participation in 'One-off activities' = Termly hours * 3
- (iv) Total Hours of holiday participation = Summer holiday hours *1.5
- (v) Total annual hours of pupil participation= (i)+(ii)+(iii)+(iv)

Average hourly cost was then calculated by subtracting unspent subsidy from the amount initially allocated and then dividing this figure by the reported total hours of pupil activity. Only 114 of the schools provided sufficient data to allow calculation of average hourly cost of activities for target children. We therefore examined whether there were any significant differences between the schools that returned sufficient data and those that did not. We found two significant differences. Schools that did not return sufficient data (a) were less likely to have their pathfinder funding mediated by the local authority or a cluster consortium and (b) tended to spend a higher proportion of their funding on equipment.

In some instances the local authority invited schools to prepare bids for funding for specific projects and the management information was returned to a local authority co-ordinator. In some of these instances one co-ordinator acted on behalf of all the schools in that authority and in other authorities 'extended school co-ordinators' returned information for a cluster of schools they were working with. Based on the qualitative evidence we divided the schools into two groups (i) where management information was returned by the representative of an individual school and (ii) where management information was returned by a local authority or school cluster co-ordinator. From our qualitative evidence we infer that schools' access to funding was 'mediated' in the second of these cases, creating the possibility that this would lead to differences in the way that the money was spent and average hourly cost of activity.

Of the total sample 169 schools provided sufficient information to allow detailed analysis of how money was spent. Of these cases, 101 schools returned their own management information and cluster or local authority co-ordinators returned management information for the other 68.

The qualitative data were gathered through twelve telephone interviews with headteachers. Each interview was (with the consent of the interviewee) digitally recorded for subsequent analysis. A summary of the conversation including the key themes identified in the analysis was sent to each interviewee for checking for accuracy and emphasis. These schools were selected by dividing the schools into

four groups according to their average hourly cost: with schools in Group 1 having the lowest hourly cost (significantly below the average) and schools in Group 4 having the highest average hourly cost (significantly above the average). For Groups 1 and 4 data were collected from four schools. For Groups 2 and 3 data were collected from two schools. The schools were chosen within the four groups to provide a range of school size and location whilst concentrating on those schools for which the nominated person returning the management information was the headteacher.

The analysis of the qualitative data suggested several themes which we present in the form of questions which we subsequently grouped in relation to our four main questions.

11.2 Results

The results are presented in relation to four main questions:

- [1] What affects the amount of the subsidy that was unspent?
- [2] What affects the kind of activities that schools choose to organise?
- [3] What affects the kind of resources are bought with the subsidy?
- [4] What affects the overall hourly cost of the activities organised?

Each section focuses on the quantitative evidence from management information provided by the schools. The interpretation of this evidence draws on the qualitative evidence from interviews with headteachers and assistant headteachers.

How much of the subsidy was unspent?

A substantial proportion of the subsidy was unspent during 2008/2009. The average percentage of unspent money was 19 per cent (with a standard deviation of 29 percentage points).

We investigated factors that might affect the likelihood that a school would not spend all its allocated funding:

- **School size:** one possibility is that larger schools would be more flexible in their ability to spend the money and would be more used to dealing with additional grants. However, it is also possible that an additional grant would be more precious to a small school because it might make a larger difference at the margin.
- **Amount of funding received per target group pupil:** A second possibility considered is that schools which received a larger grant (after taking into account the size of school) would be more likely to leave some unspent, as, whilst schools are getting used to managing a subsidy they might find it difficult to allocate and this problem will increase as the size of grant increases.

- **Proportion of pupils eligible for FSM:** we also considered the possibility that schools with a lower proportion of students eligible for free school meals might regard the subsidy as a lower priority in their planning, making it more likely that some money might be unspent.
- **Funding mediated by the local authority:** finally, it is possible that schools where the allocation of funding is mediated by the local authority might be more likely to leave money unspent since (a) they may be less sure of what they could spend money on and therefore not spend up to their limit and (b) they are not able to vire the use of the money into other purposes.

Of these variables only the last one proved significant in a multivariate regression. However, the effect size for this variable was high: schools whose subsidy was mediated by the local authority had on average an 'unspent' figure that was eleven percentage points higher than that for other schools. It could be that this is just a problem in the first stages of an initiative, and some of the interviewees (notably those with higher cost providers) referred to difficulties they had experienced in getting their programmes started.

What affects the kind of activities that schools choose to organise?

Data were collected on hours of participation in four types of activity:

- Breakfast and after school clubs
- Regular activities
- One-off term time activities
- Holiday activities

From a supply side one might anticipate that a school has to divide its provision between these different activity types. More of one would mean less of another. From a demand side we might envisage that the same pupils would be interested in participating in more than one of these activities. In this case we would expect positive associations between attendance levels in the different activities. In fact what we find no negative correlations and significant positive associations between each of the activities except between levels of participation in holiday activities and breakfast clubs. The stronger correlations are between total breakfast club hours and total 'regular activities hours (.61) and a positive association between one-off term-time activities and holiday activities (.62). Factors affecting the percentage hours devoted to different types of activity are presented in Table 11.1. Due to the relatively lower proportion of hours allocated to one-off and holiday activities, these are combined in the final column. The average split of time was roughly 40 per cent for each of breakfast clubs and regular activities and 20 per cent one-off and summer activities.

The explanatory variables included in Table 11.1 were chosen on the basis that characteristics of the school and the funding received might affect the way in which the funds were allocated. That is:

- We might expect larger schools to have more scope for organising specialist one-off events to which they could attract a sufficient group of children to make them viable;
- We might expect schools with a higher proportion of FSM children to place more importance on providing a breakfast club;
- Local authority mediation might have encouraged devoting a higher proportion of the subsidy to regular events;
- Schools with higher levels of funding per child might have more scope for arranging expensive one-off activities;
- We might expect rural schools would face more difficulty in organising breakfast and after-school activities due to the distance that children travel to the school.

Table 11.1

Factors affecting type of activities: percentage of hours in different types of activities

	Breakfast clubs	Regular activities	One-off and summer activities
	(n=117)	(n=116)	(n=116)
Constant	14.88 (0.146)	58.49 (<0.001)	27.19 (0.001)
School size	-0.004 (0.63)	-0.006 (0.357)	0.012 (0.065)
Percentage of pupils in school FSM	0.895 (0.001)	-0.364 (0.09)	-0.46 (0.024)
Funding mediated by LA (=1 if funding is mediated by the LA, otherwise = 0)	-1.77 (0.77)	-7.86 (0.12)	6.63 (0.17)
Per target pupil level of subsidy	0.049 (0.16)	-0.43 (0.13)	-0.022 (0.42)
Rural school (=1 if the school is in a rural area, otherwise =0)	14.93 (0.026)	-8.01 (0.15)	-5.65 (0.28)
R ²	0.123	0.076	0.098

Base: All schools providing sufficiently detailed management information on costs

NB: Figures in brackets show the probability the relationship is random. Findings in bold are those that are statistically significant at the 95 per cent confidence level.

How to interpret table 11.1

The table is showing the coefficients and significance values for multiple linear regression equations. So, for breakfast clubs, the percentage of hours pupils spent in breakfast clubs (as a proportion of hours pupils spent in all kinds of activities) is equal to:

- The constant (14.88)
- Minus the number of pupils in the school (school size) multiplied by 0.004 (because this has a negative coefficient it means that as the size of the school increases, the percentage of hours spent in breakfast clubs decreases – although this is not statistically significant)
- Plus the percentage of pupils in the school eligible for FSM multiplied by 0.895 (because this has a positive coefficient it means that as the percentage of FSM pupils in the school increases, the percentage of hours spent in breakfast clubs increases)
- Minus 1.77 if funding is mediated by the LA
- Plus the amount of funding allocated to the school per target pupil, multiplied by 0.049
- Plus 14.93 if the school is a rural school

The numbers in brackets are the probabilities that the relationship is random. If this figure is less than 0.05 then there is only a five per cent chance that the relationship is random, and so we consider the finding to be statistically significant with 95 per cent confidence.

The R^2 value is a measure of how much of the variance in the percentage of hours spent in the activity type can be explained by the variables included in the model. So, for breakfast clubs, 12.3 per cent of the variance is explained. This is reasonably low (although R^2 values rarely get higher than around 0.3 (or 30 per cent) in social research), and shows there are other factors influencing the proportion of hours spent in breakfast clubs.

The factor which appears to have exerted more effect is the proportion of children eligible for free school meals. Schools with higher proportions of pupils eligible for FSM tended to devote more time to breakfast clubs, and less time to one-off and holiday activities than schools with lower proportions of pupils eligible for FSM. The average FSM percentage was 17 with a standard deviation of 12. So, on average, schools with an FSM percentage one standard deviation above the mean devoted just over ten percentage points more of their activities to Breakfast Clubs and just under six less percentage points of their activities were in the form of one-off activities.

Contrary to initial expectations, rural schools were more likely than schools in urban areas to devote time to breakfast clubs: rural schools had a much higher rate (about 15 percentage points) of activity devoted to breakfast clubs.

There is a slight suggestion that larger schools offered more one-off activities (although this is not significant at the 95 per cent confidence level).

What affects the kind of resources that are bought with the subsidy?

The management information collected from schools showed how they had distributed their spending between several categories: external providers, transport, equipment, venue hire and other.

Over half the spending was on external providers and the variation across schools in this form of spending was large. Fifteen per cent of schools spent more than 90 per cent of their subsidy on external providers. We might expect that smaller schools would be more inclined to spend a high proportion on external resources as they are less likely to have the facilities and expertise to provide a range of activities. Schools with a higher proportion of FSM pupils might be more focused on providing childcare which would not place as large a demand on external providers. Alternatively, these schools might want to spend more on external providers as part of a strategy to widen the range of experiences available to these children.

There was a large variation in the proportion of the subsidy used by schools to purchase equipment. We might expect that schools that are less subject to local authority mediation would be more inclined to purchase equipment which would then be available for other uses within the school.

We might also, as noted earlier, expect rural schools to spend more on transport.

An analysis of these factors is presented in Table 11.2.

Table 11.2

Factors affecting how the subsidy was used: percentage of money spent on different areas

	External providers	Transport	Equipment	Venue hire	Other
	(n=149)	(n=149)	(n=149)	(n=149)	(n=148)
Constant	60.39 (<0.001)	4.09 (0.092)	0.257 (0.95)	0.78 (0.68)	17.55 (0.005)
School size	-0.016 (0.032)	0.00 (0.76)	0.006 (0.076)	0.003 (0.049)	0.002 (0.70)
Percentage of pupils in school FSM	-0.27 (0.22)	0.039 (0.53)	-0.066 (0.49)	0.052 (0.29)	0.164 (0.30)
Funding mediated by LA (=1 if funding is mediated by the LA, otherwise = 0)	9.40 (0.062)	0.84 (0.55)	-6.44 (0.003)	-2.23 (0.046)	-6.04 (0.098)
Per target pupil level of subsidy	-0.022 (0.44)	0.002 (0.78)	0.04 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.72)	-0.015 (0.47)
Rural school (=1 if the school is in a rural area, otherwise =0)	3.52 (0.55)	3.26 (0.053)	5.15 (0.047)	1.28 (0.33)	-1.07 (0.80)
R ²	0.078	0.03	0.15	0.06	0.03

Base: All schools providing sufficiently detailed management information on costs

NB: Figures in brackets show the probability the relationship is random. Findings in bold are those that are statistically significant at the 95 per cent confidence level.

How to interpret table 11.2

The table is showing the coefficients and significance values for multiple linear regression equations. So, for external providers, the percentage of subsidy money spent on external providers (as a proportion of all subsidy money spent) is equal to:

- The constant (60.39)
- Minus the number of pupils in the school (school size) multiplied by 0.016 (because this has a negative coefficient it means that as the size of the school increases the percentage of money spent on external providers decreases, whereas for venue hire the coefficient is positive, so as the size of the school increases, the percentage of money spent on venue hire increases)
- Minus the percentage of pupils in the school eligible for FSM multiplied by 0.27
- Plus 9.40 if funding is mediated by the LA
- Minus the amount of funding allocated to the school per target pupil, multiplied by 0.022
- Plus 3.52 if the school is a rural school

The numbers in brackets are the probabilities that the relationship is random. If this figure is less than 0.05 then there is only a five per cent chance that the relationship is random, and so we consider the finding to be statistically significant with 95 per cent confidence.

The R^2 value is a measure of how much of the variance in the percentage of money spent on the cost area can be explained by the variables included in the model. So, for external providers, 7.8 per cent of the variance is explained. This is reasonably low (although R^2 values rarely get higher than around 0.3 (or 30 per cent) in social research), and shows there are other factors influencing the proportion of money spent on external providers.

These models explain a fairly small proportion of the variation in the dependent variables, so it is important to be cautious in the weight attached to the results.

These suggest that larger schools did rely less on external providers: because the coefficient for this is negative, as the size of the school increases, the percentage of the subsidy spent on external providers decreases. The average size of school in the sample was 383 and the standard deviation was 327. So a school one standard deviation above the mean tended to spend about five percentage points less on external providers and tended to spend about one percentage point more on venue hire.

Schools whose subsidy allocation was mediated by the local authority tended to spend less on equipment hire and venue hire than schools where the subsidy was not mediated by the local authority: about six and a half percentage points less on equipment and two percentage points less on venue hire. It appears that they may have spent considerably more of their subsidy money on external providers than schools where funding is not mediated by the local authority, although this relationship is not statistically significant at the 95 per cent confidence level.

Schools with a higher per target pupil subsidy tended to spend more than those with lower levels of funding per target pupil on equipment. The average per target pupil subsidy was £181, with the standard deviation being 87. So a school with a per target pupil subsidy one standard deviation above the mean tended to spend about three and a half percentage points more on equipment.

Rural schools, as expected, tended to spend (about three percentage points) more on transport, and also tended to spend more on equipment than schools in urban areas.

What affects the overall hourly cost of the activities organised?

According to the Daycare Trust the typical cost in England to a parent of an 'after school club' was £2.87 an hour in 2008 falling to £2.67 an hour in 2009²⁵. It might be imagined the specialist activities such as football coaching, drama or ballet would be more expensive. But this is not necessarily so. Some football coaching can be accessed for hourly rates of £2.00-£3.00²⁶, drama clubs advertise hourly rates usually a little higher at around £4.50²⁷. It is, therefore, pertinent to ask whether the resources provided through the extended schools' pathfinder initiative achieved a cost per hour of activity that was greater or lower than these figures.

Schools provided information on the participation rates of targeted pupils and the following calculations use these data. However, schools reported that 'non-target' pupils also took part in the activities, commonly (from the qualitative interview evidence) at a ratio of one non-target child for every 'target' child. 'Non-target' children were usually asked to pay fees to cover the cost of their participation, but even in these cases the fees were sometimes subsidised from other school funds. Conversely, schools also reported that they absorbed some costs (such as the hours contributed by senior managers and, in some cases, hours of teaching assistants) of the additional activities into their main school budget.

It is, therefore, rather difficult to judge whether the 'hourly per child' cost calculations based on the target pupils alone over- or under-estimate the full costs. In addition, about a quarter of the schools provided insufficient data to be included in a comparison of total hours of activity per total subsidy. For these reasons the following calculations need to be treated with some caution.

We calculated the cost per hour activity at school level by dividing the subsidy that was spent (subsidy per school- subsidy unspent) for that school by the total number of hours of pupil activity recorded by the school. The average school level cost was £3.29 per hour of activity.

If the rate of participation of 'non-target' children in the activities was greater than one 'free' 'non-target' child to every five 'target children' then the hourly cost for all participating children would fall below the average hourly cost of after school clubs calculated by the Daycare Trust.

²⁵ Data gathered on the basis of a survey and published on the Daycare Trust web site at http://daycaretrust.datagate.net.uk/mod.php?mod=userpage&menu=1003&page_id=7

²⁶ Whiterose football coaching available online at http://www.whiterosesoccer.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=43&Itemid=41; Leyland Football Coaching available online at <http://courses.vivastreet.co.uk/sport+leyland-pr25/saturday-football-coaching/16036139>

²⁷ Etch Drama Club, London available online at http://www.etchkids.co.uk/index.php?option=com_virtuemart&Itemid=4&vmcchk=1&Itemid=4 Brighton Academy of Creative Training Available online at http://www.actbrighton.org/summer_school_akt.php

Whether the activities organised by schools represented good value for money depends on (a) the rate of participation of subsidised non-target pupils; (b) whether the activities provided greater benefits for children, parents and families than typical after school care; and (c) whether the targeting of participation contributed to equity in a way that could not have been achieved more efficiently through other means.

There was a large variation in hourly cost from one school to another. The minimum reported cost was a mere 23 pence per hour and 99 per cent of schools reported costs per hour of below £10, although there was one outlier at £100 per hour. Most schools (83 per cent) were clustered in the 0-£5 range. We examined the possible effects of several groups of factors on this hourly cost:

It seems probable that schools failing to provide sufficient data had levels of pupil participation that were no more than the average of those schools which did provide sufficient data. Reassuringly, this does indicate a strong relationship between level of subsidy and hours of pupil activity.

The funding for extended services received by a school varied between £400 and £88,000 with an average of £15,434 and a standard deviation of £16,639. In the context of typical school budgets the average figure is very small and might be expected to have a marginal effect on the behaviour and outcomes of a school.

We might expect the average hourly cost of extended schools activities to vary according to the following variables:

- *The school size.* Larger schools might have been able to achieve some economies of scale in their use of the subsidy, thus reducing average hourly cost.
- *Number of children in the target group:* Economies of scale might have been dependent on the size of the target group rather than the size of the school as a whole.
- *The per target pupil level of subsidy.* The per target child subsidy varies between schools, so schools which received a higher rate of subsidy per child might have been inclined to opt for more expensive activities.
- *Local authority mediation of the allocation of subsidy.* When the allocation of the subsidy was mediated by a local authority or cluster co-ordinator there might have been stronger pressure to achieve value for money in terms of lower hourly costs.
- *Rural school.* Rural schools may be expected to face higher transport costs raising the average cost per hour of activity.
- *The proportion of money spent on different types of resource: e.g. external providers, transport, equipment, venue hire.* If the school faces internal

capacity constraints it is possible that providing activities is dependent on devoting more resources to buying in external providers. The interview data found that two of the highest cost providers had devoted a large proportion of their subsidy to the purchase of equipment.

- *Proportion of activities in the form of one-off activities and after school activities as opposed to breakfast clubs.* Breakfast clubs are more akin to child care, whilst the regular activities and one-off activities are more akin to specialized activities such as drama and sports clubs. If the hourly costs reflect those in the private sector we would expect the breakfast clubs to be cheaper.

Table 11.3

Factors affecting the average hourly cost of activities

	(n=118)
Constant	-6.78 (0.23)
School size	-0.003 (0.44)
Number of Children in Target Group	0.007 (0.51)
Funding mediated by LA (=1 if funding is mediated by the LA, otherwise = 0)	2.53 (0.28)
Per target pupil level of subsidy	0.007 (0.64)
Rural school (=1 if the school is in a rural area, otherwise =0)	3.03 (0.21)
Percentage of subsidy spent on external providers	0.057 (0.20)
Percentage of subsidy spent on transport	-0.076 (0.60)
Percentage of subsidy spent on equipment	0.064 (0.42)
Percentage of subsidy spent on venue hire	0.085 (0.57)
Percentage of subsidy spent on other	-0.022 (0.68)
Percentage of activity hours in the form of regular activities	0.082 (0.062)
Percentage of activity hours in the form of one-off (and summer) activities	0.13 (0.005)
R ²	0.134

Base: All schools providing sufficiently detailed management information on costs

NB: Figures in brackets show the probability the relationship is random. Findings in bold are those that are statistically significant at the 95 per cent confidence level.

How to interpret table 11.3

Like tables 11.1 and 11.2, the table is showing the coefficients and significance values for a multiple linear regression equation (this time the equation gives the average hourly cost of activities), and the coefficients, significance values and R^2 value should be interpreted in the same way (see explanatory box beneath table 11.1 or 11.2 for further details).

Table 11.3 suggests that the only factor (of those examined) affecting the average hourly cost was choice of type of activity. One-off and summer activities were relatively more expensive. The average percentage of activities in the form of one-off and summer activities was nineteen, with a standard deviation of six. So, schools where the proportion of activity in the form of one-off activities was one standard deviation above the mean had, on average, an hourly cost that was higher by eighty pence (therefore about 25 per cent higher than the average hourly cost).

A comparison of the qualitative data from the lowest and highest cost providers suggested some other possible reasons for the differences in per pupil hourly cost. Two of the lowest cost providers indicated that their schools had provided substantial subsidies (from other budgets and from donated labour of school staff) towards the pathfinder activities. Two of these lowest cost providers also stressed the role of activity co-ordinators who managed their programmes. Conversely, two of the highest cost providers had experienced some difficulties in managing activities as a result of staff absence and turnover.

12. Summary of differences between the flexible and defined models

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

Table 12.1

Differences between the flexible and defined models		
	Flexible model	Defined model
	(n=250)	(n=123)
Proportion (%) of schools that agreed “the definition of disadvantage that we use is an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils”	70	39
Proportion (%) of schools that thought the target group definition they use is very or quite effective in enabling them to reach children who cannot afford to pay	84	66
Proportion (%) of schools that had consulted parents or pupils in the target group about the kinds of extended services they would like to be offered using the subsidy	88	82
Proportion (%) of schools that agreed “we struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils in extended school activities”	24	33
On a scale of 0 to 10, the effect the subsidy has had so far on participation rates of the target group – average score	7.2	6.2
On a scale of 0 to 10, the effect it is expected the subsidy will have in the future on participation rates of the target group – average score	8.3	7.4
Amongst schools that had charged for (some) activities before the subsidy, the proportion (%) of schools that had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy ²⁸	65	43
Proportion (%) of schools that work with external providers to provide activities	96	90
Proportion (%) of schools where the subsidy had enabled the school to increase the number of activities it offers to economically disadvantaged pupils	94	76
Proportion (%) of schools where the subsidy had enabled the school to improve the quality of its provision for economically disadvantaged pupils	90	76

²⁸ These figures are based on a subsample (schools that said at the first survey they had charged for activities before the introduction of the subsidy), this was 148 schools following the flexible model and 68 schools following the defined model.

Proportion (%) of schools where the subsidy had enabled the school to provide new activities for economically disadvantaged pupils	94	81
Proportion (%) of schools where managing the subsidy funding had caused an increase in staff workloads	88	73
Proportion (%) of schools that had encountered problems or barriers when implementing or using the subsidy	36	57

Base: All schools responding to the second telephone survey (373)

These differences show that schools following the flexible model were much more likely to think the target group definition they were using was effective than defined model schools. There were also notable differences in what the schools on the different models had achieved, with flexible model schools generally showing the subsidy having had a higher effect on participation rates, and being more likely to have improved activities and introduced new activities. Possibly related to this, flexible model schools were also more likely than defined model schools to report an increase in staff workload as a result of the subsidy.

Defined model schools were more likely to struggle to engage economically disadvantaged pupils, and more likely to encounter problems when using the subsidy.

This would suggest that, overall, schools following the flexible model have made better use of the subsidy than those following the defined model.

13. Conclusions and implications for policy

This chapter is based around the research questions that this evaluation endeavoured to answer. Answers to the research questions are summarised and conclusions drawn where relevant.

How best to target the funding at those disadvantaged pupils who would most benefit?

Schools following the flexible model were generally much more positive about the effectiveness of their target group definition than schools following the defined model. A notable minority (19 per cent) of schools following the defined model were particularly negative: both disagreeing that the defined model definition of economic disadvantage was an effective way of engaging economically disadvantaged pupils, and saying that it was not effective in enabling them to reach children who cannot afford to pay.

There was also a feeling (amongst schools on both the flexible and defined model) that it is important to have an element of discretion around the definition of the target group so that school staff can use the subsidy to fund individuals who they think need the funding, even though that pupil might not fall within the criteria of the target group. There were some advantages to the defined model identified by schools: having clear criteria put them in a strong position to know who should be getting the subsidy and made the situation easier to explain to parents who might be unhappy that their child was not subsidised; coming up with a definition of the target group could be time consuming, and following the defined model relieved schools of this burden. Overall though, a flexible definition of economic disadvantage appears to be more advantageous.

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

Many schools following the defined model struggled with the fixed hours requirements of the model. Defined model schools had some success in getting economically disadvantaged pupils to take part in two hours of activities a week during term time, but at most defined model schools few pupils had taken up 30 hours of activities during the school holidays. Amongst flexible model schools involved in the case studies, some thought they would have had less success with the subsidy if they had been trying to fulfil the defined model hours requirement. Some schools had tried using an element of compulsion in the amount of time children are expected to participate in extended schools activities in order to meet hours requirements. This would seem to be inadvisable - children often have other considerations such as homework, studying for exams and family commitments as well as existing activities to plan for.

Findings from the evaluation therefore suggest that it is more advantageous to ensure that schools and pupils should have flexibility over the hours of activities offered and taken up.

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

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

Most schools involved in the pathfinder had embraced the importance of consultation. There was a recognition that, particularly to engage harder to reach parents and pupils, it is necessary to use a range of consultation techniques. Undertaking surveys of parents and pupils was considered to be useful, but schools also saw the need to be active in talking to parents and pupils to seek out their views. Informal conversations between school staff and parents was both the most common form of consultation schools used with parents, and the one deemed most effective – although only 14 per cent of parents said they wished to be consulted in this way.

Innovative approaches such as running 'taster sessions' and inviting parents to coffee mornings to discuss activities were time consuming, but considered effective by some schools.

However, despite the range of techniques used to consult, only around half of parents were aware of consultation taking place, and around a quarter recalled being consulted themselves. This highlights the difficulties schools face in involving parents.

Consultation can be a difficult process and often happens sporadically as time becomes available. In order to fully include children and families consultation must be systematic and ongoing and utilise a range of methods as projects evolve and develop.

What is the current practice on charging for activities, and have any changes been brought about by making funding available specifically for the most disadvantaged children and young people?

Few schools were charging economically disadvantaged pupils for any activities and a third of schools were offering activities free to all pupils. Around half of schools had changed their charging practices as a result of the subsidy (with stopping charging pupils in the target group being the most common change made).

Charging policies are a complex area. While on the one hand, universal free activities can prevent exclusion and negative feelings on the behalf of those excluded, placing a charge on activities has been shown to increase their perceived value, and encourage parents to take responsibility for the welfare of their children. There is a

recognition that some schools may well have to charge for activities in order for them to be sustainable.

Does the subsidy create real additional benefits:

- **Are schools providing additional activities with the subsidy funding?**
- **Can we demonstrate additionality from the subsidy funding, avoiding duplicating or displacing funding sources already used by schools to subsidise disadvantaged pupils?**

Around a third of schools were using schemes other than the subsidy to help fund activities for economically disadvantaged pupils, and this proportion had increased slightly since the introduction of the subsidy, suggesting that the subsidy certainly had not been used to replace these other schemes. Additional benefits of the subsidy are evidenced by the very high proportion of schools that had increased the number of activities they offered, and improved economically disadvantaged pupils' access to activities.

The disadvantage subsidy pathfinder has opened up new opportunities for children and has shown the potential to raise their aspirations and enable them to learn new skills and socialise effectively. Pupils have been able to participate in new experiences that many in society take for granted and thus gain a greater social capital.

What is the average cost of provision per hour per pupil, and how much variation is there in the cost?

The average cost of providing activities was £3.29 per pupil per hour of activity, but there was a large variation in costs between different schools (although in most schools the average hourly cost was in the range £0 to £5). Findings showed that offering more one-off activities and holiday activities increased the average hourly cost as these types of activities tended to be more expensive than regular term time activities.

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

After the introduction of the subsidy, pupils in the target group were taking up an average of 2.5 hours of activities each week during term time, but there is considerable variation in this both on a school level, and on a pupil level.

Taking part in activities during the school holidays was less common and, on average, target group pupils had done just under six hours of activities each during school holidays (including half terms) in the 2008/2009 academic year.

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

Yes, 93 per cent of schools following the defined model thought there were pupils that ought to be included in the target group who did not meet the free school meals and children in care criteria.

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

The eligibility criteria tended to be set at cluster level rather than school level. Flexible model schools tended to use the defined model criteria (free school meals and children in care) as the initial basis for defining the target group, but then other criteria were used also, such as: unemployment, receipt of benefits or low income; postcode or area based data such as IMD, IDACI or ACORN; special educational needs or disabilities; and a wide range of other criteria.

There was a strong feeling in some schools though that identifying the target group was about 'knowing their pupils' and school staff were able to use some discretion in deciding who was eligible for funding. This was considered important in preventing some pupils from missing out on activities.

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

Promotion of activities was closely linked to consultation and similar methods were used for both. All schools were engaged in some kind of promotion of activities, with most schools using multiple methods to try to reach pupils and their families. Most schools sent letters to parents to inform them about activities, but there was a recognition that personal, face to face contact seems to be most effective in raising awareness and encouraging participation. This does not have to be done by a member of school staff, and indeed can be more effective when non-teaching staff are involved in face to face contact with families.

Encouraging uptake relies heavily on building relationships with families, and this takes time.

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

Schools were using a range of strategies to generate interest and motivation including the consultation and promotion already discussed. Most schools had given thought to ensuring that there was no stigma attached to receiving subsidy funding – strategies to avoid stigma mostly related to being discrete about who receives funding (in some cases even making sure the target group themselves do not know they are being targeted). There was also a strong feeling in many schools that the branding of the subsidy needed to be changed – most schools were careful not to use the term 'disadvantage'.

Different views were apparent in case study schools: some schools made activities free thinking that this would be the best way to get economically disadvantaged pupils to attend; whilst others thought that having a (small) charge for activities meant that the activities would be valued by parents and pupils and this would motivate them to take part and to continue attending.

There were also different views on how much information parents and pupils should be given about the subsidy, with some schools being totally upfront, telling target group parents and pupils that they had £300 to spend on activities for the year. In these schools it was considered that this would give parents and pupils a sense of ownership of the scheme. This seems to have had some success, but one negative consequence was pupils worrying about their money running out and not starting an activity for fear they would have to stop part way through the term.

However, tackling disadvantage is not just a matter of assisting with the cost of activities, but also about dealing with the accompanying social factors that prevent full participation such as parental and pupil attitudes, local cultures, and other aspects that affect families' lives, for example ill-health. Some schools that took part in the case studies were very aware of such issues and pointed out that it takes time to encourage uptake – staff first need to raise awareness of activities (and how they can be accessed for free) and then work on addressing the non-economic barriers to participation.

Parents, pupils and staff gave very positive reactions to the opportunities that the Pathfinder created. The Pathfinder stimulated an ethos of inclusion and many staff found the work rewarding and worthwhile. Part of this ethos included the range of effort to avoid any degree of stigma for young people entitled to the activities.

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

The subsidy has had a strong effect on participation rates. When asked to say how much effect the subsidy had had on a scale of 0 to 10, schools gave an average answer of 6.9. Analysis of management information showed that in the summer term and summer holidays 2008 (before the subsidy) 35 per cent of economically disadvantaged pupils were taking part in activities, and this rose to 71 per cent in the summer term and summer holidays 2009 (after the introduction of the subsidy).

Some schools had made small steps towards ensuring the sustainability of activities once funding is no longer available. Nevertheless it is clear that work is only just beginning and more time and support would be needed in order to sustain levels of provision for disadvantaged children after the end of the pathfinder.

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

Nine in ten schools had increased the number of activities on offer. However, this increase was not always observed by pupils and by their parents: seven in ten pupils and four in ten parents thought their school had increased the number of activities on offer. This suggests that not all pupils and families in the target group are being reached by schools' methods of promoting activities, and so are not aware of the increased choice.

One of the ways schools have been able to increase the choice of activities they can offer is by working with external providers. This can bring many benefits, as well as more choice and variety, working with external providers can stimulate growth in local provider markets, and relieve schools of the administrative burden that employing extra staff can bring. Nevertheless, schools need to be aware of the necessity for building relationships of trust and ensuring quality. Providers need to share a common ethos with schools, be reliable and have the necessary skills to deal with specific groups of students. Schools need to have an adequate system for checking and supervising outside providers which inevitably has implications for workloads.

How do schools manage the transactional impact on staff workloads (heads, teachers and others) of administering the funding? What are seen to be the most successful ways of managing workloads?

In many schools there had been an increase in workload as a result of the pathfinder, particularly for administrative and support staff in schools. Because the subsidy could not be used for administrative costs, most schools coped with the extra workload by working longer hours or by re-assigning workloads between staff. A minority of schools had found additional funding to take on new staff or pay existing staff for extra work, and in some clusters a cluster co-ordinator had been able to take on some of the administration, relieving schools of some of the burden. Where schools contracted out most of their activities to external providers, this could also lessen the workload.

Administration was a very necessary element of the success of delivery. Planning needs to give consideration to the availability of adequate resources for administrative support. For this reason workload has been considerable especially in the early stages of the pathfinder, although this has continued at the same level for a small number of case studies. However, most schools have welcomed this kind of work, valuing the opportunity to extend their range of after school activities for young people.

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

Almost all schools were tracking the take up of activities amongst the target group, mostly by using attendance registers. In very small schools (or schools with a very small target group) though, staff knew who had attended activities without the need

to take registers.

How do schools track the amount spent / number of hours of activity taken up per pupil?

From the beginning of the pathfinder schools were encouraged to track the take up of the target group both so that they could provide information for the evaluation, but also so they could see for themselves the effect the subsidy was having at their school. By the time schools had been using the subsidy for a year or so, almost all schools were tracking take up, and this was mostly done by taking attendance registers at activities.

Different clusters had different procedures for the way the subsidy was spent. In some clusters, money was given to the school at the beginning of the pathfinder and schools had responsibility for how it was spent. In these cases it was up to the school to keep accounts of how the subsidy was spent. In other clusters the subsidy money was held at cluster level and schools had to 'apply' for the funding each time they wanted to spend some of the subsidy. In these cases a cluster co-ordinator had a record of how the subsidy was spent as schools would have to explain what they wanted the money for each time they applied. From the evaluation findings we cannot say if either of these systems is 'better', but where the funding was held at cluster level there were higher proportions of the subsidy left unspent than when subsidy money was given straight to schools.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Case study summaries

Secondary A

Flexible (urban, specialist science college and community school with around 800 pupils on roll)

Emphasis on creating a good infrastructure for delivery involving consultation at various levels and an innovative promotions strategy. All pupils have been eligible to benefit from the subsidy which has been used to set up new activities, to support a pre-existing rewards programme and to ensure the continuation of the yearly transition summer school.

Background

School A is a secondary school in an extended schools cluster, also comprising nine primary schools and two special schools. The school has the highest proportion of pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds in the Local Authority. Young people in the school are described as 'parochial and insular,' rarely venturing outside the immediate areas in which they live. There was, prior to the subsidy, limited community provision which was accessed by only a fraction of the student population. That offered by the Youth Service, for instance, was only available to young people aged thirteen and above and accessed only by a cohort of this group. The school has a history of offering extracurricular activities outside of school hours, the vast majority of which were free of charge and open to all. At the start of the pilot, the intention in School A was to use the subsidy to increase the choice of activities available to pupils outside of school hours; to offer 'enrichment' opportunities giving 'life changing experiences;' to provide 'rewards' and 'treats' as part of the schools incentivization scheme and to encourage pupils to develop hobbies.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

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

it was deemed discriminatory to exclude a small percentage of the school population. Over the coming year, this means an equivalent of approximately £36 per child.

Consultation

Pupils were consulted both formally and informally and in a variety of ways during the initial months of the subsidy. Questionnaires were administered to all year groups, consultation was undertaken by student council representatives with their respective tutor groups and the school also hosted what they called a 'market day' consultation event. Around 40 pupils from School A attended the event during organised slots throughout the day and many more pupils dropped in during break and lunch times. Moreover, pupil representatives and staff were invited from cluster schools. The purpose of the day was to broaden awareness amongst pupils of local providers and to consult with them about the activities they would like to do outside of school hours. The method of consultation used on this occasion was a message board in the form of a graffiti wall. The results were subsequently analysed by pupils at School A and discussed in tutor groups. Informal methods of consultation, described as 'conversations in the context of a relationship' have been ongoing and comprise conversations between staff and pupils in the school yard or canteen, and during Physical Education lessons.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

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

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

Whilst much of the provision was aimed at encouraging sustained take up of activities, there were also 'one off' opportunities for young people such as trips to places of interest, family outings and so on. For example, during the first year, the subsidy was used to fund a trip to the local theatre for a pantomime. Holiday provision was available during February half term 2009 to certain pupils e.g. year 9 pupils went ice skating during half term and year 10 and 11 pupils enjoyed a day of go-carting, as a thank you to those who had helped out at the senior citizen's Christmas party. Discussing impact of the subsidy the deputy head/cluster lead at School A said: **'This has made choice wider and given loads of new opportunities and choice for them to do something they really wanted to do so**

they can try something different, something that parents wouldn't have been able to afford'. Prior to the subsidy, activities before and after school tended to be limited to those that staff were willing to offer and whilst there was some choice, the provision tended to be more extra-curricular and sports focused (the breakfast club being an exception). In response to consultation with pupils, School A was able to set up a much wider variety of provision outside of school hours including street dance and hip hop, Bollywood dancing, cookery, cheerleading, digital photography, art, first aid and for Y10 and 11 girls' health and beauty. Pupils who have accessed provision spoke positively about their experience: 'I went to the pantomime and it was free but I may have still gone if it wasn't free, but the fact that it was free was good.' During the second year of the subsidy, a new school building was being built through BSF. This meant that the school was restricted in its ability to offer holiday provision. The yearly transition summer school was usually held on site but this proved impossible with the building work going on. Instead, the subsidy was used to take all of the incoming year 7 pupils on a residential holiday. This meant that children continue to be more settled and confident about their transition into year 7. In addition, space has been limited at lunchtimes and tensions started to occur between the children. Secondary A has responded to this local need by providing more lunchtime clubs funded by the subsidy.

Partners

During the first year of the subsidy, Secondary A worked closely with key partners including the Council's Leisure Service and Play Service and also the Community Education Service. The school recognized that: **'We couldn't do it if it was just about what schools can provide. We need outside providers and partnership working.'** (deputy head/cluster lead). The school endeavoured to develop partnerships with a range of community providers and the 'market place' event was designed to do this and was successful in attracting representation from a range of partners including the local Children's Centre, the Play Service, a local wildlife centre and staff from the city's football club outreach education centre. Some area based providers also attended, some of whom are now running extended activities after school. Nevertheless, in the second year of the subsidy, Secondary A discovered that attendance at activities was less likely if those activities were run by people that the children were not familiar with. The school has also experienced problems with the reliability of partners who often do not have the same level of responsibility for the children, or fail to fully grasp their particular needs. For these reasons, the school now tries to encourage provision by its own staff before considering outside providers.

Funding activities and charging policy

School A has a history of providing out of school hours provision for pupils free of charge and was reluctant, therefore, to introduce a charging policy. In the past rewards such as trips to the Clothes Show Live exhibition were available only to those pupils who were eligible for a reward e.g. 95% attendance, and if parents could

cover the cost of the activity. The subsidy has made it possible for more pupils to access rewards and has enabled a raft of new activities to be set up for pupils to access without charge. Grants have also been awarded through the subsidy to provide some children with equipment, such as sports clothes, in order that they can participate in activities. A longstanding incentivization scheme was in place for pupils and certain rewards e.g. visits to places of interest, did incur a charge, meaning that some pupils were unable to take up their reward.

Management and workload

School staff and external providers run the activities that have been set up as a result of the subsidy. There is a culture in School A of school staff volunteering to run activities for a nominal fee and there have been no complaints about extra workload. There have, however, been implications for administration staff with some reporting it difficult to manage paper work and bookings. Management in school and LA co-ordinators have reported a 'massive workload' and to ease the burden a school based co-ordinator was appointed in School A to help set up new activities. The co-ordinator left post at the end of the first year, and was not replaced due to uncertainties around the continuation of funding. This has led to more work falling to the Deputy Head, who also acts as a part-time cluster co-ordinator. In addition, due to the difficulties of employing staff and the accompanying responsibilities this causes, the school has entered into a service level agreement with Barnardo's to provide support, rather than having to employ its own staff.

Primary B

Defined (Located in a disadvantaged built up area of a more rural extended school cluster, with around 300 pupils on the school roll)

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

Background

Primary B, is one of 19 schools in a larger extended schools cluster in the North-East of England, comprising 15 primary schools, three secondary schools and one special school. The age range of pupils at the school is from 3 to 11 years of age. The cluster, described as 'very diverse both geographically and historically' has a rich heritage and a mining past connecting many of the rural villages served by the cluster. The area served by the school is deprived and the transport infrastructure is poor. School B aimed to provide a rich and varied range of activities through a multi-agency approach and to achieve 80% of the target group accessing the subsidy in the way prescribed by the defined model. The school managed to achieve its aims of providing a rich and varied range of activities through multi-agency working. Uptake of the subsidy among eligible pupils is currently at the 100% mark.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School B is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria i.e. children eligible for free school meals and children in care. Subsidy staff found that applying strict criteria is not without its problems: '**[Staff member] put on all the leaflets that if you are on free school meals, you get these activities for nothing. Some of the parents are then up in arms about that because some families just get enough money to make ends meet but they don't qualify for this pathfinder subsidy.**'

Consultation

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

carried out regularly and another consultation was being planned at the time of the second visit.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

A number of traditional and innovative approaches have been used in this particular Pathfinder school to raise awareness of the subsidy and to promote uptake. Letters were sent out to families of children entitled to the subsidy. This was deemed the **'quickest and most discrete way of letting the parents of FSM children know that they can access extended school activities with no additional financial burden to themselves'**. Information about the subsidy was included in newsletters, the school website and flyers, and discussed in assemblies. Meetings also took place with key partners including Sure Start, the Play Development Service and a local organisation specialising in family support, to encourage these organisations to promote take up. Another strategy to promote take up involved offering taster sessions. Additionally, the ES Coordinator can make direct contact with parents when children are dropped off in the mornings and picked up in the afternoons.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

The intention was to offer a **'Breadth of activities to give individuals a wide choice and broaden their horizons'** The activities on offer at School B, many of which have been set up since the launch of the subsidy, include: gymnastics, ICT animation, multi-sports, football, gardening, dance & drama, crafts, hockey, cookery, judo, Lego, games, dancing, basketball. The multi-sports club has recently been extended to include provision for children from reception to year 2 (filling a genuine gap as previously there was 'nothing for them.')

The cookery club is open to families and promoted as a family activity and there is the intention to set up other activities that siblings and parents might access. Also some provision piloted at school has been set up at the local youth centre e.g. fencing and is open to children in School B and other cluster schools. During half term the school had an ice rink on site open to all children in local schools and a summer school is being planned which will incorporate a range of activities including cookery, arts and crafts and sports. School B also promote provision available locally during the holidays at the leisure centre. Activities at the centre for young people aged 5 -13 include trampolining, multi-sports, orienteering, bouldering, and an activity named 'nature detectives.'

The centre also arrange trips to other local providers for rock climbing and for arts and crafts and give young people the opportunity to do other 'chill out' activities of their choice such as watching DVDs or using games consoles. The school is recording take up of school based provision. The teacher responsible for implementing the subsidy in school explained: **'Last year we had eight clubs and 18.5 % of children on free schools meals were attending them whereas now 58% of children [on FSM] are attending [21 clubs] and that's only in the first two terms, autumn and spring.'** She added: **'We trialled charging children to go to clubs at lunchtime and unsurprisingly we had two paying children and 40 FSM.'** Twenty children attended Lego club after school and up to 100 went to the lunchtime Lego club –

about 30 of these are entitled to free school meals. Cookery club attracted 10-11 children, all of whom access the subsidy, and there was a waiting list for the next course. Regarding the work to target a particular cohort of disadvantaged children the same teacher said: **'All children on the child protection register are coming to at least two hours a week. There are ten families we've targeted; involving 17 children and this has been really good'**. School B is also recording feedback from pupils and parents who are particularly enthused and are: **'...already saying 'when is your next list of activities coming out.'**

Partners

Existing supporting projects which are built around partnership working include the area EAZ, School Sports Partnership, Community Sports Network, Play schemes, Sure Start, FE colleges, the regional development agency, and healthy schools. The school also works in partnership with a number of local providers, for example community youth clubs, the local leisure centre, sports clubs, brownie and guides etc and has links with Social Services and the Youth Service. The coordinator is very entrepreneurial in her relationships with providers and negotiates lower charges for courses of activities. A free market in OOSH activities has developed over the life of the Pathfinder.

Funding activities and charging policy

The cluster coordinator, felt that it was important that everyone pays something toward the cost of activities to get them into the way of paying for something. She felt this was important especially if funding ceased at some point in the future. As she put it:

'I think that everybody should pay a charge even if they are on free school meals or not...there are some schools who sort of are coming onto that now especially when you say to them that there might not always be funding from other places and I think they should start charging, they should be, there should be that sort of instance where people appreciate they've got to pay for something, but, they don't...yet.' The cluster co-ordinators deploy available funding to schools to deliver key objectives. A charging policy was introduced in the cluster so that only certain activities, and mainly those run by school staff, are free e.g. choir, 'chill out' club and some ICT after school provision. A range of activities with associated charges is offered including, for example, tag-rugby club free to all for a 6 week trial period. Breakfast club is £1.50 per session for all children, regardless of whether they are entitled to subsidy funding but other activities can be accessed without charge for the targeted cohort.; lego club £3.00 per 6 weeks; film club £3.00 per 6 weeks; cookery club £6.00 per 6 weeks for children in reception to year 2 and £9.00 per 6 weeks for children in years 3-6; gardening £6.00 per 6 weeks, multi-sports £4.00 per two hour session, arts and crafts £9.00 per 6 weeks; Dance £12.00 for 6 weeks, ICT club (which is additional to other ICT focused activities which are free of charge) did run at a cost of £6 for 6 weeks but school B have since decided to offer this club without charge. The teacher in school with responsibility for

the subsidy noted: **'Last time we ran the ICT club we charged and this term we've not charged and attendance has rocketed'**. In the near future an orienteering club will be set up with the support of subsidy funding to have the school mapped and a summer school is currently being planned for which there will be a charge of £2 per day. A local sports provider charges £1 for an hour of activities although provision is free for pupils entitled to the subsidy. Local providers generally request payment in advance for a ten week course and subsequently invoice the school. The local leisure centre provides holiday activities at a subsidised rate of around £5.00 per day and for families entitled to the subsidy there will be no charge. They can also access the fencing club at a local youth club free of charge and get financial support with their weekly subs for the centre. The local rugby club has received money from the Community Chest (funding stream) and this was being matched by extended school subsidy funding. This enables the provider to go into School B and other cluster schools to offer rugby training and also means that transport costs are covered and children entitled to the subsidy can receive financial support to purchase kits and attend rugby camp.

Management and workload

Teaching assistants run many of the activities after school and the subsidy is co-ordinated by a teacher in school who has Wednesday afternoons as non teaching time. This was deemed sufficient time to implement and co-ordinate the subsidy. The school is supported by a cluster co-ordinator appointed for the subsidy. It seems that while the workload increased during the subsidy set-up phase, this levelled off as the subsidy structure/system settled into place. The Cluster Coordinator was dealing with the schools in the cluster single handed. The Cluster Coordinator felt that the School Coordinator, who is very enthusiastic about the Subsidy: **'Puts a lot on herself over and above what she should be doing.'**

Secondary C

Defined (An Enterprise Trust school located in an inner city with around 550 pupils on the school roll including sixth form pupils.).

A model of implementation focused initially on one year group and on opening up the opportunity for pupils to go on weeklong residential events. Pupils are now contracted to access at least two hours of activities per week during term time.

Background

School C is a Community Comprehensive School for pupils in the age range 11–18. The school is part of an extended school cluster comprising nine other schools (primary, infant or first schools). The school is located within one of the poorest Wards in the LA and serves multiple council housing estates. There has been an influx of families in recent years from a variety of countries. Secondary C is an enterprise trust school with a tradition of offering ‘enrichment activities’ aimed at inspiring pupils. The school aimed to build on this work during the pathfinder, encouraging more pupils to benefit from the existing programme of after school provision. Moreover, it was hoped that the subsidy could enable pupils to attend residential and other trips aimed at learning and enjoyment.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School C is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care. The Assistant Head felt that: **‘The boundaries are very clear. You either qualify or you don’t. It makes it much easier for me to administer. Very happy having very clear boundaries. I’m very happy with this model. No arguments with parents. With the other model, the responsibility becomes mine. The defined model protects the school from unhappy parents’.**

Consultation

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

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

The assistant head invited all parents of year 8 pupils, and the pupils themselves, to meet with him on a one to one basis to discuss a) the residential and b) other activities that pupils might engage in outside of school hours. It was explained to pupils and parents that funding was available to cover the cost of the residential on the condition that pupils agreed to attend, over a sustained period of time, at least two hours of after school hours activities each week. The assistant head was sensitive when talking with pupils and parents, not to use any negative language but instead to use the term 'entitlement'. This approach was appreciated by parents, one of whom explained: **'The lovely thing here is that we are never made to feel like poor parents...[name of assistant head] is dealing with it so you are not going in cap in hand and feeling humiliated.'** The assistant head also wrote to parents of pupils in other year groups and sent out flyers to advertise locally provided activities. He explained: **'We've written to all parents and said students were entitled to around £300 each. I explained they [pupils] could do anything as long as it was regular'**. The response was poor and so one to one meetings were held with all eligible pupils in different year groups, and with parents. The disadvantage subsidy was rebranded in this school to make it more user friendly.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

A key aim of the subsidy at School C was to ensure that year 8 pupils were a) not prevented due to financial reasons, from participating in a week long residential and b) were accessing at least two hours of activities after school, selected from the existing programme of provision on offer prior to the subsidy. Half of year 8 pupils went on the residential and all but two pupils entitled to the subsidy took part (one pupil was too poorly to attend and the other did not want to be away from home). During their stay, pupils took part in a range of 'lessons with a difference' e.g. one of the science sessions involved handling exotic animals; during a PE lesson pupils used a rowing machine and took part in a rowing race; and in a history lesson pupils learnt about native American Indians. Activities were staffed by the organisation Learning on Location. On an evening, pupils could choose from a range of activities on offer at the camp and these included disco dancing, swimming, bowling, and pupils could also go to the on site cinema or fun fair. Feedback from pupils and parents was overwhelmingly positive and included: **'There was a wide range of activities for us. On other trips you have fun but I learnt and had fun.'** (Pupil). **'[Before the residential]...She'd had some fragmented friendships and now she has friends for life...She came back all grown up and independent. she has the memories for the rest of her life...this really was a life changing experience. [Name of daughter] is working harder and she is much more confident. Her communication and speaking up in class has all changed'** (Parent). When asked how they got the opportunity a pupil said: **'Sir said he'd pay for it and I was happy cause I didn't need to worry as Mum doesn't get much money...If you can't afford it, it is good that they can help out.'** All pupils who accessed subsidy funding signed up to do a minimum of two hours of activities per week at school.

According to the deputy head, almost all pupils have kept to their agreement and the pupils we spoke with confirmed this, explaining that they now regularly attend a range of activities including homework and spelling club, drama, sports provision (around 50% of which is run by coaches through the sports co-ordination team), table tennis and basket ball at lunchtimes and some of the more recently established after school clubs such as street dance, rollerblading, and cheerleading. Another element of the work at School C was to encourage pupils from other year groups to access provision locally, for which they could access using their subsidy entitlement. Despite schools' efforts to advertise local provision and encourage take up, the latter has proven difficult to establish with only a small percentage of pupils accessing funding for this e.g. swimming at the local leisure centre and electric guitar lessons. The original aim of the Pathfinder was to use residential holidays as a carrot to encourage pupils to participate regularly in at least two hours of extra-curricular activities a week. If pupils participate regularly, the school pays for places on residential holidays. School C provides a fixed menu of residential activities.

Partners

The sports co-ordination team are identified as a main partner for School C and its feeder schools. 'Learning on Location' is the name of the company that organised activities during the year 8 residential. The intention is for School C to engage a wide range of providers and they are working closely with the LA to identify strategies to do this. The school feels that the regional association of youth clubs will come on board to help set up and run holiday provision. The expectation is that, as the subsidy progresses, there will be scope to link strategically with the Children's University as a way to help sustain provision for younger pupils. Cluster Coordinators are actively contacting local providers. It seems too that Parent Support Advisers have been instrumental in promoting the scheme. The Assistant Head said that he was always looking for new ways to engage the children: **'One thing we don't have around here, for example, is fashion, textiles, etc.'** The subsidy has resulted in wider community involvement for the children with senior citizens. A fun club and a summer party were set up for senior citizens with the former taking place every other month. Senior citizens also engage in an oral history club in which their life experiences are used to bring history to life for the children.

Funding activities and charging policy

The residential was charged at £185.00 per pupil but free for eligible pupils. The school has a longstanding policy of not charging for the vast majority of after school activities and the programme of free provision in place before the subsidy continues to run. The few activities that do incur a charge (e.g. £2.50 per session for street dance and £2.50 for cheerleading) are on offer to pupils entitled to the subsidy at no charge. Pupils are also encouraged to access local, community based, provision for which there is a charge and access subsidy funding to cover the cost. Pupils not eligible for the subsidy pay for the activities they attend. As one child said: **'Children on FSM don't have to pay but children whose parents are working have to pay'**.

The school will help children who are not on FSM though. If some parents have difficulty paying or contributing to residential, the school allows them to pay over the time period before the residential. There may be nominal charges for the residential to enhance a sense of contribution and ownership among pupils.

Management and workload

There was a massive increase in workload at the beginning of the subsidy for the Assistant Head: **'Workload spiralled at the start and has remained the same ever since.'** After the initial increase in the workload, the Assistant Head said: **'It comes in bursts.'** 'Initially there were pupils queuing up outside his door to get forms etc.' There are so many activities now that the Assistant Head does not have so much time to work on commissioning new activities. Plans are in the pipeline for increasing involvement with the feeder primary schools. The Assistant Head said: **'Paper work is a massive problem.'** **It's a massive problem. With workforce remodelling, office staff have taken on what teachers used to do so they can't take on any more'**. Every other member of the SMT is engaged in a government initiative so there is no time to take on additional work. The assistant head is leading on the subsidy at School C. In the absence of a cluster co-ordinator, he is supported by an operational manager from the LA who spends the majority of her time supporting cluster schools with the implementation and co-ordination of the subsidy. Teaching staff continue to run some of the activities in school which they did prior to the subsidy, and sixth formers also help facilitate some of the activities. As the homework club in the library runs till later, the hours of the library staff have been increased to accommodate this.

Primary D

Flexible (urban and deprived school within diverse cluster with around 300 pupils on the school roll)

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

Background

Primary School D is located in a deprived, inner city community within a cluster of extended schools which is geographically dispersed and socio-economically diverse. The cluster of which the school is part consists of a further 6 primary schools and a secondary school. There are seven looked after children in school and a similar number of young people on the child protection register. The percentage of free school meals is around 34% and the percentage of pupils with special educational needs reaches 30% in certain year groups. Prior to the subsidy, there were some school based activities from 3.20pm until 4pm, three nights a week, and a youth club in the local community. School based provision was generally offered at no cost. School D has a clear objective to develop a range of new activities for pupils both before and after school, and during the holidays, to reflect what young people said they wanted. The school has also introduced a charging policy which it anticipates will help to sustain extended school activities.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The LA is piloting the flexible model and has defined the criteria for selecting targeted pupils and families using the Acorn (A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods) index, a geodemographic system of post code level information drawn from Census data and lifestyle surveys. The index categorizes the population and one such category is that of 'hard pressed' families. In School D, almost around 70% of pupils fall into the 'hard pressed' category. The school also drew on aspects of the LA developed 'vulnerability audit' which considers the domestic circumstances of young people and also factors such as special educational needs, health and exclusion data to identify the most needy pupils. Not all pupils meet the criteria to access funding, although the vast majority do. In the second year of the subsidy, the school realised that some of the data they were using to identify children was not always accurate or up to date. They have since introduced a certain amount of flexibility to enable them to respond to changing family circumstances.

Consultation

During year 1, school D used traditional methods of consultation including surveys and letters to parents requesting feedback and suggestions. Pupils and parents were also asked about their preferences at opportune moments (e.g. when parents collected pupils from school). The school became aware that even though they consulted with parents and pupils, this did not always guarantee take up of activities. Consultation has been ongoing via the school council and individual contacts with parents.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

At the start of the pilot consultation data were analysed and a menu of activities was produced. Letters were sent out to parents explaining that the new provision on offer was set up to reflect the feedback provided by pupils and families. On the letters, the school specified both full and subsidised rates for activities, explaining that the cost was incurred as specialist external coaches were running much of the provision. The letter provided contact details and suggested that parents speak with the school business manager if they were unsure if they were eligible for the subsidised rates. School D also hosted some information sessions, for example, an induction evening was held for all parents who wanted to find out more about the Easter residential for pupils. Another strategy to encourage take up, involved trialling a small number of activities initially (e.g. guitar lessons, 'wake up shake up' breakfast club), to see how pupils responded. Providers were bought in for the activities but costs were not passed on to pupils during the trial period. This strategy was useful for experimenting with different types of provision, but parents often got confused by the sheer amount of activities on offer. In the second year of the pilot, a simpler menu of activities was provided. Less popular activities were discontinued and more popular ones expanded and letters have continued to be sent to parents every term.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

All activities were set up in response to consultation and programmes of activities were offered to pupils during holiday periods. In addition, an Easter residential was organised to the Scottish Borders for a week long 'activity focused' holiday. Within 2 days of advertising the residential 60 children had signed up to attend and about 70% of those were benefitting from a subsidised rate. Regarding the trip the school business manager said: '**...this is all about opportunities for young people who don't get a holiday.**' Due to the success of this residential, future plans for the subsidy are to direct resources to residential holidays. During term time, a daily breakfast club has been set up and an after school club, running five evenings a week, has also been established in response to feedback from parents. The club runs from 3.20pm until 4.20pm and those children who usually attend the community based youth club after school, are collected by mini bus and transported to the community venue at 4.20pm. The after school club encompasses computer club, home learning, art and craft and games. Those pupils who attend other extracurricular provision (which runs until 4.00pm on Mondays - Wednesdays) can

join the after school club at 4.00pm for the last 20 minutes, thus offering them the choice to attend existing provision and combine this with elements of the new offer. School D also offers a range of other (some pre-existing) after school clubs throughout the week. Some activities are targeted at KS1 or KS2 pupils and a number of activities are linked to the curriculum. Pupils are highly enthusiastic about the activities on offer. Talking about the new 'wake up shake up' breakfast club, which attracts around 25 pupils daily, one young person said: **'It means I get up and play with my friends before school...we play games and you look to it and enjoy it and now I get up extra early.'** Other pupils explained: **'There is lots to do and we get to try out new things'** and, **'...there are loads of clubs, all for us to choose from, [listed] on a piece of paper.'** Parents are as sanguine when discussing holiday provision, one noting that she is comfortable in the knowledge that her son is in safe hands after school and during the holidays, and is accessing a range of enjoyable activities.

Partners

The school is working closely with two local organisations which specialize in running holiday provision and a local provider company which is facilitating some of the new activities which now run after school. They also draw on support from the 'bike it officer' in the LA for cycling proficiency and an external tutor comes in to school to provide guitar lessons. School D was aware of the existing community based youth club which offered after school provision for local young people and they did not wish to duplicate this existing offer. After careful negotiations between the school and the youth club, an arrangement was made whereby the youth club collects pupils from the school at 4.20pm and transports them to their own base. The school, the youth club, parents and partners are reported to be happy with this arrangement.

Funding activities and charging policy

A charging policy was introduced in school with activities on offer at a subsidised rate for those pupils entitled to the subsidy. The Easter residential was costed at £125 per child including all activities with a reduced rate of £50 for those pupils entitled to the subsidy. There is a £1 a day charge for most after school clubs with the exception of guitar club, charged at £2. All before and after school activities are free to those children entitled to the subsidy.

Management and workload

A business manager at School D has responsibility for the subsidy. There has been an impact on the time she has spent organising activities but this is, in her view, time well spent in that pupils and families are benefitting and the school is also fulfilling an important strand of the extended schools core offer. External providers run many of the clubs after school along with teachers who also offered their time prior to the introduction of the subsidy. Ten teachers accompanied pupils on the Easter residential and were paid for their time. The school employed a parent to act as a day to day administrator for the clubs, and she handles bookings and payment.

Secondary E

Defined (an urban Science College with around 650 pupils on roll. Also a national challenge school).

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

Background

Secondary School E is part of a very large cluster of 32 schools. The area served by the school has been identified by Government Office as a low super output area and within the most deprived 10% of areas in England. 95% of pupils live within walking distance of the school and around 90 pupils are entitled to free school meals. School E has a history of offering extended school provision including an annual 'activity focused' enrichment week. There is, however, a lack of commitment from young people to engage in activities on a regular basis, largely because of the disrupted lives that many lead. The headteacher regards the subsidy as a way to encourage sustained commitment and hoped that participation in activities will become 'the norm.'

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

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

Consultation

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

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

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

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

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

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

'I do clarinet. I'd never done it before but I spoke to my parents and they liked the idea so we filled in the form. I've done it for a term and I'm going to keep at it. I wouldn't be able to do this otherwise.' Another central focus of the subsidy has been funding activities for eligible pupils during enrichment week. The offer in summer term 2009 included a residential trip to a theme park, trips to London, camping and outward bound holidays, fishing trips and an 'adrenaline junkie' trip. Previously, **'All the middle class kids did all the wonderful things whilst the working class kids stayed and played rounders'** (headteacher). Twenty pupils have requested funding for this purpose and one of these pupils discussed what this meant for him:

'I'm going to [residential trip to a theme park] for about four days...It's in July and I feel great I can go. If it wasn't for this I'd be at school doing juggling.' His Dad added: **'It gives him the opportunity to do things he wouldn't be able to do coz we couldn't afford it.'** Another pupil also discussed the subsidy saying: **'During activities week in the summer I'm getting to go to [residential trip to a theme park] coz this is for children in care and those getting free school meals, [name of staff member at school] told me. I spoke to my carers and said I'd always wanted to go and they think it is a good opportunity coz they don't have to pay. I would never have got to go as it is a hundred and something pound...my mate got the money also and so it's really good.'** Much emphasis has also been placed on encouraging take up of local provision through introducing a referral mechanism, whereby parents, partners and Parent Support Advisers (PSAs) can refer to local providers. This process has been facilitated by a promotion strategy involving local providers offering taster sessions in school. Pupils and families have the flexibility to choose the activities they wish to do. One family, for instance, has requested that three siblings go to an outward bound residential during the summer holidays where they get to try activities like archery and abseiling. Currently only a small number of pupils and families have asked to partake in activities that are not offered by the school but with ongoing promotion of activities the expectation is that these numbers will increase considerably.

Partners

The school are able to promote a wide range of activities provided by a good range of providers. The local sports and leisure centre offer, for instance, various sports, acrobatic and gymnastics clubs, a variety of dance classes including 'new age' and 'street and hip hop', tae kwon do classes and trampolining. For young people in years 7 and 8 and those in feeder schools, there is also an 'active kidz holiday club', cycling proficiency (2 days course during holidays for young people aged 5-16) and a Saturday morning 'active kidz' club. The school also promotes a local youth volunteering project, arts and crafts provision at the local community centre and advertises a range of local clubs and groups for young people e.g. boxing, karate, football and basketball clubs, army cadets, girl guides and scouts, dance and drama schools. Steps are in place to ensure that local providers are suitable/accredited and parents are asked to sign a disclaimer meaning they also do their own risk assessment. The Local Authority have provided partners with an information pack including sections on safeguarding, invoicing and referral, and partners are encouraged to refer eligible pupils for subsidy funding to cover the cost of certain activities. There are very strong links in the cluster to the Children's University (CU), or 'Youth University' as it is referred to in School E. The aims of both were identified to be largely similar as was the focus on engaging young people from deprived backgrounds. The pathfinder has benefitted from emerging partnerships with CU providers and also the commissioning process for CU.

Funding activities and charging policy

Subsidy funding is held centrally in LA and referral forms go through to the subsidy team in the Authority. In School E, pupils are encouraged to access local provision for which there will be a charge and those entitled to the subsidy will have most, if not all, costs paid for through the subsidy. Funding can also cover joining fees, insurance, equipment and transportation costs. There is a charge for the trips offered during activity week at School E. For example, the London trip costs £260 and the 'adrenaline junkie' trip is charged at £190.00. These costs are now covered for pupils entitled to the subsidy. Certain school based activities incur a small charge for all pupils, for example, the breakfast club is charged at 20p per day.

Management and workload

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

Junior F

Defined (Junior F is a mixed gender, voluntary aided, junior school for 7-11 year olds, located in a large extended schools cluster. There are around 250 children on the school roll).

Background

School F is a Church of England Junior school in a cluster comprising 17 schools (14 Primary, 2 secondary and 1 special). The town served by the school has an indigenous population of ten thousand but there are many newcomers to the town including 'alternatives' who are drawn to the spiritual aspect of the community. Residents of the town are quite parochial and tend not to cross the road bridge to another nearby town. There are 39 children in school eligible for free school meals and one child in care. School F already offered an after school 'fun club' three evenings a week and the local infant feeder school hosts the club two evenings a week. The school aimed to build on existing provision and extend the choice available to pupils.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

School F is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care. The Community Learning Partnership Coordinator said: **'From my point of view the defined model made it simple, made it clear and otherwise you'd probably never stop. You've got to have a line somewhere that you just can't go over otherwise you'll keep stretching it'**.

Consultation

The Parent and Family Support Advisor (PFSA) undertook consultation in school with pupils and parents using surveys. Responses to the consultation were initially low. The PFSA also tried posting letters to 40 people eligible for the subsidy (delivering the letters by hand because it was less complicated to do so). Feedback from the consultation was then used to seek out providers.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

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

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

The after school fun club offers pupils a range of activities including football, multi-skills (including tag rugby and gymnastics) dance and netball. A walking bus transfers children between the junior and the infant schools. School F also offers music tuition for pupils eligible for the subsidy. A focus of the implementation at School F, and in other schools in the cluster, involves promoting access to a range of activities in the locality. The school actively encourages take up of provision at the local leisure centre, located in a cluster secondary school. Here a drama club runs on Saturdays for 6-8 yr olds and another for young people aged 9-13 years. Also, on Saturday morning there is fencing at the centre for young people aged 7+ and breakdancing for those aged 6+. For older pupils in year 6 (and secondary pupils) there is a gameplaying club for players of Warhammer and 40K. In addition there are lots of evening classes e.g. judo, karate, trampolining on Mondays; gymnastics, Tae Kwon Do, Pilates and Fencing on Tuesdays; karate on Wednesdays; badminton on Thursdays; and Tae Kwon Do on Fridays. School F also promotes uptake of activities run through a local sports association at two other cluster schools. This includes badminton, gymnastics, trampolining and for year 6 students, climbing. There are also ceramics workshops (fortnightly for 6 weeks) on Saturday mornings for pupils aged 8 and above. Moreover activities are promoted at two further leisure centres, meaning pupils have access to a wide range of sports focused activities from swimming to dodge ball. School F also promotes local holiday provision, for example that offered by the town's Play Scheme, and activities on offer at the three leisure centres, and it also employs specialist sports coaches to offer sessions on the school site during the holiday periods. According to the PFSA at School F: **'There has been a massive increase in participation. Almost 100% take up.'** The subsidy has removed financial barriers for many families, including the family discussed in this account: **'[prior to the subsidy]...one home time there was a Year 1 child crying bitterly that she wanted to do 'dance club.' Mum looked embarrassed and was trying to get the little girl to come with her. Mum explained that, at £3.50 a session, she just couldn't afford for her daughter to go. She had two other children and if one wants something the others will want it as well. The £3.50 suddenly becomes £10.50.'** (PFSA). Raising awareness is an ongoing activity as the the PFSA said: **'Every so often I clear myself 2 days and really get going on it. (School) the other primary will need another push again shortly because we've had the new reception class coming in.'** The School's philosophy is to develop sustained forms of engagement rather than one off activities although they have no problem setting up taster courses of activities to let people experience new things. The school actively sought to personalise the experience of target group children, making sure as much as possible that they engage in the activities they chose to attend.

Partners

Partnership working is a central component of the offer at School F. As outlined above, many of the activities promoted are delivered at the local leisure centre in

conjunction with the sports association which delivers activities in various cluster schools. The local leisure centre, based at a cluster school, can refer pupils to the range of activities on offer. A wider range of other local providers are part of the wider extended schools partnership. These include, for example, a local dance company which offers breakdancing and creative dance sessions; and a theatre group which runs no obligation taster sessions and a regular Saturday afternoon club. They also have good working links with two other local leisure centres and numerous sports providers for term time and holiday provision. PFSA's are seen as vital to the success of the subsidy. Through their work with families and pupils they are key referers and have been fully briefed on the range of partners involved in the subsidy. Providers are also encouraged to refer pupils to the subsidy and each are provided with an information pack covering issues such as invoicing, referring pupils (these forms go to the LA officers who hold the budget and monitor take up of the subsidy), and safeguarding policy. The subsidy schools and partners can also work with a company specialised in ensuring local providers are accredited companies.

Funding activities and charging policy

The 'fun club' provision is charged at £3.50 from 3.15pm -4.30pm, a further £3.50 from 4.30pm -5.30pm and an additional £2.50 for the period 5.30pm-6.00pm. Activities at the leisure centre at the local secondary school are individually priced. Drama club is charged at £33.75 for 9 weeks for 6-8 yr olds or £58.50 for 9-13 years; the gamesplaying club (Warhammer and 40K) is £5 per session. The cost of holiday provision varies, depending on provider. Provision offered through the town's Play Scheme is £12 per day (9am-3pm) Local theatre and drama groups have pre-existing charging policies e.g. the local theatre school charges £150 per term. Musical instrument tuition typically costs around £6 per half hour for shared sessions and sports activities run by the county sports coaching service are on offer at £3.50 per hour term-time and £12.00 per day during school holidays. Eligible pupils are offered these activities free of charge, providing pupils are referred through the correct procedure. The Community learning Partnership Coordinator explained that handing money directly to a school was something they chose not to do in (County) as past experience suggested it was not used for the purpose it was provided for.

Management and workload

A PFSA is co-ordinating and managing the implementation of the subsidy in School F and in a nearby infant school. She is supported by a cluster co-ordinator for the subsidy. Due to the other demands of her role, the amount of time the PSA now dedicates to the subsidy is less than half a day a week, although in the early stages of implementation she spent considerably more time liaising with partners and parents, much to the objection of the headteacher. In the beginning, the PFSA said, **'We just had to work on it. It's hard to recall how many hours because you just get on with it. A day a month would probably be enough to really push it'**. Working and engaging with parents is clearly made easier when a PFSA comes bearing gifts or in this case £300 per FSM child. This makes a change from staff

going out to speak to parents about their child's behaviour or some other more difficult issues. **'Initially workload is high when setting up the subsidy but then declines as you find out who the providers are, how to fill out the referral forms etc. I'm quite quick now (PFSA) said, because I've got all the subsidy information on my laptop and know all the various things and procedures I have to go through to administer the subsidy. The only thing that would take time now is a new push to make sure the reception kids get all the subsidy information.'**

Secondary G

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

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

Background

School G is an all girl community Comprehensive School in the heart of a large city in the South-east of England. The school serves the 11-16 age range. The number on the roll is usually around 1000. The cluster in which secondary School G is located is part of a Community Improvement Partnership (CIP), established three years ago, which includes 14 schools (4 secondary and 10 primary). The area served by the cluster is deprived. School G offered a range of free activities prior to the subsidy and the initiative was regraded as an opportunity to **'extend provision and try new things ... go to the next level really.'** It is anticipated that the subsidy will generate Every Child Matters outcomes and in the longer term, will lead to raised levels of achievement for the targeted cohort. According to the ES Coordinator, the number of pupils eligible for the subsidy includes 139 pupils (eligible on the grounds they claim FSM) and 259 eligible for the subsidy because their parents are in receipt of a means tested benefit. **'The numbers taking part a couple of months ago were 187 and we are now over the 200 mark.'** Their approach includes after school activities, holiday activities and individual activities. In common with other pathfinder areas the focus in this location is on the strategic, partnership, cluster level of working with activities developed for the benefit of the cluster as a whole.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The subsidy is available to any family in receipt of a means-tested benefit. Some 'special circumstances' also include pupils experiencing bereavement, looked after children and young carers. The LA compiled databases of children known to School G as 'economically disadvantaged' using measures such as Free School Meals, Looked After Children, Uniform Grants and Leisure Card holders. As the criteria for eligibility is 'receipt of means tested benefit,' staff are not always aware which families meet the criteria and have to be sensitive when making enquires with families.

Consultation

The school administers questionnaires every 18 months and also undertakes regular surveys of users of extended provision. More recently this has involved surveying users of the summer provision 2008 which was offered through the subsidy. For the

purpose of the subsidy, School G was able to draw on existing consultation and audit data which it has supplemented with recent consultation involving surveys conducted in schools across the cluster.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Flyers were sent out to all the schools and the ES Coordinator asked them to send out the flyers through the children. Nothing happened initially. Families were really slow to come forward. Word finally got through over the last six months. Families were really distrustful at first and were wondering what the catch was. The ES Coordinator said: **'We've kept the process as simple as possible. It's really spread through word of mouth really. The numbers have really picked up now'**. One strategy, when writing to parents to advise of the subsidy, and to consult with them about choice of provision, involved asking parents if they received one or more from a list of means-tested benefits. The extended schools co-ordinator actively encourages pupils to take up provision, as does the family support worker and other extended school staff such as the school nurse, and the intention is to encourage local providers to raise awareness of the subsidy. Flyers are used to advertise activities, the school has distributed brochures advertising holiday provision and activities are promoted via the school website.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

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

'Obviously it is about choice and flexibility...there are some activities which weren't [previously] offered, but also it's about maximising what we've already got, getting that information out that those activities are available.' During summer 2008 a programme of new activities was offered to pupils including pool kayaking, boxing, kite flying and 'rock band' club for pupils aged 13-16. The club for wannabe rock stars, and the boxing club now continue as regular after-school clubs. Many of the activities are cluster oriented involving pupils from across the cluster schools. These cluster activities, according to information received from the ES Coordinator, engaged 3,408 pupils in the summer holiday activities provided in 2009. At least 731 individuals attended one or more activities. Children eligible for the subsidy numbered 317. Activities included dance and drama, kite surfing, skateboarding and rock club. A Friday evening club for 10 to 13 years olds was also set up during the summer holidays 2009 and this is also on-going.

Attendance, in cluster terms, at the October half-term activities 2009 was also good with 986 places taken over 5 days. One or more activities were attended by 253 pupils. These numbers included 136 pupils eligible for the subsidy which according to the coordinator was 54% of eligible children in the cluster. This compares with 22% the previous summer. During the autumn term a 'Respect' programme, run by the local football club comprising a number of free sporting and leisure activities, was offered. Again, these activities were open to boys and girls from all the cluster

schools. A host of Christmas activities were offered during Christmas 2009 including, boxing camp, football academy, Christmas cookery and craft activities and arts, crafts, computer design, music and acting.

Discussing the boxing club a parent said: **'It was brilliant though absolutely brilliant ... really good with the children, getting them motivated and interested ... they loved it, they couldn't wait to get up ... a lot of places, when they're that age, especially for boys, everything is geared football and he doesn't seem to be...and it's nice that they're actually bringing in other things for them to do rather than just football.'** She added: **'I wouldn't have been able to afford it ... being a single parent on benefits you don't have a lot, I mean it's all down to bills come first, food, clothes, anything the children need and activities come last and if I haven't got any money that week to go out anywhere or do anything we don't.'** All eligible under 11s are entitled to a free twelve week course of swimming lessons and young people aged 11 and over are being offered a free six month membership to the local gym. Children can also access free music tuition and can access the subsidy for school trips e.g. recently there was a weekend 'transition' trip for year 7 pupils to the Isle of Wight. A pupil who accessed the subsidy for this purpose discussed enjoying time with friends and trying new activities, noting that she would like to go again.

Partners

The local swimming pool and leisure facility (with gym) are key partners, as are other local providers including brownies and guides groups and numerous external sports coaches and instructors. The LA lead for the subsidy explained: **'There are also a range of opportunities in the community and ...one of the things we've been trying to do is work with community organisations to see what is the best way in which we can work together to support children and families and if they do these activities, then we can pay the cost of them attending these activities.'** The Children's University is another main partner and through this scheme School G work with local adventure playgrounds and playleaders and trained and trainee coaches from the local University. The CIP has developed close links with local and national partners including Kip McGrath, Motiv8, all the schools in the cluster, community wardens, youth wardens, community centres, **'providers we've never worked with before who can provide things like scuba diving'**. Two PCOs are on the steering group and now run a session in the youth club on a Monday evening. This has been very successful in the sense that the police force is now working with young people informally rather than in a formal and official way.

Funding activities and charging policy

Funding is available for pupils for tuition fees, activities, any uniforms for activities, and sporting and school trips (e.g. Year 6/7 transition trip, football trip to America). There is a small charge for some after-school activities, although young people entitled to the subsidy can access these without charge. The subsidy has been used to support individual children to access groups such as Brownies, Guides, music

lessons and school and sporting trips. The skiing trip costs £600 and the subsidy pot for each child is used as a contribution toward the full cost. The rest comes from the parents and can be paid into the school bank over time prior to going on the trip.

Management and workload

The school has an extended schools co-ordinator who, as part of her role, has been promoting take up with parents and pupils and managing the subsidy at school level. She will soon be seconded to the LA to support other schools with the national roll out of the initiative. **'The admin is tremendous with this and the actual groundwork we have to do so I've done a year here and will be doing another year on secondment to deal with this because it is so much work to do'**. She is supported by the CIP Manager for the cluster and the extended services manager for the council. There is a multi-agency steering group with representation from parents, extended schools staff, key providers and community organisations e.g. a member of a community art group sits on the steering board. As the funding goes directly to the cluster and the schools for activities, there is a burden of responsibility in terms of administration, promotion, monitoring and evaluation. This 'considerable amount of work' is currently being managed by school staff. The extended school team at School G are promoting activities and encouraging take up and certain members of the team have defined tasks e.g. the pupils social worker is analysing consultation data. The LA has an admin assistant and a social worker. The admin assistant works three days a week but now the responsibility for updating the database has been passed to the schools who received training in how to use the software. It's an internet based database. Monitoring has been dispersed to all the schools in the cluster and they can link the data to their attainment databases for tracking purposes. The schools only get access to their own data but the LA can see an overview of the data from all the schools. Workload for individual activities is higher than that for group activities since it may involve making contact with shops to buy equipment, costumes, uniforms etc. The way they've managed the admin of the scheme is to redirect funds from other projects in order to employ an administrator. An arrangement with the local university resulted in a placement scheme for social workers who work on the individual side of the subsidy funded activities. They are currently on their fourth social worker. **'We wouldn't have been able to manage otherwise'**. The partnership with the local university is viewed as an important one by the subsidy team and the TDA. **'The initial workload was greater than most schools will pay for'**. **'Once you have forms etc, it's fine'**. **'Setting up time is horrendous when you are doing another job as well'**. **Once all the forms and structures are in place it's not so bad'**. A teacher intimated the impact the subsidy was having on her workload when she said: **'I get an hour and a half a day to get the subsidy work done and I'm teaching full time too. I'm not paid any extra for doing that amount of overtime. Once the systems are in place it does become easier. The workload does decrease once all the clubs are up and running.'**

Special School H

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

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

Background

Special School H is a Key Stage 2-3 special school for pupils with behavioural difficulties located in the Midlands. The school is co-located on a campus with two pupil referral units (PRUs) and a 'key team' (multi-agency team supporting extremely vulnerable pupils and families) and the head at School H manages the whole campus. Pupils are bussed in to the campus from across the city although most are from the most deprived 'white' areas of the city which are characterised by high teenage pregnancy, unemployment and single parent families. The pupil population is fluid – there is a gradual intake throughout the year and currently, out of around 50 pupils on roll, there are only 4 female pupils. Many pupils have 'very damaged' lives and some have been in trouble with the police. All pupils receive a free school meal as lunch time is a taught part of the day. There is a history of school staff delivering activities at lunchtimes although there were very few after school activities as pupils are bussed home at a set time. The aim of the school, the PRUs and the key team was to give pupils a wealth of opportunities. As a headteacher explained: **'This is about Every Child Matters and inclusion and lots [of pupils] don't have the life experiences our children would have so through this we give them a sense of enjoyment and wonderment...We want to offer enrichment and enjoyment and give them life time memories and experiences...this is all for students who generally miss out on a lot.'** She added: **'I think it is important to give them a big event that will stay with them forever and not just for the short term. It is important to have these events alongside the everyday activities'**. The Cluster Coordinator works with 37 schools divided into six clusters supporting them in various ways but also facilitating partnership working, that is, finding the most suitable providers to work with schools. Highlighting the multi-agency nature of her work, she stated that she is based in a police station and works with a range of partners including neighbourhood managers and the voluntary and community sectors.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

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

included, but was not limited to the following: FSM, lone parent household, looked after child, disadvantaged community, low reading age at reception, other negative behaviour/cause for concern (e.g. young offenders). The cluster co-ordinator discussed the implications of this: **'The government works to a formula of 60% take up. We can almost guarantee 100% take up but this means it doesn't pan out at about £300 [per pupil]. It is almost £120 but almost all are benefiting.'**

Consultation

Formal surveys were conducted followed by ongoing informal consultation. The Deputy Head said: **'We did a survey and asked the kids what they wanted. We decided we'd do something called 'Clubs' on a Friday afternoon instead. It encourages sustainability and can show progression of skills.'** The entire staff was encouraged to regularly consult with pupils and have been trained in consultation techniques. All activities have been arranged as a consequence of consultation. When asked about being consulted a pupil responded: **'It feels so good and there is so much now for us to do.'** School H was able to make a case for the flexible model on the grounds that two of the schools provided free school meals as part of their ethos anyway making it difficult to apply the FSM model. The Cluster Coordinator said: **'We were able to submit a statement and I was quite vocal in that for this particular cluster which is very unique in the pathfinder in that we would need the flexible model otherwise it would be just too difficult. I don't know if that had any bearing why School H were able to have the flexible model but it was really a major point for us in this cluster to have the flexible model'**. She went on to add that: **'With this cluster we've got children and young people for example, if it's just allocated on free school meals, two of the settings in this cluster all their children get free meals because that is part of the ethos of the schools, that they want to feed the children which means the parents don't then necessarily fill out the forms even if they are entitled to them. It would just be too difficult to say who was FSM and who was not so for us the flexible model was far more important. Predominantly boys in school and they wanted all the physical things like quad biking, some of it depends on the weather. Grassboarding. Lots and lots of activities over the school year predominantly what the children have asked for'**.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

It appears that pupil choices were initially limited by their inexperience and lack of awareness of what was available. It was important as a first step to broaden their horizons and make them aware of the range of activities they could participate in. The 'provider's day' (event attracting 18 providers) gave pupils and parents a taste of what was available in terms of local provision and the range of activities that were on offer. The ES Coordinator writes to all the providers and the school then provides the location and facilities for the event. The event is open to all the centres on the site and local schools. The Cluster Coordinator believes the personal touch works better than written invitations especially in relation to making connections and contacts with

providers: **'I talked with every single one of the providers. I phoned; I talked to them, told them what the disadvantage subsidy was all about. They were very successful events (provider fairs)'. 'The School organized refreshments etc were a key part in the success of the events'**. School H uses a pass book system and encourages pupils to take ownership over how they spend their allocation. This, according to the deputy headteacher, **'Gives them a sense of real ownership and their own budgeting of the money all links in with citizenship.'** Some pupils require frequent and gentle persuasion from staff to access funding. All staff in the school have been briefed about the subsidy and all discuss it regularly with the pupils e.g. over lunch, on the school bus. The school based family liaison officer promotes the subsidy with parents and runs a stand at parents' evenings.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

All the children currently in the school at the time of the second visit (56 children mainly boys spread across KS2 and KS3) were participating in activities of one kind or another.

Pupils are offered a varied menu of activities e.g. quad biking, climbing, horse riding, nail art, bowling, theatre trips, tickets for football matches, kick boxing, ice skating. The school will also arrange a day trip for all pupils in the summer term. A good number of pupils have accessed activities at a local outdoor adventure centre and others have visited an indoor play centre, whilst others have been bowling. Pupils reported 'enjoying' new activities, for example, a Year 9 pupil in School H spoke about their experience of quad biking, saying **'This was good and exciting, not scary,'** and a female pupil who got the opportunity to do some nail art said she felt 'great' that she had been able to try something that she had always wanted to do and was 'excited' at the prospect of horse riding. Another pupil discussed going to the football match with his father: **'It was great to go to the football match. I went with Dad and Dad loves [name of football team] also. The school paid for my Dad also,'** while another pupil spoke enthusiastically about experiencing a range of activities during a residential, including scaling high ropes and archery. Three pupils have also been on a residential trip to an activity centre. At School H a football club is also being set up and family focused activities are also being promoted which has already seen some pupils going with a parent to see their local professional football club play. There are also a family gardening club and a family cookery club, based in the local community centre. In a similar vein, pupils at the PRUs and those working with the Key Point Team are also given a wide range of activities from which to choose. The PRU for Key Stage 4 pupils, for example, offers activities that they can do in pairs or small groups e.g. aromatherapy massage, mud bugging, basketball, bleep music, DJing/MPing, paintballing etc There are also activities that they can do as individuals such as canoeing, driving cars (one pupil has opted to get the experience of driving a Lamborghini) pool, rock climbing, sailing, snowboarding (at a snow dome) etc. In the PRU for pupils in Key Stage 1 and 2, the young people have been able to access festive activities such as a pantomime and a 'Santa trip' and all pupils will benefit from a trip to London. Moreover some new activities have been set

up in school e.g. break dancing, multi-skills, table tennis and drama. One pupil is now working with a music software service they found out about at the providers' event after negotiating the price of the programme (getting it down from £130 to £100) and making the necessary calls to arrange it etc. The subsidy also enabled the school to make 'one-off' purchases such as **'board games, music production equipment, green houses and shed'**. These will be useful long-term resources that other pupils coming to the school can use. There are other more regular purchases required to make other activities possible. These include, **'fishing bait, craft material and food ingredients.'**

Partners

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

Funding activities and charging policy

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

Management and workload

The Deputy Head, who has responsibility for the accountability of expenditure and funding said: **'It is imperative we have [ES cluster co-ordinator] we are so snowed under. She has pulled everything together for us. We could do with her on site full time managing just this...we could almost do with somebody doing this full time.'** The Cluster Coordinator said: **'The workload was huge initially but we managed it. We couldn't have sustained it at that level because something's got to give. The workload has levelled off. Once the pathfinder had completed its first year everyone knew the way of working. The second year wasn't quite so intense at the end of the second year after we brought six more schools into the cluster I needed to concentrate my efforts on briefing them and getting them up to speed. It has been huge briefing all the schools and is still taking**

quite a lot of time. Myself and my two colleagues cover all 108 schools in (City).'

The Cluster Coordinator went on to say that: **'There did need to be that one key person in the schools to focus on the subsidy. We had some sustainability funding to be able to enhance (HLTA) so she could have a dedicated space of time every week just to look after the programme. That as a model has worked very well. With the roll out of the subsidy, we've offered a set amount of sustainability grant to every school that has a named person to take on that role. You do need a driver.'**

The Deputy Head said: **'Initially it was a bit of a nightmare setting it up. It was trial and error. It was making sure the money was accountable and now we've got procedures in place. So now, I think it's great. We've now got it to a level where we've delegated the various bits and we're now managing quite well. We are now moving forward with the holiday clubs.'**

Secondary I

Defined (comprehensive school, specialising in Humanities and Technology. School serves a wide and largely rural catchment with about 950 pupils)

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

Background

School I is a secondary school serving a deprived coastal town in the North East of England. The wide catchment area served by the school is largely rural and there are issues of rural isolation and deprivation for many pupils, especially as transport links are poor. Lots of pupils are bussed into school. The town in which the school is located, described as being ‘out on a limb’ is not well served by many services although there are a range of providers of activities for young people. There is much apathy in the town and this has meant it is difficult to get local people, including parents, to engage in extended schools provision. The cluster comprises six feeder primary schools and School I. Before the introduction of the subsidy, the offer of after school and holiday provision was limited and sporadic. A key aim of the subsidy was to develop holiday activities and offer pupils the opportunity to access activities of their choice during term time. Twenty-five percent of the money is top sliced and held by the High School to put on a range of holiday activities which all children can access but is then subsidized for those in the target group. There are, in the cluster, 300 pupils eligible for FSM and 53 in care. In School I 154 are eligible for the subsidy. According to the Extended Services Project Co-ordinator, School I is achieving about a 60-70% uptake among pupils eligible for the subsidy while the feeder primary schools appear to be achieving around the 100% mark.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

During the second visit staff felt that with hindsight the defined model, while restricted in its inclusiveness, was a useful starting point. One of the ES Coordinators felt that: **‘It helps you make decisions about who gets the money and how to spread the money out. It would have been an onerous task deciding on the criteria (if a flexible model was employed) and for the new clusters coming on board it’s been a massive task for them whittling it down, how to spread out the money really’.** School I is implementing the subsidy using the defined criteria of children eligible for free school meals and children in care. The Extended Services Project Co-ordinator (ESPC) explained that: **‘The two new clusters that started up in September 2009 had set their own target groups and one of the clusters found it really hard to exclude children because they were in an area of high deprivation and they wanted to include as many categories as possible and then realised that they’d got so little money per child they couldn’t make any**

effect. They've come full circle and have gone back to just FSM but with a certain number (outside the criteria) made eligible at the Head Teacher's discretion. The Local Authority (LA) has suggested to the schools that this is the model they should adopt from September because it gives schools that degree of flexibility but also that discrete target group they can start working with'.

Consultation

Electronic surveys were administered in IT lessons and pupils were also consulted via their classroom teachers who conducted head counts of pupils interested in certain activities. Year tutors took the opportunity to consult with parents when meeting with them through personal support and planning meetings. A coffee morning was also held at school with the aim of consulting informally with targeted young people and their parents. During the second visit to the school, the Deputy Head said, in reference to consultation, that: **'What we did at the start of this year was to interview every child so we could look at what we got last year, how we can do better, and actually looking at what they wanted to put on this year. So we used some of the money to pay adults to come in and interview them, ex-teachers, people we know. So we had a clear picture of what they wanted to do and what we could put on for them. Already, I'd imagine we've already beaten the level of engagement we had last year'**.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Letters and leaflets have been distributed to all pupils and parents in school. The promotional material for the activities at School I states: **'All activities provide the opportunity for children to learn new skills, be creative and more importantly have fun!'** Activities, which are booked via the extended services team in the council (often via cluster co-ordinators), are available to all on a first come, first served basis. The documentation reads: **'We may be able to subsidise those students who are keen to join in but need financial assistance.'** School staff have also met with local partners and attended meetings for looked after children with the purpose of raising awareness of the subsidy and year heads and the co-ordinators have spoken individually to pupils. The 'personal touch' is deemed important but: **'...this involves more work especially when everyone is working their jolly hardest.'** The abovementioned coffee morning was also an opportunity to promote activities and access to subsidy funding and it is anticipated that parents and pupils attending will begin to 'spread the word.' The cluster co-ordinator noted: **'It's winning hearts and minds and developing relationships and trust...the paper format doesn't always work.'** This approach is working as, according to the deputy headteacher: **'Now parents and grandparents are proactive, approaching me and saying can they [pupils] go on this and that.'** During the second visit the ES Coordinator said: **'We put coffee mornings on to try to get to the parents and letters went out to parents saying there was a coffee morning on and a lot of parents didn't engage in it'**. The DH agreed and said: **'They are notoriously hard to engage,**

parents around here, on anything. I mean, even the computer thing at the moment you can't even give them a laptop. A free laptop with a free internet connection for a year. Only two parents. It's crazy'. The subsidy in this cluster was rebranded in order to make it more user friendly.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

School I, and the cluster co-ordinators, have been pivotal in arranging holiday activities for children and young people from across the cluster. These activities take place either at School I, at the primary schools in the cluster or at local providers such as the Community Hall, Adult Education premises or the area based Youth Centre. Activities on offer during February 2009 half term included (those in italics were delivered at School I): *ultimate Frisbee*, *making music with drums and percussion*, crazy crafts (family learning activity), tri golf, Monday morning madness (provided through the youth service), designing a t-shirt, *karting*, *circuit training*, *boxercise*, *play rangers*, *rock climbing* and *soccer*. Pupils can also opt to do activities of their choice (from a range provided locally) during term time and weekends. One pupil, for example, has asked to go cycling and the school have provided the cycle and also a helmet, whilst others have opted to play rugby, go ice skating and pony riding. Another pupil requested swimming sessions which have been arranged and the same pupil is also accessing subsidy funding for a Duke of Edinburgh camping trip. This pupil explained: 'I now go swimming once or twice a week, Wednesday or Saturdays, with my Mum. They even bought my swimming costume...this is a real opportunity and it has really benefitted us as Mum has big financial issues...before we weren't going at all, well perhaps three or four times a year...when we go we do lots of challenges and I'll get healthy...I'm a bit chubby and I'd like to lose weight and this will help and when I get healthy I'll still keep going there.' 'It [the subsidy] has also paid for Duke of Edinburgh booklets and money towards the trip [school at this point said there was money to help buy equipment for camping]...Mum couldn't afford stuff but this meant I could go. Duke of Edinburgh supply some stuff but we couldn't afford leggings or boots...sometimes I think it can sound a bit cheeky but school said they can help and this is just a big opportunity for me. If things weren't provided then I couldn't go.' She added: 'I don't want to be a charity case but I've been told this isn't the case. It is just a great opportunity and I've not been camping before so it should be a really good experience hopefully.'

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

arrested to becoming involved in the scouts and he'll say, 'this has helped change my life and helped me to help others everyday of my life.' He is brilliant.' All staff concurred when they said: 'The individual activities they are doing, we've got horse riding, ice-skating, trying to set music lessons up for some of them, archery, swimming. Some of the children have 'leisure cards' which entitle them to access the swimming pool. Older students can access the gym using the same type of card. We've got the Duke of Edinburgh Awards Scheme. Some of the girls are doing the Duke of Edinburgh Awards. The subsidy pays for any expeditions and costs they incur while taking part in the scheme. Scouts, football. A real range of activities really'.

Partners

Main partners include the regional Sports Development Partnership and regional Voluntary Action Service and School I has also developed good working links with a range of local providers including the local community hall, Adult Education, the town's Youth Centre, a local organisation specialising in indoor and outdoor climbing, a local voluntary organisation offering support to children and families, another voluntary agency delivering street dance, and a community based drama group. The subsidy is linking with the local trust (similar to a children's trust) so that as the pathfinder develops it might link strategically with other plans for the locality and, there are clear links with the school sports partnership and with a national social inclusion programme which uses sport and leisure to engage young people. The deputy headteacher explained: 'We already had a good grounding but this has built up levels of partnership working.' The ES Coordinator said 'There isn't really a great deal in (Cluster area) and trying to get providers in with something different is just like a massive, massive task and people don't want to come out to (Town), they don't want to travel to (Town). We have brought one or two new things in, but predominantly we've just developed what is already out there really'.

Funding activities and charging policy

Most activities offered during February half term 2009 were priced at £1.00 a session and with up to 4 sessions running each day, the approximate cost for activities throughout the half term holiday was £20.00. Certain activities incurred a higher fee e.g. rock climbing cost £5.00 per session, although some other activities were free for all. Depending on the activity selected, pupils eligible for the subsidy funding would receive a reduce rate or a free place. The ESPC: 'Seaside towns, actually run lots of thing for the tourists but they don't actually run anything for the locals so for (Other Cluster Town) ES Coordinators they have money to put on a holiday activity programme which has been massive with the locals and has given them something to do in the summer holidays and the kids something to do in the summer holidays and this subsidy money has kick started that and it will be the same for (Town). In coastal towns you don't have things for locals'. The ES Coordinator pointed out that: 'The subsidy works out at about £204 per child

and depending on what they choose, obviously it has an impact on how many weeks they can do something. It is fully explained to the parents what the money is and roughly how much they've got and what they can do with the money. With the holiday activities that's when there's a charging policy because when we are running an activity (during the holidays) we have to cover costs but those on FSM access those activities for free. We offer the activities to everyone but non-FSM have to pay £2, £5, depending on what the activity is and we have to cost that out (provider, caretaker, equipment etc, etc.)'.

Management and workload

There has been a considerable impact on workload. The deputy headteacher at School I has responsibility for the implementation of the subsidy in school, and she is also the cluster lead. She is supported by two LA cluster co-ordinators and described their workload as 'mammoth.' A co-ordinator confirmed this saying: **'I'm an extended schools co-ordinator but the rest of my role has been put to one side and just been about the subsidy. It is a real struggle capacity wise and we are still learning all the way.'** The co-ordinators take bookings for activities and have also set up the new holiday provision. Teachers in school undertook consultation and whilst it is acknowledged that this might not be the most appropriate model, capacity of other staff to administer surveys was limited. The ESPC said referring to the workload: **'It's really time consuming. It's a lack of recognition about how long it takes to actually administer this project in that schools have had to think on their feet if you like and make it the most efficient way to administer. There isn't any chance of being able to tailor everything for everybody because schools don't have the resources to do that. It's not acknowledged in the project how much it takes to administer'**. One ES Coordinator said: **'There's not the resources in the area as well. There's kids who want things that we just can't put on'**. The other ES Coordinator said about workload: **'The workload has actually got greater because initially, last year, some of the schools did take on doing the activities, organising them for the children, but they didn't have the capacity in the school office to actually administer all the administration and organize all the activities. So they got to the stage where they said we don't actually want all the money. So, that's when I said, foolishly, I'll take it on. Consequently, our job is pretty much just the subsidy and our jobs as ES Coordinators hasn't totally slipped by the wayside but we are not doing as much as we should for the rest of our normal day jobs'**. Finally, the ESPC said in reference to the workload: **'As a local authority what we are trying to do for September 2010 and also to recognise that whenever you start a project you know it's going to take massive amounts of time, we are actually looking to, we won't ever be able to pay the full amount, but contribute to some of the admin costs in each school. So, we are looking for some money for that. The buy-in from schools, if a school with 70 pupils turned around and said we don't want the money, that would mean 70 children miss out so if we can contribute toward the admin costs then that is going to help with the 'buy-in' from the**

schools. Then, hopefully, when it's there we'll know what the future holds for the project'.

Primary J

Defined (Denominational school with around 200 pupils on roll. Primary serving a wide and socio-economically mixed catchment)

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

Background

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

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

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

Consultation

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

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

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

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

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

As many as 20 activities are available for young people to choose from during school holidays. Activities for young people in School J, and those in other cluster schools include: Get Crafty (family event for under 12s), soccer school (5-14 years), basketball, kwik cricket, ultimate frisbee and extreme gold (all for 8-15s), skate boarding and BMX biking (all ages); family trips to the national railway museum (0-10 years plus family), horse riding (8 years plus), paintballing (12-15 years), Parts Magic (8 years plus), Teddy Bears Picnic (0-5 years), cheerleading, modern movement (5-11 years), drum workshop (5-8 years), beach sports and play (8-15 years), skate boarding, Parts Art (8 years plus), boxercise (8-13 years), trampolining (11-15 years), wild things drama workshop (10 years plus), and junk modelling. These activities take place in venues across the area including School J, the Children's Centre, the local library and other community venues. Activities located at School J during the February 09 half term break included a soccer school with Bobby Charlton's Soccer School Coach and the nearby city's FC scout. During Easter 2009 a 'baby rave' took place at the local library and there were a series of trips for primary children and families to locations including a nearby seaside holiday destination, the nearest large city and also to other venues including Flamingo Land, 'Go Ape' and York Railway Museum. Holiday provision had also been arranged for Summer 2008 and October 2008 and included a similarly wide range of activities plus some new ones e.g. comic art, jewellery making, fencing, family spanish. Some extended provision is geared towards families. For instance, in conjunction with family learning, there were some free events organised for families to do activities including arts and crafts, cookery and mask making. The subsidy is paying for tutors, the local children's centre are holding the sessions and taking bookings. Other key strands of the subsidy in School J involve offering free music lessons to targeted pupils and promoting take up of local provision. Co-ordinators have negotiated a reduced price monthly leisure card allowing access to the local swimming pool and leisure centre (this fee is subsidised further for the target group). A parent of a pupil discussed what the subsidy has meant for her son: **'He now goes to street dance on Saturday mornings... when he comes home he's full of it. It's amazing the difference it has made...I knew that there were classes and then [name of head] spoke to us both about it...everything is so expensive and winter is the most expensive time of year. It costs £2.50 and this is a lot when you have to get the shopping in and pay the bills.'** She added: **'We've been into leisure world to see about swimming and he'd also like to do karate if it is set up in school and soccer also...it is all he talks about, dancing and karate...I do take him out and try to do things but it is hard...now he loves school. It is his favourite place and now they are offering**

this and it is great to have it. You need money for everything and it goes and you don't have any extra for these things'. Of the 19 eligible pupils, most have accessed the subsidy. Three children have accessed music lessons, and almost all have accessed holiday provision. The trips, which attracted children from across the cluster, took a good proportion of children who were eligible for the subsidy. Feedback from parents and young people involved in the Flamingo Land trip during October half term trip included: **'It was lovely to have a day out as a family without having to worry about the cost.'** (Parent) And: **'We have never been to Flamingo Land before it was great, can we go again next year?'** (Pupil). Providers who offer holiday provision and also some weekend provision also spoke positively about the subsidy: (feedback collected by cluster co-ordinators): **'Thank you for advertising our sessions in your booklet again, we were booked up with new children taking part. A couple of children who receive free school meals have said they would like to join the Saturday morning club.'** And: **'The activities were a real benefit for all those who took up the offer and provided them with opportunities that they would not normally have.'**

Partners

The local Children's Centre is a key partner as are Social Services, Family Learning, local sports community groups, and the sports development team in the Authority. The cluster co-ordinator said: **'We try and use local providers whenever possible.'** A booklet of providers has been produced which lists local providers under categories ranging from youth clubs to fishing to yacht club. Address and contact details for all providers are given. For the February 2009 half term, young people from School J accessed activities at a local church, a community based skate park and trekking centre, the Children's Centre, the community library and the local boat compound.

Funding activities and charging policy

All of the activities that ran during the February 2009 half term were free for pupils entitled to the subsidy. For other pupils certain activities were free e.g. Get Crafty (family event for under 12s) was free as was the junk modelling activity, the beach sports and play session, and the 'wild things' drama workshop, but many activities incurred a charge which ranged from £1.00 for cheerleading, modern movement, basketball, cricket, drumming, ultimate frisbee, gold, trampolining and boxercise, to £9.00 per day for soccer school and £22.00 per day for horse riding. Trips varied in price e.g. the trip to the local football ground was £30.00, the family outing to the national railway museum (0-10 years plus family) was priced at £3.00 per person or £10.00 for a family of 4. A similar range of activities was planned for the summer holidays 2009 and in the October half term and once again activities would be free for all children entitled to subsidy funding.

Management and workload

The Head at School J is managing the subsidy with the support of the cluster coordinators. Although she has met with all eligible pupils and most parents, she does not feel that this has impacted heavily on her existing workload as numbers of eligible pupils are low.

Secondary K

Flexible (Secondary school 11-18, with around 1250 children on roll situated in a County Town in a deprived area surrounded by areas of affluence).

Subsidy packaged as a scheme called 'Free Time' entitling eligible children to vouchers and/or payment for any activity they choose in the local area.

Background

Secondary K is large school serving a County Town. The number of children with SEN is lower than average (7.5%). The Headteacher explained that the area suffered with deprivation issues and a poor self image by its residents. The school is part of a cluster of 24 schools and the subsidy is being led by the Headteacher at the school, in partnership with the ES cluster co-ordinator, and governed by a steering group which includes local delivery partners. The main aim of the subsidy had been to increase the involvement of children and young people who are disadvantaged in leisure activities of their choice outside school hours.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The disadvantage subsidy has been used to create a scheme called 'Free Time' whereby children can receive vouchers or apply for direct payment from the school to the activity providers of their choice up to a value of approximately £200 per year. The criteria for inclusion in the scheme is:

- Entitlement to FSM
- Young carers
- Receipt of Income Support or parental disability benefits
- Receipt of Working Tax Credit up to an annual income of £18,300 (joint) or £13,000 (single).
- A subjective element
- Extreme circumstances such as bereavement

Parents need to go into school and show proof of eligibility before their children can be included in the scheme. The subjective element of the criteria was brought in to catch those children whose parents would not come into school. This criteria, in practice, was rarely used. Once the new school year started, young people were given a photographic ID card and a book of £50 worth of vouchers, and told that they could receive more if they needed them. The vouchers are linked to a number on the ID card and can only be used by the young person pictured on the card. Young people were given an information pack that explained how to use the vouchers, how to request payment for activity providers who did not accept vouchers, and contained a comprehensive booklet of over 280 local activities going on in the area accompanied by brochures from local providers. The young people we spoke to

generally had a good understanding of how the scheme worked. None of the young people we spoke to had had any difficulty in using the vouchers to pay for an activity.

Consultation

The school has found consultation with young people difficult. They have tried distributing questionnaires and an online survey, but few young people have taken part. Some of the young people we spoke to could remember being given a questionnaire but few had filled it in. There was mixed opinion from pupils about whether this is an effective method of consultation. The ES co-ordinator found the best way to find out what children want is to just give them the information pack, so they can make their own choices. Nevertheless, some children expressed the view that they should have been able to influence what was available rather than being presented with a list.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

There are currently 170 (13.7%) young people eligible for Free Time. The scheme was set up in response to the learning from the first year of the subsidy when a letter was sent to parents of children eligible for FSM, explaining that they were automatically entitled to the subsidy. However, the school wanted to encourage more ownership and parental responsibility for the scheme and so this year embarked on an extensive publicity and marketing campaign in the whole cluster area and asked parents to sign up for it. Marketing material such as posters and flyers were sent home to parents, displayed in local leisure centres and other public places such as libraries and job centres, and there was a distinctive name, logo and design used throughout so that parents and young people could recognise the scheme. Nevertheless, the enthusiasm for thinking of new ways to encourage children to get involved has not waned. Although the uptake in the first year of the subsidy was 70% of the target group, efforts are still being made to encourage a higher take up. Personalised letters are still being sent to parents, and a series of taster events are offered. A series of seminars has also been run with key partners in the scheme to brainstorm the challenges in getting young people to participate. The PSAs make a point of talking to parents to find out what the barriers to participation are, and there is a big realisation that it is not just economic, but that other barriers are in operation that influence uptake. The school has also used youth development workers to work with children on a one to one basis and signpost them on to activities.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

The majority of activities available are sports or music based. Free Time can also pay for school residential trips. The information pack also offers group activities that can be run as and when requested. The pack demonstrates the volume and variety of activities on offer – and yet young people can source their own activities and have them paid for by the subsidy if they wish. In that sense, the opportunities are unlimited, ranging from a trip to the theatre, to music lessons, gym membership, or residential holidays. The pupils who had taken part in activities under the scheme

expressed their appreciation. They told us that they were able to meet new people, learn new skills, have fun with friends and get fit. The young people also told us that they were pleased that their parents did not have to bear a financial burden for their activities.

Partners

The success of the voucher scheme relies heavily on the commitment of partners to co-operate with the scheme and continue to provide the level of provision that is needed to meet the needs of the pupils. Major partners have been the local leisure centres, and a representative from the leisure centres sits on the subsidy steering group. Both the school and the leisure centres have found working together to be mutually beneficial. On the whole, the school have found it easy to work with external agencies. Sometimes getting hold of them creates delays and difficulties which can be frustrating for school staff. The local council have been another key partner, who have provided sports apprentices to help increase the capacity at schools for leisure activities. The Head puts the perceived success of the subsidy to the good relationships between the cluster Headteachers and the Local Authority.

Funding activities and charging policy

All of the subsidy was directed towards the children, and any costs for administration were met by the main Extended Services budget. The cluster came up with a formula which meant that the school received £5 per head for each target group child, three times per year. The school monitors spending and attendance, and the attendance data triggers invoices for the external partners. Due to the increased take up of activities, local providers have had to invest in ensuring there is enough provision to meet demand, thus stimulating a local market that has created extra jobs, and attracted external funding. Many school run clubs were already free, and rather than introducing a charge for these, by advertising off site provision the school has enhanced the choice for all its pupils. Although the limit per child is currently £205.90 for this year, children were not always told how much they were entitled to as the school did not want to limit those who needed more, on the understanding that some children would use less. It was evident from our conversations with young people, however, that many of them were aware of a £200 limit, and this worried some of them. The Headteacher is keen to see the Free Time scheme continue. He accepts that without funding it may well have to adapt, or perhaps not be able to work as hard at engaging those children who are not participating, but feels that the real sustainability of the scheme is in the ethos it produces or **'sustainability of the spirit'**.

Management and workload

The Headteacher acknowledged that his workload had increased by taking the lead on the subsidy, not just for the school, but also by chairing the cluster steering group. Nevertheless, the ethos of the subsidy fits in very well with his beliefs and the way he wants to run the school. Key to this ability to concentrate on the subsidy has been the

understanding and support of the school leadership team and the governing body. The administrator responsible for the day to day running of the scheme had specific hours added on to her post to cope with the additional workload. She made it clear, however that it was not the kind of task that you could allocate a set time to, and she needed to be flexible. She also stressed that the role needed good organisational skills particularly as she also combined the role with working on reception and so was subject to constant interruptions, making it difficult to remember to record information promptly to ensure that the spending was monitored. However, like the Head, she found the role very rewarding.

Primary L

Flexible (Primary school (7-11) with around 200 pupils on roll serving a stable urban catchment).

Subsidy used mainly to facilitate access to out of school activities for named children, including those on low incomes, SEN, or vulnerable in other ways. Involves the provision of new activities that would otherwise not be available.

Background

Primary L is a smaller than average primary school serving an established area of privately owned and rented homes in a former coal mining area on the outskirts of a major city. Mobility is low, and most pupils transfer from the nearby infant school. The number of children with SEN is lower than average (6%), as is the proportion of children from minority ethnic groups. National deprivation ranking has improved in recent years but there are small pockets of deprivation existing. The school is part of a cluster of 14 schools and the subsidy is being governed by a management board (ESMB) made up of each Headteacher, an LA representative, the children's centre area manager and the extended services manager for the cluster. Many of the needs and gaps in provision are similar across the cluster. The main aim of the subsidy is to ensure that children and young people who are disadvantaged or vulnerable have the opportunities and support to be able to engage with extended services.

Implementing the subsidy and defining the target group

The criteria for defining the target group were decided by the ESMB. The ability to be creative and work in partnership was seen as challenging, but worthwhile. The criteria decided upon were broad enough to capture a range of circumstances and a range of methods were used to identify children. The criteria included:

- Those eligible for FSM
- Those living in at a postcode identified as suffering income deprivation by means of IDACI/ACORN scores
- Looked after children
- SEN
- Low attendance
- Exclusion
- Young carers
- At risk of offending
- Vulnerable in another way (e.g. hanging around school after hours)
- Children who don't engage in activities

In order to identify the children who would meet the criteria, a two pronged approach was taken. Key staff in school, including learning mentors and teaching assistants, as well as members of the locality based multi-agency children's team (JAT) were briefed, by way of presentations and briefing packs, on the criteria to be used, and asked to identify children that they thought would need to be targeted. Once this identification process had taken place, the school submitted an entitlement form to the Extended Schools Manager (ESM), who then released the subsidy funding based on how many children were identified. The school was then able to make its own decisions about how to use the funding, assisted by the ESM, and in consultation with parents and children.

Consultation

The Borough has implemented consultation opportunities at several levels over recent years. Alongside formal consultation events, there is a parent champions project. At one such consultation event in 2008, a key wish of families was to see more activities out of school hours. The need to make better use of school facilities in response to local need was also highlighted. In the response to the consultation, the Borough Council stressed that this would be achieved through extended services in schools. More specifically, the school itself sent out a consultation questionnaire at the beginning of the pathfinder to obtain parents' views on the activities that they would like to see provided for children. Since then, parents are consulted individually at parents evenings and adult learning classes, as well as in school about what parents might like to support their child. The parents we spoke to felt that they were listened to and that the school would always try and help if parents specified activities. Children are consulted in class about what activities they would like to take part in, and are asked personally by teaching assistants.

Raising awareness and promoting uptake

Because of the stability of the area, there are multiple family connections, and the staff are trusted and well known meaning that '**people know whats going on**'. Each term letters are sent to all parents, detailing the activities on offer after school. Each letter contains a section that invites parents to talk to school staff if they may have difficulty in paying for a club. The letters are followed up with personal telephone calls to the parents of those children identified as needing to be targeted. One club is specifically for children with special needs, who cannot cope with other clubs. Children are invited on an individual basis to take part in this and numbers are restricted.

Activities, take up, impact and outcomes

Some after school activities are block commissioned or provided by teachers and are open to any child in the school. These activities are usually oversubscribed and the children who were identified for the subsidy receive priority. For some children, usually those being worked with by the JAT, involvement in activities is part of a larger package of early intervention. These activities have a charge, but are usually

subsidised for all, and heavily subsidised for targeted children. These activities include football, yoga, art club, mad science, kickboxing, singing, circus skills, violin, cheerleading, gardening club and first aid. The subsidy has enabled more choice, as many of the activities would not have been able to run without resourcing from the subsidy. The subsidy has also been able to enrich experience for those children attending the clubs and enhanced the quality of experience that children have. Parents appreciate the provision of activities. They trust the school and know that their children are safe. Other activities include tailored provision for particular children and personalised packages to enable access to existing provision, such as one to one support for trips. The subsidy also enabled some children to attend a residential holiday focusing on self-esteem. This holiday was open to all, but subsidised for those eligible for the subsidy, and an additional member of staff was employed to ensure children with special needs could attend. The parents of children eligible for the subsidy were targeted first by means of a phone call.

Partners

Many of the activities and trips on offer are run by school staff, but the school has been able to engage several outside agencies to provide activities, including the YMCA and a well known local football club. The football provision (for both girls and boys) is very expensive, and without the subsidy the school would not have been able to afford to provide it, and parents could not have afforded the full amount. The school has subsidised this activity as it tends to appeal to the most vulnerable children although the activity is open to all.

Funding activities and charging policy

School L received funding based on the information they had supplied to the ESM on their entitlement form. This funding is used in two ways. Firstly, an amount of funding has been set aside to resource the infrastructure around the provision of activities. Resources are directed towards salary costs for administration, teaching assistants and supply teachers, as well as towards estate costs and photocopying. The subsidy also resources a text messaging scheme, so that parents can be contacted quickly if a club is cancelled or if plans change. Secondly, the fund is used to subsidise activities for targeted children. Much discretion is used around helping families, and although there is a list of children who are eligible for assistance through the subsidy, **'if a child turns up they are not turned away'** (ESM). Because the school is small, staff are aware of the circumstances of the families and can help where needed, either through assisting financially or offering staggered payments. Some clubs have been funded specifically from the subsidy, and although open to all, it allows certain children to be targeted. In this way, provision is opened up for people who would not normally engage. Normal practice is to charge for every activity, in order to encourage parents to value them. This means that children are more likely to turn up for sessions, and this applies even for those children entitled to the subsidy, who receive a discounted rate. Because of the identification and targeting exercise, staff

are more aware of targeting certain vulnerable groups of children, but do not always need to access the funding.

Management and workload

The ESM had experienced a substantial impact in terms of her workload. The subsidy became a priority for her, and she found that it created extra work on several fronts. Firstly, she needed to support the schools in the cluster in their identification and targeting techniques, and then ensure that they were implementing the subsidy in line with the action plan. Secondly, she found that she engaged in work for the TDA, involving presentations in London, and assessing impact and sharing best practice. Thirdly, she believes that it is important for her to keep the pathfinder moving forward, and ensure it stays a priority on local agendas. Much of the impact on her workload came at the beginning of the pathfinder, and the assumption is that the workload will lessen as time goes on, but that her input will still be needed to improve and develop the pathfinder. The subsidy has also had an impact on the workload of schools in setting up paper trails and systems for managing it, and accounting for the spend. The administrators think that as time has gone on they have got faster in what they are doing, but do not think that their workload will reduce. There has not been any impact on the workload of the site manager as he is contracted until 5.45pm to clean the school, regardless of any activities going on. The school cannot, however, offer holiday activities, as the site manager's holiday entitlement takes up most of the summer holidays, and it is difficult to recruit somebody temporarily.

Appendix 2: Case study summaries for schools interviewed about costs

Interview schedule

- A. Checking data on resource allocation (requested prior to interview).
 - 1. Provide copy of MI information for the school and request accuracy check.
 - 2. Ask for data on participation levels of non-target pupils in regular activities, breakfast clubs, one-off events, holiday-time activities.
 - 3. Ask whether any of these activities were provided before the subsidy, and if so what the level of participation was before the subsidy.
 - 4. Ask whether any of the resources (particularly equipment) acquired through the subsidy have been used by the school for other uses (i) as part of its extended provision (e.g. adult literacy) or (ii) core school activities.
- B. Outcomes for the School
 - 1. What outcome measures has the school used to evaluate the results it has achieved through the pathfinder?
 - 2. Have there been any spill-over effects from the pathfinder activities (e.g. performance of pupils in school, behaviour in school, relationships between school and the community, pupils' sense of well-being in and out of school) and if so, how have these been evidenced?
- C. Rationale for allocation of spending
 - 1. For each area of spending identified in the MI, why was this proportion of spending allocated to this use?
 - 2. Has some of the spending been more cost effective than other types of spending in achieving results?
 - 3. Given the experience of the school in the pathfinder, could results have been improved by changing the balance of spending between external providers and within school resources (e.g. staff, facilities upgrades)?

Organisation of findings

Analysis of the qualitative evidence suggested eleven themes (labeled A-K) which we subsequently related to the four main questions and expressed in terms of questions. The first four themes are related to the possible variation in benefits per hour of activity which could not be addressed through the available quantitative data.

[0] Variation in benefits per hour of pupil participation.

[A] To what extent are improvements in engagement of children and parents influencing school strategy towards the subsidy?

[B] To what extent are benefits to children expected as outcomes from the subsidy?

[C] Are school/parent relationships a priority for the pathfinder activities?

[D] To what extent are any of the outcomes for children being measured?

[1] What affects the amount of the subsidy that was unspent?

[E] What are the effects of the extent of local authority control over the use of the subsidy?

[F] Was the level of unspent subsidy simply a result of schools' unfamiliarity with managing this kind of subsidy?

[2] What affects the kind of activities that schools choose to organize?

[G] To what extent are pathfinder activities subsidised from other school budgets or voluntary donations of labour?

[H] Who decides which activities are provided through the subsidy?

[I] How does the school's current capacity affect how it chooses to use the subsidy?

[J] Is the subsidy used to provide free access to existing activities or to fund new activities?

[3] What affects the kind of resources that are bought with the subsidy?

[I] How does the school's current capacity affect how it chooses to use the subsidy?

[4] What affects the overall hourly cost of the activities organised?

[H] Who decides which activities are provided through the subsidy?

[G] To what extent are pathfinder activities subsidised from other school budgets or voluntary donations of labour?

[K] How is the targeting of access to activities managed?

Reference to each of these themes in reporting the results is indicated by including one of these letters in the text (e.g. **[A]**). After addressing each of the four main questions we present a summary for each school which is annotated with the thematic letters **[A-K]** for cross-referencing.

Group 1: Schools with lowest Average Hourly Cost

School 1.1

The extended schools pathfinder funding for this special school was held by the local authority as part of a consortium arrangement. The local authority made resources available in response to bids it received and the school understood that up to £300 was available for each targeted child. The decisions about the bids were shaped by the thinking of the teachers and the parents **[H]**.

A key issue was that the school serves a rural area and transport to and from the school is difficult for many parents, particularly those in the target group for whom the expense of arranging transport is an important problem. It was therefore decided that the priority for bidding was paying for transport. The resources were used, therefore, principally to subsidise (through transport costs) access to an after school sports club (which was an ongoing activity) and a music club (which was initiated through the extended schools pathfinder) [G]. The school used its other resources to provide 'matched funding' for teaching assistants to help with these activities. The additional teacher time was treated as 'indirect activity', but since there was no corresponding cessation of another activity, this was in effect 'voluntary labour', being an additional demand on teachers' time which was willingly given.

It is estimated that the participation of non-target children in the activities was roughly on the basis of a 1:1 ratio with target children [K]. One rationale for this was to make the activities (particularly the music club) viable. A second rationale for this was that it was felt important to provide activities in which children from different backgrounds were mixing. A third rationale was that some 'non-target' children came from backgrounds where the levels of household income meant that they experienced quite similar levels of disadvantage to those children included in the target group and there seemed little justification for excluding them. Moreover, the headteacher expressed a wish that funds could be used to provide support for these children also since a number in this category were not able to participate in the activities due to transport costs which parents could not afford.

The school does not have any measures of the impact of the activities [D]. However, it is pleased with the way that the activities have proved to be a catalyst for parental interactions (those parents who collect their own children). The school reported that direct efforts to increase interaction between parents have previously met with limited success, but the incidental opportunities arising from the extended school pathfinder activities seem to be generating new interactions [C]. It appears that these interactions have led to an increase in the frequency with which children are going to each other's homes. The increase in opportunities for social interaction and socialisation is regarded by the school as very important to children's overall development. It is believed that this is helping to build children's confidence although no measures of this have been undertaken.

School 1.2

This is a Middle School with a roll of just over 500. Given the size of the school and the range of activity that was planned the school used a proportion of the pathfinder funding on an 'activity co-ordinator' as the routine management of the activities would have taken too much time to be incorporated within the workload of the assistant headteacher overseeing the developments [G]. The decision to employ an activity co-ordinator also reflected a wish to provide children with a designated person who would be their point of contact in relation to the activities.

This was felt to be particularly important given the approach that the school chose to adopt in deciding what kind of activities should be provided. All the children in the school were informed that the school was going to receive some additional funding to support a range of activities in which they could take part [H]. Through completing a 'wish-list' in the context of a school survey and through an online survey, students were asked to indicate what kind of activities they would like to see the school providing. This process also generated conversations with parents which increased the school's interaction with parents, particularly in terms of providing parents with an opportunity to influence.

Decisions about what activities to provide were made on the basis of these data. For example, a group of year 8 girls indicated that they would like an opportunity to develop skills in relation to the health and beauty industry which they considered a possible future occupation. A health and beauty course was established which was accredited through a local college.

A majority of the activities were newly initiated on the basis of the funding provided through the pathfinder, but a minority were extensions of existing activities [J]. For example, in previous years the school had offered a residential for Year 6 students. However, since parents had to bear the cost of this residential, it was not previously very accessible to children within the target group for the pathfinder activities. The pathfinder funding was used to provide free places for children in the target group. However, this did generate some difficulties were parents who were unhappy when their children received no subsidy. The school has subsequently switched to a strategy of providing a partial subsidy to all parents alongside free places for targeted children [K]. This illustrates a problem that schools face with a 'target/non-target' group distinction in the allocation of means-tested funding. Some parents fall outside a cut-off point when their income is little different from those who are able to benefit from the subsidy. The school believes that the strategy it has adopted to overcome this problem has the advantage not only in terms of relationships between parents and the school but also in terms of providing a good social mix in participation in activities. The school estimates that the ratio of non-target to target pupils in participating in all the activities is about 2:1. In part, this is a direct response to the expressed (e.g. through the online survey) wishes of children who indicated that they preferred to engage in activities with their friendship groups: the participation of target pupils would have been lower if 'non-target' friends had not been allowed to take part.

The school spent roughly one third of the pathfinder money on external providers. This reflected the school's judgement about its capacity to provide some of the kind of activity that children requested [I]. That is, it was a natural outcome of the decision to seek children's preferences rather than to start from what the school felt able to provide within its existing capabilities. Some of the activities were provided in terms of 'taster experiences' that children could use to see if this was really the kind of thing they wanted. For example, a drama group was commissioned to provide a day 'taster

experience'. Children were able to see if this was really something they wanted before parents committed themselves to paying for a term of participation.

The school spent very little (less than half a per cent) of the pathfinder money on equipment. This was explained in two ways. First, a number of the activities requested by students (e.g. drama club, the health and beauty course) did not require equipment that the school did not have (since outside groups were employed to provide this) [I]. Second, the school was able to fund its equipment needs from other sources.

Nearly half of the pathfinder funding was allocated under the 'other' heading. A substantial proportion of this was used to fund an activity co-ordinator who provided the children with a key point of contact as well as making sure activities were properly organised, co-ordinated and monitored. Given that the average cost per hour of pupil participation was £1.29 (well below the average for the sample) this strategy appears to have paid off.

The school believes that there have been many benefits from the pathfinder activities:

- In terms of children's welfare (e.g. breakfast club providing food to start the day and social/friendship opportunities; evaluations completed by children show that they have enjoyed the activities).
- In terms of children's engagement with school (as shown in attendance levels and behaviour, both of which are monitored and in terms of their confidence). Children have attributed the benefits of the activities to the school providing them with opportunities, increasing positive attitudes towards the school [A].
- In terms of children's skills: opportunities to participate in sport and drama have raised children's skills levels; some activities such as the health and beauty course have contributed to vocational skills and awareness of an occupational area in which children might, in the future, seek employment [B].
- In terms of improved school/parent relationships [C].
- In terms of business links.

School 1.3

This is a small school which was one of a number whose extended school pathfinder funding was administered by a local authority co-ordinator. In this scheme each child in the target group was allocated a budget of £300 and parents of these children were informed that this amount of money was available to pay participation fees for their child wishing to enrol in pathfinder activities. This approach to allocating funding tends to promote spending on external providers as parents must apply for their allocation to be used on very specific activities and this can be easily identified in the cases of activities for which a charge is generally made. However, 'external providers' in this case include part-time staff providing after-school activities. These staff are regarded as part of the school [I]. This system also precludes any children outside the target group from benefitting financially. 'Non-target' pupils only benefit to

the extent that activities are made viable to provide by the pathfinder funding. However, in the case of this school the pathfinder activities were already in existence and the funding enabled participation of children from the target group whose parents would otherwise have not been able to pay for their child's participation **[K]**.

The headteacher referred to two difficulties with this funding system. First, the delineation of the target group means that parents either receive £300 or nothing. Parents whose incomes place their child fractionally outside the target group receive no support and the headteacher referred to 'considerable resentment' amongst this group of parents **[K]**. The school has seen 100 per cent year-on-year increase in the number of children eligible for free school meals and the headteacher believes this reflects the incentive (due to the pathfinder funding) of having your child eligible for the target group as much as any change in parents' financial circumstances. Second, some parents do not take up their full allocation of subsidy. Whilst the management information suggested no 'unspent money' this was because this category was a relationship between the local authority and the parents as the school was not a devolved budget holder. In fact, since parents were allocated £300 a year, the actual level in the 'unspent' category was 15 per cent of the total allocation **[E]**. The school is not able to vire these funds into other uses within the pathfinder. The headteacher of this school indicated that if this opportunity had been available she would have used to extend free access to the activities to children of parents whose incomes placed their children just outside the target group.

Some pathfinder activities are heavily subsidised from other school funds **[G]**. The most important elements here are the regular breakfast and after-school clubs. The total annual wage bill for these is £17,000 and the school receives about £4,000 in fees paid by parents. Only a tiny fraction of this is covered by the payments received via the pathfinder scheme. The headteacher estimated that this subsidy from main school funds is roughly equivalent to the cost of two learning support assistants. She took the view that whilst it was uncertain whether the provision of the after school clubs had any different effect on academic attainment (when compared with learning support assistants), she was convinced that the social welfare benefits for children and parents in the target group were much greater from the after-school provision than they could be from employing additional learning support assistants **[B]**. She referred to a couple of parents for whom she believed that this provision had been 'a life saver' and some children for whom the after school clubs provided 'a way of being more active and a lot of children say 'can I stay?'' The school has not attempted to directly measure any of the perceived benefits of the pathfinder activities. In a fairly small school it is possible to identify particular children who seemed to have derived particular benefits. One child has been able to develop potential in music through lessons that her parents would not have been able to pay for. One child, who had been rather shy with classmates had developed social confidence after participating in football coaching sessions. The over-riding themes in participation at this school were (i) children participating in 'enrichment activities' (such as coaching in sport or music) which parents could not afford and (ii) relieving demands on low-income parents from after-school care.

School 1.4

This school allocated roughly a third of its pathfinder funds to providing target pupils with free access to after school clubs and the remainder largely to the cost of running a breakfast club that was free to all children who attended [K]. The principle of the breakfast club being free to all children is currently under review in the light of its ongoing costs. The school estimates that attendance at the breakfast club was split evenly between target and other children. Roughly two-thirds of the attendees at the after school clubs were non-target children and one third children in the target group. The school estimates the annual staffing cost of providing the breakfast club at £6,000. On the basis of the school's management information it appears that just over half of this cost was met through the pathfinder funding, with the remainder coming from other school funds [G].

The breakfast club was initiated with the pathfinder funding, but the after school clubs were in existence before the pathfinder, although there were previously no opportunities for free access [J]. The after school clubs are largely sporting: e.g. football, multi-sport, but also include a ballet class. Each activity is provided by an external agency and fees are charged to children outside the target group. The choice of type of after school activities that are available was therefore made before the pathfinder was initiated [H]. Children and parents have not been consulted over the kind of after school activities which should be made available. The take-up of these activities by children in the target group 'has not been particularly good'. The school felt that this reflected a degree of parental apathy in the face of activities that were available without cost to their children.

The expected outcomes from the activities were specific. The school wanted the breakfast club to facilitate a prompt start to the day, reducing the number of late arrivals and making it more likely that children would be ready to start their formal work on time. It was believed that effects on behaviour were slight [B]. The sporting activities were expected to develop children's fitness and health whilst giving them opportunities to improve their skills. Spill-over effects were not a priority, although some improvements in peer interactions were hoped for.

The school is currently reviewing its provision. Previously the school has provided one school trip a year. This provision has been limited by the ability of parents to pay for their children to participate in such activities. Increasing these opportunities is now regarded as a priority in order to extend the experience of children from low income backgrounds. The school has applied for an additional grant to enable it to subsidise transport costs for more frequent school trips (such as to museums).

Group 2: Schools with below average hourly cost

School 2.1

This is a small rural school with roughly 30 children on roll, of whom 10 were in the target group. The pathfinder funding was devolved to the school [E] which chose to

spend roughly three-quarters on external providers. The main rationale for this was that the school was too small to have the necessary expertise (e.g. in relation to archery and a 'drum club') and facilities (such as a hall that could be used for dance) to provide appropriate additional facilities [I]. Schools within the cluster shared information about potential external contractors to use. The school decided what activities to offer on the basis of views expressed by the children [H]. All children were asked for their views, but the recording of responses enabled the views of children in the target group to be given preference. Parents were informed about the school's involvement in the pathfinder project and that this would mean that some activities would be provided for free only to children in the 'target group'. Only one complaint was received from a parent whose child was not in the target group [K]. Parents were not asked to suggest what activities might be suitable.

Some activities (such as a 'cookery club') were continuations of existing activities which were already running on a 'pay for participation' basis [J]. Children in the target group were given the opportunity to participate without payment and this extended involvement from this group of children. Other activities (such as an archery club) were new. The headteacher estimated that 'non-target' children participated in activities on roughly a 1:1 ratio with children in the target group. However, whilst children in the target group gained free access to the activities, other children were asked to pay a fee, so these children only benefitted in terms of the availability of the activity and any extent to which the per-child fee was effectively reduced due to the participation of 'target children'.

A small amount of the subsidy was used for transport and for equipment. The latter was largely in the form of consumables for the cookery club. An example of transport expenditure was arranging transport to a dance festival. This was an annual event that the school had participated in during previous years [J]. However, formerly the transport of children to and from the event had relied on the ability and willingness of parents to drive children there and back and this had meant that children in the target group had previously tended to miss out on this kind of experience.

The headteacher believed that the pathfinder activities had made it 'easier to be inclusive' [B], which she regarded as particularly important for a small school. Previously, children in the target group had tended to be excluded from additional activities due to having to pay. This, she believed, had knock-on effects on children's self-esteem and sense of belonging to the school community. She believed that through their participation in the activities, children in the target group had increased in self-esteem and their readiness to engage with routine activities as learners. She particularly noted improvements in participation in group work and anticipated that this would lead to increases in achievement in academic subjects. She described one of the children in the target group as 'a changed child'. Another Year 5 child now had a much more positive attitude to school following their participation in a 'drum club' that had been initiated at their suggestion. Children and their parents were reported as responding very positively when they had an opportunity to shape the activities which took place. The school was not using any specific measurement indicators

(e.g. of self-esteem) to check these observations, but the headteacher felt that, in a small school it was possible to observe these changes acutely and reliably [D].

Just over twenty per cent of the available funding was left unspent at the end of the year. This had occurred because the school had believed that they would be able to roll this forward into the following year and they were still working out how best to use the available money [F]. In the current year the school is expecting to spend all of the allocation and is actively reviewing ways in which it can achieve best-value. More expensive activities (such as the archery) are currently under review.

School 2.2

This is a small rural primary school which had, prior to the pathfinder, only been able to offer a fairly limited provision of after school activities. In fact, a survey of parental opinions undertaken by the school before the pathfinder had identified after-school activities (though not a breakfast club) as an aspect of the school's services that they would like to see expanded [H]. The school's judgement is that the pathfinder has enabled it to 'offer a lot more' and this is supported by its survey evidence from parents. The school based its allocation of the subsidy on the wishes of parents expressed through this and another survey and the wishes of children who were also surveyed. The preferences of target children and their parents were prioritized in interpreting these surveys, although little difference was found between the preferences of the two groups.

In all but one case access to the activities was provided free to target children whilst non-target children were asked to pay the full cost [K]. One activity, a karate club, was at a more expensive rate (£5 per session) and participation in this was also subsidised by the school for non-target children. Overall, four new after-school activities were initiated through the subsidy. In addition, participation of target children in existing activities was increased through providing free admission and covering transport costs which were important to the participation in a few of the children since this is a rural school. Some parents specifically requested opportunities for children to attend one-off events (e.g. horse-riding and swimming). Decisions about how to spend the subsidy were led by the preferences expressed by children and parents [H]. These suggestions required the school to use external providers (notably for sporting activities) and to buy equipment (e.g. for a gardening club) because the school did not already have these facilities [I].

The school received advice from the local authority on how best to spend the money and was required to provide reports summarising and justifying the way the money was spent [E]. The school has also been expected by the local authority to track outcomes. However, the school has been free to direct the subsidy as it thinks best and the tracking has been informal rather than formal. That is, the school has been using 'student and parent involvement' as key indicators, but it has been judged so far that it is appropriate to largely track these informally [C]. Given that the school is small it is feasible for the headteacher to keep personal track of when parents are making contact and what form that contact is taking. Nonetheless, the school has

used some survey data from parents to judge their satisfaction [D]. A recent survey (after the initiation of the pathfinder) found that 85 per cent of responding parents thought that the school's after-school provision was 'very good', whilst this had been a concern for parents before the pathfinder. The school is now looking to extend its formal tracking. It is planning to use a self-esteem scale to provide an indicator of children's engagement.

Almost 45 per cent of the subsidy was spent on providing equipment. Much of this was to provide equipment (notably a shed) for a gardening club. Books were also purchased for a book club. In both these cases the equipment has also been used during the school's curriculum time.

Group 3: Schools with above average hourly costs

School 3.1

This primary school has tried to extend the targeting of the pathfinder activities so that they included children just outside the target group as well as those within the target. The school has been acutely conscious of the needs of some families (such as those not receiving family credits) who are best described as 'low-income families' although their incomes place them just above the cut-off point for free school meals eligibility [K]. On average participation in the activities has been roughly three-quarters target group children and one quarter others.

The school involved parents and children in deciding what activities might be supported through the pathfinder funding [H]. Letters were sent to parents of children in the target group and other parents identified by the school as falling just outside the target. Many of the suggestions from parents involved sport and none was considered by the school to be an inappropriate activity.

Roughly three-quarters of the money was spent on external providers because the school did not believe it had the expertise or resources to provide the activities suggested by parents [I]. Examples of activities provided were: tennis, golf and boxing. Access to these activities was provided free for children in the target group (and those close to the target group) whilst other children were expected to pay fees. The school supplemented the resources available from these sources by meeting from the general school budget the costs of teaching assistants who helped with these activities [G]. However, the largest element of cross-subsidisation has probably come in the form of time allocated by the headteacher.

Transport costs for children to go on residential trips were also met from the pathfinder budget. Parents and children in the 'target' and 'close to target' groups were also invited to attend dance and theatre productions (selected by the school) free of charge [C]. The reasoning behind this kind of activity was to provide occasions when parents and children could experience new cultural activities together. The school saw this as a way of extending cultural horizons in ways that the parents could not afford.

The school has not used any systematic measures of outcomes, but has received appreciative letters from parents [D]. One parent wrote 'my children have never been able to do this before' whilst other parents have commented on improvements in their children's behaviour at home. Improving relationships between parents and children and between parents and other parents has been a central part of the school's strategy. The school has worked with other schools with the support of the local extended schools co-ordinator, to arrange activities in which parents from different cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds are mixing together [I].

School 3.2

All the activities provided by this secondary school were either free to all pupils or free to target pupils and provided at a subsidised price to non-target pupils. The free and subsidised provision for non-target pupils was, according to the school's assistant headteacher, 'effectively financed through the pathfinder subsidy' [K]. All new activities initiated through the pathfinder subsidy have been made available free to all pupils. Existing activities have been made available for free to target pupils and at a subsidised rate to non-target pupils. The rationale for this strategy was to avoid possible difficulties with non-target pupils and parents that might arise if they were asked to pay the full price when others were not. The school estimates the average rate of participation of non-target to target pupils as roughly 2:1. For this school, therefore, the calculated hourly cost of activities from the management data is a large overestimate (since that figure only includes the participation of target pupils).

Some of the new activities (such as yoga club) have been more strongly focused on the target pupils than others (such as a Go-Karting club). In practice, the early morning activities have been more focused on target pupils and the summer activities have tended to be the highest proportion of participation from pupils outside the target group. The rationale for the choice of activities has been largely professional judgement exercised by the school leadership team [H]. A major consideration has been the availability of good quality external providers. Dialogue with staff responsible for extended provision in other schools has been valuable in identifying suitable external providers. The school then invited potential providers to run a taster session for pupils (mostly from the target group). These pupils then indicated their preference between the options that were made available to them. Parents were not involved in this consultation process [C]. The school serves a locality where the main ethnic group is Asian, with a high proportion of Sikh families. The school reports that the parents are generally very supportive of the school 'apart from a minority who put the barriers up'.

The school is expecting the activities provided through the subsidy to broaden students' experience and to improve their attitude towards school. The success of activities is being judged through pupils' attendance. A dance club was stopped because attendance was low. However, where an activity (such as a yoga club) is relatively expensive in terms of per pupil hourly activity it may be retained because of perceived benefits for target pupils. Inclusion staff have reported that students

attending this (yoga) club have developed more positive attitudes to school [B]. The school calculates that the regular (after school) activities are more expensive per hour than the one-off activities it has organised. This is attributed to the greater dependence on external providers for the after-school activities. The per pupil hourly cost of one-off activities can be low when the school is able to spread costs between a large number of participants rather than paying a fixed per pupil fee to an external provider.

The school spent very little on equipment having been advised by the local authority co-ordinator that spending on equipment would be approved [E]. The school has made payments to staff who have provided after-school and one-off activities. A summer school provided in the first year of the subsidy involved a lot of pupils and was a major item in the school's spending. Without this spending the amount of the subsidy that was unspent would have been much larger. The school started its pathfinder activities rather late, so spending the subsidy was compressed into the second half of the year. The school is not expecting any of its allocation to be unspent in the current year [F].

Group 4: Schools with highest average hourly cost

School 4.1

At some point in time all pupils at this Infants School have had opportunities to participate in the 'extended school' activities [K]. One of the activities that was financed through the extended schools pathfinder was an art club which had been run previously, largely as a result of interest and support from parents. A large proportion of the additional money was spent on materials (for reading and maths, music and art) which were provided to parents to use at home [F]. No evidence has yet been gathered on whether parents have continued to use these resources [D]. One future target for the school is to get parents to come in and learn how to use these resources (and particularly the games) with their children. However, the school has no appropriate facilities for a crèche and many of the parents have younger children so this would present practical difficulties [I]. It is believed that the activities funded through the extended services pathfinder have improved students' behaviour and socialisation within the school. The main indicators that are referred to as evidence of children's greater engagement are: (i) greater willingness to volunteer their ideas and suggestions; and (ii) more sustained concentration [A].

School 4.2

The majority of the resource was used by this primary school to set up a school community radio station [I]. A substantial proportion of this money was used to buy equipment which the school now owns. The school's strategy was strongly influenced by the headteacher who has subsequently left the school. The radio station is not currently operating although this position is being reviewed by the acting headteacher. As a newcomer to the school the acting headteacher became aware of the existence of the radio equipment through her review of the school's facilities after

being appointed [C]. The radio station has not been mentioned to her by parents or children at the school. It is believed that the rationale for using the money in this way was to create new connections between the school and the local community whilst giving the children opportunities for public communication and expressing their voice. However, the cost per hour of children's activity was more than 50 per cent higher than the average, so the outcomes during the year would have needed to be very positive for these children to make the strategy value for money. A community radio station could, potentially, also have strong positive community and school/community outcomes (e.g. in being a conduit for information) [B]. However, there is no record of any evaluation of such outcomes [D]. If the radio station had been performing a strong role in this way it is likely that some parents and some children, at least, would have been indicating their disappointment that the service had stopped.

The school has been following a different strategy with its pathfinder resources during the current financial year. Resources are targeted at children in years 3-6 with activities organised for lunchtime and after school. The lunchtime activities have been organised particularly for those children for whom other commitments (e.g. attendance at the Mosque) make participation in after school activities not practicable. Most of the activities this year have had a sporting emphasis and the choice of activities has been determined by the teacher co-ordinating the programme [H]. This teacher has drawn on their knowledge of external providers to guide the selection of activities. This process is currently under review, with a possibility that in future the school council will be asked to discuss the range of activities that are offered. The current objectives that are directing the school's use of resources are: to enhance sports provision and health education; to develop children's self-esteem and confidence; and to provide experiences that would otherwise be unavailable to children in the target group [B]. The school is not currently measuring these outcomes, but teachers' observations of children are being used to monitor the effectiveness of the programme [D].

School 4.3

This primary school has a proportion of FSM children of 0.6 of a standard deviation above the average for the sample, with roughly a quarter of the school's children being in the target group. The allocation of subsidy funding was mediated by the local authority through an extended schools co-ordinator [E]. The school was advised that it could not spend any of the subsidy on equipment. If the opportunity had been there then the school reports that it would have used some of the funding in this way [I]. The school used the subsidy to strengthen and develop its approach to providing children with activities out of school hours. Some of the subsidy was used to extend participation in existing activities whilst some of the subsidy was used to introduce new activities. It is estimated that participation in the activities has been roughly 50 per cent target children and 50 per cent non-target children [K]. The school estimates that many of the 'non-target' children come from homes where family income is little different from that of the 'target children'. This is an important consideration in the school's strategy. Children outside the target group have been asked to pay

something towards the cost of their participation, whilst the remainder of the cost has been met through the school's other budgets, reflecting the previous stance of the school towards providing additional activities.

The new activities were chosen following consultation with parents [H]. There was a formal consultation with parents attending parents' evenings and informal consultation with parents as they collected children. Children were also asked to provide their views. The key outcomes that have been targeted through the subsidy are (i) reducing lateness and (ii) increasing engagement with the school as evidenced through reducing exclusions [A]. It is believed that late arrivals and exclusions have gone down for target and non-target children although the school has not yet carried out a formal analysis of the figures.

School 4.4

All the activities at this High School were open to target and non-target children [K]. The level of participation was roughly 50 per cent target children and 50 per cent non-target children. In many instances the activities were free to all children although non-target children were required to pay something towards the cost of some of the activities. However, this charge was generally not the full-cost, with the remainder being met from other school budgets. Prior to the pathfinder subsidy there were a few academically orientated after school activities. The subsidy has been used to greatly extend the scope of the activities with a particular emphasis on sport. All of the pathfinder funding during 2008/2009 was used on external providers as, at the time, it was felt this was a practicable way to initiate activities [I]. At this time it was felt that 'there was not a lot of buy-in' to the additional activities from school staff. In this financial year the school was allocated a sum of money to deploy as it wished. In the current year the local allocation system has changed. Whilst schools have a dedicated allocation, they are required by the local authority [E] to present a plan which justifies the allocation of spending in terms of specified objectives. The school has welcomed this change in approach.

The school is currently looking to change its pattern of provision. Following the appointment of a new headteacher there is an expectation that all members of staff will devote some time to supporting activities outside of timetabled hours [G]. This will release school resources to be used for these activities, reducing reliance on external providers. It is anticipated that this will release some of the subsidy to initiate a breakfast club which has, up to now, not been part of the provision. The school is also reviewing the charges that are made to 'non-target' children with a view to making these activities more sustainable by generating a larger flow of revenue from these pupils. The school has also surveyed children to gather data on what kind of additional activities they would prefer [H]. As a response to this information the school is intending to provide a breakfast club and will switch some of the subsidy away from other activities in order to provide this. It is also expecting to release money for a breakfast club by switching from external to internal providers for some of the activities.

The member of the senior management team responsible for leading the provision estimates that she devotes about 36 hours a year to these management duties **[G]**. With the hours that are provided by other staff responsible for delivering the activities the total level of school resource which is provided in addition to the pathfinder subsidy could be quite large. It is not clear how much of this resource is effectively a voluntary gift from staff and how much is a substitution of time away from other school activities.

The school has used attendance and examination performance data to review the effectiveness of the activities provided **[D]**. The key indicators have been 'better than expected attendance' and 'better than expected achievement'. Attendance of the target pupils has risen to close to the school average, although this has not been checked with significance tests. The biggest rise in attendance has been observed in those target children from ethnic minorities. The school is currently developing its approach to gathering data on students' sense of well-being in school and it is anticipated that survey data will be used to systematically review the impact of participation in the subsidised activities on students' sense of well-being at school **[B]**.

Appendix 3: Whether pupils are attending activities at the target level

Term time

The term time model looks at whether the young person meets the target of attending two hours worth of activity per week in term time.

There were four stages to the model. The first held phase and model of the school constant. When these were accounted for, school attributes were tested. The third stage looked at the parental attributes, whilst the fourth then looked at the pupil characteristics.

By controlling for only the phase and model followed by the school in the model, it showed that those in secondary schools were around 46 per cent more likely to meet the target attendance than those in primary schools. Respondents in schools following the defined model, were not significantly different to those following the flexible model in terms of meeting the target attendance levels, although they tended to be slightly less likely to meet the target attendance.

Controlling for the phase and model, the proportion of school pupils that were eligible for FSM and the size of the school were also tested. Pupils at schools with more than 20 per cent of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely than those at schools with 10 – 20 per cent eligible for FSM to meet the target attendance.

The third stage looked at the parental attributes, and tested sex, marital status, working status and tenure of the parent responding, how they felt they were managing financially, whether they had a car, or were on benefits (other than Child Benefit or Tax Credits). None of these factors were found to be significant when tested in the model when phase and model, and FSM eligibility level of the school were controlled.

The final block looked at child characteristics, and tested the sex of the young person, age band, FSM eligibility, whether they had statement of special educational needs, the number of children they lived with who went to the same school, whether they enjoyed school, and whether they did activities outside of school.

For the child, given that the phase, model and FSM level of the school were controlled for, the age was found to be significant in whether they met the target attendance, with older children being more likely than 4 – 6 year olds to attend the target level. Those who were 10 or older were between three and five times as likely as 4 – 6 year olds to attend at the target level. Those who enjoyed school were also 53 per cent more likely than those who did not enjoy school to meet the attendance level, and children who did activities not provided by the school were almost twice as likely than children who did not attend activities not provided by the school to meet the target attendance.

Once age was introduced into the model secondary schools were no longer significantly different to primary schools as to whether the child met the target attendance level.

Whether young person attends the target level of activities during term time

Question	Code	BLOCK 1 Model and phase of school		BLOCK 2 School attributes		BLOCK 4 Pupil characteristics	
		Sig.	Exp(B)	Sig.	Exp(B)	Sig.	Exp(B)
Phase	Primary (ref)		1		1		1
	Secondary	*	1.46	*	1.69		.79
	Special		1.05		.94		.59
Model	Flexible (ref)		1		1		1
	Defined		.68		.75		.77
Constant			.68				
Proportion of pupils in school with FSM eligibility	1.00 Less than 10% (ref)				1		1
	2.00 10% up to 20%				.57		.59
	3.00 20% or more				1.09		1.11
Constant					.67		
Whether does activities not provided by school	No (ref)						1
	Yes					*	1.96
Whether YP enjoys school	No (ref)						1
	Yes					*	1.53
Age band	4 - 6 (ref)						1
	7 - 9						1.40
	10 - 13					*	3.15
	14 +					*	4.73
Constant							.20

Holidays

This looked at whether the young person attended holiday activities for 30 or more hours a year.

Similarly to term time, this model is built in four stages, looking at phase and model of the school, other school attributes, parental attributes and child characteristics. The first stage fixed the phase and model of the school. When these alone are controlled for, neither have a significant impact on meeting the target holiday attendance. The second stage tested out different features of the school, such as the size of the school, and the proportion of pupils that are eligible for FSM. Children attending schools with higher proportions of pupils that are eligible for FSM are nearly four times more likely to meet the target attendance, when the phase and model of the school are taken into account.

The third stage tested the characteristics of the parents; sex, marital status, working status and tenure of the parent responding, how they felt they were managing financially, whether they had a car, and whether they were on benefits (other than Child Benefit or Tax Credits).

Young people in families who say they are 'just about getting by' are 76 per cent less likely to be meeting the target attendance levels compared with those who are 'comfortable' or 'doing alright'. Those where families were finding it quite or very difficult to cope were less likely to meet the attendance level, but this was not significantly different to those who were comfortable. Children in families where the parent is aware of any sources of funding are about twice as likely to meet the target attendance levels compared with those who are not aware of funding arrangements.

The final stage looked at the characteristics of the child. Once the phase, model and FSM level of the school, how well the family is managing financially, and whether the parent is aware of funding is taken into account, those who do activities not provided by the school are nearly three times as likely as those who don't do activities not provided by the school to meet the target holiday attendance. Young people who enjoy going to school are about five times more likely to meet the target attendance than those who don't enjoy school. For the holiday period, age no longer appeared as being significantly associated with meeting the holiday target attendance.

Whether young person meets the target level of attendance during the school holidays

		FORCE phase and model		Test school features		Test family attributes		Test child attributes	
		BLOCK 1	BLOCK 2	BLOCK 3	BLOCK 4	Sig.	Exp(B)	Sig.	Exp(B)
		Sig.	Exp(B)	Sig.	Exp(B)	Sig.	Exp(B)	Sig.	Exp(B)
Phase -	Primary (ref)		1		1		1		1
	Secondary		1.39	*	2.29	*	3.50	*	4.19
	Special		1.82		1.51		1.33		2.50
Model -	Flexible (Ref)		1		1		1		1
	Defined		1.01		1.37		1.23		1.21
	Constant		.06						
Proportion of pupils eligible for FSM at school -	Less than 10%				1		1		1
	10% up to 20%				1.01		1.43		1.68
	20% or more				3.85	*	6.06	*	6.27
	Constant				.02				
How well family are managing financially -	Comfortable/alright (ref)						1		1
	Just about getting by					*	.24	*	.23
	Finding it quite/very difficult to cope						.54		.46
Whether aware of any sources of funding for children from families less able to pay	No (ref)						1		1
	Yes					*	2.06		1.90
	Constant						.01		
Whether do activities not provided by school	No (ref)								1
	Yes							*	2.87
How much YP enjoys going to school	No (ref)								1
	Yes							*	5.03
	Constant								.00

Appendix 4: Original guidance for the extended schools subsidy pathfinder from the then DCSF

EXTENDED SCHOOLS SUBSIDY FUNDING FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

A guide to the 2008-09 pathfinder

“We need to ensure that children from disadvantaged backgrounds and their parents do not miss out but have a chance to benefit from extra out-of-school tuition and after-school clubs... The £265m funding will enable all schools to offer those children two hours per week of group activities in term time, plus 30 hours of additional activities over the holidays.”

Secretary of State, 10 July 2007

Introduction

In the Children’s Plan, published in December 2007, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) set out plans to make £265.5 million in funding available to schools between 2008 and 2011. This funding will help schools provide a comprehensive range of exciting, high quality extended services, and ensure that these are accessible to all children and young people, focusing on those disadvantaged by economic circumstances and children in care.

From September 2008, the Department will be running a pathfinder to explore how best it can support schools to meet this objective. The pathfinder, which will involve schools in 18 local authorities, will be supported by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) and build on the excellent progress made to date in establishing sustainable and inclusive extended schools.

This document is intended to act as a guide to the pathfinder for schools and local authorities. It also provides some background on extended schools. It is not intended as definitive practice guidance for pathfinder schools and authorities, and should therefore be read alongside the training and support materials and update packs provided by the TDA.

Background

The Children's Plan clearly sets out the government's commitment to bringing about the system-wide transformation needed to deliver the five Every Child Matters outcomes. Every Child Matters calls for all children and young people to be given the support they need to:

- be healthy
- stay safe
- enjoy and achieve
- make a positive contribution, and
- achieve economic well-being.

Extended schools are at the heart of the delivery of these outcomes. By 2010, the government wants all schools to provide the core offer of extended services²⁹:

- childcare (in primary and special schools)
- a varied menu of activities including study support and play
- parenting support, including family learning
- swift and easy access to targeted and specialist services, and
- community access to facilities including adult and family learning, ICT and sports facilities.

Schools are not expected to provide these services alone, or necessarily to deliver them on site. Instead, they should work in partnership with local authorities, and with other schools and agencies, including voluntary and community organisations and, where appropriate, provide signposting to existing services.

In May 2008, over 10,500 schools were already delivering the full core offer, with many more offering some extended provision. Between 2003 and 2008, the government invested over £840 million in extended schools. A further £1.3 billion has been committed in the current spending period, 2008-09 to 2010-11. This very significant investment will make a real difference to the ability of local authorities and schools to provide access to high quality extended school activities that reflect local needs and priorities.

Services for all: addressing economic disadvantage

Research shows that high quality out-of-hours activities can help improve well-being, raise standards of achievement and make a real contribution to reducing attainment

²⁹ For more information on extended schools go to www.tda.gov.uk/extendedschools

gaps. In many cases, extended services will give economically disadvantaged children and young people and children in care³⁰ the opportunity to participate in activities that otherwise would have been denied them.

However, for extended services to be financially sustainable, schools may have to pass on charges to participating children (note that schools are expected to follow clear guidelines on charging³¹). At the same time, they must ensure that activities are open to all, not just those with the means to pay for them. Charging must not leave economically disadvantaged children and young people vulnerable to exclusion.

The government recognises that economic disadvantage may prevent children and young people from taking part in extended schools activities. It is therefore providing £265.5 million in funding over the next three years – £8.5 million in 2008-09, £40 million in 2009-10 and £217 million in 2010-11 – specifically to address this issue.

The Children's Plan sets out a vision of how schools can use the funding to enhance their extended services offer:

“Schools are encouraged to consult with children and young people and their parents on designing programmes of activities to help increase engagement with learning, offer new opportunities...and help stretch higher achievers – and are required by law to involve disabled children. In addition, through new support mechanisms, schools will be better able to help address individual barriers to learning.

Tackling deprivation and disadvantage to reduce attainment gaps is a core focus of extended schools. We have already announced that we are making £265 million available by 2010-11 to help schools provide and commission an exciting range of activities for children and young people.

This funding will help subsidise access to these opportunities by disadvantaged children, young people and children in care, who through their economic circumstances would otherwise be unable to participate. The funding will give schools the confidence to focus on providing what would most benefit children and young people, not just limited to what they can afford to pay for.”

Guiding principles

The DCSF has developed a set of principles to guide how the funding is used:

³⁰ Throughout this document, the term “economically disadvantaged children and young people” is used to mean both children and young people disadvantaged by economic circumstances, and children in care.

³¹ Planning and Funding Extended Schools: A Guide for Schools, Local Authorities and their Partner Organisations (www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/resources-and-practice/IG00125/) and www.tda.gov.uk/remodelling/extendedschools/knowhow/fundingandcharging.aspx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The DCSF recognises that circumstances in every school and for every pupil are unique, and that there will be times when it is unclear how best to use the funding or whether it is appropriate to use it for a specific purpose. These principles are intended to guide schools in their decision-making.

The funding formula

In allocating the pathfinder funding to local authorities, the DCSF has used a formula for pathfinder schools which attributes equal weight to the number of pupils eligible for free school meals and local deprivation as measured by the DCSF tax credit indicator³², a broader definition of economic disadvantage. The resulting funding is sufficient for a take-up rate of two-thirds or more of FSM pupils, as is typically found for extended services activities. The DCSF aims to use tax credit data to allocate funding to all local authorities by 2010-11.

The pathfinder

The pathfinder aims to explore two key aspects of making extended services more accessible to children and young people from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. First, it will look at how to identify those children and young people who are eligible for funding support to participate in activities:

- What factors should schools consider in defining the target group?

³² www.teachernet.gov.uk/docbank/index.cfm?id=12225

- How can the criteria for defining the target group be communicated in a way that is transparent and demonstrably fair?
- What support do schools and local authorities need to make these decisions?
- What other learning can be applied here?

Second, it will look at the activities schools should be offering children and young people, and how they should be delivered:

- Does a fixed number of hours of activities per week simplify the offer?
- Does a fixed hour offer place undue constraints on children, parents and schools?
- How can schools build on the momentum generated by 'one-off' activities by delivering ongoing programmes of activity?

The pathfinder will test two models, 'flexible' and 'defined', whose key characteristics are summarised in the following table.

	'Flexible' model	'Defined' model
Target group	Schools use local definitions of economic disadvantage to determine eligibility for the subsidy	Children who are eligible for free school meals and children in care
Offer	Flexible, as long as extended school activities are sustained over time	Around two hours of activities a week, and 30 hours in the holidays

All participating schools within a local authority will test the same model.

What will be expected of pathfinder schools

The following expectations are based on established best practice in extended schools. Building on this, the DCSF expects pathfinder schools to use the funding to strengthen and improve access to a core offer of services, not to view it as a separate initiative.

Defining the target group

The purpose of the funding is to target funding at economically disadvantaged children and young people. Defining the target group will be a key challenge, and the approach taken will depend on which model is being used.

As outlined in the table above, in the 'defined' model, criteria have been set centrally and in line with public announcements. Schools using this model should ensure that funding is only available to children and young people who are eligible for free school meals and those in care.

Schools and local authorities using the 'flexible' model will develop and apply their own funding criteria. Many schools are already operating informal subsidies and the pathfinder will look to build on this experience. Schools may of course choose to include recipients of free school meals and children and young people in care within their target group, but they may also take into account other factors or indicators of economic disadvantage. This requires considering approaches which move beyond FSM, something many schools and LAs are already doing. This may mean considering direct indicators of economic disadvantage, such as parents/carers being out of work and those on low incomes or claiming benefits, including those just above the FSM threshold.

It can also mean considering other approaches to identifying economic disadvantage, using information and knowledge about children and young people which may indicate economic disadvantage. The following list, which is neither definitive nor exhaustive, sets out some potential examples of information which may be known to schools:

- Index based on child's postcode of residence - based on index of multiple deprivation or the tax credit data;
- young carers;
- families in temporary or poor accommodation;
- economically disadvantaged children with special educational needs;
- children of young parents;
- refugee or asylum seeker children;
- those children and young people experiencing difficult family issues, such as bereavement, living with family members other than parents, parents with physical or mental health problems or disability, domestic violence, and parents in custody or with debt problems.

Note that while health, social and cultural factors may also act as barriers to the uptake of extended services, they should not themselves be criteria in applying the funding.

Whatever the criteria used, they should be transparent and fair and avoid the risk of stigmatisation. We would encourage schools and clusters to work with each other to develop criteria, and local authorities to support and guide schools in their decisions.

Funding

The level of funding available is based on the assumption that around £300 will be spent on each targeted child over the course of the year. This will of course vary according to individual needs and circumstances, including the exact number of children in the target group and participation rates.

In line with established principles, funding will not be ring-fenced at school level. However, pathfinder schools will be expected to use the funding to support access to participation in extended schools activities for the target group, not to develop other

aspects of the extended schools core offer, to pay for related activity such as consulting children and parents or to meet other indirect or capital costs.

For many pupils – particularly in rural schools – the cost of transport to and from activities is a major financial barrier to participation. To help address this, in both the fixed and the defined models, funding can be used to subsidise transport where appropriate.

Consultation

In line with established best practice, the DCSF expects schools to consult children, young people, parents and the wider community when developing their menu of extended services activities. Evidence shows that extended services have the most impact on confidence, engagement with learning and attainment where children and young people are given a real say in the kind of activities provided.

Many schools will already be familiar with using questionnaires, running focus groups and using input from school councils. Indeed, some may be experiencing “consultation overload”. However, experience suggests that different techniques are needed to successfully engage with economically disadvantaged groups. Where necessary, the TDA will help schools identify appropriate and targeted consultation techniques and tools.

Ownership

Involving children and young people and their parents/carers in choosing, designing and continuously improving the activities on offer will help create a sense of ownership. This will help ensure that activities are valued, and drive increased and sustained participation. This is a difficult objective, but the potential benefits are significant.

Encouraging participation

There are many barriers to participation in extended schools activities, including financial, health, social and cultural factors and low motivation. Subsidy funding can only be used to tackle financial barriers to participation, with schools and LAs expected to build on existing activity to address these other barriers so as to maximise the positive impact of extended services on all pupils, including those in the target group.

Additionality

The DCSF’s intention is that the funding should result in real ‘additionality’; that is, it should provide additional access to activities rather than replace existing services. In some cases this might mean running or commissioning new activities; in others it might mean opening up access to existing activities to the target group. Effective consultation with children and families will help guide these decisions. Schools will be expected to provide evidence of additionality through tracking and management information.

Working in clusters

Clusters of schools should agree how they will work together to use the subsidy funding to best effect. Where schools within a cluster are using the 'flexible' model, the DCSF recommends that the same definition of the target group is applied across the cluster to avoid any perceptions of unfairness.

A cluster approach to using external providers can also be valuable, enabling schools to more easily commission and sign-post collectively. This enables clusters to share the activity involved in managing relations with other providers, as well as identifying potential providers of services to meet identified needs or offer new opportunities. It can also be easier for providers to engage at a cluster level rather than at an individual school level. The role of the cluster coordinator is critical here.

Sustained interest and participation

Research shows that children and young people benefit from regular and sustained participation in extended services activities. For schools using the 'defined' model, this will be achieved through the regular provision of around two hours of activity a week. For schools following the flexible model, there will be some freedom as to the frequency and regularity of sustained provision: for example, funding could be used to pay for more expensive but less frequent activity, such as taster or one-off sessions, school trips or other 'transformative experiences'. However, if outcomes are to be sustained over time, schools will need to complement such 'one-offs' with regular activity.

Partnership working

Commissioning activities from external providers, especially the voluntary and community sector, can bring real benefits, including enabling schools to offer a far wider range of activities. These organisations will also often have considerable experience and expertise in engaging with disadvantaged children and young people and breaking the cycle of disaffection and lack of engagement in learning.

School improvement planning

A recent Ofsted report on extended schools found that the schools with the most effective services had integrated the development of extended provision within their school improvement plans, with a clear focus on improving positive outcomes for children and young people. Ofsted also commented that since their previous report schools have become more aware of the need to evaluate the impact of their services on the outcomes for children, young people and their families, although very few had begun to measure this systematically.

The DCSF expects schools to think strategically about engaging the target group, encouraging participation and to manage the process effectively by planning ahead and

establishing clear measures of success from the outset. Making extended school activities part of a whole school improvement strategy will maximise their impact on attainment and ensure that participation enabled by subsidy funding is seen as part of the school's wider extended services offer, avoiding any stigma. The TDA's School Improvement Planning Framework^[1] helps schools to focus on outcomes and demonstrate impact.

What will be expected of pathfinder local authorities

Activities will be delivered through the extended schools programme and funding used at school level. All funding must be devolved to schools taking part in the pathfinder, as clearly stated in the funding condition of grant. Funding has already been calculated by the DCSF at an individual school level, and local authorities are encouraged to allocate it on this basis.

Local authorities and, in particular, extended schools remodelling advisers (ESRAs), are expected to support schools through the pathfinder and to ensure that activities paid for through the subsidy are incorporated into their wider extended schools activities and any other relevant strategies. Local authorities also have an important role to play in sharing learning and best practice with other local schools. The DCSF encourages local authorities to consult local social partnerships to discuss the pathfinder and potential workload implications.

Evaluation

The DCSF plans to look at a range of evidence during the pathfinder. Lessons learned will then be applied to the full roll-out of funding (see below under 'Future plans'). Some of this learning will come from the TDA, and some from a systematic evaluation of the work being done by pathfinder schools and local authorities.

The pathfinder is intended to provide answers to the following key questions:

- How can schools best identify the most economically disadvantaged children and target funding at them in a simple, transparent and fair way, while avoiding stigmatisation?
- How can schools best engage the target population in activities? Is a fixed-hour offer the most effective approach?
- How best can children, young people and their parents be consulted about the sort of activities they would like to participate in?
- How can the impact on the workloads of teachers, school leaders and support staff be minimised?
- How can schools be encouraged and supported to engage with outside organisations to commission a varied range of activities?

- How can this funding help secure additional activities, including through links to existing funding and extended schools charging policies?
- How can schools measuring the impact of the subsidy funding?
- How can schools and clusters best be supported by local authorities?
- How can the subsidy best secure activities for disadvantaged children and young people?

The DCSF has commissioned the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) and Newcastle University to produce an independent evaluation of the pathfinder. An initial report to be delivered in April 2009 will inform the scaling up of the project in 2009-10, and full findings will be made available in April 2010. To produce a high quality evaluation, the research team will need the input of all those involved in the pathfinder. The local authorities and schools involved have committed to sharing information and engaging in the process of evaluation. DCSF thanks them in advance for their support and assistance

Future plans

The pathfinder will run from September 2008, scaling up in funding from £8.5m in 2008-9 to £40m in 2009-10. The DCSF will use this period to gather both evidence of good practice and information about any barriers and problems faced by the participating schools and authorities. This learning will help shape policy development and influence the delivery of subsequent funding. The TDA will play a key role in this, including by sharing best practice and emerging solutions with other pathfinder schools as they are identified. The DCSF is keen that evaluation findings are shared with pathfinder schools, both through the interim report expected in spring 2009 and also through the informal sharing of feedback on an ongoing basis.

The DCSF, working with the TDA, plans to develop proposals for making additional funding available to further local authorities from April 2009, ahead of the roll-out of full national funding in 2010-

Ref: DFE-RR042

ISBN: 978-1-84775-804-0

**© TNS-BMRB, Newcastle University and Staffordshire
University**

October 2010