Organisation, services and reach of children's centres

Evaluation of children's centres in England (ECCE, Strand 3)

Technical appendices

June 2015

Kathy Sylva, Jenny Goff, Naomi Eisenstadt, Teresa Smith, James Hall, Maria Evangelou, George Smith & Pam Sammons – University of Oxford

Contents

List of tables

List of Abbreviations

CCLMRS	Children's Centre Leadership and Management Rating Scale
ECCE	Evaluation of Children's Centres in England
SSCCs	Sure Start Children's Centres
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance between groups
EM	Expectation Maximisation
NPQH	National Professional Qualification for Headship
NPQICL	National Professional Qualification in Integrated Centre Leadership
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education

1. A Hierarchical Cluster Analysis of CCLMRS Items and Leadership Questionnaire Factors

1.1 Introduction

The report of the first fieldwork visits (Goff et al., 2013) contained multiple measures that reflected and captured centre leadership and management within Sure Start Children's Centres. Of these, the *Children's Centre Leadership and Management Rating Scale* (CCLMRS: Sylva, Chan, Good and Sammons, 2012), an interview based rating tool, was administered by fieldworkers who scored 20 items that were then converted into 5 subscale scores and an overall mean quality score for the centre. Accompanying the CCLMRS as a measure of centre leadership and management were two versions of a self-report 'Leadership Questionnaire': One completed by centre managers and a second by key staff. Several factor analysis procedures were carried out on questionnaire data in order to meaningfully reduce the data into subscales scores akin to the 5 from the CCLMRS (Goff et al., 2013). Ultimately, 17 subscale scores were derived from the centre manager questionnaire data and 16 from the key staff.

Considered together, the data from the CCLMRS and the two versions of the questionnaire provided a means for ECCE to triangulate information on the leadership and management practices taking place in children's centres. At one extreme, there is a high inference researcher-implemented rating scale with strict criterion to follow – on the other, are self-report questionnaires with an unavoidable bias in their response. Added to this, the nature of self-report meant that disparities were possible between the responses of managers themselves, and the responses of their key staff.

Overall then, there was merit in exploring patterns across the three measures of centre leadership and management, especially when this can be accomplished through statistical techniques that simultaneously attempt to capture the essence of the achieved data in a fewer number of variables. Hierarchical Cluster Analysis was used to see whether the ECCE children's centres could be categorised according to common patterns in response to questions recorded in 53 variables (details of these measures and their origins can be found in first Strand 3 ECCE Report, Goff et al., 2013):

1. The 20 original CCLMRS items

2. The 17 subscales originating from the self-report manager leadership and management questionnaire

3. The 16 subscales originating from the self-report key staff leadership and management questionnaire.

1.2 Results

1.2.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1.1 presents descriptive statistics for the 53 variables measuring leadership and management from data collected in 2012. Missingness can be observed on all variables (max: n=16; min: n=2) and only 74 centres returned scores for all 53 measures. Three measures were reverse coded (partner agency cohesion [manager and key staff], and staff delegation) and achieved scores commonly existed across the entire range of possible values (0->5 for CCLMRS; 0->6 for the leadership questionnaires).

Table 1.1 Descriptive Statistics for the 53 variables measuring leadership and management in ECCE. From 2012 (Wave 1) data. For n=121 SSCCs.

Variable	n	Missing	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median
Vision and Strategic Planning	115	6	.00	5.00	1.44	1.37	2
Performance Management	115	6	.00	5.00	2.91	1.46	3
Achieving Positive Outcomes for Families and/or Children	115	6	.00	5.00	2.22	1.23	2
Safeguarding Children	115	6	.00	5.00	1.80	1.34	2
Recruitment and Induction of New Staff	115	6	.00	5.00	2.23	1.52	2
Line Management	115	6	.00	5.00	2.08	1.36	2
Professional Development of Staff	115	6	.00	5.00	3.68	1.30	4
Qualifications & Experience of Senior Staff	119	2	.00	5.00	2.02	1.42	2
Qualifications & Experience of Other Staff	116	5	.00	5.00	4.53	1.01	5
Financial Management	112	9	.00	5.00	1.59	1.77	0
Staff Timetables and Ratios	116	5	.00	5.00	1.92	1.27	2
Child Learning	115	6	.00	5.00	2.71	1.71	3
Parenting and Family Support	114	7	.00	5.00	1.93	1.21	2
Outreach and Home Visits	113	8	.00	5.00	2.42	1.39	2
Multiagency Partnerships	115	6	.00	5.00	1.37	1.20	2
Parent Consult and Community Engagement	115	6	.00	5.00	1.61	1.42	2
Space and Equipment	116	5	.00	5.00	2.28	1.38	2
Centre Health and Safety	116	5	.00	5.00	1.53	1.62	2
Staff Meetings and Consultation	115	6	.00	4.00	0.97	1.30	0
Branding and Publicity	115	6	.00	5.00	1.78	1.79	2
Collaboration: Centre manager	108	13	2.17	6.00	4.50	0.80	n/a
Integration: Centre manager	108	13	3.10	6.00	5.37	0.53	n/a
Partner agency communication: Centre manager	106	15	1.00	6.00	4.92	0.82	n/a
Partner agency cohesion: Centre manager *(Reverse Coded)*	106	15	1.00	5.19	2.31	1.15	n/a
Parent/community involvement: Centre manager	107	14	1.39	6.00	5.47	0.66	n/a
CPD Centre manager	107	14	3.33	6.00	5.61	0.49	n/a

Variable	n	Missing	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median
Data use Centre manager	107	14	3.33	6.00	5.23	0.59	n/a
Monitoring through observation: Centre manager	107	14	2.00	6.00	4.30	1.04	n/a
Monitoring and evaluation activities: Centre manager	108	13	2.83	6.00	5.05	0.68	n/a
Monitoring value for money: Centre manager	107	14	2.71	6.00	4.98	0.83	n/a
Vision and standards: Centre manager	108	13	4.89	6.00	5.80	0.27	n/a
Focus on learning: Centre manager	105	16	1.18	6.00	5.61	0.71	n/a
Safeguarding: Centre manager	106	15	5.00	6.00	5.94	0.19	n/a
Valuing staff: Centre manager	107	14	3.55	6.00	5.46	0.48	n/a
Distributed leadership: Centre manager	105	16	1.16	6.00	4.11	1.05	n/a
SMT:/SLT delegation: Centre manager	106	15	1.00	6.00	5.15	1.02	n/a
Staff involvement on decision making: Centre manager (Reverse Coded)	106	15	1.00	5.03	2.62	0.96	n/a
Collaboration: Aggregated Key staff	108	13	2.44	6.00	4.90	0.75	n/a
Integration: Aggregated Key staff	107	14	2.25	6.00	5.41	0.62	n/a
Partner agency communication: Aggregated Key staff	107	14	2.59	6.00	5.05	0.73	n/a
Parent/community involvement: Aggregated Key staff	107	14	4.15	6.00	5.49	0.38	n/a
Partner agency cohesion: Aggregated Key staff (Reverse Coded)	107	14	1.00	4.67	2.24	0.89	n/a
CPD: Aggregated Key staff	107	14	2.93	6.00	5.35	0.65	n/a
Data use: Aggregated Key staff	109	12	3.45	6.00	5.03	0.56	n/a
Monitoring through observation: Aggregated Key staff	109	12	1.30	6.00	4.19	1.02	n/a
Monitoring and evaluation activities: Aggregated Key staff	107	14	2.09	6.00	5.10	0.78	n/a
Monitoring value for money: Aggregated Key staff	105	16	2.18	6.00	5.28	0.72	n/a
Vision: Aggregated Key staff	109	12	3.26	6.00	5.66	0.52	n/a
Focus on learning: Aggregated Key staff	108	13	3.00	6.00	5.67	0.54	n/a
Safeguarding: Aggregated Key staff	109	12	3.61	6.00	5.86	0.32	n/a
Valuing staff: Aggregated Key staff	108	13	3.67	6.00	5.46	0.52	n/a
Distributed leadership: Aggregated Key staff	108	13	1.85	6.00	4.12	0.86	n/a
SMT:/SLT delegation: Aggregated Key staff	107	14	2.45	6.00	5.34	0.64	n/a

1.2.2 Hierarchical Cluster Analysis

Treating the 20 CCLMRS items as continuous, and after the missing values on the 53 variables were imputed using the SPSS EM algorithm, Hierarchical Cluster Analysis suggested a Three Cluster Solution. Table 1.2 presents the results from the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis. As increasing numbers of clusters were generated, their agglomeration coefficients (measuring the distinctiveness of the 121 children's centres) decreased. The largest changes in the agglomeration

coefficients were found when estimating up to three clusters; estimating any more than three started to have a noticeably reduced effect on the size of the coefficients. The three cluster solution distinguished the 121 SSCCs into the following three percentages:

- Cluster 1: 19 per cent (n=23 of 121)

- Cluster 2: 32 per cent (n=39 of 121)

- Cluster 3: 49 per cent (n=59 of 121).

With Hierarchical Cluster Analysis suggesting that there were three distinctive clusters underlying the responses of the 121 children's centres to the 53 leadership measures, these clusters were then interpreted according to how the 53 measures varied. As all the questions were being treated as continuous, simple one-way ANOVAs were carried out to distinguish the three clusters. The mean values of the 20 CCLMRS items are presented in Table 1.3, the 17 centre manager subscales in Table 1.4, and the 16 key staff subscales in Table 1.5.

Table 1.2 Results from the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis. Change in decreasing Agglomeration Coefficients as increasing numbers of clusters are generated within the 2012 Leadership and Management measures (Wave 1)

Estimated Clusters	Agglomeration Coefficients at this step (n) [I]	Agglomeration Coefficients at last step (n-1) [J]	Change [J-I]
1	6360.000	-	-
2	5685.273	6360.00	674.73
*3**	*5271.474*	*5685.27*	*413.80*
4	5063.471	5271.47	208.00
5	4873.425	5063.47	190.05
6	4688.300	4873.42	185.13
7	4547.544	4688.30	140.76
8	4408.462	4547.54	139.08
9	4293.959	4408.46	114.50
10	4181.990	4293.96	111.97
11	4076.007	4181.99	105.98

* Suggested optimal number of clusters. Estimating further clusters contributes much less to distinguishing between different children's centres

Common across Tables 1.3-1.5 are the Cluster Labels, *'Lower', 'Intermediate (reference category)'*, and *'Higher'*. These subjective labels[1] were given on the basis of the means presented in Tables 1.3-1.5. The clusters previously numbered 1-3 were given the new Cluster Labels as follows:

1. *'Lower'*: 19 per cent (n=23 of 121 children's centres)

2. *'Higher'*: 32 per cent (n=39 of 121 children's centres)

---

[1] Given that all centres might be objectively "high" or "low": There is a lack of external criteria for reference.

3. *'Intermediate' (Reference Category):* 49 per cent (n=59 of 121 children's centres).

Considering the ANOVA results presented in Tables 1.3-1.5, 45 out of the 53 (85%) leadership questions significantly differed across the three clusters. There are at least two reasons that can explain the cluster-consistent responses on the remaining eight measures[2]:

1. These are truly centre-consistent measures, perhaps driven by legal legislation or other factors (especially likely for the three centre-consistent observed-based CCLMRS items)

2. The five centre-consistent self-reported manager measures were all in areas of leadership that managers may have felt that they had little choice in response towards. Possibly driven by knowledge of what children's centres *should be doing* regardless of whether their centre was *actually doing this* (most particularly: *Partner Agency Cohesion* and *Safeguarding*). This is likely given that responses in these five areas were significantly different across clusters when reported on by key staff rather than managers (compare Tables 1.4 and 1.5).

The final two stages of evaluating the three clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis were to: evaluate the rigour of the ANOVA results presented in Tables 1.3-1.5, and to evaluate the effect of the EM missing data estimation procedure. The rigour of the ANOVA results presented in Tables 1.3-1.5 was evaluated with follow-up equivalent non-parametric tests (Kruskal-Wallis) whereas the effect of the EM missing data estimation was determined by repeating all the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests – but on the non-imputed versions of the 53 leadership questions (i.e. those shown in Table 1.1). The ANOVA tests were found to yield robust results[3]. The consequences of imputing the missing data were found to be minimal. Again, the results of the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests were almost entirely consistent with those obtained from analysis of the imputed data. Only one of the 53 leadership measures altered in terms of how it significantly differed across the three suggested clusters of leadership[4].

The overall (mean) CCLMRS score was significantly related to leadership practice[5] which is unsurprising given that leadership practice is partly based on the 20 items that make up the CCLMRS.

---

[2] 1. *Qualifications of Senior Staff* (CCLMRS item); 2. *Qualifications of Other Staff* (CCLMRS item); 3. *Space and Equipment* (CCLMRS item); 4. *Partner agency communication* (Manager subscore); 5. *Partner agency cohesion* (Manager subscore); 6. *Parent/community involvement* (Manager subscore); 7. *Monitoring through observation* (Manager subscore); 8. *Safeguarding* (Manager subscore)

[3] Only the previously insignificant findings relating to centre manager self-reported *partner agency communication*, *monitoring through observation*, and *parent/community involvement* changed, from statistically insignificant (p>0.05) to significant (p<0.05). The previously insignificant findings relating to manager-reported *partner agency cohesion*, *safeguarding*, and the observer-rated (CCLMRS) *staff qualifications*, and *space and equipment* all remained p>0.05.

[4] Centre manager self-reported *monitoring through observation* stayed insignificant via both ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis in the non-imputed data. Previously, in the imputed data, when analysed through the Kruskal-Wallis, this relationship had been suggested this to be significantly different

[5] η^2=0.51, p<0.001, a 'moderate' effect size.

Table 1.3 The mean values of the 20 CCLMRS items across the three clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster analysis

CCLMRS items (n=20)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
Vision and Mission	lower	23	0.72	2	12.035	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.20	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.19	120	--	--
Performance Management	lower	23	2.09	2	21.876	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.45	118	--	--
	higher	39	3.98	120	--	--
Achieving Positive Outcomes for Families and/or Children	lower	23	1.44	2	29.322	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.86	118	--	--
	higher	39	3.18	120	--	--
Safeguarding Children	lower	23	2.07	2	5.268	.006
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.43	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.23	120	--	--
Recruitment and Induction of New Staff	lower	23	1.79	2	11.273	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.79	118	--	--
	higher	39	3.08	120	--	--
Line Management	lower	23	2.04	2	8.360	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.66	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.72	120	--	--
Professional Development of Staff	lower	23	3.46	2	5.300	.006
	intermediate (reference category)	59	3.41	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.20	120	--	--
Qualifications and Experience of Senior Staff*	lower	23	1.97	2	.080	.924
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.97	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.08	120	--	--
Qualifications and Experience of Other Staff*	lower	23	4.75	2	1.137	.324
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.41	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.64	120	--	--
Financial Management	lower	23	0.77	2	10.416	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.23	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.52	120	--	--
Staff Timetables and Ratios	lower	23	2.10	2	5.273	.006
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.54	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.34	120	--	--
Child Learning	lower	23	2.48	2	14.639	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.05	118	--	--
	higher	39	3.73	120	--	--
Parent and Family Support	lower	23	1.27	2	7.249	.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.81	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.38	120	--	--
Outreach Home Visits	lower	23	1.97	2	14.376	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.02	118	--	--
	higher	39	3.29	120	--	--
Multiagency Partnerships	lower	23	0.54	2	12.526	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.27	118	--	--
	higher	39	1.96	120	--	--
Parent Consultation and	lower	23	1.20	2	20.702	<0.001

CCLMRS items (n=20)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
Community Engagement	*intermediate (reference category)*	59	1.09	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.66	120	--	--
Space and Equipment*	*lower*	23	2.11	2	2.253	.110
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.12	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.67	120	--	--
Centre Health and Safety	*lower*	23	0.99	2	14.662	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.06	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.56	120	--	--
Staff Meetings and Consultation	*lower*	23	0.57	2	4.261	.016
	intermediate (reference category)	59	0.80	118	--	--
	higher	39	1.42	120	--	--
Branding Publicity	*lower*	23	1.42	2	19.763	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	1.03	118	--	--
	higher	39	3.02	120	--	--

CCLMRS items not significantly different across the three clusters (n=3)

Table 1.4 The mean values of the 17 Centre Manager Questionnaire subscores across the three clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster analysis

Centre Manager subscores (n=17)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
Collaboration: Centre manager	*lower*	23	4.08	2	11.114	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.38	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.90	120	--	--
Integration: Centre manager	*lower*	23	5.05	2	9.543	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.34	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.60	120	--	--
Partner agency communication: Centre manager*†	*lower*	23	4.66	2	2.113	.125
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.85	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.08	120	--	--
Partner agency cohesion: Centre manager (Reverse Coded)*	*lower*	23	2.66	2	1.515	.224
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.33	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.15	120	--	--
Parent/community involvement: Centre manager*†	*lower*	23	5.28	2	1.526	.222
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.46	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.58	120	--	--
CPD Centre manager	*lower*	23	5.39	2	4.668	.011
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.58	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.75	120	--	--
Data use Centre manager	*lower*	23	4.80	2	11.213	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.26	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.45	120	--	--
Monitoring through observation: Centre manager*†‡	*lower*	23	4.12	2	1.676	.192
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.22	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.53	120	--	--
Monitoring and evaluation activities: Centre manager	*lower*	23	4.63	2	11.526	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.02	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.38	120	--	--
Monitoring value for money: Centre manager	*lower*	23	4.40	2	10.929	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.95	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.32	120	--	--
Vision and standards: Centre manager	*lower*	23	5.70	2	4.741	.010
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.78	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.89	120	--	--
Focus on learning: Centre manager	*lower*	23	5.01	2	16.141	<0.001
	intermediate (reference	59	5.68	118	--	--

Centre Manager subscores (n=17)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
	category)					
	higher	39	5.88	120	--	--
Safeguarding: Centre manager*	*lower*	23	5.95	2	.433	.650
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.91	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.95	120	--	--
Valuing staff: Centre manager	*lower*	23	5.14	2	7.323	.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.49	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.57	120	--	--
Distributed leadership: Centre manager	*lower*	23	3.58	2	6.585	.002
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.02	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.48	120	--	--
SMT:/SLT delegation: Centre manager	*lower*	23	5.02	2	4.565	.012
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.93	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.51	120	--	--
Staff involvement on decision making: Centre manager (Reverse Coded)	*lower*	23	3.06	2	6.210	.003
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.63	118	--	--
	higher	39	2.23	120	--	--

*Subscores not significantly different across the three clusters (n=5)
†Subscore that significantly differed across clusters when examined via the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test
‡ Subscore that did not significantly differ when analysed with non missing-imputed data

Table 1.5 The mean values of the 16 Key Staff Questionnaire subscores across the three clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster analysis

Key Staff subscores (n=16)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
Collaboration: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.12	2	29.342	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.91	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.32	120	--	--
Integration: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.71	2	32.492	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.47	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.70	120	--	--
Partner agency communication: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.27	2	32.177	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.05	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.48	120	--	--
Parent/community involvement: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	5.15	2	15.152	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.52	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.61	120	--	--
Partner agency cohesion: Aggregated Key staff (Reverse Coded)	*lower*	23	2.82	2	15.320	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	2.38	118	--	--
	higher	39	1.75	120	--	--
CPD: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.78	2	23.366	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.34	118	--	--

Key Staff subscores (n=16)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
	higher	39	5.72	120	--	--
Data use: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.49	2	19.298	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.08	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.24	120	--	--
Monitoring through observation: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	3.42	2	13.089	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.19	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.62	120	--	--
Monitoring and evaluation activities: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.22	2	30.881	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.15	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.49	120	--	--
Monitoring value for money: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.42	2	26.628	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.40	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.49	120	--	--
Vision: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	5.03	2	38.183	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.72	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.92	120	--	--
Key Staff subscores (n=16)	Clusters suggested by the Hierarchical Cluster Analysis	n	Mean	ANOVA results		
				df	F	Sig.
Focus on learning: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	5.12	2	19.904	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.74	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.83	120	--	--
Safeguarding: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	5.55	2	15.310	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.86	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.96	120	--	--
Valuing staff: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.88	2	29.605	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.47	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.73	120	--	--
Distributed leadership: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	3.32	2	16.458	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	4.21	118	--	--
	higher	39	4.39	120	--	--
SMT:/SLT delegation: Aggregated Key staff	*lower*	23	4.78	2	19.379	<0.001
	intermediate (reference category)	59	5.29	118	--	--
	higher	39	5.66	120	--	--

2. Linking features of children's centres

2.1 Features of children's centres that link to Managerial Qualifications

Table 2.1.1 illustrates the lack of statistical relationship between the two measures of managerial qualifications considered in this report. Managers were equally as likely to hold a Leadership Qualification regardless of their highest level of education.

Table 2.11 The relationship between a manager's highest academic qualification and whether they held the NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification

Two measures of manager qualifications		Manager highest academic qualification. n (mean rank)	Kruskal-Wallis ($\eta^{2\dagger}$)‡	p-Value
Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification? n (mean rank)	*No*	27 (51.85)	0.00	n.s.
	Yes	81 (55.38)		

Notes:† Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1)** in order to obtain effect sizes[6]
‡ Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Tables 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 present the bivariate inferential statistical analyses that were carried out in order to determine the extent features of centres were related to the two measures of managerial qualifications considered in this report.

---

[6] Following the guidelines of: Horn, R.A. (2008). *The Kruskal-Wallis Test*. Northern Arizona University. Accessed 11 June 2014, <http://oak.ucc.nau.edu/rh232/courses/EPS625/Handouts/Nonparametric/The%20Kruskal-Wallis%20Test.pdf>

[7] Based on the guidelines of: Ferguson, C.J. (2009). An Effect Size Primer: A Guide for Clinicians and Researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. 40(5), pp 532-538.

Table 2.1.2 Features of children's centres that link to a manager's highest academic qualification

Domain	Features of children's centre	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification		
		n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & *then mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	100	-0.13[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	96	0.03	n.s.
	Outstanding	19	*39.92*	-
	Good	57	*50.42*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	20	*51.18*	-
Centre Leadership	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	107	0.06[†]	n.s.
	Centres clustered by leadership practice	108	0.00	n.s.
	'Lower'	21	*52.05*	-
	'Intermediate'	52	*55.08*	-
	'Higher'	35	*55.11*	-
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	104	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	62	*50.84*	-
	(B) Cluster	36	*53.97*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	6	*60.83*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	105	0.03	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	39	*57.06*	-
	(B) Cluster	49	*52.48*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	15	*47.77*	-
	Virtual Centre	2	*25.75*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	106	-0.03[†]	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	108	0.04[†]	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	108	-0.04[†]	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	108	0.03[†]	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	108	0.02[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	98	0.14[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	99	0.11[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	98	0.00[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for ρ: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (n-1) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Table 2.1.3 Features of children's centres that link to whether a centre manager held the NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification

Domain	Features of children's centre	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification? (st.res.* or mean ranks)			
		No	Yes	Chi-Square ($\eta^{2\dagger}$)‡, or Kruskal-Wallis (η^2)‡	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	26 (48.65)	74 (51.15)	0.00	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	n=101	-	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	*9 (-0.4)*	*15 (0.4)*	-	-
	Good	*16 (0.8)*	*41 (-0.8)*	-	-
	Satisfactory/ Requires Improvement	*4 (-0.6)*	*16 (0.6)*	-	-
Centre Leadership	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	25 (51.86)	74 (49.37)	0.00	n.s.
	Centres clustered by leadership practice	n=108	-	0.00	n.s.
	'Lower'	*5 (-0.1)*	*16 (0.1)*	-	-
	'Intermediate'	*13 (0.0)*	*39 (0.0)*	-	-
	'Higher'	*9 (0.1)*	*26 (-0.1)*	-	-
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	n=104	-	000	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*17 (0.4)*	*45 (-0.4)*	-	-
	(B) Cluster	*8 (-0.6)*	*28 (0.6)*	-	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*2 (0.4)*	*4 (-0.4)*	-	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	n=103	-	0.06	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*9 (-0.5)*	*30 (0.5)*	-	-
	(B) Cluster	*13 (0.2)*	*36 (-0.2)*	-	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*3 (-0.5)*	*12 (0.5)*	-	-
	Virtual Centre	*2 (2.4)*	*0 (-2.4)*	-	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	27 (61.72)	80 (51.39)	0.02	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	24 (48.92)	78 (52.29)	0.00	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	26 (55.81)	80 (52.75)	0.00	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	27 (56.35)	81 (53.88)	0.00	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	27 (61.20)	81 (52.27)	0.02	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	27 (45.11)	71 (51.17)	0.01	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	27 (41.55)	72 (53.13)	0.03	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	25 (49.04)	73 (49.66)	0.00	n.s.

Notes: *st.res=*standardised adjusted residuals*, values over ±1.96 indicate a statistically significant (p<0.05) proportion;
† Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (n-1) in order to obtain effect sizes[6]
‡ Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

2.2 Features of children's centres that link to Centre Leadership and Management

Table 2.2 presents statistics that describe the relationships that were shared between the CCLMRS measure of centre leadership and management, and other features of children's centres.

Table 2.2 Features of children's centres that link to children's centre leadership and management quality

Domain	Features of children's centre	Quality of centre leadership via CCLMRS Mean		
		N	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & then mean ranks	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	100	0.00[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	96	0.08	0.018
	Outstanding	20	63.80	-
	Good	60	45.48	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	16	40.72	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	99	0.06[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	99	0.00	n.s.
	No	25	51.86	-
	Yes	74	49.37	-
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	102	0.03	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	63	55.39	-
	(B) Cluster	34	43.74	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	5	55.30	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	103	0.11	0.011
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	40	63.50	-
	(B) Cluster	46	43.40	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	15	50.90	-
	Virtual Centre	2	28.00	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	106	0.30[†]	0.002
	Service Delivery and Ethos	101	-0.02[†]	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	105	0.41[†]	<0.001
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	107	0.15[†]	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	107	0.24[†]	0.014
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	97	0.06[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	98	0.02[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	96	-0.05[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for ρ: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

2.3 Features of children's centres that link to Centre Effectiveness according to Ofsted

Table 2.3 presents the bivariate inferential statistical analyses that were carried out to determine the extent to which centre features were related to effectiveness according to Ofsted Ratings. Only two of the measures were related to Ofsted ratings of centre effectiveness to the minimum acceptable threshold of statistical significance ($p<0.05$):

1. Overall (Mean) CCLMRS leadership and management score ($p=0.018$)

2. The total number of services that a centre offered in 2011 ($p=0.018$)

Table 2.3 Features of children's centres that link to centre effectiveness according to Ofsted

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	Ofsted Rating of Centre Effectiveness n (st.res.)* or n (mean rank)			Chi-Square ($\eta^{2\dagger}$)‡, or Kruskal-Wallis ($\eta^{2\dagger}$)‡	p-Value
		Outstanding	*Good*	*Satisfactory/ Requires Improvement*		
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	20(56.50)	65(50.72)	19(54.39)	0.01	n.s.
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	19(39.92)	57(50.42)	20(51.18)	0.03	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	n=96	-	-	0.01	n.s.
	No	*4(-0.4)**	*16(0.8)**	*4(-0.6)**	-	-
	Yes	*15(0.4)**	*41(-0.8)**	*16(0.6)**	-	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	20(63.80)	60(45.48)	16(40.72)	0.08	0.018
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	n=103	-	-	0.02	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*13(-0.2)**	*42(1.0)**	*11(-0.9)**	-	-
	(B) Cluster	*6(-0.3)**	*18(-0.5)**	*8(1.0)**	-	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*2(1.1)**	*2(-0.9)**	*1(0.0)**	-	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	n=104	-	-	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*9(0.4)**	*9(-0.3)**	*3(.1)**	-	-
	(B) Cluster	*23(-0.8)**	*30(0.4)**	*9(0.3)**	-	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*9(0.6)**	*9(-0.1)**	*2(-0.5)**	-	-
	Virtual Centre	*0(-0.5)*	*1(0.8)*	*0(-0.5)*	-	-

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	Ofsted Rating of Centre Effectiveness n (st.res.)* or n (mean rank)			Chi-Square $(\eta^{2\dagger})^{\ddagger}$, or Kruskal-Wallis $(\eta^{2\dagger})^{\ddagger}$	p-Value
		Outstanding	*Good*	*Satisfactory/ Requires Improvement*		
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	21(54.83)	66(54.33)	20(52.03)	0	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	20(49.95)	64(53.51)	18(49.00)	0	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	20(57.48)	66(52.82)	20(51.78)	0	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	23(74.91)	70(55.32)	22(48.84)	0.07	0.018
	Total services offered in 2012	23(66.35)	70(56.99)	22(52.48)	0.02	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	20(53.18)	59(45.51)	17(53.38)	0.02	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	20(47.80)	59(51.85)	18(41.00)	0.02	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	18(52.78)	29(48.84)	19(44.03)	0.01	n.s.

Notes: *st.res=*standardised adjusted residuals*, values over ±1.96 indicate a statistically significant (p<0.05) proportion;
[†] Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes [6];
[‡] Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

2.4 Features of children's centres that link to Organisational Models

Table 2.4 presents the bivariate statistical analyses that were carried out to determine the extent to which features of centres were related to its Organisational Model in 2013. This model was related to the overall quality of centre leadership and management (via mean CCLMRS score).

Table 2.4 Features of children's centres that link to its Organisational Model in 2013

Domain	Features of children's centre	Organisational Models in 2013. n (st.res.*) or (mean ranks)				Chi-Square $(\eta^{2\dagger})^{\ddagger}$, or Kruskal-Wallis $(\eta^2)^{\ddagger}$	p-Value
		One Centre Unit	*Cluster*	*Hub-and-spoke model*	*Virtual Centre*		
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	39 (49.77)	51 (56.86)	15 (51.87)	2 (79.50)	0.02	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	n=104	-	-	-	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	9 (0.4)	9 (-0.3)	3 (0.1)	0 (-0.5)	-	-
	Good	23 (-0.8)	30 (0.4)	9 (0.3)	1 (0.8)	-	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	9 (0.6)	9 (-0.1)	2 (-0.5)	0 (-0.5)	-	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	39 (57.06)	49 (52.48)	15 (47.77)	2 (25.75)	0.03	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	n=105	-	-	-	0.06	n.s.
	No	9 (-0.5)	13 (0.2)	3 (-0.5)	2 (2.4)	-	-
	Yes	30 (0.5)	36 (-0.2)	12 (0.5)	0 (-2.4)	-	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	40 (63.50)	46 (43.40)	15 (50.90)	2 (28.00)	0.11	0.011
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	42 (60.79)	54 (54.59)	17 (61.35)	2 (63.00)	0.01	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	42 (50.77)	51 (57.81)	16 (67.94)	2 (24.00)	0.05	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	43 (65.90)	53 (52.55)	17 (56.71)	2 (43.75)	0.04	n.s.

Domain	Features of children's centre	Organisational Models in 2013. n (st.res.*) or (mean ranks)				Chi-Square ($\eta^{2\dagger}$)‡, or Kruskal-Wallis (η^2)‡	p-Value
		One Centre Unit	*Cluster*	*Hub-and-spoke model*	*Virtual Centre*		
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	44 (61.39)	54 (61.50)	17 (48.88)	2 (25.00)	0.03	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	44 (58.66)	54 (60.59)	17 (52.71)	2 (77.00)	0.01	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	41 (55.77)	49 (51.17)	15 (59.47)	2 (46.00)	0.01	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	42 (57.45)	49 (54.21)	15 (50.50)	2 (29.50)	0.02	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	42 (49.10)	49 (54.78)	14 (65.89)	2 (54.75)	0.03	n.s.

Notes: *st.res=*standardised adjusted residuals*, values over ±1.96 indicate a statistically significant (p<0.05) proportion;
† Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
‡ Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak' [7]

2.5 Features of children's centres that link to Multi-agency Working and Integration

Table 2.5.1 describes the bivariate relationships shared between the three measures of a centre's Multi-agency Working and Integration: *vision and partnership; service delivery and ethos;* and *management, governance, and infrastructure.* Only one significant correlation was found between these three measures: Centres which had higher scores in terms of *multiagency governance and infrastructure* were more likely to score higher on the multiagency *vision and partnership* scale.

Table 2.5.1 Bivariate relationships shared between the three measures of a centre's multi-agency working and integration

Three measures of Multi-agency Working and Integration:		(1)	(2)	(3)
(1) Multi-agency: *Vision and Partnership*	Spearman's Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.102	0.28
	p-value	--	.279	.002
	n	119	114	117
(2) Multi-agency: *Service Delivery and Ethos*	Spearman's Correlation Coefficient	.102	1.000	.104
	p-value	.279	--	.273
	n	114	115	113
(3) Multi-agency: *Management, Governance, and Infrastructure*	Spearman's Correlation Coefficient	0.28	.104	1.000
	p-value	.002	.273	--
	n	117	113	119

Tables 2.5.2, 2.5.3 and 2.5.4 describe the features of children's centres that were related to multiagency working and integration. A centre's leadership and management was related to multi-agency working *activities* (via the *Vision and Partnership,* and *Management, Governance, and Infrastructure* scales) while *attitudes* towards multi-agency working (via the *Service Delivery and Ethos* scale) were related to the extent of a centre's focus on improving parenting, and the total number of services that a centre offered in 2011.

Table 2.5.2 Features of children's centres that link to a centre's Multi-agency *Vision and Partnership* Score

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η²)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	109	-0.02[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	107	0.00	n.s.
	Outstanding	*21*	*54.83*	-
	Good	*66*	*54.33*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*20*	*52.03*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	107	-0.03[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	107	0.02	n.s.
	No	*27*	*61.72*	-
	Yes	*80*	*51.39*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	106	0.30[†]	0.002
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	114	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*70*	*59.86*	-
	(B) Cluster	*37*	*52.89*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*7*	*58.21*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	115	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*42*	*60.79*	-
	(B) Cluster	*54*	*54.59*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*17*	*61.35*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*63.00*	-
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	119	0.08[†]	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	119	0.13[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	106	0.11[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	107	-0.05[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	106	0.14[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak' [7];
*Where **η²** is calculated from the generated **X²** statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes [6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for **η²**: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Table 2.5.3 Features of children's centres that link to a centre's Multi-agency *Service Delivery and Ethos* Score

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	106	0.14[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	104	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	20	*47.95*	-
	Good	64	*53.31*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	18	*49.00*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	102	0.04[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	102	0.00	n.s.
	No	24	*48.92*	-
	Yes	78	*52.29*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	101	-0.02[†]	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	110	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	69	*56.43*	-
	(B) Cluster	35	*52.19*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	6	*64.17*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	111	0.05	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	42	*50.77*	-
	(B) Cluster	51	*57.81*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	16	*67.94*	-
	Virtual Centre	2	*24.00*	-
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	115	0.20[†]	0.029
	Total services offered in 2012	115	-0.05[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	101	-0.11[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	102	0.06[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	102	0.20[†]	0.046

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak' [7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and **(n-1)** in order to obtain effect sizes [6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak' [7]

Table 2.5.4 Features of children's centres that link to a centre's Multi-agency *Management, Governance, and Infrastructure* Score

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η²)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	109	0.02[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	106	0.00	n.s.
	Outstanding	*20*	*57.48*	-
	Good	*66*	*52.82*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*20*	*51.78*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	106	-0.04[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	106	0.00	n.s.
	No	*26*	*55.81*	-
	Yes	*80*	*52.75*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	105	0.41[†]	<0.001
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	114	0.02	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*71*	*60.88*	-
	(B) Cluster	*36*	*50.83*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*7*	*57.50*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	115	0.04	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*43*	*65.90*	-
	(B) Cluster	*53*	*52.55*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*17*	*56.71*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*43.75*	-
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	119	0.00[†]	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	119	0.14[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	105	0.03[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	106	0.12[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	105	0.01[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak' [7];
*Where **η²** is calculated from the generated **X²** statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes [6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for **η²**: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak' [7]

2.6 Features of children's centres that link to Reach

Table 2.6 presents the bivariate inferential statistical analyses that were carried out to determine the extent to which centre features were related to its success at reaching the families within its reach area (measured via percentage). Only one feature was related to reach to the minimum acceptable threshold of statistical significance ($p<0.05$): The number of family needs met.

Table 2.6 Features of children's centres that link to 'Reach'

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	104	0.00	n.s.
	Outstanding	*20*	*56.50*	-
	Good	*65*	*50.72*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*19*	*54.39*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	100	-0.13[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH	100	0.00	n.s.
	No	*26*	*48.65*	-
	Yes	*74*	*51.15*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	100	-0.01[†]	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	106	0.00	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*65*	*54.15*	-
	(B) Cluster	*34*	*53.79*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*7*	*46.07*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	107	0.02	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*39*	*49.77*	-
	(B) Cluster	*51*	*56.86*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*15*	*51.87*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*79.50*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	109	-0.02[†]	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	106	0.14[†]	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	109	0.02[†]	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	117	-0.11[†]	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	117	-0.09[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	100	-0.02[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	101	-0.21[†]	0.04
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	97	0.02[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[,7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak' [35]

2.7 Features of children's centres that link to Service Delivery

Tables 2.7.1 and 2.7.2 show the relationships that were found to exist between features of children's centres and the number of services that centres delivered in 2011 and in 2012.

Table 2.7.1 Features of children's centres that link to the number of services delivered in 2011

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	117	-0.11[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	115	0.07	0.018
	Outstanding	*23*	*74.91*	-
	Good	*70*	*55.32*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*22*	*48.84*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	108	0.03[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	108	0.00	n.s.
	No	*27*	*56.35*	-
	Yes	*81*	*53.88*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	107	0.15[†]	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	116	0.04	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*72*	*63.28*	-
	(B) Cluster	*37*	*51.92*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*7*	*44.07*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	116	0.03	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*44*	*61.39*	-
	(B) Cluster	*54*	*61.50*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*17*	*48.88*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*25.00*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	119	0.08[†]	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	115	0.20[†]	0.029
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	119	0.00[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	107	-0.10[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	108	0.02[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	107	0.04[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];
*Where **η^2** is calculated from the generated **X^2** statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes [6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for **η^2**: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Table 2.7.2 Features of children's centres that link to the number of services in 2012

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η²)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	117	-0.09[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	115	0.02	n.s.
	Outstanding	*23*	*66.35*	-
	Good	*70*	*56.99*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*22*	*52.48*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	108	0.02[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	108	0.02	n.s.
	No	*27*	*61.20*	-
	Yes	*81*	*52.27*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	107	0.24[†]	0.014
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	116	0.00	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*72*	*59.26*	-
	(B) Cluster	*37*	*56.26*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*7*	*62.57*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	117	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*44*	*58.66*	-
	(B) Cluster	*54*	*60.59*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*17*	*52.71*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*77.00*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	119	0.13[†]	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	115	0.05[†]	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	119	0.14[†]	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	107	0.11[†]	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	108	0.15[†]	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	107	0.12[†]	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7]; *Where η² is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6]; [‡]Effect Size thresholds for η²: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Tables 2.7.3 and 2.7.4 show the relationships between features of children's centres and service clustering models in 2011 and 2013.

Table 2.7.3 Features of children's centres that link to service clustering in 2011

Domain	Features of children's centre	Service Clustering in 2011. n (st.res.*) or (mean ranks)			
		no	*yes*	Chi-Square ($\eta^{2\dagger})^{\ddagger}$, or Kruskal-Wallis ($\eta^2)^{\ddagger}$	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	112 (57.97)	5 (82.00)	0.02	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	n=115	-	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	23 (1.0)	0 (-1.0)	-	-
	Good	67 (-0.6)	3 (0.6)	-	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	21 (-0.3)	1 (0.3)	-	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	103 (54.72)	5 (50.00)	0.00	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	n=108	-	0.00	n.s.
	No	26 (0.3)	1 (-0.3)	-	-
	Yes	77 (-0.3)	4 (0.3)	-	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	104 (54.12)	3 (49.63)	0.00	n.s.
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	114 (60.27)	5 (53.80)	0.00	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	110 (57.22)	5 (75.20)	0.01	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	114 (60.17)	5 (56.10)	0.00	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	123 (65.23)	5 (46.60)	0.01	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	123 (65.26)	5 (45.80)	0.01	n.s.
Evidence-Based Practice	Total programmes offered in 2012	114 (60.70)	5 (44.00)	0.01	n.s.
	Total programmes offered in 2013	108 (57.94)	5 (36.80)	0.02	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	102 (53.43)	5 (65.60)	0.01	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	103 (54.74)	5 (49.60)	0.00	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	102 (53.99)	5 (54.30)	0.00	n.s.

Notes: *st.res=*standardised adjusted residuals*, values over ±1.96 indicate a statistically significant (p<0.05) proportion;
† Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and **(n-1)** in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
‡ Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Table 2.7.4 Features of children's centres that link to service clustering in 2013

| Domain | Features of children's centre | Service Clustering in 2013. n (st.res.*) or (mean ranks) | | | |
		no	yes	Chi-Square $(\eta^{2\dagger})^{\ddagger}$, or Kruskal-Wallis $(\eta^2)^{\ddagger}$	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	96 (56.35)	21 (71.10)	0.03	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	n=115	-	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	19 (0.1)	4 (-0.1)	-	-
	Good	55 (-1.1)	15 (1.1)	-	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	20 (1.2)	2 (-1.2)	-	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	89 (57.19)	19 (41.92)	0.04	0.039
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	n=108	-	0.00	n.s.
	No	21 (-0.7)	6 (0.7)	-	-
	Yes	68 (0.7)	13 (-0.7)	-	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	89 (54.49)	18 (51.58)	0.00	n.s.
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	95 (58.60)	24 (65.54)	0.01	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	90 (56.57)	25 (63.16)	0.01	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	94 (60.96)	25 (56.38)	0.00	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	103 (64.61)	25 (64.04)	0.00	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	103 (64.34)	25 (64.14)	0.00	n.s.
Evidence-Based Practice	Total programmes offered in 2012	96 (62.39)	23 (50.04)	0.02	n.s.
	Total programmes offered in 2013	89 (60.68)	24 (43.35)	0.05	0.021
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	87 (54.15)	20 (53.35)	0.00	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	88 (58.45)	20 (37.10)	0.07	0.005
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	85 (53.70)	22 (55.16)	0.00	n.s.

Notes: *st.res=*standardised adjusted residuals*, values over ±1.96 indicate a statistically significant (p<0.05) proportion;
[†] Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
[‡] Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

2.8 Features of children's centres that link to Evidence-Based Practice

Tables 2.8.1 and 2.8.2 present the relationships that were found to exist between features of centres and the number of well-evidenced programmes or strategies delivered in 2012 and 2013. This list of well-evidenced programmes was mentioned in the Report of Allen (2011).

Table 2.8.1 Features of children's centres that link to the number of well-evidenced programmes or strategies that centres delivered in 2012

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η²)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	109	0.00[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	108	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	*21*	*49.55*	-
	Good	*67*	*55.07*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*20*	*57.78*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	107	-0.05	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	107	0.01	n.s.
	No	*26*	*48.38*	-
	Yes	*81*	*55.80*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	106	-0.11	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	114	0.02	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*71*	*54.12*	-
	(B) Cluster	*36*	*63.21*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*7*	*62.43*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	114	0.05	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	*43*	*51.77*	-
	(B) Cluster	*53*	*65.10*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*17*	*54.18*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*36.25*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	118	-0.06	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	113	-0.07	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	117	-0.02	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	119	0.14	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	119	0.14	n.s.
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	106	-0.09	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	107	0.00	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	106	0.10	n.s.

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for ρ: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[,7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Table 2.8.2 Features of children's centres that link to the number of well-evidenced programmes or strategies that centres delivered in 2013

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	103	-0.11[†]	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	101	0.06	0.043
	Outstanding	20	*61.53*	-
	Good	62	*45.69*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	19	*57.26*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	102	0.03	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	102	0.02	n.s.
	No	27	*45.28*	-
	Yes	75	*53.74*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	101	0.12	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	112	0.04	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	69	*51.88*	-
	(B) Cluster	36	*64.25*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	7	*62.14*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	113	0.06	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	42	*48.54*	-
	(B) Cluster	52	*61.41*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	17	*66.71*	-
	Virtual Centre	2	*37.50*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	112	0.15	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	107	0.11	n.s.

Category	Measure	n	value	sig
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	111	-0.06	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	113	0.30	0.001
	Total services offered in 2012	113	0.24	0.009
Parenting Services	Need-targeting, parent: No. needs targeted	106	0.08	n.s.
	Need-targeting, family: No. needs targeted	107	0.15	n.s.
	Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	106	0.21	0.030

Notes: [†]Effect Size thresholds for ρ: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
[‡]Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

2.9 Features of children's centres that link to Parenting Services

Table 2.9.1 shows the statistical relationships that existed between the three measures which considered *Parenting Services* within this report. A centre's focus on improving parenting behaviour was found to be unrelated to the number of needs covered by parenting services; either the needs of parents or the needs of families. Conversely, centres that targeted a greater number of needs also had a (significant) tendency to do this for both parents and the broader family unit (ρ=0.32, p=0.001, a 'weak' effect size).

Table 2.9.1 The statistical relationships that existed between the three measures of Parenting Services.

Parenting Services		Need-targeting, parent: No. of needs targeted	Need-targeting, family: No. of needs targeted
Need-targeting, family: No. of needs targeted	Spearman's Rho (ρ)*	.32	-
	p-value	.001	-
	n	107	-
Centre focus on improving parenting behaviour	Spearman's Rho (ρ)*	.13	.04
	p-value	.178	.700
	n	103	104

Note: *Effect Size thresholds for ρ: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];

Tables 2.9.2 to 2.9.4 present the statistical relationships that were found to exist between each of the three measures of a centre's Parenting Services and the other features of children's centres which were included in the report.

Table 2.9.2 Features of children's centres that link to the number of parental needs focused on with centre services

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho $(\rho)^\dagger$, or Kruskal-Wallis* $(\eta^2)^\ddagger$ & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	100	$-0.02^\dagger$	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	96	0.02	n.s.
	Outstanding	*20*	*53.18*	-
	Good	*59*	*45.51*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*17*	*53.28*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	98	$0.14^\dagger$	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	98	0.01	n.s.
	No	*27*	*45.11*	-
	Yes	*71*	*51.17*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	97	$0.06^\dagger$	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	106	0.02	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*66*	*50.37*	-
	(B) Cluster	*34*	*58.62*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*6*	*58.92*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	107	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*41*	*55.77*	-
	(B) Cluster	*49*	*51.17*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*15*	*59.47*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*46.00*	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	106	$0.11^\dagger$	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	101	$-0.11^\dagger$	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	105	$0.03^\dagger$	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	106	$0.05^\dagger$	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	106	$-0.05^\dagger$	n.s.

Table 2.9.3 Features of children's centres that link to the number of family needs focused on with centre services

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)[†], or Kruskal-Wallis* (η^2)[‡] & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	101	-0.21[†]	0.040
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	97	0.02	n.s.
	Outstanding	20	47.80	-
	Good	59	51.85	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	18	41.00	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	99	0.11[†]	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	99	0.03	n.s.
	No	27	41.65	-
	Yes	72	53.13	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	98	0.02[†]	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	107	0.01	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	66	56.83	-
	(B) Cluster	35	49.36	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	6	50.00	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	108	0.02	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) Unit	42	57.45	-
	(B) Cluster	49	54.21	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	15	50.50	-
	Virtual Centre	2	29.50	-
Multiagency Working and Integration	Vision and Partnership	107	-0.05[†]	n.s.
	Service Delivery and Ethos	102	0.06[†]	n.s.
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	106	0.12[†]	n.s.

| Service Delivery | Total services offered in 2011 | 107 | $0.15^{\dagger}$ | n.s. |
| | Total services offered in 2012 | 107 | $0.13^{\dagger}$ | n.s. |

Notes: †Effect Size thresholds for **ρ**: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];
*Where **η²** is calculated from the generated **X²** statistic and (**n-1)** in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
‡Effect Size thresholds for **η²**: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

Table 2.9.4 Features of children's centres that link to a centre's focus on improving parenting

Domain	Features of Children's Centre	n	Spearman's rho (ρ)†, or Kruskal-Wallis* (η²)‡ & then *mean ranks*	p-Value
Centre Reach	Centre Reach (percentage)	97	$0.02^{\dagger}$	n.s.
Ofsted Effectiveness	Ofsted Rating of Effectiveness in the Early Years	96	0.01	n.s.
	Outstanding	*18*	*52.78*	-
	Good	*59*	*48.64*	-
	Satisfactory/Requires Improvement	*19*	*44.03*	-
Manager Qualifications	Manager: Highest Academic Qualification	98	$0.00^{\dagger}$	n.s.
	Manager: Holds NPQICL/NPQH Leadership Qualification?	98	0.00	n.s.
	No	*25*	*49.04*	-
	Yes	*73*	*49.66*	-
Centre Leadership and Management	Overall (mean) CCLMRS Score	96	$-0.05^{\dagger}$	n.s.
Organisational Models	Organisational Models in 2011	106	0.00	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*66*	*52.29*	-
	(B) Cluster	*36*	*55.44*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*4*	*56.00*	-
	Organisational Models in 2013	107	0.03	n.s.
	(A) One Centre (standalone) *Unit*	*42*	*49.10*	-
	(B) Cluster	*49*	*54.78*	-
	(C) Hub-and-spoke model	*14*	*65.89*	-
	Virtual Centre	*2*	*54.75*	-
Multiagency Working and	Vision and Partnership	106	$0.14^{\dagger}$	n.s.

Integration	Service Delivery and Ethos	10 2	0.20†	0.04 6
	Management, Governance, and Infrastructure	10 5	0.01†	n.s.
Service Delivery	Total services offered in 2011	10 6	0.01†	n.s.
	Total services offered in 2012	10 6	0.18†	n.s.

Notes: †Effect Size thresholds for ρ: ±0.80+ 'strong', ±0.50-0.79 'moderate', ±0.20-0.49 'weak'[7];
*Where η^2 is calculated from the generated X^2 statistic and (**n-1**) in order to obtain effect sizes[6];
‡Effect Size thresholds for η^2: 0.64+ 'strong', 0.25-0.63 'moderate', 0.04-0.24 'weak'[7]

References

Goff, J., Hall, J., Sylva, K., Smith, T., Smith, G., Eisenstadt, N., Sammons, P., Evangelou, M., Smees, R., and Chu, K. (2013). *Evaluation of Children's Centre's in England (ECCE) – Strand 3: Delivery of Family Services by Children's Centre's Research Report* [online]. DfE Research Report No. DFE-RR297. Goff et al. (2013) report available through this link [Accessed 06 Feb 2014].

Ferguson, C.J. (2009). An Effect Size Primer: A Guide for Clinicians and Researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. 40(5), pp 532-538.

Horn, R.A. (2008). *The Kruskal-Wallis Test* [online]. Northern Arizona University. Horn (2008). available through this link [Accessed 29 Jul 2014].

Sylva, K., Chan, L., Good, J. and Sammons, P. (2012). *Children's Centre Leadership and Management Rating Scale: CCLMRS.* Oxford: Department of Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: Michael.Dale@education.gsi.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

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