

Research Report
No 260



Evaluation of Pilot Summer Activities for 16 Year Olds: Summer 2000

*Jo Hutchinson, David Henderson and Sarah Francis
SQW Ltd*

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

© Crown Copyright 2001. Published with the permission of DfEE on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Crown Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

ISBN 1 84185 458 1
March 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	Introduction	1
2	Characteristics of Pilot Projects	8
3	Characteristics of Participants	24
4	The Impact of the Programme	31
5	Conclusions and Recommendations	51
 ANNEXES		
A	Methodology	
B	Pen Portraits of Pilot Projects	
C	Additional Tables	

Executive Summary

Introduction

- 1.1 The “Pilot Summer Activities for 16 year olds” programme ran over the summer of 2000, supported by the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE). The programme aimed to support young people as they left school in the transition to further education or training. £1 million of funding was made available to 32 projects during the summer. Projects were alerted early in the year and pilots formally appointed in June. The DfEE did not prescribe the sorts of young people who would be eligible although they had to be 16 years old and without definite plans after completion of their GCSEs.
- 1.2 The programme was evaluated by SQW Ltd who were appointed to undertake the research in June. The evaluation sought to identify how well the programme as a whole had performed against its twin objectives of easing the transition from school, and of improving the personal and social skills of young people who took part. The evaluation also sought to identify good practice among the pilots. Evaluation research comprised a number of elements including:
- questionnaires distributed by project managers to participants at the outset of the programme and then again at its completion
 - monitoring data returned by project managers
 - telephone consultations with all project managers
 - 8 case studies.

Characteristics of pilot projects

- 1.3 Thirty two projects were delivered over the summer reflecting a wide range of activity and approaches to the programme. Most were run either by Local Authorities or by outdoor centres run as Trusts (many with links with particular Authorities). The average project size in terms of young people attending was around 50. The smallest project saw 7 young people, the largest 232 young people. Many of the projects ran their programmes several times. The average duration of project was between five and seven days although the shortest ran for 3 and the longest for 21 days.

- 1.4 The majority of projects offered programmes either entirely or predominantly based around outdoor adventure activities. A significant minority of projects also offered IT related activities. The range of other activities which projects offered include work experience, community and environmental projects, football coaching, indoor activities such as drama, music and fashion, discussion forums, CV design, construction skills and introductions to the armed forces.
- 1.5 Some projects were able to offer some form of contact with the project prior to the outdoor activity week, although in many cases this was a session to introduce the types of activities, and provide an indication of the types of clothing and so on which the young people would need to take. It was generally agreed that if the projects had had more planning time they would have sought to offer a thorough introduction which was more closely aligned with the aims of the programme.
- 1.6 A number of projects adopted a 'light touch' approach to post-programme activity. This involved recognising and celebrating what had been achieved by those taking part. In some cases a formal awards event was arranged with friends and family invited to attend. The purpose of such an event was to reinforce the sense of achievement obtained by participants and to provide some link between the week away and the young persons home environment.
- 1.7 A handful of projects undertook further work with the young people after completion of the outdoor activities events. Some youth and community workers continue to have contact with the young people who participated. This can bring benefits in that relationships based on trust, respect and better mutual understanding may have been forged through the outdoor activities, this then provides a firm foundation for subsequent work with and support for the young people on their return. Again, most project managers remarked that they would endeavour to provide further follow up activities in future, but in reality this requires partnership between those supporting young people in their community and those running the outdoor activities. In many cases the creation or strengthening of such partnerships was a key factor in the success of the programme and is one which should be built in to the future programme.

Characteristics of participants

- 1.8 Approximately 1460 young people participated in the programme, a number which falls short of the 3000 forecast in early summer. The main reason for the shortfall was difficulty recruiting appropriate young people, and this was attributed by project managers to lack of time to set up the programme. It was also due to problems with fledgling partnership arrangements.

1.9 The key characteristics of the group as a whole are as follows:

- 78 per cent were aged 16
- 61 per cent were male
- 8 per cent said they had a disability
- 88 per cent described their ethnic background as white
- 21 per cent had taken less than 5 GCSEs
- 67 per cent said they rarely missed school.

1.10 In the UK about 3 per cent of children aged 0 – 16 have a disability, while 10 per cent of young people under the age of 18 come from ethnic minority backgrounds. The pilot programme has therefore achieved a reasonable balance of participation in terms of representation of the overall population. However, given the relatively high proportion of young people at risk who come from ethnic minority backgrounds, and/or who have low academic qualifications and ambition, the Pilot programme needs to ensure that it reaches a better representation of the ‘at risk’ group.

Impact of the programme

1.11 The programme sought to achieve impacts either in terms of the transition from school, or in terms of greater social and personal skills, and preferably both. The programme did have an impact on young people’s plans. At commencement of the programme 76 per cent planned to go to school or college, at the end of the programme this had risen to 81 per cent; a moderate but significant increase. Furthermore 41 per cent said that the programme had either completely shaped or had a big influence on their plans (which may refer either to vocational or educational ambition, or plans for their social and leisure time). However, there was a small group (of 20 per cent) for whom the programme had no influence on their plans. In an open question, 65 per cent identified ways in which the programme had made them think differently about their lives.

1.12 Further analysis revealed that young people who reported that they often or sometimes missed school; those who were less motivated, were more likely to report that the programme had influenced their plans.

- 1.13 A large proportion of the participants of the programme commenced it with fairly high assessment of their skills across the range of self esteem, group working, leadership, communication, problem solving, time management, openness to new experiences and IT skills. As a general finding, those young people who thought their skills were already quite highly developed were more likely to think that they had improved after the programme had finished.
- 45 per cent of participants thought that they have improved their group working, communication and problem solving skills
 - four in every ten participants thought they have improved their self-esteem, leadership, and confidence with new experiences.
- 1.14 A significant minority thought that their level of skill across the various attributes had decreased at the end of the programme.
- 30 per cent reported a decline in group working, time management and technology skills
 - a quarter reported a reduction in their leadership, communication and problem solving skills.
- 1.15 However, in an open question 79 per cent of individuals were able to identify ways in which they felt they had changed as a result of the programme, with almost a third pointing to the fact that they felt more confident. Other effects included that they felt more considerate towards others, had better social skills, and had been able to overcome some fears.
- 1.16 A telephone follow up of 150 participants in October confirmed that these effects appeared to last beyond the immediate end of the programme. Most were at school, 6th form (33 per cent), or college (56 per cent). A third said that in retrospect the programme had affected their plans in that (for half of these) they were now more determined to succeed or had their plans confirmed; or, (for a third) that the programme had helped them to decide on what to do at college or what sort of training to do. Nine out of ten said that someone they knew had made some sort of comment about how they had changed.
- 1.17 The programme has benefited different groups in different ways. In particular, less motivated young people reported greater impacts in terms of transition plans than the more motivated. There was little difference regarding the gender of participant. For a small minority the programme appeared to have little positive impact.

Good practice

- 1.18 The findings outlined above, when considered with the testimonies of project managers and young people at the case studies outline a number of ways the programme should proceed in the future. These include:
- 1.19 **Targeted recruitment:** to ensure that young people who might otherwise not enter appropriate provision or might drop out, participate in the programme. Consequently:
- the programme should start earlier
 - co-operation of schools and youth workers is needed to identify young people
 - recruitment should adopt a personal approach, rather than expecting young people to volunteer.
- 1.20 Young people need to have **clear expectations** about the programme, and to be aware that it is not a free holiday:
- parents need to know about the programme, be assured that it is ‘official’, and support the involvement of their children
 - young people should be involved as much as is practical in the design of the programme both to encourage ‘ownership’ of the project and commitment to it.
- 1.21 **Appropriate workers** should be involved in the design and delivery of the programme. Generally workers from a number of different agencies and organisations are involved in various elements of the programme, and it is this which drives the need for a partnership approach.
- workers with continuing contact with the young people should be involved. It may be more appropriate therefore for youth workers, personal advisors, college staff, or community workers to attend the outdoor activities programme than teachers (unless there is sixth form provision)
 - workers need adequate advance warning of the timing of the programme to book their holidays accordingly
 - outdoor activity staff may need not only to have experience associated with teaching the activities, but also have experience of working with this group of young people.

1.22 **Programme design:** the evaluation research is unable to report on an “optimal model” for intervention, however the following elements were generally thought to be desirable:

- clarity of learning outcomes – what is each session designed to achieve?
- pre- outdoor activity sessions to introduce the aims of the project, and undertake preliminary work
- a range of activities to offer “something for everyone”
- continual review and feedback
- encouraging young people to take responsibility for organising some element of the programme
- offering accreditation wherever possible to acknowledge the achievements made by young people
- continuing to work with young people after the outdoor activities part of the programme is over, perhaps maintaining some contact through the early months of their training or college experience.

1.23 Within the general points outlined above, there should still be sufficient room for individual projects or partnerships to experiment further to find ways of working which are most suitable for the young people they work with and their local circumstances.

Summary

1.24 The pilot summer activities programme had demonstrated positive impacts for the majority of young people who participated. The future development of the programme should build on these foundations to further strengthen and target the programme. Future evaluation should work with project managers to further refine the instruments used and provide greater insight into the impacts of the programme.

1 Introduction

Background

- 1.1 This is the evaluation of the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) Pilot Summer Activities for 16 year olds programme. The DfEE, as part of a drive to develop its lifelong learning agenda, funded a number of pilot schemes during Summer 2000 which aimed to reduce the numbers of young people not in education, employment or training.
- 1.2 DfEE made £1million of funding available to 32 pilot projects during Summer 2000. Projects were alerted in May and pilots appointed during June. The intention was to provide activities for between 2,000 and 3,000 young people. The DfEE did not prescribe the sorts of young people who would be eligible although they had to be 16 years old and without definite plans after the completion of their GCSEs. A number of projects targeted disaffected young people and one project specifically targeted ethnic minorities.
- 1.3 A wide range of activities were provided but frequently included adventure activity, arts and drama, work experience, community work, volunteering and travel. One project, the World Challenge/Wednesbury EAZ pilot, was self funded but had requested that they be included within the evaluation.
- 1.4 This section of the evaluation report will provide further context of the Pilot Summer Activities Programme. It begins by outlining the current policy context and then the rationale for the programme, before introducing the aims of the evaluation.

The policy context

- 1.5 The rationale for the programme is that 16 year olds not engaged in education, employment and training after sitting their GCSEs, are more likely to be unemployed by the age of 21 than other young people. An intervention is required at this stage to bridge the gap between school and other provisions and ensure that young people remain engaged thus increasing their chances to find, and sustain, employment in their later years. The key to this intervention is to achieve a transition between the worlds of school and post-school experience. The Summer Activities programme may be seen as providing 'rites of passage' for young people not involved in educational activity.

- 1.6 The UK government through its pathways approach for New Deal and the continuation of support proposed by the Connexions strategy, is increasingly shifting the emphasis towards the prevention of exclusion and anti-social behaviour, by committing resources and effort at critical points in all young people's lives. One of these critical points is when young people leave school, particularly if they leave with no or low qualifications (one in 16 young people fall into the former category), or have experienced the range of other factors of exclusion (including ethnicity, family background, disability, drugs or offending behaviour).
- 1.7 This is further endorsed by the Social Exclusion Unit's report, "Bridging the Gap" which recognises the importance of keeping young people positively occupied. Non-participation in education or employment between the ages of 16 and 18 is a strong predictor of later unemployment, (more than 40 per cent of those not in work or training at 16 are in the same situation at 18), and this 'unemployment disadvantage' persists as young people progress into adult life.
- 1.8 The report also recognises the difference between young males and females at this age. Whereas involvement in crime is cited as a related consequence for non-participating males, the non-participation of women between 16 and 18 is taken as a powerful predictor of teenage motherhood and possible further social exclusion. The report outlines the social and financial costs to the individual and the rest of society in both the short and long term of non-participation of this group.
- 1.9 The themes of these developments (progression, participation, employability, inclusion and so on) have been carried into a range of policy developments (notably Learning to Succeed) affecting schools and post 16 education including:
- Curriculum 2000, including enrichment activities
 - Work related learning for 14-16 year olds
 - The Connexions Strategy
 - Excellence in Cities
 - Education Action Zones
 - SRB interventions.

- 1.10 These seek to widen participation in the opportunities available to all young people by:
- offering advice and guidance to young people that recognises each person's own strengths and constraints
 - tackling barriers to inclusion; and increasing incentives to participate; and
 - developing skills, attitudes and aspirations among young people which help them to access opportunities in employment, education and training.
- 1.11 A key element of this approach is to focus attention from outside traditional groups of learners, and towards those who are excluded or at risk of exclusion. In many, although not all cases, these latter groups will be closely correlated with young people who have low or no qualifications. It is important that as expectations and aspirations amongst this group are improved a mechanism exists to support and encourage them through further education, training or employment. Their experience has to be overseen by an individual with responsibility for their progress and it has to be a high quality experience.

The rationale for the programme

- 1.12 The pilot summer activities programme for 16 year olds seeks to maintain constructive contact with young people in the summer after they take GCSEs. More specifically it aimed firstly to secure an effective transition from school to further education, training or appropriate employment. Its second key aim was to develop the skills young people require to succeed in life. These include:
- self-esteem
 - confidence
 - team work
 - leadership
 - to broaden the horizons of the young people involved.
- 1.13 The value of outdoor activities or adventure activities is thought to derive from a number of processes. Firstly it facilitates group formation and group working which encourages social interaction and facilitates the development and display of a number of positive social actions

including responsibility for one's self and for others, peer group learning, offering and receiving encouragement and reward, and task based leadership.

1.14 Other ways in which outdoor education may support young people include:

- **New / different environment.** Some young people may rarely or never experience the countryside, or wilderness, consequently the opportunity to spend time away from their usual environment is valuable in its own right
- **Different people.** Mixing groups of young people from different areas or different backgrounds, or meeting new training staff also encourage wider social interaction, exposure to different ideas and different cultures
- **New / different experiences.** The actual range of activities which people undertake and the way in which they are “taught” (or in which learning is facilitated) again, opens up new possibilities in young people's minds
- **Relationship with staff.** Young people may see professional adults such as youth workers or teachers in a different light on outdoor activities as staff may be more relaxed. Enhanced relationships and bonds of trust may be developed which add value to work with the young people after the outdoor experience is over
- **Equal opportunities.** Securing personal development gains among girls to encourage their equality with boys may, according to Humberstone¹ (1987) be better achieved through mixed-sex outdoor education than through other teaching media
- **Health and well-being.** Exposure to new sporting or leisure activities may encourage their take up on a longer term basis, and the benefits of physical activity are well documented. Also, the psychological feeling of well-being which affects many people after contact with nature could also have positive effects.

1.15 There are therefore several ways in which outdoor education or activities can encourage both personal social development and can facilitate self-reflection and self-actualisation. However, the experience may not be wholly beneficial to all who participate. For some young people the thought that they may have failed, either in the social or physical element of the

¹ Humberstone, B. (1987) Organisational factors, teachers approach and pupil commitment in outdoor activities, PhD, University of Southampton.

experience “can be a self-destructive experience spreading negative effort to other aspects of self”(Barrett and Greenaway, 1995²).

- 1.16 In some respects, support for outdoor activities is given on the basis either of intuitive logic (which has regard to the type of factors outlined above) or perhaps to personal experience. There is not a great deal of empirical evidence to support the view that outdoor activities use learning processes which are distinct from other learning environments and which achieve positive social development outcomes for young people. Dr. Higgins (1997, 9)³ a researcher in the field notes that “ perhaps the reason we do not succeed in driving home our case and convincing others of the value of this form of education is that it is so obvious to us. However, others may not be so easily persuaded and we must find convincing arguments”
- 1.17 Barrett and Greenaway (1995, 2) in an extensive review of literature conclude that “the lack of data concerning developmental outcomes is due to problems with how these might properly be measured, rather than to the fact that they do not exist”.
- 1.18 This evaluation of the Pilot Summer Activities programme therefore presented an opportunity to explore whether the programme had achieved its aims, it also provided an opportunity for assessing ways in which any benefit might be measured in the future.

Evaluation

- 1.19 SQW Ltd were commissioned by the DfEE in June to carry out the evaluation of the Pilot Summer Activities. An evaluation framework was agreed with DfEE which would enable the evaluators to assess the following:
- the extent to which the Pilot Summer Activities Programme has been successful in achieving its stated objectives
 - additional benefits derived from the programme
 - good practice lessons in the delivery of activities for the target client group
 - the effectiveness of systems for targeting of young people most likely to benefit

² Barrett, J. and Greenaway, R. (1995) Why Adventure? The role and value of outdoor adventure in young people’s social development, Foundation for Outdoor Adventure, UK.

³ Higgins, P. (1997) “why educate out of doors?” in Higgins, P. Loynes, C. and Crowther, N. A guide for outdoor educators in Scotland, Scottish Natural Heritage: Perth and Adventure Education; Penrith.

- identification of changes to the programme to increase its impact, if continued, in future years
- establishment of an evaluation model which can be applied by projects in future rounds of the programme.

1.20 The evaluation framework can be viewed as a pilot as much as the activities themselves were. This framework is comprised of the following elements:

Table 1.1: The elements of the evaluation framework

<i>Element of the evaluation framework</i>	<i>Achieved responses</i>
Project data from all pilots at both pre-start and post programme stages.	Monitoring forms were sent to all 32 projects, 28 forms were returned (27 for section B).
Survey of participants as they commenced and as they completed the pilot activity.	1460 young people participated in the programme (data from monitoring forms and returned questionnaires). 875 pre-activity and 974 post activity forms returned. 1073 participants returned either a pre- or a post- activity questionnaire. 777 participants completed both pre- and post- activity forms.
Telephone follow up of participants in October.	A representative sample of 150 follow up interviews completed (11% of participants). – based on number completing – as above.
Telephone interviews with all projects during the pilot and upon completion.	32 summaries of project issues completed.
In-depth case studies incorporating the views of the young people, programme leaders and other agencies involved.	8 case studies completed.

1.21 Further details of the methodologies used in devising the framework and the analysis of results can be found in Annex A. An interim report outlining key findings from data received and analysed was presented to the DfEE in September 2000, to provide an early indication of key messages to inform policy and the design of the second pilot of the programme in Summer 2001. Draft reporting took place in November.

1.22 Feedback to managers of Pilots was two-fold. Firstly a summary of results from questionnaires completed by young people at their project was provided, compared with the national average. Secondly, a presentation of key results from the evaluation of the 2000 programme and discussion of methods and approaches which could be used for 2001 was undertaken in early December with project managers at a meeting in London.

This report

- 1.23 This report presents a full analysis of findings from all the elements of the evaluation research. The data is presented to address the objectives of the evaluation and the report may draw on two or three different data sources in a discussion of an issue. The data source is given in the text whenever necessary.
- 1.24 The report has not been used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of particular projects – rather to evaluate the programme as a whole. Only case study projects have been used to illustrate particular points in the text.
- 1.25 The rest of this report is structured as follows:
- chapter 2 details the characteristics of the pilot projects including details of recruitment and pre-start processes, the activities delivered and post-programme systems
 - chapter 3 examines the characteristics of participants on the programme
 - chapter 4 considers the results of the survey work and what this tells us about the impact of the programme
 - chapter 5 contains a summary of our findings and conclusions, views on what constitutes good practice for projects and for future evaluation, and reviews key policy implications.
- 1.26 More detailed statistical analysis is contained in the Annexes along with brief pen portraits of all the Pilots and their activities.

2 Characteristics of Pilot Projects

Introduction

2.1 This Chapter provides information on the characteristics of the pilot projects. Illustrative examples are taken from the in-depth case studies to highlight key points. Specific issues discussed in this section include:

- the selection of projects
- the range of types and approaches used by the pilots
- the activities offered by pilots.

Project Selection

2.2 Over half of the 32 pilot projects had become aware of Pilot Summer Activities through the press releases following a speech by David Blunkett which floated the idea of the initiative. The pilot projects became interested because of the following factors:

- they already delivered activities which they thought could meet the needs of the target client group and the programme offered an incentive to work with a *new type of client*
- they already worked with the target client group and the pilot offered a means of *developing* existing provision
- in a smaller number of cases projects felt that they had experience of the activities and the client group concerned and that the programme provided a means of *expanding* existing provision.

Brathay Trust was formed over 50 years ago to provide young apprentices with experience of outdoor and environmental work. It is now a private company delivering management development programmes for businesses. It retains a charitable wing which delivers activities to young people. Brathay became aware of the Pilot Summer Activities through the national press, felt it would fit well with their experimental learning approach and decided to contact DfEE. Brathay already has good links with the Careers Service and other youth services in Cumbria but extended these links to surrounding areas as a result of their decision to bid.

- 2.3 Contact was usually made with DfEE at this point to express an interest although several were contacted directly by DfEE itself. The press releases provide an effective means of communicating basic information about the programme and stimulating early interest among significant numbers of projects. The other principle means of finding out about the pilot was through direct contact by the DfEE and by network contacts within the adventure activities industry.
- 2.4 One aspect of the selection process, an unintended benefit, has been the **development of networks and links between the adventure activity industry, youth services and a range of other agencies**. In some cases these links were already established and pilots in this category benefited in terms of recruitment and attendance by youth workers or other professionals. This was important in at least three respects:
- gauging the numbers likely to attend
 - assessing the level of support required for groups of disaffected young people
 - in the capacity of the projects to manage the young people once the programme was underway.
- 2.5 The Pilot Summer Activities programme, within the demanding time constraints allowed, encouraged projects to further develop these links or establish new links with agencies. These new partnership links did not always function as effectively as had been anticipated. It is clear from many of the interviews with project staff that this had been one of the most notable learning experiences from the pilot. Nevertheless, the capacity of so many projects to establish these links as quickly as they did is perhaps one of the most impressive achievements of the pilot and a number of good practice lessons were identified which are discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

Project Characteristics

- 2.6 A total of 32 projects commenced the pilot summer activities programme. A brief description of each project can be found in Annex B, which draws together data from both telephone consultations and monitoring data. Review of the range of types of programmes, their activities and their approaches reveals a very broad range of actions pursued within the Pilot programme. This sub-section briefly provides an overview of the types of pilot within the programme as a whole.

Type of project sponsor

2.7 Of the 32 projects, Local Authorities and Outdoor centres run as Trusts were the major participants in the programme (Table 2.1). A smaller number of projects *classified themselves* as being private sector companies or community based initiatives.

Table: 2.1 Project sponsors

<i>Lead organisations</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>
<i>Local Authority</i>	13
<i>Outdoor Centre Trust</i>	11
<i>Private</i>	4
<i>Community / Voluntary</i>	4

2.8 When asked about their major partners in developing their bids to DfEE an extremely varied range of organisations were cited. Key partners were frequently defined as those responsible for recruitment and schools were the single biggest category of partner organisation. Local authority youth services were another frequently cited category. Other partners included:

- Employment and Careers Services
- Colleges
- Social and probationary services
- Voluntary and community based organisations e.g. NACRO
- Training and Enterprise Councils
- Private companies.

Project size and duration

2.9 The size of projects, in terms of the number of young people they worked with varied considerably. The largest, from those for which we have received full monitoring details, were those of Brathay Trust (232 participants), Wednesbury EAZ/World Challenge (168) and YMCA National (158). The smallest projects were Calvert Trust (7) and South Cerney (10). The average was 50 participants per project.

2.10 Some of the larger projects ran several repeats of their programme over the summer period. The duration of the pilots, in terms of the number of days any young person attended, varied considerably. Individual project runs ranged from 3 to 21 days duration with almost half of the projects offering programmes which lasted 5 days.

Project activities

2.11 All but one of the projects offered programmes either entirely or predominantly based around outdoor adventure activities (Table 2.2). A significant minority of projects also offered IT related activities. The diversity of the Pilot Summer Activities programme is illustrated by the range of activities classified as being ‘other’ which includes, amongst others:

- discussion forums and group-work
- work experience initiatives
- CV design and interview preparation
- community and environmental projects (including environmental sculpture)
- indoor activities
- construction skills
- sports and fashion.

Table 2.2: Activities

	<i>Outdoor</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>Arts & Drama</i>	<i>Other</i>
<i>No of projects</i>	31	6	3	15
<i>Percent</i>	97	19	9	47

North Lincolnshire is a local authority delivered pilot. It became involved after receiving an email from DfEE. Their programme has 6 objectives which, amongst others, includes:

- **developing self worth**
- **improving social skills**
- **encouraging participation by all (for which a young co-ordinator has been appointed)**
- **providing accredited learning outcomes.**

There are specific aims for each of these objectives e.g. achievement of the nationally recognised Community Sports Leader Award resulting in improved employability for those young people involved.

Residential

- 2.12 All projects offered an element of residential experience. For some of the longer running projects in particular the residential element was combined with community based work, either at a school, youth centre, community centre or alternatively in a work place if there was an element of work experience.
- 2.13 For some of the projects the residential element of the programme was held quite a long way from where the participants lived with several of the projects being run in Wales, Cumbria, the Derbyshire Dales and in one case on the island of North Uist in Scotland. In other cases the residential was held in a facility which was a relatively short drive time away. For others the residential was on board a boat. Some projects felt it important to take the young people well away from their homes and communities and that the distance from home was a key factor in encouraging a sense of adventure. Others argued that it was important to offer a different type of environment and that in some parts of the country you do not have to travel far to feel totally removed from normal surroundings. It was clear however, that if there is a major element of travel this can account for between one or two days of what may well be a relatively short programme anyway.

Staffing

- 2.14 Monitoring form information indicates that the total number of staff involved in delivering activities ranged from a staff per participant ratio of 1:10 to more than 1:1. Seven projects had ratios of between 1:10 and 1:5; fourteen projects had ratios of 1:4 and 1:3, while six projects had 1:2 or higher. Only two of the projects with a high staff : participant ratio were dealing with the largely un-motivated groups, the remainder did however have lower than average numbers of participants.

- 2.15 The types of staff involved ranged from teachers, youth workers, outdoor activity instructors, careers staff, parents and volunteers. Three quarters of the staff involved were classed as outdoor activity instructors, with 11 per cent being youth workers. There was some debate regarding both the appropriateness and the availability of teachers for the programme. For young people leaving school and needing on-going support, the involvement of teachers is probably less important than the involvement of youth workers, or in time, of Connexions Personal Advisors.
- 2.16 A major challenge for many of the projects was to adapt their existing programmes, or formalise them, in such a way as to achieve the developmental objectives determined by DfEE. In some cases the staff involved were qualified and experienced in the delivery of adventure activities but often had less experience of the needs of the target client group. One of the most frequently reported challenges for delivery staff was the need to focus upon personal outcomes in terms of confidence, teamwork etc for participating individuals. This emphasis was welcomed by many of the staff involved.
- 2.17 More than one project identified the achievement of the developmental objectives of the Summer Activities programme as an area where **staff training** was required, subsequently two workers at Darlington Outdoor Pursuits have now enrolled on a Youth Leader Training Course. This is an area where DfEE intervention, to help identify training opportunities and **promote good practice**, might add value to the activities of the projects and help them to meet the specified objectives of the programme.

Project Costs

- 2.18 Project costs varied considerably. Costs were reported as ranging from £2,300 (for a five day programme with 10 participants), to £115,501 (for a series of 5 day experiences for a total of 232 participants). The costs of running the Pilot programme comprised a number of different elements most notably staffing costs and the costs associated with accommodation and subsistence (Table 2.3). Eight projects were unable to provide either total costs, or breakdowns of cost by mid November.

Table: 2.3 Elements of cost (n=24)

<i>Element</i>	<i>Average % of total</i>
<i>Staffing</i>	41
<i>Administration</i>	10
<i>Equipment</i>	3
<i>Travel</i>	6
<i>Accommodation and subsistence</i>	29
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	11

Table: 2.4 Cost per day, and cost per participant per day by project (n=26)

<i>Cost per day (£)</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>Cost per participant per day (£)</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>
< 500	3	<50	10
501-1000	10	51 – 100	13
1001-1500	7	101 – 150	2
1501-2000	3	151 – 200	0
2001+	3	201 +	1

2.19 Costs per day ranged between £3814 and £293 with an overall average of £1253 per day. Table 2.4 demonstrates that the majority of projects fell in the range of £501-£1000 per day. A clearer means of comparing costs across projects is provided by the calculation of cost per participant per day, (the average duration of each individual run was used in this calculation). Projects ranged between £220 and £21 per participant per day with an overall average of £70. As the table illustrates thirteen projects were within the £51 – £100 cost bracket with just one project in the £200+ range.

2.20 The variation of the range of costs may be explained by a number of factors:

- some costs may have been under-reported, by LEAs for example who may have in effect contributed a lot of staff management time in kind
- some centres will be more expensive than others, it would not be surprising to find higher costs from commercially run operations which operate without subsidy
- the residential element is a significant proportion of the cost, those projects which ran longer residential or repeated residential elements may be more expensive

- projects which ran a wider range of activities, or which sub-contracted some aspects of the programme may incur higher staffing and management costs
- projects which spent a higher proportion of time on outdoor activities would incur different cost structures to those with a range of outdoor and indoor activities.

2.21 Forty two per cent of projects were more than 90 per cent DfEE funded, and a further 29 per cent were more than 80 per cent DfEE funded. In most cases the LEA funded the remainder. Almost all were offered free to participants although a small number of projects also employed a small returnable deposit primarily to reduce drop-out.

Designing activity programmes to achieve policy objectives

Marketing / Recruitment

2.22 In order to attract 16 year olds and in particular those who are at risk of exclusion, the pilot projects did have to address the challenge that they had to encourage young people who demonstrated signs of *non*-participation to participate in their scheme. However, programmes aimed at all young people are tackling this issue, and the way a scheme is “marketed” or “sold” to recruit a young person is crucial to its ability to deliver outputs and outcomes.

2.23 The pilot projects used a variety of methods to recruit young people onto their programmes. The majority of projects relied upon partner organisations to recruit on their behalf. Most frequently this tended to be schools or youth services. Another frequently cited partner was the Careers Service. Other partners identified included:

- Voluntary and community sector organisations
- Employment Services
- Colleges
- Social services and Youth Offending Teams.

2.24 A smaller number of projects carried out the recruitment, at least in part, using their own resources. They often relied on less targeted means of recruitment including press and radio advertising. In general, the telephone interviews would suggest that this was not a particularly successful method of recruitment and a number of the pilots had obtained a poor response in terms of both attracting the numbers required and communicating the objectives of the programme to young people. Several projects reported cases of young people attending

anticipating a “holiday” and being surprised by the level of commitment required. A number of projects also expressed the concern that those young people sufficiently motivated to respond to media advertising were less likely to find the activities of benefit than those who lacked the motivation to become involved.

Pre-outdoor activity days/events

- 2.25 Projects which were run from outdoor centres faced logistical difficulties undertaking pre-activity events although a couple of projects did send staff to centres where the young people were based to offer briefing sessions. In other cases the pre-activity support which was offered tended to be one or two hour briefings (sometimes with parents) about what to expect on the week away and what to bring.
- 2.26 Some of the projects of longer duration were able to offer a range of other team building, base-lining and expectation management programmes. The interviews and case studies would suggest that **more intensive involvement by the project staff in the pre-programme preparation** stage was a successful means of communicating the objectives of the programme to potential participants and reducing the subsequent “no-shows” or drop-outs.

The core programmes

- 2.27 Most of the pilots offered a set programme of activity and events, this was particularly true of those of shorter duration. In some cases young people were offered a choice, were encouraged to say what they wanted to do, or even to organise some events for themselves:
- one project encouraged young people to decide on what they wanted to do on a trip away (in this case it was to Alton Towers), they decided on this option after being allocated a budget and they had to weigh up the various alternatives, individual preferences and costs
 - one project offered a choice of environmental enhancement / community work or work experience
 - one project encouraged the young people to organise their sailing expedition, including discussing where they might go, and doing the shopping and other preparation.
- 2.28 **Encouraging participants to take responsibility for deciding what to do, or how to do it, at some stage during the project appeared to be effective in increasing ‘ownership’ of activities.** There were cases where projects had to go beyond their own organisations’

capabilities in order to ensure that they were able to offer specific activities which the young people had decided they wanted to do.

The *World Challenge/Wednesbury EAZ* pilot was a joint initiative involving 4 Education Action Zone secondary schools. The programme was comprised of 3 elements:

- a programme launch in each school
- a 3 day foundation expedition
- a follow-on exploration of the world of work, ICT, sports and leisure and community service.

A range of post-programme options are offered through the *World Challenge/Wednesbury EAZ* network of partner organisations. This includes football skills, fire-fighting and dance. In addition, there are opportunities for participants to meet people from various backgrounds and professions including the armed forces, ICT professions and business people.

- 2.29 Linking the outdoor activities to social development objectives was easier to achieve than linking with the “transition” from school objectives of the programme. One approach, adopted by many of the projects, was to combine the physical challenge aspects with more reflective group-work discussion, focusing upon what had been learnt through the activities undertaken and how this learning experience might shape the decisions participants would take once they were back home. A significant number of projects had adopted this approach.
- 2.30 In other cases discussion sessions or workshops were held on Action Planning (sometimes with involvement of local careers services), and other related activities, such as CV design. A handful of projects invited organisations such as the Armed Forces and the Police to attend the project and explain what their jobs are like and how to get them.
- 2.31 In several cases the links between the activity and the learning objectives of the pilot programme were implicit; it was assumed that the activity would have the desired outcome. **Greater clarity of programme design** may ensure that both staff and participants appreciate the point of the programme.
- 2.32 Feeding back progress achieved to the young people is important. This is done routinely in post activity feedback sessions for most of the outdoor education providers. In addition, a range of other techniques were employed by projects to encourage and ‘capture’ the development and ‘distance travelled’ aspects of the pilot, which included:
- the use of formal psychometric testing to establish a participant baseline and measure progress over the duration of the project and, in a very small number of cases, beyond

- encouraging participants (and staff) to keep, update and review journals of progress – in some cases this was in electronic or video format
- facilitated action-planning with participants focusing upon strengths, weaknesses, areas for development and choices to be made.

Post-outdoor activities

- 2.33 A key determinant of whether the Summer Activities programme will achieve sustainable success will be the extent to which partner agencies will be able to work with the young people involved and build upon what has been achieved in the pilots. Many of the projects themselves identified this as being an issue of concern. There was a view that although a one-off intervention can bring about a significant change in individuals, a longer-term intervention is required to maximise the benefits for more disaffected young people.
- 2.34 There is a limit to which the members of the Outdoor Activities industry alone can bring this about. It is very clearly a partnership issue that can only be achieved through active involvement of agencies both with a longer-term perspective and who are geographically proximate to the young people's homes. The activity providers do, however, have an important and potentially very powerful role to play. **It is not enough to believe, as a number of projects appeared to, that their responsibility ends as soon as the programme is completed.** This was, perhaps, one of the major areas of weakness and should be a key area for development in advance of future programmes.
- 2.35 A significant number of projects require, or actively encouraged, involvement by parents or workers linked to the young people. Some youth workers will continue to have contact with the young person upon completion of the summer pilot. This can bring benefits in that:
- a better, less unequal relationship will have been attained – this is important because the quality of previous relationships with 'authority' is often a key issue in disaffected young people's unwillingness to engage with statutory services
 - youth workers, whether they be employed by local authority youth services, by schools, colleges, careers or Youth Offending Teams, or in the voluntary sector, will have a better understanding of the young person's personal development needs and capabilities resulting in more appropriate or more effective intervention thereafter.
- 2.36 Some concern was expressed that the involvement of teachers might be counter-productive in that it was positive for young people to feel that they had been given a 'clean slate'. Our interviews with project staff and participants did not provide much evidence to support this

view. Teachers were in any case, because of the timing, difficult to recruit and in some instances payments were made to encourage attendance. We would support the argument, however, that the Summer Activities programme must be forward-looking and that if workers are to be involved they should, where possible, represent those agencies with whom the young person may need to engage in the future.

Learning Mentors are responsible for co-ordinating multi-agency action within specific schools and the Learning Mentor at *Westfield School* submitted a bid to DfEE on behalf of 3 secondary schools in the area. Eight places were made available for each school and were targeted by the Learning Mentors and school Heads who, between them, had a good awareness of young people who would fit the DfEE criteria. Letters were sent to targeted young people and this was followed-up by telephone contact. Timing of the programme did cause some difficulties, especially in encouraging girls *who met the criteria* to take part. This is something *Westfield School* intends to address in subsequent bids.

- 2.37 A number of projects adopted what might be seen as a ‘light touch’ approach to post-programme activity. This involved recognising and celebrating what had been achieved by those taking part. In some cases a formal awards event was arranged with friends and family invited to attend. The purpose of such events being not only an opportunity for all involved to have some fun but also to reinforce the sense of achievement obtained by participants. One consultee likened this to ‘rites of passage’ for the young people involved.
- 2.38 Many of the projects were clearly aware of the need to link their activities to the future choices which young people would face upon completion of the programme. Some attempted to meet this need through their own efforts, for example by building career or educational choices into action-planning with participants. A number of projects used the results of personal development reviews – self-completed, peer group or undertaken by project staff – as a means of encouraging participants to think about what they had learned during the programme. One consultee described this as a form of “memory jog”. A small number of projects, such as YMCA and Himmat, employ their own youth workers who are able to maintain a degree of contact with some participants.
- 2.39 Several projects adopted a more partnership-oriented approach and built contact by other agencies with whom the young people might form a relationship into their programmes. Careers staff attended a number of projects to discuss with participants, on a group or one-to-one basis, their future intentions and options. In one case a full-time careers adviser was appointed to the delivery team to provide advice and assistance whenever required. In other projects, youth workers attending the pilot have been appointed as personal mentors to the young participants to help sustain the impact of the intervention. The Nottinghamshire County Council pilot makes provision, for young people considered not ready for the

transition to further education or employment, through a 16 to 24 week course in life skills as part of the Gateway Initiative. At their most innovative, some of the post-programme interventions offer a model of how the Connexions programme might operate in practice.

Effect of time-scales

2.40 The major difficulty reported by the pilot projects, concerned the time-scales for the launch of the programme. Approximately two-thirds of projects identified this as a factor which had a deleterious effect upon their programme. It was particularly evident in terms of recruitment. The time-scales resulted in two major difficulties:

- in almost all cases the young people targeted had sat their GCSEs and left school for the summer making it more difficult for projects to inform their client group of the initiative and to provide pre-programme preparation
- almost half of projects reported that they had suffered from participants simply not showing up or dropping-out of their programme (resulting in a total drop-out rate of 21per cent across the scheme, based upon the numbers commencing/completing) which they felt could have been avoided through more intensive pre-programme preparation.

2.41 Although time-scales were clearly a significant factor, it is probable that their effect has been over-stated to some degree. The Summer Pilot Activities programme was truly a pilot scheme in a number of ways. Many projects were working with the client group for the first time, formalising the developmental aspects of their activities to meet the DfEE specified objectives and/or establishing links with new partner organisations. The pilot provided a genuine and rapid learning experience for many of the projects involved, for example:

- a number of pilots deliberately experimented in terms of the types and the mix of young people they worked with in different weeks
- others used a range of recruitment methods or recruited through a range of different contacts (mostly of necessity), and subsequently found who they could work with and what worked best for them
- the skills and attitudes of staff were also tested, some found that the support of ancillary staff – the caterers and caretakers – was an important contributing factor to the success of the project. Others found that the skills associated with being able to teach an outdoor activity safely were necessary but not sufficient for the aims of the programme.

- 2.42 In such circumstances it is to be expected that there will be an element of trial and error and that good practice lessons (of which there were many) will require time for dissemination.
- 2.43 The various recruitment and targeting difficulties outlined above were less significant for those projects with good pre-established links with partner agencies. Such projects could proceed with a level of confidence in the capacity of the recruitment agent to identify the agreed number of participants and to target in a consistent and effective manner. A handful of projects had been intending to do something along the lines of the pilot programme anyway, in these cases the projects were either able to increase the numbers of young people to whom it could be offered, or offer a wider range of activities. In most cases the provision was additional to that which would have gone ahead anyway.

Summary

<i>Key statistics</i>	
Number of projects participating	32
Number of participants*	1460
Total number of participant days	757
Number of projects offering outdoor activities only	8
Length of the shortest programme (per participant)	3
Length of the longest programme (per participant)	21
Total costs associated with delivering the programme**	£673,364
Total DfEE support	£641,626

* Note: information based on returns from primary research: total number of participants reported at completion of programme was 1600

** Note: information based on returns from 26 projects

- 2.44 The majority of the thirty-two projects were either charitable trusts or local authority managed. They were motivated to become involved in the Summer Activities programme because it offered a means of improving the *scale* or *quality* of what they currently delivered. Additionality was present in all but a few cases. An unintended benefit of the programme has been the enhancement of existing or forging of new partnership links between activity providers and agencies working with young people.
- 2.45 A majority of projects responded to David Blunkett's speech when he floated the idea in the national press. The DfEE had to be proactive in their approach in order to respond to the launch of the scheme and were successful in attracting an appropriate number of pilot projects. The timetable was challenging and this limited the efforts of providers to attract young people meeting the specified criteria, because projects only got the go-ahead as young

people had already left school after their exams – therefore the most obvious route of recruitment (or at least of identification of appropriate participants) was not available. Some of the recruitment difficulties are also attributable, in some cases, to lack of experience of the client group and the agency framework which works with them.

2.46 The projects are very diverse in terms of scale, approach and in the mix of activities on offer. This diversity provides a great deal of learning material upon which DfEE and the activity industry's own networks must capitalise. The key test for those marketing the pilot programmes is to encourage those people to participate who also happen to be those least likely to volunteer for activities associated with education. To do this effectively requires:

- good partnership links
- a time-scale which allows for recruitment before the most disaffected young people drift away from school
- sufficient time to meet potential participants and prepare them for the challenges ahead.

2.47 The absence of these factors in many cases has resulted in a lower take-up than might have been anticipated, a lack of consistency with regard to targeting and, in some pilots at least, a high level of drop-out. In spite of these difficulties, the pilot projects have achieved a great deal in a short period of time and have demonstrated a considerable degree of innovation to surmount barriers to success. It is important that the lessons learnt from the year 1 pilot are incorporated into subsequent rounds.

2.48 The majority of projects were predominantly outdoor in nature but frequently complemented by other types of activity. The developmental aspects of the programme, determined by DfEE, have presented the providers with a challenge which most can be said to have responded with a degree of success. The activity industry itself has acknowledged that the combination of youth work skills and activity experience required to deliver effectively are not always in supply (especially during the high demand period of summer) and that staff resources have been stretched. Awareness of the need to place greater emphasis upon personal development and the skills needed to work with often disaffected 16 year olds is high within the projects. The DfEE might consider what role it might play in helping the projects overcome this gap.

2.49 Post-programme support mechanisms are clearly important in ensuring that the Summer Activities programme achieves a sustainable impact. One of the key messages to emerge

from this first round of pilots is that this aspect of the programme is perhaps the most under-developed. There are examples of good and innovative practice but perhaps fewer than might have been anticipated. The development of the Connexions programme is important in at least three respects:

- it provides an opportunity for projects to play a more central role, along with other partners, in the framework of services for young people
- it provides opportunities for a consortium approach which, if developed properly, might lead to a more sophisticated form of provision through the buying in of relevant providers and activities on behalf of young people
- the concept of the Personal Advisor offers an opportunity for the summer activities projects as part of a continuum of support rather than a one-off intervention.

3 Characteristics of Participants

Introduction

- 3.1 This Chapter provides more detailed information on the types of young people who got involved with the pilots. In particular it looks at the characteristics of those young people who took part, why they were interested in doing so and what they wanted to get out of the experience. The information used in these sections is mainly derived from the questionnaires completed by participants.

Characteristics of participants

- 3.2 The pilot summer activities programme sought to recruit 16 year olds who were leaving school and who were unsure of their plans. This is a relatively broad definition of a target group but it would be reasonable (given the context of the “Bridging the Gap” report) to expect relatively high participation from young people:

- of ethnic minority background
- with disabilities
- with low expectations of their academic achievement at school
- with poor school attendance records.

- 3.3 This is not to say however, that young people with uncertain plans would necessarily share these characteristics, nor was the programme expected to target exclusively young people with these characteristics. Rather it was an opportunity available to those young people who would benefit most from it.

- 3.4 In the earlier stages of the programme it was anticipated that up to 3000 young people would participate in the programme. In the event, approximately 1460 young people participated in the summer activities programme. This figure is derived from information provided by project managers in their monitoring forms and from questionnaire returns for those projects whose forms were not received. Table 3.1 outlines the key characteristics of the group:

Table 3.1: Characteristics of participants

	Participants %
Age:	
<i>15 years</i>	14
<i>16 years</i>	78
<i>17 years</i>	8
Gender	
<i>Male</i>	61
<i>Female</i>	39
Disability	
<i>With a disability</i>	8
<i>With no disability</i>	92
Ethnicity	
<i>Black</i>	3
<i>Asian and other non-white</i>	9
<i>White</i>	88
No. of GCSEs taken	
<i>Less than 5</i>	21
<i>More than 5</i>	79
School attendance	
<i>Rarely missed school</i>	67
<i>Sometimes avoided school</i>	20
<i>Often avoided school</i>	13

Age

- 3.5 One quarter of those who participated in the programme were not in the appropriate age range. Some of those aged 15 or 17 could still be leaving school, some young people may not reach the age of 16 until June / July / August, others may have missed a year of schooling (for example due to illness). In other cases, project managers sought to infill places with 15 or 17 year olds, given their problems with recruiting 16 year olds in the time frame available. Several felt that there was a very strong case for working with 15 year olds and younger, in that a longer term, more preventive, programme can be developed. However, given the policy focus on the transition of 16 year olds there is a need by projects to ensure that they are able to target more effectively in future years.

Ethnicity

- 3.6 In the UK, 10 per cent of young people under the age of 18 come from ethnic minority backgrounds, whereas 12 per cent of the participants on the programme did. The pilot programme has, therefore, achieved a reasonable balance of participation in terms of ethnicity in its first year. However, given the relatively high proportion of young people at risk who come from ethnic minority backgrounds (for example African – Caribbean pupils are five times more likely to be excluded from school), the Pilot programme needs to ensure that it continues to reach a good representation of the ‘at risk’ group, rather than representation of the population as a whole.

Disability

- 3.7 In the UK around 3 per cent of children aged 0-16 have a disability, while 8 per cent of those on the programme reported that they had some sort of disability. Disabled participants were found in four of the 32 projects. Again, representation in terms of the population is good, but less so in terms of the population of young people ‘at risk’.

Academic performance

- 3.8 Almost eighty percent of participants had taken more than 5 GCSEs while two thirds described themselves as rarely missing school. While DfEE made it clear within their guidance that the programme was not exclusively for those liable to achieve a low level of attainment or with poor attendance records these are characteristics likely to be shared by those at risk during the transition from the school environment. The overall balance of the programme therefore appeared to be skewed towards the non core target group.

Future plans

- 3.9 In addition, relatively high proportions of young people (76 per cent) stated at the outset of the project that they already had plans to go to school (including 6th form) or college at the end of the summer. Only 4 per cent reported that they did not know what they were going to do. This may overstate the strength of their conviction about attending college or school and their ambitions regarding what they want out of the experience, however the majority clearly intended to go on to further education or training as they began the activities experience.

Levels of personal social development

- 3.10 Both the pre-activity and the post-activity questionnaires contained a series of statements against which participants were asked to rank their own ability or confidence. Their

responses were then allocated a score and the overall responses were then divided into quartiles. These processes are outlined in more detail in the Methods Annex. The results of this analysis (Table 3.2) show that a significant proportion of the participants thought that they possessed very good skills in areas such as self-esteem, problem solving, technology and time management as they started the programme. At the other end of the scale, far fewer participants admitted to poor levels of skills. Nevertheless, over ten per cent of participants thought their skills and attitudes relating to technology, group working, communication and open-ness to new experiences were very low.

Table 3.2: Participants responses grouped into skill types and graded by quartiles, pre-activity n=857

	Top	Higher	Lower	Bottom
<i>Self-esteem</i>	33.7	51.9	12.8	1.6
<i>Group working</i>	8.4	60.3	18.9	12.6
<i>Leadership</i>	8.6	52.6	34.1	4.8
<i>Communication skills</i>	18.4	54.7	11.4	15.5
<i>Problem solving</i>	32.5	46.6	19.3	1.6
<i>Time management</i>	28.4	49.2	19	3.6
<i>Confidence with new experience</i>	13.5	62	7.6	17
<i>Technology</i>	30.3	39.9	15.9	13.9

- 3.11 The figures outlined above may under-represent the extent of participation of socially excluded young people. They are derived from analysis of the questionnaire returns, and project managers reported that some groups found difficulty with some aspects of the forms and may therefore have been less likely to fill them in. In future years evaluation processes should seek to collate background information on each participant from project managers (in conjunction with participants) to provide population information.

Girl A was confident about getting good enough grades to go on and do A-Levels in college. Although she was quite confident about her academic abilities she lacked confidence in her appearance. She also admitted to being rather intolerant of others and having a short fuse when others made detrimental comments about her. She jumped at the chance of free sailing and doing something constructive with her summer break even though she did not know of anyone else doing the programme. Living in such close proximity to others taught her to be more tolerant of others and she also became less concerned about the way she looked - 'didn't bother brushing my hair or looking in the mirror after the first few days'. Her mum has noted a change in her attitude since she started the programme. 'it's been good to see her doing other things rather than sitting in front of the TV all the time'.

Marketing

- 3.12 A quarter of participants said that they were told about the programme in school as part of a group, and a further quarter heard about it through a community or a youth group (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: How young people heard of the programme (n=869)

<i>Source of information</i>	<i>% of participants</i>
<i>all of my yr group were told about it at school</i>	26
<i>I heard about it through a community or youth group</i>	23
<i>a small group of us were told about it at school</i>	16
<i>Other</i>	16
<i>a friend</i>	8
<i>a teacher/other teaching professional</i>	6
<i>my mum or dad heard about it first</i>	5

- 3.13 They were motivated to attend by a number of factors (Table 3.3) but by far the most frequent response when questioned why they wanted to take part was that it sounded like good fun (83 per cent). Around four in ten young people said that they did it to improve skills, that they wanted to meet new people and they wanted to improve their self-confidence.

- only 37% of 15 year olds wanted to do it to meet new people, compared with 41% of 16 year olds and 55% of 17 year olds
- a majority of males and females said they took part because it sounded like good fun, but it was the young males who recognised the greater long term benefits of taking part; 29% of males said they took part because they thought it would improve their chances of training/employment compared with 19% of females.

Table 3.3: Reasons for taking part (n=869, multiple response)

	% of participants
<i>it sounded like good fun</i>	83
<i>to meet new people</i>	42
<i>to improve my skills</i>	42
<i>to improve my own confidence</i>	39
<i>I've done something similar and enjoyed it</i>	36
<i>my friends were doing it</i>	36
<i>I wanted something to fill my time over the summer</i>	32
<i>to learn a bit more and broaden my horizons</i>	26
<i>thought it would improve chances of training/employment</i>	25
<i>I'd heard from someone I trust that it was a good programme</i>	18
<i>I'd heard that the people who run it were very good</i>	14
<i>I planned to do something similar but this was free</i>	10
<i>Other</i>	6

- 3.14 Ten per cent of respondents said that they planned to do something similar, but attended the project as it was free. This may represent an element of opportunity cost for those few cases where demand for places exceeded supply. Even if this were the case, the work undertaken at the project in terms of transition planning should be different from commercial alternatives sold as holidays, so those young people should still have attained some level of additional benefit.

Summary

Key statistics on participants	
Number of participants	1460
Proportion aged 16	78%
Proportion with a disability	8%
Proportion of males	61%
Proportion who took fewer than five GCSEs	21%
Proportion who "sometimes" or "often" missed school	33%
Proportion who would either go to college or school in autumn as they commenced the programme	76%

3.15 The target client group was young people leaving school, who were possibly undecided on their plans for the future, and / or who might benefit from an experience to develop their personal characteristics. The participant profile suggests that the Summer Activities pilots have achieved a positive level of uptake by ethnic minority and disability groups. A significantly higher proportion of males took part (61 per cent) than females but this may, to some degree, be explained by the higher proportion of males fitting the specified criteria. The key statistics demonstrate that the majority of young people who participated do not immediately appear to be part of the core client group. It is recommended that targeting mechanisms be given a high priority in forthcoming discussions regarding next years programme. A number of factors have to be taken into consideration however, to put this statement into context:

- projects have a very short time during which to recruit young people, and many had finished exams and were out of daily contact with schools when pilots tried to recruit, many were unable to be as discerning as they would like
- in terms of the age spread, in a minority of cases young people may not yet have reached their sixteenth birthday at the time of the pilot, furthermore young people with disabilities may have missed long periods of school to undertake treatment and may therefore be over 16 when they leave school
- young people may plan to go to college but not have clear plans of what to do and why
- many projects actively sought to achieve a mix of participant types to encourage learning and mutual understanding across cultures and backgrounds
- projects depend upon partner organisations for effective recruitment and targeting and in some cases the necessary links did not exist or were not up to the task.

3.16 The key test for those marketing the pilot programmes is to encourage those people to participate, who also happen to be those least likely to participate. To do this effectively requires time both to develop the projects and to secure effective partnership relationships.

4 The impact of the programme

Introduction

- 4.1 The impact of the programme among young people who participated can be seen in two different aspects. Firstly there is the impact on their plans for the future, whether they will be returning to college and their attitudes towards their future education and vocations. The second impact relates to how they feel about themselves and their personal characteristics. This section reviews the overall impacts of the programme on each of these two objectives. It then goes on to assess whether the impact varies by type of participant or by type of project. The information in this section is based mainly on returns to the pre-activity and post-activity questionnaire, supplemented by our follow up telephone survey of participants.

Overall Impact on future plans

End of summer destinations

- 4.2 Most of the young people expressed clear views of what they wanted to do at the end of the summer as the pilot commenced (Table 4.1). **The proportion of those seeking either to go to school or to go to college at the end of the pilot increased from 76 per cent to 81 per cent**, a moderate, albeit statistically significant, increase.

Table 4.1: Participants intentions in the autumn

	<i>Pre-activity%</i> <i>(n=853)</i>	<i>Post-activity %</i> <i>(n=931)</i>
<i>Go to college</i>	38	42
<i>Stay at school</i>	38	39
<i>Join a training scheme</i>	5	6
<i>Get a place on a MA / NT</i>	6	6
<i>Get a job</i>	8	4
<i>Be self-employed</i>	0	0
<i>Be unemployed</i>	0	0
<i>Don't Know</i>	4	1
<i>Other</i>	2	2

Table 4.2: The nature of changes to participants' perceptions

<i>Pre activity response</i>	<i>Post activity response</i>							
	<i>School College</i>		<i>Training</i>		<i>Employment</i>		<i>Don't know / Other</i>	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<i>Go to school / college</i>	566	98	9	2	2	0	2	0
<i>Training</i>	12	15	58	81	2	3	0	0
<i>Employment</i>	7	17	11	24	25	54	3	7
<i>Don't know / other</i>	11	48	8	35	2	9	2	9

- 4.3 Table 4.2 demonstrates the move from what individuals thought they wanted to do before the activity commenced and where their ambitions then lay at the end of the project. It shows that 566 individuals wanted to return to school and college both before and after the project, and that 98 per cent of those who said they wanted to go to school or college at the start of the programme had not changed their minds at the end. It shows that young people who formerly either wanted to enter employment, or they didn't know, were the group most likely to change their minds. It also shows those who initially aimed to find employment, were interested more in training options than school or college after the project.

Influence of the programme on plans

- 4.4 While the proportions seeking to continue their education after the programme did not change dramatically, the numbers who said that the pilot programme had influenced their future plans was nonetheless significant. **Forty one per cent of participants reported that the programme had either completely shaped their plans or had a big influence on their plans.** Forty per cent said that it had a little influence on their plans. However, for 1 in 5 participants the experience had made no influence on their plans.

Ways in which the project made young people think differently about their plans.

- 4.5 The survey also asked a number of open questions. One question asked, "has the programme caused you to think differently about important areas of your life?". Sixty five per cent of participants were able to identify ways in which it had. Their responses demonstrated a range of effects including those related to future career and future prospects, but also to their own sense of self, their attitudes to other people and their leisure pursuits.

Some examples of responses to the question “*has the programme caused you to think differently about important areas of your life?*”

- Yes about my college and GCSE
- Yes, possibly not choosing a career involving being stuck behind a desk
- It helps you to know that there is more options to your working life
- Yes, do more climbs and become an instructor
- Has shown and prepared me more for a career in the army
- Futures prospects in the building trade
- To at least give things a go, if you don't like it then at least you know that you don't.
- Yes, I now want to leave my house more and find new friends
- I value my life more
- about wanting to do more water sports in my free time and seeing there is more to do and places to go
- it has made me think about what role I take in a team but I am still unsure about what it is
- have learnt that to get on with people and talk to them you have to find something interesting to talk about
- What I'm going to do when I'm older and in my gap year

4.6 These responses were coded and are summarised in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Has the programme caused you to think differently about important areas of your life? (n=811)

	Response %
Yes – no further response given	1
Yes – coded response:	
<i>More sociable / communicate better</i>	6
<i>The way I treat others</i>	3
<i>To listen to others' opinions and value them</i>	2
<i>Team work</i>	5
<i>The future – career / education / training</i>	9
<i>The future – other activities / general aims</i>	5
<i>Maturity / growing up</i>	1
<i>To try new things</i>	5
<i>More confident / overcome fears</i>	7
<i>Getting fitter / more healthy</i>	3
<i>Other</i>	17
Don't know	1
No	35

Boy B – Was nervous about the choices he would have to make at this stage in his life. He realised that he had to make his own choices and couldn't depend upon his parents anymore. He didn't know what he wanted to do. The activities had helped him to become interested in doing youth work. He realised that he would have to train for this and was seeking the youth workers' help in identifying what options were available to him. "I wasn't bothered about my GCSEs before, but now I am. I realise that they will affect what courses I could do to get into youth work".

4.7 Whether the programme had influenced or changed participants' plans or not, it is significant that **85 per cent of all participants said that the summer programme had made them more determined** to achieve their future plans.

Overall impact on personal characteristics

4.8 The summer activities programme sought to ease the transition from school to college, but it also sought to develop a range of personal characteristics of young people including:

- to develop self esteem
- to develop confidence
- to become good team workers

- to develop leadership skills
- to broaden horizons.

4.9 The questionnaires which participants were asked to complete both before they commenced their programme and again at its end, contained a section designed to test attitudes. Participants were asked to grade their own attitudes and abilities (on a four point scale) against a series of statements representing self-esteem, leadership skills, group working and so on. Their responses were then allocated scores. Table 4.4 provides an overview of the level of movement pre-activity and post-activity for those young people for whom we received both questionnaires (a representative sub-set) against each of the range of personal attributes.

4.10 This Table demonstrates that **the programme has improved many participants' perceptions of their abilities.**

- 45 per cent of participants thought that they have improved their group working, communication and problem solving skills
- four in every ten participants thought they have improved their self-esteem, leadership, and confidence with new experiences.

Table 4.4: Proportion of individual participants whose 'scores' changed

	Scores increased	Scores stayed the same	Scores decreased	Number of matched responses
	%	%	%	
<i>Self esteem</i>	39.4	38.9	21.7	759
<i>Group working</i>	44.9	22.8	32.3	762
<i>Leadership</i>	41.5	32.8	25.7	756
<i>Communication</i>	46.4	26.3	27.2	760
<i>Problem solving</i>	45.4	30.5	24.1	754
<i>Time management</i>	37.9	31.7	30.4	754
<i>New experiences</i>	40.3	32.9	26.8	760
<i>Technology</i>	33.6	36.4	30.0	750

4.11 It also demonstrates however, that **for many young people the experience had no, or even negative impacts on their views of their own abilities.** Thirty per cent reported a decline in group working, time management and technology skills, while a quarter reported a reduction in their leadership, communication and problem solving skills.

- 4.12 The decline in self-perception of skills and attributes could be due to re-inforcement of a failure – that young people have been presented with challenges and social situations and they feel that they have failed at them. An alternative interpretation of the decline in self-perception may be that the young people have been exposed to situations where they have developed a greater realisation of what group working, communication and leadership skills are. The decline in scores may therefore simply reflect a more realistic appraisal of their own skills.

Self-perception of change

- 4.13 Again, the responses to some of the open questions which were posed provide further insight into how the participants thought they had changed as a result of the programme. Almost 80 per cent of participants reported that they had changed in some way.

Some examples of responses to the question “*have you changed as a result of the programme?*”

- my PMA had definitely improved - you learn how to face things with a positive attitude
- I have learned that you don't always have to be around people you know to have a laugh - I came on this course on my own and it was great fun
- yes, I have met and made friends with people from different backgrounds
- I have changed. I will now listen to what people have to say before jumping straight into the problem
- not as scared to speak out as much as I was
- I have grown in my ability to work as a team with strangers
- find out things I like and don't like eg rock climbing, canoeing, body boarding
- no, I haven't changed in 2.5 days (stupid question)
- I'm not sure if I've changed or not

- 4.14 These responses were then coded and the overview of replies is presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Have you changed as a result of this programme? (n=864)

	Response %
<i>Yes – no further comment</i>	2
<i>Yes – coded response:</i>	
<i>More confident</i>	32
<i>Learnt new skills</i>	6
<i>Overcome fears</i>	3
<i>Better team worker</i>	9
<i>More considerate</i>	15
<i>More outgoing in terms of dealing with people</i>	5
<i>More adventurous / willing to try new activities</i>	2
<i>Fitter / more active</i>	1
<i>Found out more about myself</i>	1
<i>More decided about future plans</i>	0.5
<i>Less of a trouble maker</i>	0.5
<i>Other</i>	3.2
<i>No</i>	21

Girl C was living with a foster family. She is outwardly very confident and forthright, but confessed to having problems with people in authority and particularly males. Her foster mum had seen the opportunity in the paper and had encouraged her to apply. She had really enjoyed the programme - although at one point the close living arrangements with three other girls meant that she caught a bus home instead of participating in the final days activities - she knew that if she stayed she might lose her temper. Nevertheless she had really valued the experience of living and working with the other members of the team - for her the most valuable part of the programme was sitting round the table talking at the end of the day. She also thought that she was more aware of herself listening and taking orders than she normally would.

Most valuable

4.15 Table 4.6 demonstrates that when asked, as an open question what they had found most valuable, almost a third of respondents (30 per cent) said that the most valuable aspect of the programme was the team work and group activities, while an additional 22 per cent specified either particular activities or activities in general. A further 18 per cent valued making new friends and meeting people.

Some examples of responses to the question “*what would you say was the most valuable part of the programme?*”

- Doing the gig because it was the first time I've sang in front of people
- Gaining confidence by doing things you wouldn't do, mixing with people you wouldn't usually mix with
- Sailing to the Isle of Wight as I've never done it - I was a bit nervous but I'd do it again
- Getting the certificate so I can move on to further education in sport
- Kayaking and information about wind
- when we were all talking and seeing what people thought of us
- when we organised it and went off for the day
- conquering my fear of heights
- getting to know one another and living peaceful together as a team.

Table 4.6: What young people found most valuable (selection of most frequent responses)

<i>Category of response</i>	<i>(%)</i>
<i>Team work / group activities</i>	30
<i>The activities</i>	22
<i>Making friends / meeting new people</i>	18
<i>New experiences / new skills</i>	7
<i>Overcoming fears / building confidence</i>	5
<i>Everything</i>	3
<i>Staff support / advice</i>	3
<i>Gaining accreditation</i>	1
<i>Nothing</i>	1

Boy D - Had no plans for the summer. He would probably just have played football with his friends or gone ice-skating. He now feels that he has really achieved something with his time and will have a certificate to prove it. He felt that he'd learnt a lot about teamwork and how it wasn't constructive just to complain about things.

4.16 Clearly, at the end of the programme the **young people had valued the experience and the opportunity to go away, do some new and different activities and make new friends.** Further analysis revealed that younger participants and those who were less educationally

advanced particularly valued the experience of doing the activities (possibly because they are less likely to have had the opportunities to do so before). **Unprompted, the young people did not link their experiences to the transition from school to further education or training.**

Least Valuable

- 4.17 While 22 per cent of those completing the post-activity questionnaire said that the most valuable elements were the activities, 21 per cent said that the activities (either particular activities or the activities in general) were the least valuable elements (Table 4.7), so as many participants did not value them as those that did. However, only 2 per cent said that the group work was the least valuable. Other aspects of the programme which were not valued were evening activities (6 per cent), the poor behaviour of some of the other participants (4 per cent), and form filling (4 per cent). Males tended to view the rules and regulation imposed by projects in a less favourable light than females (8 per cent versus 4 per cent), whereas poor behaviour rated more highly for females than for males (5 per cent and 3 per cent respectively).

Some examples of responses to the question “*what would you say was the least valuable part of the programme?*”

- Getting up that early
- food - and cannot use mobile phones
- Some activities were tiring and boring
- walking with loads of bags
- free time - too much of it
- when some in the group got selfish
- getting wet
- canoeing gave me too much time to think
- the evaluation
- sometimes the free time could be a bit boring because there was nothing to do in the hostel
- climbing up a mountain then coming back down again.

Table 4.7: What young people found least valuable (selection of most frequent responses)

Category of response	(%)
<i>Nothing / no response</i>	28
<i>The activities</i>	21
<i>Evening activities</i>	6
<i>Group work</i>	2
<i>Food and other domestic issues</i>	5
<i>Rules and regulations (inc. safety aspects)</i>	6
<i>Form filling</i>	4
<i>Poor behaviour of other young people</i>	4

4.18 It is worth noting that respondents were able to identify elements of the programme which they valued, but were more likely to identify aspects of the projective which they did not particularly enjoy rather than those which were not valuable.

Impact on young people – the longer term perspective

4.19 The telephone follow up of 150 participants in October, indicated that young people’s plans had changed both in terms of what they wanted to do at college, what they eventually wanted to do as a job, and how they wanted to spend some of their leisure time. This exercise confirmed that 35 per cent felt that the programme had changed their plans. Of these:

- half said that it had confirmed their plans
- a third that it had helped them to decide on college or training
- a quarter that they now wanted to pursue a career in outdoor education, and
- 10% that they now had a new hobby.

4.20 These responses demonstrate that young people do not compartmentalise their lives for instance into work, training, leisure and family. When they say that their plans have changed as a consequence of being on the programme it might relate to any area of their life and not just to their future career plans.

4.21 The young people were asked, what in retrospect had been the most valuable aspect of the programme. Seventy per cent identified participation in the actual activities as being the most valuable aspect of the programme. When asked to explain their response, teamworking and

group work skills were the most frequently identified (39 per cent), followed by elements such as overcoming fear, learning new things, good fun, and there being a general sense of achievement.

- 4.22 **The follow up exercise demonstrated that after a period of time to reflect on the programme, only 9 per cent said that they had not changed as a result of the programme.** As with the analysis of responses as the programme finished, the types of change are quite similar and include greater confidence, better group working and communication skills, increased motivation and greater clarity of plans for their future.
- 4.23 In addition, 91 per cent of young people from the follow up exercise said that someone else had commented on the fact that they had changed. In a third of cases this came from either a parent or a friend, while almost a quarter said that another professional adult had said so.
- 4.24 It is therefore clear that the memory of the programme, and its influence has lasted at least a month (and in some cases it will be more like three). The fact that a relatively high proportion of young people are attending school, sixth form or college suggests that the programme has encouraged young people to stay “within the system”. A return to a similar sample in a years time would be interesting to indicate longer term impact, particularly given the fact that the latest we could telephone them was in October, which may be too early for young people to have dropped out of provision.

Impact on different groups

- 4.25 The previous section has outlined the overall impact of the programme on participants. However, the impact was felt differently by different groups of people. The types of participants can be grouped by gender, age, number of GCSEs taken, and school attendance, and they can be correlated with impact both in terms of future plans, and impact on personal characteristics.

Table 4.8: Participants' intentions before and after the programme

	<i>Av</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>Motivated</i>		<i>Un-motivated</i>	
	<i>Post</i>	<i>pre</i>	<i>post</i>	<i>pre</i>	<i>post</i>	<i>pre</i>	<i>post</i>	<i>pre</i>	<i>post</i>
<i>Go to college</i>	42	37	42	39	43	39	43	39	42
<i>Stay at school</i>	39	32	35	46	41	46	44	23	23
<i>Join a training scheme</i>	6	8	7	2	4	3	3	7	12
<i>Get a place on an MA</i>	6	6	8	5	4	4	6	10	8
<i>Get a job</i>	4	10	5	5	3	4	2	13	9
<i>Be unemployed</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Don't know</i>	1	5	2	2	1	3	1	5	4
<i>Other</i>	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2

Table 4.9: Influence of programme on participants' plans (n=961)

	<i>Completely changed plans %</i>	<i>Big influence on plans %</i>	<i>Little influence on plans %</i>	<i>No influence on plans %</i>
By age:				
<i>15 years</i>	4	33	41	22
<i>16 years</i>	7	31	42	20
<i>17 years</i>	15	35	31	19
By gender				
<i>Male</i>	8	34	39	20
<i>Female</i>	5	34	41	20
By no. of GCSEs taken				
<i>Less than 5</i>	12	31	40	16
<i>More than 5</i>	4	35	41	20
By school attendance				
<i>Rarely missed school</i>	6	34	40	20
<i>Sometimes avoided school</i>	7	35	41	17
<i>Often avoided school</i>	10	37	30	24
Total	7	34	40	20

4.26 Tables 4.8 and 4.9 demonstrate the following trends:

- projects working with slightly older young people have had more influence on changing their plans

- impact on plans for females is the same as that for males, although overall females were more likely to want to continue school or college than males
 - those who are less motivated (in terms of school attendance) are more likely to have had their plans changed by the projects.
- 4.27 Further study shows that some of the projects were more influential than others, for instance at least two thirds of participants at six of the projects reported that their project had either completely shaped their plans or had a big influence. However, from the information we have there is no single or combination of factors which clearly differentiates these six projects from the other thirty two.
- 4.28 The analysis of participants and their personal characteristics before and after the project occurred has been further examined to ascertain whether there were certain types of individual who were more or less likely to have improved or decreased their scores. Annex C outlines the characteristics of those whose scores increased and decreased, and the characteristics of those scoring in the top and bottom quartiles. The key findings in terms of participant characteristics are:
- across all the different skill types a higher proportion of males than females scored themselves in the top quartile (49 per cent of males scored in the top quartile for self-esteem for example, compared with 28 per cent of females)
 - young people who rarely missed school were more likely than those who sometimes/often avoided school, to score their ability in the highest quartile against most of the characteristics
 - young people who often avoided school rated their problems solving skills and their confidence with new experiences relatively highly.
- 4.29 Between 1 per cent and 21 per cent of participants rated their abilities in the bottom quartile for the range of characteristics, there was little difference in participant type amongst this group although:
- a slightly higher proportion of those who rarely missed school rated their skills in five of the eight personal characteristic types in the bottom quartile.
- 4.30 In terms of distance travelled:

- older participants were slightly more likely than younger ones to increase their scores; although against technology, self esteem and time management members of this group also reported decreasing scores
- those having taken fewer than 3 GCSEs were less likely to have increased their scores; and markedly more likely to have decreased their scores against six of the eight characteristics
- against most of the personal characteristics, those who often avoided school were less likely to have increased their scores, and more likely to have decreased their scores.

4.31 The variances outlined above are based on observable differences from the average. In terms of statistical significance the key finding relates to the influence of motivation and academic achievement on self-esteem; those who rarely missed school and who had taken more than five GCSEs were more likely to have improved their self esteem rating. The other trends noted here are statistically unproven, further research in future years would identify whether or not they are unfounded.

4.32 The qualitative feedback from young people indicated that the impact of the summer activities programme occurred at a number of different levels, affecting young people's plans and their thoughts about themselves and their own abilities. The quantitative element of the research sought to indicate the extent to which there were improvements across the full range of skills and young people's plans for the future. The indication from this work is that beyond the range of highly personal impacts, different groups experienced positive impacts in different ways. Most notably, those who were less likely to attend school regularly (the less motivated group) were more likely to have had their plans influenced by projects and were less likely to perceive improvements across the range of personal characteristics.

Boy E had been very keen to be involved in the programme after first hearing about it through the local Careers Service. He had nothing to do this summer and had not been able to get a job so he saw it as a good opportunity to learn new things. He was particularly attracted by the focus on the development of personal skills as he feels this is his area of weakness. He specifically expressed an interest in working with special needs children after experiencing problems with dyslexia when he was younger. He thoroughly enjoyed the community-based element of the programme spent at summer schools for year 6 and year 7 pupils. He found that he set up good relationships with the children as he was able to offer something different to the teachers and he was closer to their own ages. Although not fully decided about what he wants to do next, he has learnt a lot about himself as a result of this programme. Having been picked on because of his size he has now learnt to deal with this by ignoring snide comments or by giving as good as he gets. He would recommend the programme to others as it helps you to 'find out about yourself and about others. You'll also gain lots of new friends'.

Impact of different projects

- 4.33 The evaluation sought to identify impacts at a programme level, and not to evaluate individual projects. Nevertheless, if impacts can be attributed to particular project variables then this would provide a useful indication for the future development of the programme. Information was available for the duration of projects (in terms of the number of days any young person would spend on the project), staff-student ratios and whether projects offered outdoor activities only or a combination of outdoor activities with other activities. In addition to assessing the influence of these factors individually on participants' plans and attributes, we also developed two typologies, one which combined duration of project with mix of participants, and one which combined activities with mix of participants (see Annex A).

Staff to Participant Ratio

- 4.34 Table 4.10 suggests that staff to participant ratio might be a significant factor in terms of project delivery. In terms of participant *satisfaction* there is a positive link between satisfaction levels and overall view of the project as expressed by participants. Higher staff to participant ratio projects scored more highly in terms of meeting or exceeding participants' expectations. None of those attending the high ratio projects were disappointed by what they had experienced.
- 4.35 There is also a link between staff to participant ratio and project outcomes. High staff to participant ratio projects were more successful in terms of completely shaping or having a major influence on participants plans for the remainder of the summer and beyond. Only 11 per cent of participants from high ratio projects reported that the Summer Activities programme had no influence on their plans as compared to 20 per cent of those attending medium and low staff to participant ratio projects respectively.
- 4.36 Moreover there was a significant relationship between staff ratios and changes to some personal characteristics. Most notably, participants whose leadership scores decreased were more likely to have attended projects with higher staff ratios. The analysis therefore suggests that staff to participant ratio is an important factor both in terms of delivering the project successfully and in achieving the objectives of DfEE.

Table 4.10: Staff to participant ratios

	<i>Low ratio %</i>	<i>Medium ratio %</i>	<i>High ratio %</i>
Overall view of project			
<i>Better than expected</i>	69	71	76
<i>Pretty much what I expected</i>	28	27	22
<i>Worse than expected</i>	3	3	2
Influence on plans			
<i>Completely shaped plans</i>	6	7	11
<i>Had a big influence on plans</i>	32	35	44
<i>Had little influence on plans</i>	43	38	34
<i>Had no influence on plans</i>	20	20	11

Duration of the project

- 4.37 Project duration was a less significant factor than staff ratio in terms of impact on young people’s plans. Table 4.11 demonstrates that longer projects were generally more likely to have influenced plans than shorter projects.
- 4.38 The influence of duration of project on personal characteristics scores (see Annex C) is again inconclusive. The length of project did not affect score increases; although shorter projects tended to be more likely to be associated with decreasing scores.

Table 4.11 Duration of project

	<i>Shorter duration % < 7 days</i>	<i>Longer duration % 7+ days</i>
Overall view of project		
<i>Better than expected</i>	75	69
<i>Pretty much what I expected</i>	23	27
<i>Worse than expected</i>	1	4
Influence on plans		
<i>Completely shaped plans</i>	7	7
<i>Had a big influence on plans</i>	32	36
<i>Had little influence on plans</i>	39	39
<i>Had no influence on plans</i>	22	18

Project Type

4.39 Projects were characterised as either Type A – D (relating to mix of participants and duration) and Type E – H (relating to mix of participants and types of activity). Table 4.12 demonstrates that:

- shorter projects with participants which included the less motivated were more likely to have little or no influence on plans
- projects which offered only outdoor activities for participants which included the less motivated were more likely to have a big influence on plans.

Table 4.12: Change on plans by project type

	Completely changed plans %	Big influence on plans %	Little influence on plans %	No influence on plans %
By project type (A-D)				
<i>A – short intervention, mostly motivated</i>	6	33	38	23
<i>B – short intervention, mix of types</i>	7	28	48	17
<i>C – long intervention, mostly motivated</i>	4	28	44	25
<i>D – long intervention, mix of types</i>	11	51	30	8
By project type (E-H)				
<i>E – outdoor only, well motivated</i>	6	30	38	26
<i>F – outdoor only, mix of types</i>	6	52	29	14
<i>G – mix of activities, well motivated</i>	5	31	42	21
<i>H – mix of activities, mix of types</i>	10	40	39	11
Total	7	34	40	20

4.40 Annex C shows the characteristics of participants in both the top quartile and the bottom quartile of post-activity results. In terms of project type there were few variations between the types, there are however indications that projects which ran short interventions with a mix of participant types were more likely to report a higher than average incidence of participants who rated their skills in the lowest band.

4.41 Annex C also includes further breakdowns of the characteristics of participants whose scores either increased or decreased. Key findings are:

- activity type did appear to have some impact with projects offering a range of activities achieving the best results in terms of increases in scores (with changes to leadership scores being statistically significant)
- participants whose scores increased were involved in projects where there was a mix of participant types recruited. E.g. with regard to improving self esteem 43 per cent of those in H type projects saw their scores increased compared with 39 per cent of those in G type projects - the difference being the type of participants
- Participants from F type projects tended to correspond with decreasing scores thus suggesting that outdoor only projects were slightly less successful in developing personal characteristics.

Summary

<i>Key statistics on impact</i>	
Proportion for whom the programme has helped shaped their plans	41 %
Proportion for whom the programme has had no influence on their plans	20 %
Proportion who have improved group working scores after the project	45 %
Proportion who have decreased group working scores after the project	32 %
Proportion who have increased communication scores after the project	46 %
Proportion who have decreased communication scores after the project	27 %
Proportion who felt that they had changed in some way	80 %

4.42 The programme has had little impact upon the actual choices made by the majority of young people regarding their destinations in Autumn, mainly because most of them already had plans either to stay on at school, or to go to college. Perhaps somewhat paradoxically, young people did respond positively to a question which asked whether their plans had changed. This may be explained by two factors:

- young people may still plan to go on to college, but they may have changed their views about either what they want to do when they get there, or what they want to get out of it
- young people tend not to segregate their lives in to work / home / leisure / education / training – therefore their change of plans may reflect a change in any one of the different areas of their lives.

- 4.43 Different groups of young people responded differently to the programme's aims for transition from school to further education or training. Participants who were taking part in longer projects, in projects which offered a range of activities, and which involved a mix of motivated and less motivated young people were more likely to respond that the project had had a significant impact upon themselves and their plans. The more motivated young people were more likely to have firm plans, and indeed this was reflected in the responses, they were the group less likely to say that the project had affected their plans.
- 4.44 The programme also sought to encourage the development of personal skills. The research measured this using a series of statements against which participants were asked to grade their own attitudes and abilities on a four point scale. This process highlighted a number of points:
- most participants thought they scored quite highly against the various personal characteristics when they began the programme – probably reflecting the highly-motivated nature of the majority of the participants
 - nevertheless, 45% reported an improvement in their group working, communication and problem solving skills
 - a significant minority (approximately a third) thought that did not have good group working and leadership skills to begin with, and indeed, 32% of participants reported a lower score for group working, and 26% a lower leadership score, after the programme
 - while individuals who scored well against the various skill elements at the start of the programme, increased their scores across all skills at the end of the programme, this was not true for participants who commenced the programme with low skill scores. In other words, improvements in personal skills are more likely to be demonstrated amongst young people who already have good skills, than amongst those with lower level skills
 - regardless of whether they had improved their skills, or changed their plans a lot of the young people who participated valued various aspects of the programme, and indeed those young people who sat fewer than 5 GCSEs valued the experience of doing the activities much more than those with higher academic ambition
 - almost 80% of participants reported that they had changed in some way as a result of the programme.

- 4.45 More young people have improved their personal skills in a number of dimensions, than have experienced no change or a negative impact, but young people who already had quite high levels of skill were more likely to demonstrate (or acknowledge) improvement. Overall, young people did value the experience, four in five said that they had changed in some way, and most identified an element of the programme which they particularly valued.
- 4.46 There is no clear and unequivocal picture of the impact of different types of project, (indeed there was no clear model of project types). The most important variable appears to be staff ratios although it is more likely that the range of different staff types, or their intrinsic skills and qualities will have a greater impact than their numbers. Similarly the types of activity which young people are involved with could have different impacts, perhaps not so much whether they do rock climbing as opposed to water ski-ing (for example) but more in terms of the intensity of the experience and their level of involvement or engagement with it. This is something which should be explored further in future evaluations.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

- 5.1 This report has presented evidence from project managers and young people participating in the Pilot Summer Activities for 16 year olds Programme. The delivery of the pilot was strongly influenced by two key factors. The first was that the programme was run as a Pilot, with a relatively open ended invitation for projects to propose ways in which they could deliver the objectives set out by the DfEE. Consequently there was a range of diversity of approaches and different models adopted, and indeed, there were several projects which continued to develop their approach throughout the summer. Secondly, the pilot was run (out of necessity) with rather short lead in times and many projects suggested that this constrained their ability to develop a programme of events as diverse or as extended as they would like.
- 5.2 In turn these circumstances have affected the evaluation. Firstly, there is no single model (or defined set of models) of intervention against which the processes and impacts can be measured, and indeed, projects were developing their own models throughout the summer. Secondly, the evaluation was also affected by the short lead in time with no opportunity to pilot instruments. Consequently the evaluation can be seen as a pilot process, just as the projects are.
- 5.3 This concluding section of the report, firstly outlines the key findings of the evaluation research in brief. It then goes on to outline recommendations for the projects, and recommendations for the future evaluation research, before concluding with a summary review of the implications for policy.

Summary of key findings

- 5.4 Thirty two pilot projects were able to adopt the DfEE objectives for the programme and to deliver projects which met those objectives to varying extents. There is a good deal of good will for the programme and determination to make it work particularly among the networks of outdoor educators. Those projects which already had good relationships with other key partners working with the target group of young people tended to report a greater degree of success particularly with the recruitment aspect of the programme.
- 5.5 Projects adopted a range of approaches to programme structure, recruitment, activities, involvement of young people, staffing and accreditation. Elements of these which were considered to be good practice are outlined in the following section.

- 5.6 The majority of young people who were involved in the programme reported that they derived some benefit. The type and depth of benefit is in many ways intensely personal and responses to open questions reveal some insight about how they feel they have developed. These responses reveal that for most of the young people who participated the impact of the programme on their thoughts about their future was, at best, second to the impact on their feelings about who they were, their strengths and their weaknesses. These two are inter-related; young people who feel more confident generally, or who have overcome inhibitions about meeting new people are more likely to approach the further education or training experience with a level of excitement and determination to succeed. However, if the programme is primarily about encouraging young people to make and implement decisions about their futures, then greater emphasis on their transition to further education or training would be expected.
- 5.7 A minority of young people did not report that the programme had affected them positively. For some, it may have had a neutral effect, for others a negative effect. Findings show that these are more likely to have young people with relatively low levels of self confidence in their own abilities, consequently there is a danger that for a few participants the programme simply reinforced their sense of low achievement.
- 5.8 Overall, however the programme has had a positive impact. This is a message which was reinforced by young people on reflection at least a month after their programme had finished. In the telephone sample survey of 11 per cent of participants, nine out of ten reported that they had changed as a result of the programme, and indeed that someone else had commented on the fact that they had changed.
- 5.9 These findings suggest that the programme should continue, but that the projects should be more geared to delivering the “transition outcomes” than the “personal development” outcomes; in the context of outdoor education the latter may happen anyway, but the former may only derive from a planned programme of interventions. They also suggest that there are a number of outstanding questions which future evaluation research should address. The following section goes on to outline recommendations for the projects, followed by recommendations for future evaluation.

Recommendations for future practice

- 5.10 The projects which participated in the Pilot represented a great diversity of types, and approaches to the objectives set by the DfEE. Nevertheless, across the projects, a number of features of good practice could be identified. These will not always apply to all situations, but they are worth consideration by all projects and project funders.

Recruiting young people in the target range.

5.11 The recruitment of young people who were the most likely to be able to benefit from the programme, and who were also in the appropriate age range, was one of the most difficult aspects of the Pilot programme. Partly this was due to the lack of pre-existing partnership arrangements, partly due to the challenging time scale, and partly due to intrinsic difficulties of encouraging young people whose key characteristic is lack of involvement with education or training to participate in a programme whose ultimate aim is to guide them into appropriate education or training. The following were identified as key issues or examples of good practice:

- Networking Formal and informal networks were used to **recruit** young people and staff to the programme. In some cases networks were also used to **refer** young people between projects to make up numbers.
- Recruiting females Some projects reported difficulty in recruiting young women to the programme. The presence of **female staff members**, and their **friends** was thought to be important for them to want to attend.
Some projects expressed a concern that outdoor activities tended to attract young males. The nature of the activities on offer and the **way in which the programme is promoted** and recruited for are important considerations in ensuring an appropriate gender mix.
- Recruiting young people from ethnic backgrounds One project worked solely with ethnic minority groups. Others actively sought a mix. Their success in recruitment depended on the use of **appropriate networks and relationships** between “field workers” (such as youth workers and schools) and young people from a variety of backgrounds.
- The personal approach Projects which hoped to recruit young people through publicity and media campaigns, generally reported a low level of response. Where it worked it was young people’s parents who often responded to the advertisement first.
Personally addressed letters, or one to one conversations to encourage participation appeared to work much better in bringing forward young people who were part of the target group. Not only did the more intensive forms of pre-programme intervention appear to improve targeting but many consultees felt that it was necessary to reduce the drop-out rate.
Care should be taken to ensure that participants feel that their selection makes them feel **special**, rather than **stigmatised**.
- Parental support Recruitment efforts must address the concerns of parents as well as young people. Where programmes expect young people to attend over a period of time, or from home, **active support from parents** is necessary. Some projects held **pre-start meetings** for young people with parents to establish their support prior to the formal commencement of the programme, in addition to the requirement for a parental support form.

- **Clear expectations** With a pre-planned programme, young people need to be very clear about what they will be expected to bring (in terms of a detailed **kit list**), **who else** will be attending, **how they will get** to the centre, and what **facilities** are available nearby (shops etc). 27% of participants thought that they did not have sufficient information about the project prior to its start.
- **Branding** Several projects gave the pilot summer activities programme their own name. If a DfEE brand name were established, with some accompanying **publicity material**, the programme would have greater credibility, at least for parents, which might assist the recruitment process.

Staff

5.12 Projects used a range of approaches to staffing the projects. A range of different staff were used including teachers, outdoor activity supervisors, youth workers, community workers, parent volunteers, and learning mentors. Survey work suggests that projects with a higher staff student ratio were more likely to have influenced participants' plans. The mix of staffing and the nature of staff input varied across the projects but good practice elements include:

- **Skills** Staff involved in outdoor activities, and drama, art and computing all need to have a **good technical understanding** of what they are teaching, together with all the appropriate **health and safety** issues. However, the necessary technical skills are necessary, but not sufficient to work well with the type of young people at whom the programme is targeted.

Staff also need to be able to relate well with the young people, and build trust and respect if they are to encourage young people to seriously consider their future options.

In particular, young people need to be able to access **good quality advice** about future career options which is locally meaningful and is appropriate to their own circumstances and background.

Staff tended to **enjoy the challenge** of working with the target client group. This was particularly the case where staff were clearly aware of the developmental aspects of the Pilot and understood what they were working towards.
- **Occupation** **Youth workers, personal advisors, or college staff** may be more appropriate to attend the programme than teachers. These people are more likely to have ongoing contact with the young people and are therefore in a better position to build on the legacy and good will created through the programme. The involvement of workers is undoubtedly of value in sustaining the impact but their involvement must be carefully managed to ensure that young people feel that they have "made a break from their past".
- **Involvement** All staff require **sufficient notice of the timing** of the programme, to be able to book their holidays accordingly.

Where teachers had been encouraged to get involved, there were some problems getting sufficient numbers. Some projects were considering **offering payment** in recognition of the additional tasks associated with the programme.

Delivering the programme

5.13 The safety and well-being of all participants was a primary concern across all projects, and while this is clearly of prime importance, for the purposes of the evaluation it was accepted that the safety aspects of the pilots were satisfactory.

- **Challenging** Activities delivered under the programme should be sufficiently challenging to “**expose young people to the attainment buzz**”, but care should be taken to ensure that there is something for everyone.
- **Duration of programme** Projects which were of longer duration had a higher likelihood of young people reporting that the project had either completely changed or had a big influence on their plans. Programmes of less than 5 days may be too short to provide genuine challenges for young people, and to undertake **meaningful work** to guide them in the transition period.

Longer duration projects were also less likely to experience high **drop out rates**. This may be due to the more intensive pre-project work which a longer running project (almost by definition) will be able to do.

Several of the longer running projects ran sessions 2 or 3 days a week, partly to allow young people to undertake some **summer employment**.
- **Mixed groups** Exploration of the survey data did not yield any statistically significant relationships between impacts achieved and projects with mixed or homogenous groups – although some differences were observed.

Some projects thought that mixing groups of young people with **different backgrounds, experiences, and aspirations** can be helpful. Some projects found that the experience of building new friendships, learning from others’ experiences and having the more motivated young people “pull up” their less motivated peers worked well. Other projects found that the differences were too contrasted to work well. Overall the consultations would suggest that an element of mixing generally works well, as long as staff are aware of the potential problems and address them positively and pro-actively.

Some project managers commented that there were incidents of **racist or sexist behaviour**, particularly early on in the project, but that they should be challenged immediately.
- **Mixing activities** The projects offered a range of activities, some offered a choice between outdoor activities and other types of activity, others combined outdoor with a range of activities including work experience, voluntary work, music, drama, IT and others. Again, the survey data does not provide a clear indication of **which combination worked best**. However, projects which offered a range of activities over a longer time period could offer “something for everyone” and could undertake more in depth Transition work.
- **Session review** Many projects reported that learning from the experience is reinforced by **regular reviews of activities**. At the end of a session or a day, the group leader will review what was achieved, what was learned, and how significant this is in other aspects of life. This was a valuable means of enhancing and reinforcing what had been learnt through the activities.

However, some projects reported that they needed **more specialist input** for aspects of careers advice, or informing young people of the opportunities which may exist in their local area in terms of provision to help improve literacy, numeracy and IT skills for example. The more active involvement of careers services, colleges and other training providers was thought important to achieve the objective of supporting the transition process.

- Follow on

Most projects thought that some sort of follow up work would be desirable for the young people. In some cases this would take the form of an end of programme **event** (to hand out certificates of achievement for example), in others the programme was thought to be part of a **longer term relationship** with the young people.

Some projects carried out evaluations of the young people’s progress – by both staff and their peers – this appeared to work well and gave the young people a sense of progress. One initiative sent evaluation forms out to young people upon completion of the programme to provide a “memory jog” of what they had achieved.

Most of those interviewed recognised that some kind of follow-up within the young people’s own community after the completion of the programme was necessary if the benefits of the Summer Pilot were to be sustained. **Links with Connexions** initiative may be crucial.
- Ownership

Young people appreciate some degree of “ownership” of the programme. Their **involvement in the planning and design** of some elements of the programme can contribute to skills development, motivation and commitment to the programme. The ideal situation, given an appropriate lead-in time, would be to build this in as part of the pre-programme preparations with young people.
- Relationship building

Project staff, particularly in a residential setting, are able to develop good relationships with young people and address issues which are personal, complex, or behavioural in ways which are different to those to which young people are accustomed. The **quality of the learning experience** for young people is very much **dependent on the quality of these relationships**. Particularly for the more vulnerable groups of young people, it is important that workers can build on the experience over a longer time period to support them further into further education or training.
- Accreditation

A minority of projects (often those which are of longer duration) offered the opportunity to accredit an aspect of the programme. Where this occurred, young people were **very positive about the opportunity**.
- Responsibility

Young people appreciate being treated differently on the programme to their experience of school. One demonstration of this is to **delegate some responsibility** to them, for example some projects encourage young people to organise all aspects of some part of the programme such a day out or an expedition.

Recommendations for future evaluation

- 5.14 A number of issues with the evaluation research emerged from both the evaluators and from project managers, indeed, one of the question areas for telephone consultations was to suggest ways to improve the evaluation of the programme for the following year. A number of key elements have been identified.

- Control groups

The progress or ‘distance travelled’ of young people on the programme should be compared either with young people in the same group, but who did not attend a project, or of young people overall of the same age. It may be possible either to generate a control group of young people who were identified by the “recruitment agencies” as being suitable for the programme, but who were unable to take up a place either because of a shortage of places, or because they wanted to take up summer employment. An alternative would be to use research instruments which have been applied elsewhere (perhaps Neill’s Life Effectiveness Questionnaire⁴) to compare scores.
- Timing of survey delivery

For the 2000 summer pilot, the only practical option was to encourage project managers to deliver the pre-activity and the post-activity questionnaires at the start and the end of the activity week. In future, it would be preferable for it to be delivered as they were recruited, and then again, as the overall programme finished – perhaps in late September. This would overcome any potential post-adventure euphoria effect.
- Piloting

There was no time to pilot the research instruments for the summer 2000 evaluation. The majority of projects reported no difficulties with the instruments, however those dealing with young people with low academic ambition thought it should be simplified, and the layout made more friendly (with graphics such as smiley faces to replace text).

There was also a suggestion that a computer based form would be more popular.

These options could be explored with an advisory group of project managers participating in both this year and next years programme.
- Assisting completion

Some project managers had to help young people to fill in the forms, others left the young people to it. Future evaluation processes may require both a worker and the young person to complete pre- and post-questionnaires as part of a one to one session to register the young person and to clarify their needs and expectations, and then at the end of the programme to review achievements and learning. Alternatively, a simplified form with further project management guidance could be used.
- Information from young people

Future instruments could concentrate on personal characteristics and thoughts about future careers and options for the autumn.
- Monitoring data

Future monitoring forms could be directed at two levels, project managers and project staff.

If possible, it would be preferable to record information about participants backgrounds, academic and school attendance records from project managers rather than from participants.

Data could be requested and supplied either on paper or on computer disk.

More specific and timely information is needed on types of activity and duration; levels of staffing throughout the project; type of residential; community and group characteristics, and intensity of involvement of young people. Project managers will need to know what information will be required during their planning phase.

⁴ Neill, J. Marsh, H. and Richards, G. (1997) Life Effectiveness Questionnaire: Development and Psychometrics, Sydney, Australia, University of Western Sidney.

- Objective assessments The methodology adopted in 2000 relied on participant self-assessment of distance travelled. An objective assessment of progress made by individuals would be desirable, if this is offered by a professional then it should be developed in conjunction with the young person. If the assessment is offered by a parent or guardian, it would be good if this were done with the young person but it could not be specified as a requirement. One project undertook a postal questionnaire of parents and received a very creditable 50 per cent return.
- Longer term impact The real impact of the programme will be felt months, or years after the programme is complete. There is a possibility that next years evaluation could follow up some of the participants of this years evaluation by telephone. Alternatives for future years should be considered.

5.15 The key point is that the future evaluation programme can build on the experience of the summer of 2000 to further develop instruments and approaches. There is also time to ensure that the instruments used in 2001 have been developed in conjunction with a group of project managers to offer views both of what is desirable, what is practical and what has been used to effect at a local level before.

Implications for policy

5.16 The recruitment of young people, the creation of challenging opportunities, and the provision of support to meet all their needs all require effective inter-agency working and indeed in some cases the pilot programme has been a **catalyst** for new relationships. In most cases however the pilot has been delivered through existing relationships. This is a strength in that it further consolidates existing arrangements, but in some cases it has been a weakness in that not all the agencies who should be involved have been. The **creation of new and wider partnership arrangements** to bring together an appropriate range of skills and expertise should be a feature of the next summer activities programme. They will therefore need more time to pull together and to refine their bids. If these partnerships are based on **Connexions** pilot relationships, or at least in Connexions areas this would be valuable in the longer term.

5.17 Partnership arrangements are also important in terms of **post-programme support**. This is an area that would benefit from greater emphasis in subsequent funding rounds and could be highlighted through the bidding process. Projects need to consider how they can sustain the impact of their activities throughout the summer. They also need to work with partner organisations to ensure that participants receive follow-up support to ensure they build upon what they have achieved and are helped to make informed choices regarding training, education and employment while motivated by their recent experiences.

5.18 The pilot programme has proved beneficial in some way, for most of the young people who participated. To generalise, the greatest improvements in terms of transition planning were

seen among young people with lower academic expectations, while the greatest improvements in personal characteristics (from a high starting point) were seen amongst the more motivated young people. If the policy is primarily aimed at retaining young people in the education and training system and easing the transition from school then **higher proportions of young people with low expectations as they leave school should participate** in the programme.

- 5.19 **Defining** the characteristics of “young people with low expectations as they leave school” is not straightforward. They may be from ethnic backgrounds, have low school attendance records, have been entered for few GCSE’s, have a disability or have Special Educational Needs. They may demonstrate none of the above and yet still have low expectations for a number of other reasons, therefore it is likely that the programme in future years will still **have a significant minority of participants who do not demonstrate these “low expectations” characteristics** and yet still could benefit from the programme. Projects themselves have said that they think that it is important to get a mix of participants, both to improve the mix and the nature of learning from those who participate, but also to ensure that the programme does not suffer from stigma.
- 5.20 Projects that work with this target group and involve a wider range of partners, possibly over a longer time period, will inevitably be **more costly** in terms of staff input. In the short term a higher cost per participant may be anticipated, in the longer term however, it may be possible to derive some leverage from other agencies with shared agendas. These agencies might include the local careers service, FE providers, or probation service, however their contribution would be quite limited. It would also be possible to derive further benchmarks to assist funding partners identify what represents good value for money.
- 5.21 The vast majority of projects would not have gone ahead with the project were it not for the drive and the support offered by the Pilot programme. Those that were already planned were able to deliver some added value through increasing their input or through offering additional activities. In addition most outdoor centres reported that summer was their busy period for commercial activity, so for many the Pilot programme was not “just” an additional source of funding, although for some LEA centres this may have been the case. Furthermore, ninety per cent of participants would almost definitely not have done outdoor activities were it not for the programme. **Deadweight spending** therefore was not a major issue with this programme. Nevertheless future programmes should still have regard for this issue.
- 5.22 The **learning objectives** of particular activity types should be made more explicit. Many project managers were able to identify a range of potential learning outcomes for a range of activities, but these were seldom written down. This was particularly true of activities designed specifically to ease the transition from school. Projects should be encouraged to

think of ways of identifying how they will achieve all the various learning outcomes. The training of staff on techniques to develop these aspects of the activities they provide will enhance the projects' contribution to DfEE objectives and may be particularly important as demand for suitably qualified staff increases as a result of the expansion of the pilot programme next year.

- 5.23 The availability and quality of **management information** varied quite considerably between projects. All projects keep registration data for the young people who attend the programme but not always in database format. Compliance with requests for monitoring data has been slow in several cases and there needs to be a greater commitment to accountability, alongside a greater period of prior warning regarding what these requirements will be.
- 5.24 The pilot summer activities programme in 2001 will be experimental in that it will involve many of the participants in new partnerships or in different relationships with existing partnerships. Within this however, there may be some room to allow **some experimentation** in terms of working with different participant types, over different time periods, and mixing residential with non-residential activities. If projects wish to explore different approaches, satisfactory evaluation procedures should be agreed in advance to ensure that future projects can learn from their experiences.

ANNEX A: Methodology

1: Quantitative data gathering techniques

Introduction

A1.1 This section outlines the quantitative methodologies used in the evaluation framework. The four main elements were:

- Pre activity questionnaires
- Post activity questionnaires
- Follow-up survey
- Project monitoring data.

A1.2 These were intended to complement the more qualitative data that was gathered through the pre and post project consultations together with the case study visits.

A1.3 The following section looks at each of these quantitative techniques in turn and incorporates further explanations of the analysis referred to in the main report.

Questionnaire Survey

A1.4 There were two main questionnaires used in the survey:

- **Pre-activity questionnaire.** This was designed to establish a baseline for those taking part in the Summer Activities Initiative with regard to their future plans and their strengths and weaknesses. The questions also covered issues of ‘getting involved’ and ‘reasons for taking part’
- **Post-activity questionnaire.** This was designed to be used as a follow-up tool to track changes in participants’ strengths and weaknesses following the period of intervention. It also included questions on the programme as a whole and asked for participants’ views on the process.

- A1.5 Both questionnaires asked for background information regarding participants' age, ethnicity, disabilities and details of their academic background as well as school attendance.
- A1.6 All 32 Project Managers were sent copies of both questionnaires together with pre-paid envelopes for their return. The mail out took place during the week beginning 7th August, 2000 and analysis was carried out on those returned by 22nd September, 2000.

Survey Responses

- A1.7 At the specified deadline responses were received from 1073 individuals from across the pilot projects. This represents a 77% response rate based on the estimated number of respondents taking part. The response rate varied in terms of pre and post activity questionnaires – 63% and 70% respectively. Table A1 shows a more detailed breakdown of responses on a project by project basis.

Table A1: Survey Responses By Project

Project Names	No of participants (completing)	No of participants returning questionnaires
Outward Bound	72	37
Brathay Hall Trust	189	94
Bowles Outdoor Centre	37	30
Cumbria Outdoors	13	29
Dorset Outdoor Centre	16	16
Devon County Council	13	13
Notts County Council	35	22
Calshot	60	54
Duchy College	17	17
Lindley Training	35	23
Leicestershire County Council	27	26
Cwm Pennant	64	65
Summitreks	31	31
The Himmat Project	41	39
North Lincolnshire	124	29
YMCA	34	63
Shafton	34	30
Meridian Trust	10	10
South Cerney	5	8
Actual Reality	22	22
UKSA	62	54
Darlington Outdoor Pursuits	28	10
Calvert Trust Kielder	7	2
Venture Trust	63	46
Middlesbrough	13	14
The Expedition Company	45	46
Outdoor Trust	90	66
Rhos y Gwaliau	13	13
World Challenge	168	164
Total	1458	1073

Note: Differences between columns indicate variations in numbers commencing and numbers completing.

Issues Arising

A1.8 The following affected the response rate for questionnaire completion and should be taken into account during the analysis stage:

- **Timing of mail out.** Given the short lead in time to the evaluation some projects had started their first set of runs prior to the questionnaire being distributed. Where this was the case it was not always possible to gain a true baseline assessment of the participants and only post activity questionnaires would have been completed

- **Problems associated with questionnaire completion.** These were mainly brought to light during consultations with a minority of project managers and other staff involved in project administration. They centred around the following themes:
 - ◆ Question interpretation
 - ◆ Suitability of open questions
 - ◆ Presentation/choice of language.

Follow-up Survey

Questionnaire Design

A1.9 This was intended as a research tool to confirm or clarify some of the comments made in the main survey with regard to the impact on future plans and personal characteristics. The discussion was centred around the following:

- Current status / GCSEs obtained
- Role of project in determining future plans
- Impact on personal characteristics (evidence and impact)
- Ongoing contact with project staff/other participants
- Overall view of the project.

Sampling Framework

A1.10 Participants completing post activity questionnaires were asked to provide telephone numbers on a voluntary basis thus enabling the follow up survey to be conducted in September. 674 participants - 63% - did provide telephone numbers for follow-up purposes. Respondents were then selected using a random stratified sample to give a representative picture across the projects. Three attempts were made at different times of the day to contact individuals. A target of 10% of the estimated 1400 participants was set. Table A2 shows actual numbers of interviews completed. The response was representative in terms of gender and educational achievement.

Table A2: Follow-up Survey – Achieved Responses

Project Name	Number of responses	Project Name	Number of responses
Outward Bound	7	North Lincolnshire	3
Brathay Hall Trust	16	YMCA	10
Bowles Outdoor Centre	3	Shafton	3
Cumbria Outdoors	3	Meridian Trust	3
Dorset Outdoor Centre	2	South Cerney	2
Devon County Council	2	Actual Reality	2
Notts County Council	4	UKSA	13
Calshot	5	Darlington Outdoor Pursuits	4
Duchy College	6	Venture Trust	6
Lindley Training	3	Middlesbrough	2
Leicestershire County Council	2	The Expedition Company	9
Cwm Pennant	6	Outdoor Trust	9
Summitreks	1	Rhos y Gwaliau	1
The Himmat Project	8	World Challenge	15
		Total	150

Project Monitoring Forms

A1.11 These were included in the evaluation pack sent to 32 Project Managers in August. The forms comprised two sections:

- **Section A** – to be completed on project commencement. Covered costs, staffing levels, project length, recruitment issues and participant characteristics
- **Section B** – to be completed following project completion. Covered questions on characteristics of participants completing the project.

Response Rate

A1.12 The deadline for the return of questionnaires was 22nd September by which date 28 of forms had been returned representing an 88% response rate across all projects. The response rate was slightly lower for Section B – 27 projects returned these.

2: Quantitative Analysis

Data Input and Coding

- A2.1 The data from the pre-activity, post activity and follow-up survey was coded and manually entered into SPSS for analysis along with data from the Project Monitoring Forms.
- A2.2 The coding frames used for the open questions are detailed below:

Pre-activity Questionnaires

Q7 Have you taken any steps towards what you intend to do after the programme has finished?

1	Yes – general statements
2	No / not yet
3	Applied to go on a course / have an interview for - college/6 th form related
4	Got information
5	I have a place at school/ college/6 th form or just started
6	Organised / have a place on a training scheme / apprenticeship
7	Already started – a job
8	Already started – in school / 6 th form
9	Applied for job(s) / have interview for jobs
10	I am seeing my careers adviser
11	Other

Q4 How did you hear of this programme? Other responses

1	YMCA
2	Newspaper
3	Careers adviser/office
4	Friend
5	Care worker / youth worker / probation officer/social worker / training provider eg Trident
6	Police officer
7	Letter (not stated where from)
8	Lifeskills training programme/other training programme
9	School teacher/other teaching professional
10	Other

Q6 What do you intend to do now that the programme has finished? – other responses.

1	Join the armed forces
2	Retake my exams
3	Carry on with my A-levels
4	Carry on with my GCSEs
5	Carry on with my training scheme
6	Carry on with my apprenticeship
7	Carry on with my job
8	Work for the family business
9	Other

Post-activity Questionnaires

Q5 How do you think the information could be improved?

1	No improvements
2	Yes, improvements needed
3	No information received
4	Information received too late
5	More accurate/specific information
6	Info needed about: what to bring
7	Leaflets/brochures/photos /video / made more interesting / visit by someone from centre
8	Other
9	Information about rules

Q7 How do you think the support you were given could have been improved?

1	Doesn't need improving
2	Needs improving
3	Don't know
4	More support
5	Less pressure
6	More individual attention
7	Less strict
8	More instructors
9	Less support
10	Other
11	More / clearer information

Follow-up Survey

Q7 (a) Which activity (or aspect of the course) did you find the most valuable?

1. Problem solving tasks	2. Residential aspect
3. Gaining certificates	4. Feedback aspects
5. Non water based outdoor activity	6. Water based outdoor activity
7. Drama/Music	8. constructing/building things

Q7 (b) Why did you find that the most valuable aspect?

1. General sense of achievement	2. Overcome fears
3. Learnt something new	4. Useful experience ie for career
5. Teamwork and group work skills	6. Built up confidence
7. Built up physical/mental strength	8. Challenging
9. Enjoyed it/good fun	10. Other

Q8 Is there any way in which the course could be improved?

1. Yes	2. No
3. More evening/night time entertainment	4. Better pre-course information
5. Better organisation	6. Better domestic provision
7. Duration of the course needs to be longer	8. More supportive staff
9. More discipline for disruptive students	10. Wider variety of activities
11. More freedom in free time	12. More geared towards careers

Attitudinal Statements

A2.3 Both the pre and post activity questionnaires included an identical question that was intended to track participants' strengths and weaknesses before and after intervention. The question comprised of a series of attitudinal statements which were regrouped as follows:

<p>Self-esteem</p> <p><i>I feel good about myself most of the time</i></p> <p><i>I sometimes feel that I cannot cope with things</i></p>	<p>Problem Solving</p> <p><i>I enjoy working out the best way of tackling a task</i></p> <p><i>I like to start a task straight away</i></p>
<p>Group Work</p> <p><i>I'm often the first to volunteer for things</i></p> <p><i>I usually enjoy working with others</i></p> <p><i>I do my best work on my own</i></p>	<p>Time Management</p> <p><i>I am usually on time for things</i></p> <p><i>I don't like being given deadlines</i></p>
<p>Leadership</p> <p><i>I usually enjoy guiding those around me</i></p> <p><i>I prefer others to set me clear tasks</i></p>	<p>New Experiences</p> <p><i>I usually enjoy trying out new activities</i></p> <p><i>I usually prefer to mix with people I know</i></p> <p><i>I like visiting new places</i></p>
<p>Communication</p> <p><i>I usually have no problems speaking to those in authority</i></p> <p><i>I am often uncomfortable when challenging those older than myself</i></p> <p><i>I enjoy participating in group discussions</i></p>	<p>Using new technology</p> <p><i>I enjoy using computers</i></p> <p><i>I can usually work out how to use new computer packages</i></p> <p><i>I'm not very keen on using new technology</i></p>

A2.4 Respondents were asked to rate their agreement on a four-point scale. These ratings were then turned into a 'score' for each personal characteristic, and this allowed analysis to be generated at two main levels:

- **Level 1** – quartiled responses
- **Level 2** – Matched responses (i.e., those individuals who completed both a pre and a post activity questionnaire) - to track changes.

A2.5 The following table gives a good indication of how well the matched responses represented the main survey population.

Variable	% Main Survey	% Matched Responses
Age		
15 yrs	14	14
16 yrs	78	80
17 yrs	8	6
Gender		
Male	61	59
Female	39	41
Disability		
With a disability	8	8
Without a disability	92	92
Ethnicity		
Black	3	3
Asian and other non-white	9	8
White	88	89
No of GCSEs taken		
Less than 5	21	22
More than 5	79	78
School Attendance		
Rarely missed school	67	70
Sometimes avoided school	20	19
Often avoided school	13	11

Project Categorisation

Staff Ratio

A2.6 This was calculated using the total number of participants commencing (where this information was available from the project monitoring forms) divided by the total number of staff involved – also drawn from the Project Monitoring data. The ratios were calculated for the following projects and grouped accordingly.

- **High** staff:participant ratio – 1:2 to 1:1, 22% of projects
- **Medium** staff:participant ratio – 1:4 to 1:3, 26% of projects
- **Low** staff:participant ratio – 1:10 to 1:6, 52% of projects.

Motivational Level of Participants

A2.7 The responses given to the question on school attendance was used to gauge what we have termed participants' overall levels of motivation, although it could be an indication of a number of other factors. This was categorised as those who rarely missed school and those who sometimes or often avoided school. 67% of respondents fall into the first category and 33% the latter. This is based on responses to the pre activity questionnaire.

Composite Project Types

A2.8 We have however developed two categorisations of projects from the data we have analysed that combine the character of the type of project with the character of the type of participant at that project. These are summarised in the tables below:

Project Characteristics A-D

<i>Type A</i>	<i>Type B</i>
Short intervention, mostly motivated	Short intervention, mix of participants
38% (11) projects	21% (6) projects
44% (579) participants	17% (223) participants
<i>Type C</i>	<i>Type D</i>
Longer intervention, mostly motivated	Longer intervention, mix of participants
21% (6) projects	21% (6) projects
19% (253) participants	20% (258) participants

Notes:- Short intervention corresponds with projects of up to and including 7 days duration, (the mean duration being 8 days).
 Longer intervention corresponds with projects of more than 7 days duration.
 Mostly motivated corresponds with projects where >65% of participants rarely missed school
 Mix of participants correspond with projects where <65% of participants rarely missed school.

NB. 65% was selected as within individual projects there was a natural break at this point of participant mix. It is also close to the 67% which was the overall proportion of participants' who 'rarely missed school'.

Project Characteristics E-H

<i>Type E</i>	<i>Type F</i>
Outdoor only, mostly motivated	Outdoor only, mix of participants
24% (7) projects	10% (3) projects
35% (453) participants	8% (108) participants
<i>Type G</i>	<i>Type H</i>
Outdoor plus other, mostly motivated	Outdoor plus other, mix of participants
34% (10) projects	31% (9) projects
29% (379) participants	28% (373) participants

Notes:- Outdoor only corresponds with projects where this was the only main activity.
 Outdoor plus other corresponds with projects where outdoor activities were supplemented with one or more other main activity.

3: Significance Tests

A3.1 The tables below indicate which differences between participants' responses were or were not statistically significant at least at the 95% confidence level.

Table A3: Tests of significance for variables on 'influence of programme on future plans'

Variables	Significant?
Participant characteristics	
Gender	No
Age group	No
Motivation levels - as measured by school attendance	No
GCSEs sat	No
Project Characteristics	
Project duration	No
Activity type	Yes ⁵
Cost	Yes ⁶
Staff ratio	No

Table A4: Tests of significance for variables on 'movement of scores for attitudinal statements' between pre and post activity

Variables	Self-esteem	Group work	Leadership skills	Communication skills	Problem Solving	Time management	New experiences	New technology
Participant characteristics								
Gender	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Age group	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes ¹⁰	No
Motivation levels (as measured by school attendance)	Yes ⁷	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes ¹¹
GCSEs sat	Yes ⁸	No	No	No	No	Yes ⁹	No	No

⁵ Participants who attended 'outdoor only' type projects were more likely to say that the programme had not influenced their plans.

⁶ Participants who attended higher cost projects were more likely to say that the programme had influenced their plans

⁷ Participants who sometimes or often avoided school were more likely to show a decrease in scores with regard to self esteem.

⁸ Participants who sat fewer GCSEs were more likely to show a decrease in scores with regard to self esteem.

⁹ Participants who sat over 5 GCSEs were more likely to show an increase in scores with regard to time management skills.

¹⁰ Participants in the younger age groups were more likely to show a decrease in scores with regard to confidence in new experiences.

¹¹ Participants who sometimes or often avoided school were more likely to show an increase in scores with regard to skills in new technology.

	Self-esteem	Group work	Leadership skills	Communication skills	Problem Solving	Time management	New experiences	New technology
Project Characteristics								
Length of project	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Activity type	No	No	Yes ¹²	No	No	No	No	No
Cost	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Staff ratio	No	No	Yes ¹³	Yes ¹⁴	No	No	No	No

Table A5: Tests of significance for variables on intention to continue training or education

Variables	Significant?
Participant characteristics	
Gender	Yes ¹⁵
Age group	No
Motivation levels (as measured by school attendance)	Yes ¹⁶
GCSEs expected	Yes ¹⁷
Project Characteristics	
Length of project	No
Activity type	Yes ¹⁸
Cost	No
Staff ratio	Yes ¹⁹

¹² Participants who attended 'outdoor plus other' type projects were more likely to show an increase in scores with regard to leadership skills.

¹³ Participants who attended low staffed projects were more likely to show an increase in scores with regard to leadership skills.

¹⁴ Participants who attended medium or high staffed projects were more likely to show an increase in scores with regard to communication skills.

¹⁵ Female participants were more likely to continue school or college than males.

¹⁶ Motivated participants were more likely to continue school or college than unmotivated participants.

¹⁷ Participants who sat over 5 GCSEs were more likely to continue in school or college than participants who sat fewer GCSEs.

¹⁸ Participants who attended 'outdoor only' type projects were more likely to continue in school or college than those who attended 'outdoor plus other' type projects.

¹⁹ Participants who attended high staffed projects were more likely to continue school or college than those who attended lower staffed projects.

ANNEX B: Pen Portraits of Pilot Projects

Project Name	No. pt'pts	Description
1. Outward Bound, Ullswater	72	An initial 5 day non-residential induction was followed by 12 days residential where participants took part in outdoor activities, drama and other creative type workshops as well as individual environmental and community based projects. Bradford Outdoor Association provided contacts with schools, youth workers and social services.
2. Brathay Hall Trust, Ambleside	232	Five days of problem solving activities at the charitable trust site culminated in a major team based task. Participants were recruited locally through Careers and Youth Services – partners who have worked with this charitable trust in the past.
3. Bowles Outdoor Centre, Tunbridge Wells	38	Bowles, a registered charity since 1964 incorporated three main elements into its programme. An initial residential week at Bowles was followed by either a two week community based or work experience project – based in the participants' home towns - and finally participants returned to Bowles for a 2 day post activity review incorporating team based activities. Youth services in Barnett, Worthing and Deal together with the Trident Trust helped recruit for this project.
4. Cumbria Outdoors	40	This non-profit making organisation ran 2 projects – an outdoor activity based 'Adventure Summer School' and a 'Music Summer School' - where participants produced and designed their own CD – both of three weeks duration. Information about the programme was distributed to local Youth Services who then encouraged potential candidates to contact Cumbria Outdoors directly.
5. Dorset Outdoor Education Service	16	The 5 days of outdoor pursuits based at the local authority's camping centre focussed on the team building aspects of activities such as abseiling, biking and overnight camps and a Careers Advisor was available for participants to consult throughout the programme. The Careers Service, through their links with Connexions identified participants from the main urban centres of Weymouth and Portland.

6. Devon County Council	13	An initial 3 day session encouraged group formation and allowed participants to plan the activities for the coming week – which culminated in a canoe expedition. The recruitment process built on the existing partnership between Devon CC, Tavistock Community College and Dartmoor Centres with the college identifying young people who would benefit most.
7. Nottinghamshire County Council	35	The ASCENT group, working in conjunction with the council's environmental and education services department, ran a week's residential programme followed by a week's work experience together with a post activity review and presentation evening. Having initially targeted all young people from Year 11 in Nottinghamshire who were seen to be failing to make the transition between school and further training they also recruited via youth and offending services as well as through mailshots.
8. Calshot Activities Centre, Southampton	60	Calshot, part of the Arts, Countryside and Community department at Hampshire CC, ran two 5 and one 10 day course which included a range of outdoor activities in the New Forest and water sports on the Solent. Recruitment was via direct contact with schools throughout Hampshire and the separate unitary authorities of Portsmouth and Southampton.
9. Duchy College, Cornwall	17	The college offered a five day activity based programme which included a canoe journey and an expedition across Dartmoor as well as providing help and advice with CV preparation. Participants were drawn from schools in Avon, Somerset, Devon, Cornwall and Dorset, and regional youth offices were also targeted.
10. Lindley Training, Sheffield	35	Working with a range of partner organisations outdoor activities were complemented with indoor activities such as IT training, web site development, a First Aid course and visits to local companies. Recruitment was mainly through Lindley's existing networks together with publicity in the local press.
11. Leicestershire Education Department	25	Based at Beaumanor Hall three groups of young people undertook three days of outdoor activities together with digital photography and IT workshops. Leicestershire Residential Services in conjunction with Leicestershire Education department used their existing networks with youth organisations, schools and SEN units to recruit.

12. Cwm Pennant Mountain Centre, Gwynedd	64	Two groups of participants were recruited from Uxbridge and Leicestershire via the Youth Services departments. Participants experienced a mixture of outdoor based and indoor activities over the 5 and 6 day period with the focus on establishing positive relationships between participants and youth workers/teachers.
13. Summitreks Ltd, Cumbria	48	Two groups of participants undertook 5 days of outdoor activities interspersed with group work and Action Planning at High Close Youth Hostel in the Langdale Valley. Recruitment was via Oldham Youth Service and throughout the programmes Youth Workers were available to give advice on careers and future plans.
14. Westfield School, Sheffield	20	Participants were recruited from 3 schools in the local area to undertake outdoor based work with a residential element, day trips, motorcycle maintenance and safety sessions and a Castaway Expedition at the end of the 5 weeks. The programme built on the well established network of Learning Mentors who were instrumental in programme delivery and recruitment.
15. Foundry Mountain Activities Ltd, Sheffield	46	A week of residential based activities at sites across the Peak District were offered to young people nominated by youth workers and schools in North Sheffield. Comparisons between an all male, all female and mixed group will inform the centre what group type worked most effectively.
16. The Himmat Project, Halifax	52	Four groups of young people of Asian ethnic origin travelled from their homes in the Halifax, Bradford and Keighley area to the Western Isles. Day time outdoor pursuits were supplemented with group work sessions and evening reviews, and follow up will be provided by Himmat workers in the Autumn.
17. North Lincolnshire Unitary Authority	124	The programme capitalised on good links between the departments of education and leisure to provide a range of 2 and 3 day courses over the summer months with the potential for candidates to gain accreditation in football, First Aid and Community Sports Leadership. Local training providers and the Youth Service assisted in the recruitment process.

18. YMCA National Centre – Lakeside, Cumbria	158	Eight 5 to 7 day sessions incorporated a mix of outdoor activities, group work sessions, as well as community work and guidance about future careers. Recruitment was via YMCAs countrywide with the resultant group representing a geographical spread between Central London and the North of England.
19. Shafton Youth Community Group, Barnsley	54	Daytime activities included swimming and quad biking as well as visits to local places of interest while evening activities incorporated IT workshops, First Aid courses and Arts and Theatre activities. Advertisements in the local press complimented the main recruitment drive through local schools.
20. Trinity Sailing Foundation, Devon	18	This non-profit making organisation ran four 7 day courses based on a sailing adventure which saw participants taking responsibility for daily tasks as well as following the RYA Competent Crew syllabus. Recruitment was mainly via local employment and youth organisations which distributed information to potential 16 year olds.
21. Meridian Trust Association, Portsmouth	10	Run by a small charity, the project offered 2 weeks sailing with one week in the ship-building workshop. Participants were drawn locally via media advertising.
22. South Cerney (Outdoor Education Centre), Cirencester	10	As part of the Education Dept at Gloucestershire CC South Cerney ran a 5 day programme involving outdoor activities complemented with careers advice provided by Learning Partnership West. Local youth and community services were asked to nominate potential 16 yr olds who would be likely to benefit.
23. Actual Reality Learning & Leadership Trust, Argyll	24	Participation in outdoor activities as well as learning about the safety aspects of survival in the outdoors was complimented with a programme of activities to develop the young person's IT skills. This independent organisation worked with Pathway Outdoor Adventure to recruit young people from the Birmingham area.
24. UKSA, Isle of Wight	62	This registered charity set up four 5 day programmes consisting of water based outdoor activities. A combination of contacting local schools and youth clubs together with direct marketing and use of the local press was the main form of recruitment.

25. Darlington Outdoor Pursuits Club	28	Darlington and District Youth and Community Association – an organisation with charitable trust status - delivered three 5 day programmes which centred on outdoor activities. An active recruitment campaign was pursued through the local press and the Careers Service.
26. Calvert Trust Kielder, Northumberland	7	The group consisted of 16 yr olds with physical or learning disabilities recruited via Special Needs Schools in the local area. 5 days of non-writing based activities took place at the Trust and care workers or parents accompanied the participants throughout.
27. The Venture Trust, Inverness	71	Run by a registered charity outdoor pursuits, expeditions and creative workshops together with one-to-one counselling sessions were offered over three 11 day projects. The majority of the voluntary referrals came via the Trust's partnership with Fairbridge teams throughout England and statutory referrals came via established links with Youth Offending Teams.
28. Middlesbrough Council	13	The project was based at Thorntree youth club and was formed around the existing partnership between Lifelong Services, Youth Services and the local council. Participants, drawn from the local area, were involved in a range of outdoor activities culminating in an 'errand of mercy' task at the end of the 7 days.
29. The Expedition Company, Taunton	45	The Expedition Company ran two separate courses in North Wales and Exmoor, and recruited young people in the Taunton catchment via youth groups, career services and probation services. Outdoor activities varied according to the different settings but each programme also included navigation skills workshops and First Aid courses.
30. The Outdoor Trust, Northumberland	120	Links with local education departments were the main form of recruitment for this charitable trust. The final group of participants undertook a week of activity based sessions during the day together with review sessions at night. First Aid and navigation sessions also provided the young people with an insight into outdoor survival.
31. Rhos y Gwaliau, Gwynedd	13	Run by a charitable trust that is partly funded by Berkshire LEA they recruited via mailshots from contacts supplied by the careers services and other networks in Berkshire. Participants travelled to the centre in Gwynedd where they undertook a range of outdoor pursuits and environmental work together with group work sessions during the evenings.
32. Wednesbury EAZ / World Challenge	168	Working with their flagship EAZ, this commercial organisation offered a 3 day residential at Repton College where a range of outdoor activities were available alongside drama/dance, football and IT skills. Recruitment involved an initial presentation to all year 11 pupils at the four partner schools.

ANNEX C: Additional Tables

Participant characteristics of those in top and bottom quartiles, and for those whose 'scores' increased or decreased

Characteristics of participants scoring in top quartile - post activity

	self esteem	group work	leadership	commu nication	prob solving	time man	confidence in new experiences	technology
Gender								
Male	49	15	16	31	44	33	20	38
Female	28	11	11	29	34	32	27	20
Age								
15	41	16	12	32	36	32	27	27
16	38	14	15	31	42	35	23	31
17	35	12	13	40	40	21	23	21
GCSEs								
under 3	44	11	16	17	51	23	18	24
3 to 5	33	14	9	19	42	23	14	51
over 5	42	13	15	34	39	36	26	33
School attendance								
rarely missed school	43	14	15	34	41	37	50	33
sometimes avoided school	34	14	11	21	34	22	51	55
Often avoided school	34	9	14	25	47	25	54	28
Project types A-D								
A - short intervention mostly motivated	41	15	15	29	41	36	25	31
B - short intervention, mix of types	36	11	13	20	36	27	16	21
C - longer intervention, mostly motivated	44	11	14	35	37	30	22	31
D - longer intervention, mix of types	39	14	15	34	45	13	27	36
Project types E-H								
E - outdoor only, motivated	38	13	14	28	38	33	25	28
F - outdoor only, mix of types	43	11	8	23	33	17	23	24
G - activity mix, motivated	45	14	14	35	41	34	22	33
H - activity mix, participant mix	37	13	15	29	43	34	22	31
Overall	41	13	14	30	40	33	23	31

Characteristics of participants scoring in bottom quartile - post activity

	self esteem	group work	leadership	commu nication	prob solving	time man	confidence in new experiences	technology
Gender								
Male	1	16	4	15	1	3	22	14
Female	5	15	2	13	1	3	19	16
Age								
15	2	14	2	12	1	6	21	14
16	1	17	2	15	1	2	22	16
17	2	16	4	8	2	2	6	21
GCSEs								
under 3	1	17	7	15	2	2	21	12
3 to 5	2	17	2	12	1	3	12	10
over 5	1	16	2	14	1	3	23	16
School attendance								
rarely missed school	1	16	2	15	1	2	22	16
sometimes avoided school	2	16	3	12	1	6	19	13
Often avoided school	1	13	7	10	1	6	14	14
Project types A-D								
A - short intervention mostly motivated	1	17	3	15	1	2	21	17
B - short intervention, mix of types	3	14	6	19	2	4	16	7
C - longer intervention, mostly motivated	1	14	2	12	1	3	23	15
D - longer intervention, mix of types	1	17	3	10	1	4	22	15
Project types E-H								
E - outdoor only, motivated	1	16	3	15	1	3	18	18
F - outdoor only, mix of types	4	9	8	11	6	2	17	14
G - activity mix, motivated	1	16	2	14	1	2	25	15
H - activity mix, participant mix	5	17	3	14	1	5	20	12
Overall	1	16	3	14	1	3	21	15

Characteristics of participants whose scores increased

	self esteem	group work	leadership	commu nication	prob solving	time man	confidence in new experiences	technology
Gender								
Male	40	46	43	45	44	38	41	33
Female	39	43	40	49	48	37	40	35
Age								
15	39	53	44	39	48	33	45	27
16	39	44	40	47	45	40	39	35
17	43	38	51	54	41	27	48	26
GCSEs								
under 3	36	40	40	45	41	27	37	34
3 to 5	41	49	38	50	49	35	44	41
over 5	41	45	43	47	45	41	41	32
School attendance								
rarely missed school	42	45	42	46	46	38	41	31
sometimes avoided school	36	45	44	48	46	41	39	45
Often avoided school	31	40	33	46	40	31	39	33
Project types A-D								
A - short intervention mostly motivated	38	43	44	47	45	38	43	34
B - short intervention, mix of types	38	47	45	51	42	41	42	39
C - longer intervention, mostly motivated	38	48	36	44	48	33	36	28
D - longer intervention, mix of types	45	42	41	45	44	42	40	37
Project types E-H								
E - outdoor only, motivated	37	42	42	46	47	40	45	34
F - outdoor only, mix of types	37	48	44	41	48	30	56	35
G - activity mix, motivated	39	48	41	46	46	34	37	30
H - activity mix, participant mix	43	44	42	48	43	43	39	39
Overall	39	45	42	46	45	38	40	34

Characteristics of participants whose scores decreased

	self esteem	group work	leadership	commu nication	prob solving	time man	confidence in new experiences	technology
Gender								
Male	23	32	27	28	26	33	27	28
Female	20	32	24	26	21	27	26	32
Age								
15	20	31	20	33	26	34	30	32
16	22	33	27	27	24	29	28	29
17	28	31	20	22	26	38	7	44
GCSEs								
under 3	35	39	28	36	29	42	28	35
3 to 5	35	31	35	29	24	36	29	27
over 5	16	31	24	25	25	27	26	29
School attendance								
rarely missed school	18	31	24	27	24	29	27	31
sometimes avoided school	27	33	29	27	24	30	26	27
Often avoided school	34	42	29	30	28	43	22	29
Project types A-D								
A - short intervention mostly motivated	22	31	24	26	23	25	24	28
B - short intervention, mix of types	24	33	27	34	31	36	32	36
C - longer intervention, mostly motivated	21	36	24	27	22	35	31	35
D - longer intervention, mix of types	21	29	32	27	26	31	24	24
Project types E-H								
E - outdoor only, motivated	22	31	25	25	22	26	22	28
F - outdoor only, mix of types	19	22	26	37	30	56	11	42
G - activity mix, motivated	22	35	23	27	23	32	31	32
H - activity mix, participant mix	23	32	30	29	28	30	29	27
Overall	22	32	26	27	24	30	27	30

Participants' intentions in the autumn

	Pre-activity% (n=853)	Post-activity % (n=931)
<i>Go to college</i>	38	42
<i>Stay at school</i>	38	39
<i>Join a training scheme</i>	5	6
<i>Get a place on a MA / NT</i>	6	6
<i>Get a job</i>	8	4
<i>Be self-employed</i>	0	0
<i>Be unemployed</i>	0	0
<i>Don't Know</i>	4	1
<i>Other</i>	2	2

Participants' intentions in the autumn – matched questionnaires only

	Pre-activity% (n=772)	Post-activity % (n=762)
<i>Go to college</i>	38	40
<i>Stay at school</i>	39	39
<i>Join a training scheme</i>	4	6
<i>Get a place on a MA / NT</i>	6	6
<i>Get a job</i>	6	4
<i>Be self-employed</i>	0.3	0
<i>Be unemployed</i>	0	0
<i>Don't Know</i>	3	1
<i>Other</i>	3	3

Participants responses grouped into skill types and graded by quartiles pre-activity & post-activity n=857 n=959 respectively

	Top		Higher		Lower		Bottom	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<i>Self-esteem</i>	33.7	40.5	51.9	48.7	12.8	9.5	1.6	1.2
<i>Group working</i>	8.4	13.3	60.3	59.1	18.9	11.7	12.6	15.9
<i>Leadership</i>	8.6	14.3	52.6	55.6	34.1	27.4	4.8	2.8
<i>Communication skills</i>	18.4	30.4	54.7	47.9	11.4	7.7	15.5	13.9
<i>Problem solving</i>	32.5	40	46.6	46.3	19.3	12.5	1.6	1.1
<i>Time management</i>	28.4	32.8	49.2	50.3	19	13.9	3.6	3
<i>Confidence with new experience</i>	13.5	23.1	62	52	7.6	4	17	20.8
<i>Technology</i>	30.3	30.6	39.9	39.5	15.9	14.9	13.9	14.9

Participants responses grouped into skill types and graded by quartiles pre-activity & post-activity – matched questionnaires only

	Top		Higher		Lower		Bottom	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<i>Self-esteem</i>	33.8	41.8	52.3	48.9	12.7	8.2	1.3	1.0
<i>Group working</i>	8.6	13.9	60.1	57.9	18.7	11.3	12.7	16.7
<i>Leadership</i>	8.5	14.2	53.4	56.8	33.8	26.8	4.2	2.1
<i>Communication skills</i>	19.2	31.7	54.6	47.0	11.3	6.8	14.9	14.4
<i>Problem solving</i>	32.4	41.1	46.8	47.1	19.4	11.0	1.4	0.8
<i>Time management</i>	29.3	33.5	49.0	49.5	18.5	14.5	3.3	2.5
<i>Confidence with new experience</i>	13.2	23.3	61.8	51.8	7.6	3.7	17.4	21.2
<i>Technology</i>	31.4	29.7	39.6	38.9	15.2	15.1	13.8	16.3