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"It's about changing a generation ...it's breaking the cycle."
(Principal)
Western Australia was selected to be the lead jurisdiction for the Extended Service School Models project which has been project managed by the Department of Education. A national Steering Group was established that comprised representatives from the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Victoria, South Australia, Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and Queensland, the Catholic and Independent school sectors and the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations. Those jurisdictions not actively represented in the Steering Group have been provided ongoing correspondence throughout the project. Drawing on the emerging themes of the research the Steering Group has provided recommendations to support effective and sustained implementation of models and practice and a process to move these forwards at a national level.

This Final Summation Report, supported by the recommendations through the national Steering Group and the Stage 1 Literature Review, will be presented to the Standing Council for Education and Early Childhood Development (previously the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood and Youth Affairs) and will enable the identification and documentation of promising innovative models, and take a national approach to their evaluation, with a view to understanding what works, where and under what circumstances.

Please note that the data contained in this report has been prepared for the Department of Education, Western Australia by TNS Australia. It may not be suitable for other applications. The use of this information for any other purpose should be discussed with the lead authors. TNS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised use of this information by a third party.
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- Kathy O’Donoghue, Director TNS Social Research (kathy.odonoghue@tnsglobal.com)
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In this report, the term Aboriginal is respectfully used to refer to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.
List of Case Studies

Throughout this Summation Report, there are consistent references to 'Case Studies' that were conducted as a major component of the methodology. Further description on the methodology behind these case studies is provided in the 'Research Method' section of this report. The table below provides a reference of each case study across core variables.
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Social Research
1. Executive Summary

In December 2008, all Australian State and Territory Governments entered into an agreement with the Australian Government for the three Smarter Schools National Partnerships: Literacy and Numeracy, Low Socio-Economic Status (SES) School Communities and Improving Teacher Quality. These National Partnership (NP) agreements are part of the school reform initiatives of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), and provide significant resources to selected schools with the aim of improving student achievement, particularly in schools serving low socio-economic status (SES) school communities.

The National Partnerships aim to drive an ambitious reform agenda to lift the quality of education and improve the educational outcomes for all students. In considering the reform strategies being developed by jurisdictions, opportunities were identified for significant national collaborations to support the implementation of the National Partnerships.

At its meeting in April 2009, the Ministerial Council for Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) agreed to progress six national collaboration projects with a State or Territory identified to lead each initiative:

- School Performance Improvement Frameworks
- Innovative Strategies for Small and/or Remote Schools
- Parental Engagement in Schooling Low SES Communities
- Extended Service School Models
- National Literacy and Numeracy Diagnostic Tools
- School Leadership Development Strategies

The Australian Government considers the Extended Service School Models Project a priority to support the educational needs and wellbeing of students in low SES communities. It aims to facilitate the targeted delivery of support services to young people who are most at risk of not engaging in education and making a successful transition to schooling, further education and training and participation in the wider community.

Aim of the project

The first stage of the Project was to undertake a comprehensive literature review to determine what is currently in place in Australia and overseas. The literature review, completed by the Foundation for Young Australians, provides a comprehensive overview of models, the services provided, why they are used, how they are implemented and how they may be applicable to the Australian context. The literature review provided the foundation upon which the second and final stage of work, undertaken by TNS Social Research, is based and is available at: http://smarterschools.gov.au/supplementary/Pages/NationalKeyReformProjects.aspx.

The research in this stage of the project was designed to profile the current models of extended service schooling in Australia; to understand enablers and barriers to the sustainability and successes of the range of approaches; and to provide direction on good and best practice such that it can be effectively shared across jurisdictions.

Evidence was collected from a range of sources, including analysis from national and international literature (stage one of this project); comprehensive mapping of current models in Australia (via a quantitative Principals survey); stakeholder interviews; a quantitative survey of parents; and in-depth case study analyses (through case study immersions in 24 Australian schools). The discussion that follows summarises the common themes that emerged from this research.
What is the profile of extended service schooling in Australia?

The need for extended service schooling in Australia.

There is a complex range of issues impacting the education of Australian young people and the way schools operate. These issues often extend beyond those directly related to schools and reflect those evident among family units, and in the broader community.

Schools agree that in order to achieve optimum outcomes for students, the impact of these needs must first be recognised, and issues mitigated. Identification of, and a desire to address, these complex needs is the most common catalyst for adopting an extended service schooling approach. The ‘Principal survey’ indicated that half (53%) of responding Australian schools are currently endeavouring to address these needs through the development of an extended service schooling approach. Furthermore, there is unanimous agreement (100% of those who responded) among schools not currently delivering extended services that there is, indeed, a need for such approaches.

The majority of schools (66% of those who responded to the ‘Principal survey’) currently delivering extended service schooling anticipate their provision will expand in the next three years. Thus, the need to support schools in their delivery via an ongoing manner is important to acknowledge. This research provides guidance on the scope of potential models that will assist those undertaking an extended service schooling approach.

There is a ‘grass roots’ desire for extended service schooling among parents.

This research indicates that the desire among parents for extended service schooling is strong. The majority of parents participating in the ‘Parents survey’ agree that “schools should provide more than just education” (77% agree) and that “It takes an entire community to educate a child” (75% agree). In addition, these parents agree that “schools should be appropriately supported by Government so they can provide more than just education” (85% agree).

Extended service schooling is broad in its reach, and has the potential to touch the lives of many Australians.

The educational attainment and wellbeing of children are central to the goals of extended service schooling in Australia. However, the objectives of extended service schooling extend considerably further in scope to include parents and care-givers, schools and school staff, communities and the system itself. Thus, effective extended service schooling approaches have the potential to touch the lives of many Australians.

Australian models are characterised by customised, place-driven approaches.

The approach to extended service schooling in Australia is not “one-size-fits-all”. Rather, it is characterised by place-driven approaches that are customised and tailored in their design and delivery to the needs and specificities of each school and its local community. Flexibility to achieve customisation is considered a necessity for successful extended service schooling, and most case study schools believe that current resourcing approaches facilitate this.

It is noted that while the overall approach is customised to the individual school, most Australian designs incorporate an element of school-based delivery in their modality, rather than only referring those in need to agencies outside the school.
External funding and partnerships are central to the way extended service schooling in Australia is resourced.

While National Partnership funding was highly valued by those schools receiving an allocation, there was concern that it is a finite source. Schools in this research acknowledged the need for ongoing support to ensure that successful approaches are sustainable in the longer term. This research noted a desire by schools for strategies at a national level that will support extended service schooling in an ongoing manner.

This research identified that schools use varied approaches to access resources and are highly dependent upon the commitment of school leadership teams and / or those employed under broader governance structures to manage funding and partnerships to achieve this (such as the Innovative Community Action Networks in South Australia, and the Northern Territory’s ‘Strong Start, Bright Future’ strategy).

Schools typically pursue funding from a variety of sources including grants, as well as through partnerships with community-based and not-for-profit organisations, business, industry, and further education providers. Nearly all schools in this research (94% of those who responded to the Principals survey) indicate they initiate partnerships as a component of their resourcing.

What does extended service schooling in Australia achieve?

Of the schools undertaking models of extended service schooling that participated in this research, the majority (a range of 73% to 98% depending on their objectives) considered their school successful in achieving the agreed goals. Case study schools cite many examples of success and the positive difference extended service schooling makes to the lives of children, parents, school staff and local communities.

An over-reliance on anecdotal evidence of success, rather than the application of thorough and established evaluation tools, was noted throughout this research. Consequently, many of these outcomes could be considered aspirational because of the lack of rigorous quantitative evidence.

This aside, the observed outcomes of extended service schooling in Australia are often significant, and are noted below.

outcomes for children ...

The three most consistently observed outcomes for children included:

- **Improved behaviour** – most notably inside the classroom, but also on school grounds, in their home and in their community.

- **Social skill development and school transition** – providing students with opportunities to socialise, learn social skills, build social networks and ease the transition for new students.

- **Improved educational attainment** – observations made included; more positive attitudes by students towards learning and classroom engagement; “at risk” children were supported and the “playing field” levelled; higher graduation completion levels and, in some cases, improved literacy and numeracy results.
Some schools also noted:

- an increase in the confidence and self esteem of children;
- an increase in student attendance rates;
- emotional benefits such as delivering a sense of “security” to children; and
- improvements in future prospects as a result of redressing inequities.

The most frequently observed outcome of extended service schooling for parents related to the **increased access of services by parents** due to physical proximity, and a reduction in the attitudinal barriers of accessing ‘external’ services. This was often described as resulting in enhanced parenting skills, increased adult learning (for example, literacy skills, numeracy skills, cooking skills, computing skills etc), and improved personal and social confidence.

Some schools also mentioned:

- reduced social isolation of parents in their community;
- increased parental engagement in the school;
- reciprocity and a sense of parental responsibility; and
- improvements in parent-teacher relationships.

Increased **community access to services** – providing greater access to “new” and “existing” services and programs, as well as bringing resources “back” into the community was often described during the case study research. It was also felt that extended service schooling assisted in the development of a sense of community by enhancing community cohesion and pride, and building local capacity.

It was noted in around half of the case study schools that there was a perceived **improvement in school reputation within their local community** as a result of their extended service schooling approach.

It was felt that this improved reputation supported:

- an increase in student enrolment numbers;
- an increase in teacher attraction – with a greater number of applicants, and perceived higher quality applications;
- an improvement in teacher retention;
- a reduction in school vandalism; and
- an increase in the number of parent and community advocates within the school.

There were also perceived outcomes for school staff which related to the **facilitation of teaching - enabling teachers to focus on their “core business”** with a reduction in behavioural issues, better management of “at risk” students, and an increase in student engagement in the classroom and school.

In addition, some schools discussed:

- opportunities for professional development; and
- a sense of achievement, shared involvement and reward from observing the positive outcomes of their approach.

Some stakeholders also referred to effects they felt related to longer term, broader outcomes for the economy. These included:

- a cost-efficient approach to tackling longer term social issues;
- an improvement in career pathways for students that could reduce social inequality and break the cycle of welfare dependency;
a better skilled workforce benefiting local businesses;
- an increase in parental employability;
- fostering greater connections between businesses and communities which could improve business performance; and
- the ability and potential for schools to generate income.

**What are the enablers and barriers to success and sustainability?**

There were many factors uncovered throughout this research that were considered both enablers and barriers to success and sustainability. While often system-level, they also related to community and parents, schools and school staff.

The six most consistently discussed enablers which emerged from this research include:

1. securing consistent **funding** from a variety of sources;
2. embedding the philosophy of the approach into the **culture** of the school;
3. developing and maintaining an **understanding** of the needs of the local community so that the approach can be modified, as necessary, to align to these needs;
4. having the physical and human **resources** to support at least some school-based delivery of services;
5. a school-based capacity to develop strong **partnerships** with external agencies, particularly for schools in jurisdictions that do not have broader governance structures to manage this process;
6. provision of **system-level support** to assist schools in navigating their way from identification of need through to implementation and evaluation of their extended service schooling approach.

Some of the identified **challenges** that schools face in the development, implementation, and maintenance of their models of extended service schooling include:

1. navigating, and working within, **funding** systems at a school-level;
2. **building parent support** for the philosophy of the model so that they are keen to embrace and participate in the services provided;
3. mitigating any potential negative **stigma** associated with parents, their children, or members of the broader community, accessing services through the school;
4. addressing the impact of **staff turnover**;
5. maintaining an appropriate **balance** between a focus on educational outcomes and a focus on the wellbeing of students more broadly; and
6. ensuring a **shared understanding** of the model and its aims with a range of stakeholders.

**What defines good practice?**

As mentioned previously, and reiterated throughout the Final Summation Report, this research can not propose one single model of best practice in extended service schooling - the need for flexibility to meet diverse and changing needs of communities precludes such a notion. However, common attributes which were considered best practice by the case study schools include:

1. Start “small” and utilise existing services and programs.
2. **Continual evolution** is required to maintain relevance of the services and programs.
3. **Wide consultation** (internal and external) is critical from the outset, and should be conducted in an ongoing manner. It is essential to understand the school and its local community so that the model is tailored to its needs.
4. **Partnerships and objectives** need to be formalised and shared, but not at the expense of flexibility and the ability to develop the approach as needs change.

5. A **school leader** who is fully committed to the approach and willing to drive the process from identification to implementation needs to be identified from the outset. It was noted that this does not necessarily need to be the Principal.

6. A **supporting team of school drivers** will ensure the responsibility and workload is shared.

7. **Multiple funding sources** should be secured.

8. **System support** is required.

9. A **coordinator position** was noted as highly beneficial to the success and sustainability of many models of extended service schooling.

10. **Communication strategies** whereby “successes and wins” can be shared and celebrated among school staff, partners and communities should be implemented at a school-level.

11. **Evaluation mechanisms** should be included from the outset.

---

**How would schools like to be supported?**

Six key themes emerged from this research – each of which schools consistently believed were central to successful implementation of sustainable and effective models of extended service schooling.

The themes, which also reflect the challenges and strategies articulated in the Stage 1 literature review, are provided in summary below:

1. **Support schools to access consistent funding**
   Funding was consistently expressed as a key enabler (and barrier) to the sustainability and success of models. Many schools felt they would benefit from support in securing and maintaining funding.

2. **Support school-level establishment of dedicated roles to help coordinate extended service schooling approaches**
   Schools consistently described coordinator roles as an essential component to the sustainability and ongoing evolution of models of practice. The significant amount of time involved in developing and delivering extended service schooling was well documented within this research.

   Some schools are not currently aware that National Partnerships funding can be used to fund this role. Sharing knowledge around the most effective use of this position, including assistance in accessing other sustainable funding opportunities, and forming partnerships, may need to be strengthened. This is of particular relevance in jurisdictions where individuals are not employed under broader governance structures to perform this role (as in South Australia’s Innovative Community Action Networks, and Northern Territory’s ‘Strong Start, Bright Futures’).

3. **Articulate a process for establishing effective interagency collaboration**
   Extended service schooling approaches often involve multiple agencies. The extent to which successful interagency collaboration was achieved was considered a vital enabler – and, equally, an inhibitor if unsuccessful.
The development of a resource to support schools to successfully engage with external agencies was identified as beneficial to ongoing successes.

Guidelines or principles for collaboration would need to support flexibility so that schools are able to deliver place-driven approaches.

4. Support flexibility and the ability to adapt to the changing needs of the school community

Successful extended service schooling is not a “one-size-fits-all” approach. Policies and structures that provide flexibility for schools to be responsive to the needs of their local community are essential. Over-defining what, and how, services are offered will impede the natural evolution of extended service schooling and its ability to adapt to changing needs.

Maintaining flexibility at a system level is critical. Continued acknowledgement that flexibility is a core component of successful extended service schooling will be important.

5. Provide targeted professional learning opportunities for school leaders, teachers and other staff

Extended service schooling is relatively new to Australia. The limited shared understanding of extended service schooling may impede the likelihood that it will be immediately supported, implemented and maintained at the school level.

Schools indicate that they would benefit from access to professional learning opportunities which relate to the principles, and practices, of extended service schooling.

6. Develop online resources to guide and support schools in extended service schooling

In many schools, an extended service schooling approach will be new territory. Many processes will be developed by individual schools as part of the potentially steep learning curve that schools will experience as they design and implement the school-driven approach to meet their needs.

Schools in this research noted that they would benefit from access to a range of information and support resources. This includes information about processes, communication mechanisms, best practice guidelines and methods of evaluation.

This research indicated that such tools would need to be designed as a guide, rather than be prescriptive in nature. Flexibility remains key to successful implementation to ensure that models are driven by schools and reflect local needs that may alter over time.
2. The structure of this report

With the wealth of information collected throughout this research, this report is a summation of the key findings across the various research techniques employed. This summation report should be read in conjunction with the reports listed below in which further information is provided across each of the core research stages:

Final Summation Report \textit{(this report)} synthesises:

- **Case Study Report**
  - Individual record and analysis of the 24 case studies against the research objectives. \textit{Case studies are referenced individually throughout the summation report. The case studies are referenced by number in blue brackets.}

- **Principal Survey Report**
  - Descriptive analysis against each question included in the Principal Mapping Survey. \textit{This is referenced as ‘Principal Survey’ throughout the report.}

- **Parent Survey Report**
  - Descriptive analysis against each question included in the Parent Survey. \textit{This is referenced to as ‘Parent Survey’ throughout the report.}

- **Stakeholder Report**
  - Summation of the findings from the qualitative stakeholder research.

The aforementioned reports held a high degree of consistency in their findings and it is this synthesis which is included forthwith.
3. The policy and program context

3.1 Program background

In December 2008, all Australian State and Territory Governments entered into an agreement with the Australian Government for the three Smarter Schools National Partnerships: Literacy and Numeracy, Low Socio-Economic Status (SES) School Communities and Improving Teacher Quality. These National Partnership (NP) agreements are part of the school reform initiatives of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), and provide significant resources to selected schools with the aim of improving student achievement, particularly in schools serving low socio-economic status (SES) school communities.

The aim of the National Partnerships is to drive an ambitious reform agenda to lift the quality of education and improve the educational outcomes for all students. In considering the reform strategies being developed by jurisdictions, opportunities were identified for significant national collaborations to support the implementation of the NPs.

At its meeting in April 2009, the then Ministerial Council for Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) agreed to progress six national collaboration projects with a state or territory identified to lead each initiative:

- School Performance Improvement Frameworks
- Innovative Strategies for Small and/or Remote Schools
- Parental Engagement in Schooling Low SES Communities
- Extended Service School Models
- National Literacy and Numeracy Diagnostic Tools
- School Leadership Development Strategies

Western Australia was selected to be the lead jurisdiction for the Extended Service School Models project which has been project managed by the Department of Education (WA).

The Australian Government considers the Extended Service School Models Project a priority for supporting the educational needs and wellbeing of students in low SES communities. It facilitates the targeted delivery of support services to young people who are most at risk of not engaging in education and making a successful transition to schooling, further education and training and participation in the wider community.

This project aims to promote a shared knowledge across all jurisdictions of best practice in implementing models of extended service schooling, including describing key opportunities and risks that may apply in the national context.

To facilitate the collaboration and a national approach, a Steering Group was established that comprised representatives from the Departments of Education in Western Australia, Victoria, Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory, South Australia and Queensland, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Catholic Education Office WA, as well as professional associations and key stakeholder groups who were keen to engage in the Project. As corresponding members of the
Steering Group, the Independent Schools Council of Australia (ISCA) and Mr Rob Fry, President of the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations Inc (WACSSO) were copied in to all correspondence.

The first stage of the Project was to undertake a comprehensive literature review to determine what is currently in place in Australia and overseas. The literature review, completed by the Foundation for Young Australians, provides a comprehensive overview of models, the services provided, why they are used, how they are implemented and how they may be applicable to the Australian context. The literature review is available at:


The literature review provides the foundation upon which this second and final stage of work is based and involves researching and mapping current activities in place in schools across Australia. TNS Social Research (TNSSR) was the successful consultancy responsible for developing this report.

This Final Report, to be presented to the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood and Youth Affairs (MCEECDYA), will enable the identification and documentation of promising innovative models, and take a national approach to their evaluation, with a view to understanding what works, where and under what circumstances.

3.2 The system background

It is noted that there are both similarities and differences between the states and territories in terms of their local structures and policies within the education sector. The purpose of this report is not to highlight differences between different jurisdictions however, the following is noted:

1. In 2006 in Victoria, the Department of Education and Training was changed to the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development and has key responsibilities for learning outcomes from birth to adulthood. This is different to most other jurisdictions where early childhood is not included in the departmental remits.

2. In South Australia, there is a governance structure named Innovative Community Action Networks (ICAN). This is a community focussed project to provide flexibility around learning options for children and young people who are disengaged from learning or are at high risk of doing so. In South Australia, a large proportion of the National Partnerships funding has been allocated to ICAN in order to roll the initiative out to all regions of South Australia, rather than being allocated to individual schools as was the case in most other states. The Department of Education and Children’s Services in South Australia has responsibility for schooling and children’s services.

3. In the Northern Territory, some schools’ models commenced because their community was one of the 29 Remote Service Delivery locations agreed to under the Council of Australian Government’s National Partnership Agreement to improve access to Government services for Aboriginal Australians living in remote communities. This resulted in linking of schools and changes in leadership structures through the use of business management models.
3.3 The need for research

Extended service schooling is newer in its implementation within Australia relative to other locations such as USA, Canada and the United Kingdom. Internationally, it has evolved considerably over the years as a result of receiving increased Governmental focus as a result of recognition that many of the issues which influence an individual’s school experience can not be solved within the school system alone. Fundamentally, it represents a shift in thinking towards a holistic approach to addressing student need.

Evidence presented in the literature suggests that while the philosophy underpinning the implementation of extended service schooling has commonality across schools, the actual implementation and the model that is used, may take a variety of forms. That is, models of extended service schooling do not suit a ‘one size fits all’ approach. They rely on the ideology of social inclusion whereby contextual, socially relevant, tailored approaches are required to meet the needs of divergent school communities.

The project brief defined extended service schooling as approaches which ‘work in partnership with Government, local providers, community members and each other to offer a range of extended services to students, their families and the local community. They are a model for engaging students, parents and community to compliment that already experienced inside the classroom’. This is the definition which has been used throughout the research.

Much of the literature suggests that the benefits of extended service schooling are far reaching and can include\(^1\)\(^2\):

- **Benefits to the child** – such as increased attendance and decreased suspension rates, enhanced educational outcomes, better preparedness on school completion and transition between primary and secondary, a reduction in risk behaviours, improved social and relational aspects and, improved teacher relationships (among others).
- **Benefits to parents** – such as providing them with greater flexibility to balance their family and work commitments by facilitating easier access to support services.
- **Benefits to teachers** – such as the facilitation of classrooms in which children are more willing to engage, teachers are able to focus more on their roles as educators, and a reduction of competing demands on school staff as a result of broader access to wider support services for children.
- **Benefits to community** – such as an increased sense of community connectedness and safety, and the building of social capital.

The capacity of extended service schooling to respond to diverse needs is considered a strength of the approach. Significant learnings can be developed from detailed investigation of the models, the contexts in which particular models operate, the attributes of the various models, and their relationship to community needs. Sharing this knowledge has the potential to inform development of robust, appropriate and sustainable models.

\(^1\) Dryfoos, JG; Quinn, J; Barkin C (Editors), Community Schools in Action, Lessons from a Decade of Practice, Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.

\(^2\) Bond, S; Learning support programs, Education reform beyond school, Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2009.
4. Research method

4.1 Aims of this research

This research aims to assess process and impact measures from the program and provide clear direction on how best to move forward in terms of understanding the profile of models that are currently being used and planned, sharing and promoting good and best practice and developing recommendations for effective and sustained implementation.

Evidence has been collated from a range of sources and activities, including analysis from:

- National and international literature (Stage One of this project)
- Comprehensive mapping of current models
- Case study analysis

At the highest level, the goals of this research were to answer the key questions:

- What are the models of extended service schooling implementation and the commonalities and differences between models in Australia?
- What are the facilitators and enablers to extended service schooling in the Australian context?
- What are the barriers and inhibitors to extended service schooling in Australia?
- What does ‘best practice’ look like, and how can it be effectively shared?

4.2 The methodology

This research involved the integration of multi-methods and data sources to provide a robust evidence base to address the evaluation questions. The methodology was designed to incorporate existing data and knowledge, and gather insights from a wide range of audiences, including Principals, teachers, parents and external stakeholders (including both system-level stakeholders and partners). In summary, the approach involved:

Establishment stage | Environmental scan | Questionnaire testing | Mapping survey of Principals | Survey of parents | Interviews among key stakeholders | Case studies within schools (MAIN RESEARCH TOOL)

Below is a short summary of the methodology in each stage. A full description of the methodology for key stages (in particular, the final four stages above) is clearly defined in the individual reports separate to this Summation Report.
4.2.1 Establishment stage

The project began with an establishment stage, to review the approach and develop an Evaluation Framework to support the Evaluation Strategy. Part of the establishment stage was engagement with each member of the Steering Group. There were several meetings (face to face and via telephone) held during the establishment phase with the aims of:

- introducing the key members of each team;
- addressing minor contractual issues;
- reviewing and discussing the methodological approach;
- discussing the format and structure for the Evaluation Framework and identifying resources and materials available required for the development of the Framework; and
- sharing accessible materials.

4.2.2 Environmental scan

The environmental scan was conducted to review existing academic literature including the report from Stage One of this project, and to identify the range of local and international activities and models of extended service schooling. An extensive review of the materials was undertaken and the findings from this stage of the research were used in the development of the Principal’s questionnaire, the parent questionnaire, the discussion protocols for the case studies and stakeholder interviews, and to inform the overall background to the research.

4.2.3 Testing of mapping questionnaire

A sample of Principals in each jurisdiction were contacted and asked to participate in a semi-structured telephone interview to test the Principal’s mapping questionnaire. The aim of this was to inform the design of the survey for the mapping exercise with regard to the interpretation of terminology, constructs and questions, as well as to gauge any potential questionnaire gaps.

Participation was voluntary and participants were pre-approached by their Department to inform them of the project, its objectives and to introduce them to TNSSR. A total of 16 interviews with Principals were conducted. The discussions in these interviews were collated and common themes were utilised to refine the mapping survey prior to its launch. These interviews were conducted via telephone and averaged 20-25 minutes in duration. The learnings from this questionnaire testing were integrated into the final ‘Principal Survey’.

4.2.4 Mapping survey of Principals

An online survey was emailed to all school leaders in Australia. Contact details were sourced via a government marketing list, which is managed by A-ZGovbiz. Appropriate consent/notification was gained from Catholic, Independent and Government school bodies in each jurisdiction with the majority of Principals receiving advance communication regarding the survey from the relevant body in order to encourage a
higher response rate. The only exception to this was Queensland, which was excluded from the survey due to restriction clauses on the approval to conduct the research within Government schools.3

In order to ensure that a broad range of Principals participated including those who did not provide, or were not aware of, extended service schooling – all Principals were encouraged to take part in the survey as part of the invitation. The following text was included in the invitation:

“Should I complete the survey if I do not consider my school an ‘Extended Service School’? We need responses from all schools – not just those who consider themselves to be ‘Extended Service Schools’. This is because in order to get the ‘true picture’ across Australia, we need input from the full continuum of schools – from those offering no services, to those who may be ‘starting off’, to those who are established and those who have lapsed. This will aid our full understanding of potential barriers (either experienced or anticipated), to factors which decrease need for delivery etc.”

The survey was piloted to a small number (10% of the total sample) of Principals. The responses from this initial pilot were checked in detail to ensure the questionnaire was functioning as intended. Following this, the full sample was emailed a survey invitation. A total of 908 Principals responded to the survey and 421 of these completed the full survey. This equates to an overall response rate of 11.4% and a completion rate of 5.3%, that is, not all Principals completed the full survey. From these 421 participants, a total of 200 Principals reported they did not provide extended services compared to 221 Principals who reported they did.

The margin of error associated with the results of the Principal Survey is a maximum of +/-3.57pp3. The Auditor General requirements in Western Australia stipulate the maximum margin of error allowed in Governmental reporting is +/- 5pp and therefore, the margin of error associated with this survey is considered acceptable. This means that readers should have a high level of confidence in the reported data.

Analysis was undertaken on this data to develop a Path Model to attempt to understand the perceived success of student outcomes by school principals. This model yielded a chi-squared statistic of 10.56 with 5 degrees of freedom and a probability of 0.06 from the sample size of 221. This test statistic indicates that the fit of the data to the hypothesised model is adequate.

The full results of the Principal survey and the full survey instrument, can be found in the Principal Survey Report which is separate to this document. This includes a summary of the sample profile and descriptive statistics across all measures.

4.2.5 Survey of parents

The online parent survey was conducted among parents of school children to provide information on awareness, attitudes and experience (or not) with extended service school models. The sample was accessed through Australia’s largest online research panel and targeted respondents who were most likely to benefit from, and have experience with, extended service schools, i.e. parents with a lower socio-economic status. For the purpose of the survey this was defined as those with children aged 17 years and under with

---

3 Standard error = Square root of [p(1-p)/n] where p=% and n=sample size. A design factor of 1.96 was applied.
an income of less than $81,000 per annum. This income definition means that the resulting sample is weighted towards lower and middle socio-economic status households as it excludes those with higher socio-economic status. **It is intentionally, therefore, not population representative.**

A total of 4,568 respondents completed the survey which took, on average, 15 minutes to complete. Soft quotas were imposed to achieve a nationally representative sample. This means that broad targets were set to ensure that the resulting sample collected was age, gender and state representative. The data was subsequently post-weighted by these variables according to ABS 2006 Census data.

The full results of the Parent survey, and the full survey instrument, can be found in the **Parent Survey Report.**

### 4.2.6 Interviews with key stakeholders

A further component of the evaluation involved consultations with key informants from stakeholder organisations. These aimed to:

- Provide contextual information and insight into the need for, and background to the development of extended service schooling and partnership arrangements;
- Provide evidence to inform aspects of the evaluation including views on performance, processes and impacts, opportunities and achievements;
- Identify other source of data or documents to inform the evaluation; and
- Ensure transparency and equity of the evaluation in engaging with stakeholders.

TNSSR proposed a number of stakeholder groups and organisations for inclusion, and this list was supplemented by suggestions from Steering Group members. Further stakeholder interviews were conducted throughout the research process based on recommendations from other interviewees, researcher contact with relevant organisations via the case studies, and through attendance at an Extended Schools Forum in Western Australia. In total 29 interviews were conducted, mostly via telephone, with the majority of interviews lasting approximately one hour.

More detail on the stakeholders represented, the findings from the stakeholder interviews, and the discussion protocols, can be found in the **Stakeholder Report.**

### 4.2.7 Case studies within schools

The most significant component of this research was the conduct of case studies in schools. A school immersion technique was used whereby a TNSSR researcher visited the case study school for up to two days, immersing themselves in the school community, and talking to as many people as possible – including the Principal, teachers, parents and other stakeholders involved in the provision of extended services in the school. This allowed a fuller understanding of the context surrounding that school in terms of the extended services provided and the needs that these addressed.

Members of the Steering Group nominated a number of schools within their jurisdiction for consideration / inclusion in the case study component. These schools were identified as having two or more extended
services. Nominated schools were first approached by the Steering Group member, then subsequently by TNSSR to explain the research and confirm their consent to participation. Prior to making contact with school Principals, TNSSR sought research approvals for Government, Independent and Catholic schools in each state of Australia through the relevant Departments and Associations. Once approval was granted for a jurisdiction TNSSR approached Principals regarding their involvement in the case study and collaborated to arrange suitable dates for the research to occur and engage the Principal in arranging interviews with the target groups.

A total of 24 case studies were conducted, the majority of these (22 out of 24) conducted via the immersion technique. Two schools were unable to participate via immersion due to prior commitments held by the school. Both of these schools expressed a preference to be included in the research by telephone interview with the Principal instead. This is recognised as a limitation of these two case studies and is clearly noted in the full description of these case studies.

A minimum of two schools from each state/territory were included in the research to ensure a wide representation. The schools selected included representation from primary and secondary, Independent, Catholic and Government sectors. A summary of the characteristics of the schools visited is listed below (school names are withheld to protect the anonymity of participants).

**Summary of school characteristics included in the research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Date of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>25 &amp; 26 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>17 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Primary and Secondary</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>28 &amp; 29 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Primary and Secondary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Primary and Secondary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>18 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>25 &amp; 26 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>29 &amp; 30 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>23 &amp; 24 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>29 &amp; 30 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>29 &amp; 30 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>13 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10 &amp; 11 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>29 &amp; 30 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>22 &amp; 23 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Primary and Secondary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>24 &amp; 25 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16 &amp; 17 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>15 &amp; 16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>17 &amp; 18 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Primary and Secondary</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>29 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>22 &amp; 23 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>25 &amp; 26 November 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that there was a greater number of primary schools included as case studies relative to secondary schools (as nominated by jurisdictions). It is, however, noted that it was the observation of the researchers that the discussions undertaken in primary and secondary schools yielded largely consistent themes.
A mix of informal and semi-structured interviews were conducted at each case study school. Interviews varied in length depending on the participant and the time available with researchers maintaining a flexible approach to ensure minimal disruption at the school. Researchers were also available at breaks and other informal occasions to speak with staff and other interested parties.

A summary of the interviews carried out by our researchers follows, however, the research techniques varied between schools as the researchers were guided by the recommendations of the Principals in the most appropriate techniques for each individual school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Research technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal / School Leaders</td>
<td>An individual in-depth interview was held with the Principal and any other school leaders deemed appropriate. On average this took around 1 hour. In many cases, a follow-up interview was conducted with the Principal on conclusion of the case study to debrief on the common themes that emerged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and support staff</td>
<td>Individual interviews and/or small group sessions were conducted with as many teachers who were willing to participate. These were conducted at times that were considered appropriate / least disruptive. For example, some were held at morning teas / lunch times / before school / after school / during free lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions / mini groups with parents</td>
<td>Discussions were held with parents whose children attended each school. The discussions were relatively informal and moderated by a TNSSR consultant. These lasted for 30-60 minutes, with anywhere between 2 and 10 parents participating per group. Some parent interviews were conducted individually, depending on the guidance of the school. In most states, parents were provided with a $60 incentive as compensation for their time and travel to-from the school, however there were some states (New South Wales and South Australia) where this was not deemed appropriate and instead this money was allocated to hiring a relief teacher to ease the burden on the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local stakeholders</td>
<td>In-depth interviews were held with local stakeholders – from the school and community. These lasted for approximately 30-60 minutes (depending on the individual’s availability). Most were conducted in-person during the time the researcher was present in the school, however, some were conducted via telephone at a later date if the participant was unavailable at the time of the case study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions/ mini groups with the P&amp;C/ school council</td>
<td>Discussions with representatives of each school’s P&amp;C or school council also formed a part of each case study where possible. The discussions were relatively informal and lasted for 30-60 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each case study was summarised upon conclusion and the key findings written up by the researcher who conducted the interviews. A reporting framework was developed and agreed with the Department of Education (WA) to ensure a consistent format and allow for comparisons between case studies.

The case study summaries represent the researcher’s view of the school’s model in terms of its design, its processes and its impact. The case study summaries were provided to each participating school’s Principal for reflection prior to publishing and were, in principle, endorsed by each.

Each of the case studies is individually summarised in the **Case Study Report**. The discussion guides according to each target group can be found in this report.
4.3 **Acknowledgement of methodology limitations**

In any research, there are methodological limitations that must be acknowledged in order to provide context to the reliability and replicability of the research and its findings. The consistency of findings throughout all stages of this project’s methodology suggests that the limitations noted below have not critically impeded this research. The noted methodological limitations to this research include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The limitation</th>
<th>The potential impact of this limitation</th>
<th>The measures of control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Schools can be difficult to access for research** | All jurisdictions noted the extent to which schools are over-researched and the potential impact this has on achieving high response rates. In turn, this has the potential to impact representativeness and reliability of quantitative results, as well as participation in the qualitative case studies. | To address this concern, the following was undertaken:  
  - In recruiting schools for participation in the case studies, a best-practice method for approaching schools to ensure participation was employed. Protocols for ensuring a positive participation experience were agreed and developed.  
  - In recruiting Principals for participation in the mapping survey, Principals were provided considerable detail about the project up-front to ensure their understanding of its importance / value, and comprehensiveness from the outset.  
  - Where possible, Principals were made aware of the research via their jurisdictions prior to receiving the survey invitation; and, all necessary approvals processes were followed by sector and jurisdiction to ensure its validity among potential respondents. |
| **Using a convenience sampling method** | The case study schools were nominated by each jurisdiction, and were not determined via a structured sampling approach. The basis for nomination was that the jurisdictions were aware of the school’s delivery of extended services. | To control this, the mapping survey was emailed to all schools rather than using a convenience sampling approach. The quantitative results from this survey are reported alongside the case study findings where appropriate to provide additional context and verification. |
| **Exclusion of one state in the quantitative survey** | Compliance with Governmental procedures in one state meant that it was excluded from the Principal survey component of the methodology. This limits the national representativeness of the mapping tool. | It is noted that three qualitative case studies were conducted in this jurisdiction and their schools were therefore not excluded from the entire research process. The researchers were careful to observe any differences by jurisdiction in all analysis and reporting and it is noted that overall, there was a high level of consistency observed among jurisdictions. |

---

This table is continued overleaf.
The limitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The potential impact of this limitation</th>
<th>The measures of control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The desired design of each case study was defined from the outset and agreed by the Department in terms of discussion protocols and audiences for inclusion.

The actual design of each case study, however, necessarily relied on the needs of the individual schools and its resulting structure, and therefore did vary between some schools. Each case study was necessarily limited by the scope facilitated by the school.

To control for this variable from the outset:
- Schools were provided up-front communication as to the desired structure of the case studies and the relevance of each design component.
- A template ‘running sheet’ was provided to schools throughout the ‘set-up’ stage to provide clear guidelines and assist in their understanding of their input in the case study design.
- The researchers initiated consistent follow-up communication with the schools throughout the case-study organisation process to ensure all components were understood in terms of their importance and contribution to the research, and to ensure that any issues or concerns were raised, and appropriate solutions developed, in advance.

The individual design of each case study

Several case studies were limited by the challenges of discussing the topic itself. This arose because of the lack of clarity within the school of its’ model, and this was particularly true when talking with newer staff members.

In addition, the informal and often ad-hoc nature in which these models currently exist within many schools meant that articulating all services / activities / programs and interventions in an organised fashion became difficult. This meant that the researcher was often sorting ‘pieces of a jigsaw puzzle’ in order to sufficiently describe the model.

Following the lead researcher’s conduct of the first two case studies, all researchers involved in the project were briefed on this fact such that any potential complications it may present could be accounted for while at the school conducting the case study and reporting would be sufficiently comprehensive.

The emergence of extended service schooling

Engaging Aboriginal audiences in research in a way that is appropriate and meaningful was an important consideration to this research as their inclusion in the project was critical. Different approaches are, however, required to engage Aboriginal audiences as traditional research methods are often culturally inappropriate.

Aboriginal participation was sought throughout the case study stages, but was not a specific focus of the quantitative parent survey although, not excluded. It was acknowledged up-front that quantitative surveys (regardless of the data collection method) are culturally inappropriate for Aboriginal audiences, and result in data that is not considered representative. Therefore, the findings relating to Aboriginal audiences necessarily rely on the case study research.

Engaging Aboriginal participation

So, if you’re interested in learning more about the research, you can check out the source, which is labeled as “social research.”
5. Mapping extended service schooling in Australia

5.1 The need for extended service schooling in Australia

The Stage 1 literature review indicated that the most common starting point for the inception of extended service schooling approaches emerges from the understanding that many of today’s young people have complex needs which need to be addressed such that their schooling can be effective. The findings of this research are consistent with this, and suggest that Australian young people face a vast array of issues which impact on their education and, therefore, schools face complex challenges which impact on their operations. This research confirms the basis of need for extended service schooling approaches in Australia.

The following is a sample of the range of “issues and problems” which were uncovered throughout this research. They were indicative of the frequently described identification of need which was often the catalyst for inception of an extended service schooling approach by the case study schools. This list is not exhaustive, but rather, is designed to provide context and confirm the need for extended service schooling in Australia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The range of “issues / problems”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family / parent related</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child related</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School and staff related</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community related</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 The existence of extended service schooling in Australia

For the purpose of this research, extended services were defined to Principals as “… any service or activity, accessible through the school that works in partnership with the community providing coordinated services aimed at enhancing outcomes for young children, people and their families. Note that this definition excludes your Department’s specialist services provided for children with learning difficulties or disabilities (i.e. programs /funding received directly by your department for children with learning difficulties / disabilities) as there is a considerable body of knowledge surrounding the efficacy of programs such as these already in existence.”

As shown in Chart 1, this research suggests that, at the time of this research, around half (53%) of schools in Australia are already delivering extended services in some form. The prevalence of extended service schools is largely consistent by jurisdiction, sector and location with no statistically significant differences recorded (those with base-sizes of less than n=30 are highlighted with red text).

Chart 1: The existence of extended services in Australian schools
Source: Principal Survey – All responding schools (n=421)
Survey question: Does your school (either independently, or via partnerships) provide extended services (as per the previous definition) to either your school’s community, or the wider community? (Q1)

Extended service schooling across the globe is characterised by customised approaches. Thus, there is typically wide variation between schools in terms of the objectives of their approach; the services they deliver; and the modalities of delivery. The remainder of this report seeks to document the differences and similarities of approaches observed within the Australian context.
5.3 The objectives of extended service schooling in Australia

The Stage 1 literature review observed that internationally, children are most often the central focus of the objectives of extended service schooling. The common objectives relate to educational attainment and behaviour management, as well as dealing with welfare and health issues. In many cases, this focus on children also means including parent interventions within the model. Community-level interventions are also present internationally, but are more frequently included as secondary objectives.

Consistent with this, central to the objectives of extended service schooling in Australia are student educational outcomes and reducing the barriers to learning (Chart 2). However, there is also evidence of objectives relating to school culture more broadly, parents, the community, the system and school staff. It was clear from the case studies that many of these goals are interrelated and should not be considered mutually exclusive.

Chart 2: The common objectives of extended services

Source: Principal Survey

Survey question: Overall, what objectives underpin the service(s) delivered in your school? Please select as many from the list that apply. (Q13)
The case study research supports the data in Chart 2, and enabled exploration of the specificities of these objectives. These are summarised in Chart 3 below, and described more fully on the pages which follow. Broadly, they cluster into objectives that relate to:

- **Children** – who are at the centre of extended service schooling in Australia.
- **Parents and care-givers**
- **Community**
- **Teachers and schools**
- **System**

**Chart 3: The objectives of extended service schooling in Australia (summary)**
Source: Case study research

It is important to note that the case study schools consistently expressed these objectives as being **long-term** and this sentiment was strongly echoed by stakeholders, as well as supported by the literature. Thus, the ongoing sustainability of extended service schooling is critical to its ultimate success. The monitoring systems in place by which to evaluate their efficacy should take this into account when designing and assessing key performance indicators.
5.3.1 Child focused objectives

As stated in Section 5.3, the central objectives of extended service schooling in Australia relate to children. In the Principal’s survey, three quarters (75%) indicated that the primary focus of their extended services was to improve children’s development and academic attainment by supporting them through learning, health and social issues.

Throughout the case studies, the three most frequently mentioned objectives related to student outcomes / education - reducing the barriers to learning, fostering student ambitions and expectations, and improving student learning outcomes. These are described more fully below.

Reducing the barriers to learning was reported by the majority of case study schools in one form or another, and three quarters (77%) of those in the Principals Survey indicated it was an objective underpinning their school's model. Within the case studies, some of the students were reportedly trying to deal with many serious social and family issues such as domestic violence, sexual abuse, impacts of alcohol and other drug use by family members, dysfunctional families, overcrowded houses, etc and may have mental health issues, learning difficulties, etc that further impact not only on their capacity, but also on their willingness to engage in education. Thus, being able to identify and address these needs was seen as a fundamental prerequisite to reducing the barriers to learning and enabling full participation. [5, 15 and 22]

Many students in the case study schools were from low socio-economic, low education, low employment suburbs, with a higher than average level of welfare dependency. One of the stated objectives of teachers in these schools was to attempt to ‘raise the bar’ in terms of student aspirations and prospects by fostering their ambitions and expectations. [11, 12 and 21] Some schools were simply seeking to increase child(ren)’s exposure to different experiences and provide them with a greater range of opportunities and inspirations. [11, 13 and 24] Other schools, especially those in small Aboriginal communities, sought to retain promising students and enable them to undertake further training in education provision and/or to be employed at the school. [4, 5]

Improving student learning outcomes was considered a major objective for the education system in its entirety (as evidenced by the central role that NAPLAN results play, and the use of outcome based KPIs) and was frequently described by case study schools as an objective of extended service schooling. Improving the educational outcomes of children was considered a prerequisite to building capacity and inclusion; to stemming the degree of disenfranchisement among “at risk” subgroups; as well as an important means of overcoming economic disadvantage. [11, 15 and 16]
While these were the three most strongly articulated objectives relating to children, there were several other objectives relating to children that were discussed throughout the case studies and these relate to;

- **Increasing the engagement of all children** – The importance of engaging all children in schools and education was widely acknowledged by schools participating in this research as one of their primary objectives. This objective was expressed equally by school Administrators, teachers, support staff, partners and parents. Supporting this, three quarters (72%, Principal survey) stated that a target audience of their extended service schooling is ‘all students, regardless of risk or engagement level’.

- **Levelling the playing field among “at risk” students** – In addition to the desire to increase the engagement of all children, seeking to level the playing field specifically among “at risk” students was considered an important complementary objective expressed in many case study schools. This was a particular priority for schools with high proportions of ‘at-risk’ children or children with high welfare needs. [1, 5 and 8] Overall, three in five (61%) schools providing extended services (Principal Survey) stated that ‘at risk students’ were one of their target audiences.

  One challenge discussed by parents in relation to this, was the need to balance the specific focus on “at risk” students with the broader focus on ‘all children’. Some parents reported that children who do well, or who perform the desirable behaviours without coaxing are not sufficiently acknowledged or rewarded because the school’s focus is on “at-risk” cohorts. Some parents felt that that average students could potentially miss out on the opportunities presented to targeted “at risk” students if the appropriate balance was not achieved. [2, 3, 10 and 15]

- **Helping all children reach their potential** – Related to the objectives linked to engaging all children within schools and education and levelling the playing field for “at risk” children, many schools stated that an objective of their extended service schooling was to provide all students with the same level of access to opportunity and therefore, to help them achieve their full potential. [10, 19 and 21]

- **Increasing attendance rates** – Low-attendance was a major issue for most of the schools in the case studies: it was noted by many interviewees that if a child is only present for two days of each week, then they are only covering two-fifths of the curriculum, which impacts heavily on the student’s ability to meet literacy and numeracy standards. [2, 4 and 7] Thus, increasing attendance rates was frequently mentioned as a core objective of extended service schooling.

- **Promoting a positive sense of culture and identity** – This was of particular concern for case study schools with high proportions of Aboriginal students, such as small remote Aboriginal communities. [5, 11 and 12] Two in five (38%) Principals (Principal Survey) indicated that Aboriginal students and families were a target of the services delivered by their school. In remote schools, this was frequently described as a core objective.
5.3.2 Parent / care-giver and family focused objectives

The three consistently mentioned objectives of extended service schooling that related to parents and care-givers were: Increasing engagement in the school / education; building parental capacity with their children; and developing positive relationships with schools. These are described more fully below.

The desire to increase parental and care-giver engagement in the school, and education system, was a frequently mentioned objective of extended service schooling in Australia. Two in three Principals (66%, Principal Survey) indicated that ‘parental / care-giver engagement’ was a core focus of their model. Throughout the case studies, it was consistently expressed that parental / care-giver engagement was a critical factor for success, because it has been found that when parents and care-givers were involved in, and committed to, their child’s education, attendance improved which facilitated improved educational performance. [7, 19 and 24] It is noted that an increase in parental engagement is attributed in the literature to a raising of parental aspirations – both for themselves, and for their children – and is hypothesised to assist in closing attainment gaps.

An additional parent-focused objective was lifting parental / care-giver capacity, including the improvement of parenting skills. It was thought that demonstrating to parents and care-givers the important role they play in helping children to achieve learning outcomes could both assist in adjusting their often negative perceptions of school and education, as well as equip them with the skills and confidence to be involved personally with their children’s education and the school community more broadly. Another aspect of skill development was to improve parenting skills in the area of consistent child discipline as this, it was believed, would positively impact attendance rates, and then in turn the achievement of learning outcomes. [2, 12 and 20]

The final goal for parents was related to staff, and that was fostering or developing good relationships between parents and school staff. This goal is also related to the first goal for parents – engagement – since good relationships promote willingness to engage. [4, 8 and 12] Three in five (64%) Principals (Principal Survey) indicated that ‘connecting the school to home’ was a goal underpinning their school’s approach.

"...It’s about people and services working together for the common good of families and children"  
(Principal, Case study 23)

---

* Sharples, J; Slavin, R; Chambers, B; Sharp, C, Effective classroom strategies for closing the gap in educational achievement for children and young people living in poverty, including white working-class boys (2011), Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People’s Services
5.3.3 Community focused objectives

A frequently mentioned community objective was developing a strong relationship between the school and its local community, as well as building capacity within the community. Seven in ten Principals (Principal Survey) indicated that 'connecting the school to community' (69%) and 'building community connectedness and social capital' (69%) were core objectives of their model.

It is noted that for some small communities – particularly remote Aboriginal communities - the school is not only an integral part of the community, it is the largest employer. It sometimes even takes on a surrogate community leadership role, ensuring that services are brought into the community and that people within the community are supported.

For these types of schools, it was seen as important in the long term for leadership and administration matters to become the purview of community governance boards or councils. In order to facilitate this handover, school staff report encouraging community members to take on roles in the school to give them experience in administration and other matters. [4 and 5] Having an intimate understanding of the community becomes critical in approaches that encompass community focussed objectives such that they are effective and sustainable.

In some case study schools, it was articulated that providing the local community access to essential services was an objective core to their approach. This was particularly evident in (but, not limited to) smaller communities where service access was considered difficult.

5.3.4 Staff focused objectives

Other objectives, claimed by a smaller number of case study schools, were those relating to staff such as staff retention [5, 14], improving teaching conditions [2], professional development [11] and promoting cultural understanding [4] among teachers.

This result is not to say that these are not issues or objectives for other schools. In fact, throughout the case study research it was obvious that many of the schools grappled with the issues surrounding teacher retention, however they were rarely mentioned as goals. Instead, they were discussed as inhibitors or barriers to success, as well as unplanned outcomes of the model itself. [8, 11 and 15]

Two in five (37%) Principals (Principal Survey) indicated that ‘easing pressure on teaching and support staff was an objective of their school’s approach.

"...it’s holistic, so the teachers can focus on teaching"

(Principal, Case study 2)
5.3.5 System focused objectives

The consistently mentioned system focused goals were:

- **Early intervention** - A major system objective was the delivery of *early intervention programs* and preschool pathways to encourage parents to link their children into educational systems and services from a very young age. The rationale behind this appeared to be two-fold:

  1. **To facilitate smooth transitions into the school system by young children** – this was thought to be the key to ensuring that as children get older, they already have positive experiences of schooling and patterns of behaviour that support continued attendance. [10, 20]

  2. **To expose parents to contact with the education system thereby normalising parent-school interaction and contact behaviours** – described as moving to a more proactive model of early intervention and pre-planning. [1, 7 and 11]

- **Transition through the system** - A further and related objective was to ensure *smooth transitions throughout each child’s education pathway*. [10, 16 and 20] This was less frequently cited than other objectives by Principals as an objective of their school’s model (39% Principal Survey).

- **Attaining consistent educational standards irrespective of location** – there were a number of reasons provided as to why there was such inconsistency including; inexperienced teachers, constantly changing policies, remote locations, etc. [5, 14]
6. Design: Inception and implementation

As discussed in Section 5, there is a vast array of issues that extended service schooling approaches in Australia seek to address. These needs vary considerably between schools and the local communities in which they operate. It therefore stands to reason that throughout the case studies, there were both considerable similarities and differences in the way schools designed, implemented and maintained their approach, as well as the type of services they provide.

The Stage One literature review highlighted that flexibility to design and tailor approaches at the ‘school-level’, and adapt to changing needs, was considered a strength of extended service schooling. This research confirms that this need for flexibility exists within the Australian context. The importance of maintaining school-level flexibility through design and evolution was mentioned frequently throughout the case studies.

This makes identification of a single approach to best practice of extended service schooling potentially misleading as this would suggest a ‘one size fits all’ solution. This aside, it is acknowledged that school Principals who choose to adopt a model of extended service schooling need information that provides a clear pathway to successful implementation and guidance through each stage. Thus, the remaining focus of this report is to discuss the most common approaches, rather than determine a single model of best practice.

The following chapter provides an overview of the styles of implementation in the case study schools including: the process for the identification of need; resource requirements; funding; and review and evaluation. It seeks to identify the common aspects and factors which contribute to the efficacy and sustainability of models, rather than identification of a single model (s) for recommended adoption in particular circumstances.
6.1. The school-level catalyst for adopting an extended service schooling approach

The most commonly mentioned catalyst for adopting an extended service schooling approach was the identification of a specific need (most frequently related to student outcomes, and reducing the barriers to learning – refer to Section 5.3) which then led to actions being taken to address this in a global or systemic way. [11, 19 and 24]

The driving force for this was most often the School Principal. The Principal usually has the most power to bring about the necessary changes within the school, and is therefore usually the key instigator of change. The quote below was indicative of the sentiment held by many Principals in the case studies and references the perspective that a change in approach is required in order to address the complex needs of today’s children.

“...if you keep doing what you’re doing [a non-extended service approach], you’re powerless.”
(Principal, Case study 3)

In addition to specific needs being the catalyst for adoption of extended service schooling approaches, it was also noted through the case studies and discussions with stakeholders that a change in Government or sectoral policy was often the catalyst for changes made at a school level, and the adoption of an extended service schooling approach. The literature supports this and suggests that many models begin as a part of policy, or a change in policy, which results from broader system level identification of the aforementioned needs within and across communities. Outside of Australia, one example of this is the ‘Every Child Matters’ agenda which is cited as the starting point for a range of models in schools across England. The significant impact that Government policy can have in supporting and driving extended service schooling must be acknowledged.

One example of evidence of this within the Australian context relates to those schools classified as Remote Service Delivery locations in the Northern Territory. As part of the changes adopted under the Council of Australian Government’s National Partnership Agreement to improve access to Government services for Aboriginal Australians living in remote communities, these schools have commenced a coordinated approach to their extended service schooling with business management models and a leadership structure which facilitates one individual guiding the school’s strategy. Similar examples can be cited as per the Victorian Government’s inclusion of early childhood within its former Department of Education and the South Australian Government’s adoption of its ICAN policy.

---

6.2. Common methods of implementation

Throughout the case studies, there were a number of consistently observed mechanisms by which extended service schooling has been implemented and operates in Australia. These features were not mutually exclusive and include being driven by an individual; ad-hoc implementation; formation of case management teams and/or school leadership teams; as well as those that involved implementation via collaboration and the co-location of agencies.

The most frequently reported approach to the establishment and implementation of extended service schooling was that of an individual driving the program. As noted in Section 6.1, this was most often the Principal. [12, 20 and 24] It should, however, be noted that while Principals were frequently the driver at a school level, at a service interface level, the programs and activities were frequently delivered by individual staff members (sometimes in their own time) [15, 21], and/or in partnership with other agencies and thus, not solely reliant on the Principal.

It was noted that several of the case study schools did not consider it essential for extended service schooling to be driven by the Principal. Rather, it was felt that any individual could undertake this task, provided they were (a) passionate and committed to the philosophy of extended service schooling, (b) willing to be proactive and innovative and, (c) empowered and supported by the Principal.

A more ad-hoc method of implementation was reported in a number of locations. It seemed that while some long-term programs were activated in an analytical and planned manner involving an individual driving the implementation, others were activated on a more ad-hoc basis by individuals incorporating ideas of their own accord, or by bringing ideas with them from other schools. Thus, school staff reported a number of ideas or programs that they had instituted locally on an ad-hoc basis to address a particular local need. [2, 4 and 5]

Utilisation of a case management team was usually how models that were designed to focus more specifically on “at risk” students were implemented. Case management teams usually comprised school staff, staff from external agencies, and staff from partner agencies – particularly where co-location was present (discussed further below). [1, 5 and 21] While case management teams were more ‘hands-on’ in terms of their focus on individual students, the distinction between case management and school leadership team approaches (discussed further below) is not always clear as leadership team members were also member of staff with roles and functions in delivery.

School leadership teams were a feature of many case study schools. However, it was noted that school leadership teams were more involved in the general administration and logistics of service planning and provision on school campuses, while case management teams were more ‘hands-on’ for individual students. [4, 7 and 8]

In approaches where services and programs were co-located within the school, the role of developing and implementing the approach was often shared between agencies and/or partners.
6.3. The role of consultation and communication

Consultation played a large role in the inception, implementation and maintenance of many of the case study schools’ approaches to extended service schooling. It was considered an essential component of extended service schooling.

As highlighted in the quote below, most schools discussed the consultation process as one that needed to be comprehensive – involving as many stakeholders as possible - and authentic in nature.

"...the fact that the whole school is involved and has common goals makes it easier – it needs to be a whole of school approach"  
(Coordinator, Case study 3)

Consultation was undertaken at different levels, with different contributors, and for different purposes. All of these were essential in their own ways for the healthy inception, and ultimate functioning and sustainability, of the school’s approach. The discussion which follows summarises the findings from the case studies and the Principal survey (refer to Charts 4 and 5).

Teachers

Teachers were considered essential to integrate in the consultation process by the case study schools. Most case study schools considered teachers the most important stakeholder with whom to consult. The Principals’ survey confirms that they were frequently included in the need identification and planning process (93% include - Chart 4), as well as during maintenance (94% include - Chart 5).

Throughout the case studies, it was stated that teachers and staff members were consulted for a number of reasons, including to:

- Identify a program or strategy that would work and address particular issues of concern.
- Develop the necessary policies and procedures in order to be able to administer the program or strategy.
- Foster staff engagement and build a strong and supportive team who are committed to the goals and aims of the model, and will actively and positively work to change the culture of the school. [10, 12 and 19]
Consultation with parents and care-givers was also considered of high importance by the case study schools. Again, the Principals survey confirms this – 88% of schools reported to consult parents and care-givers during the inception and maintenance stages. Consultation with the broader community reportedly occurred less frequently than consultation with parents (34% did not consult with community during inception and 34% during maintenance) however, the reasons for this consultation when it did occur were generally similar, and related to:

- Identifying and understanding local community concerns, issues and barriers that the school needs to overcome from the perspectives of families and communities.
- Formulating ways to appropriately address those concerns, issues and barriers.
- Fostering shared ownership of the intervention program / approach, the school and the education of children within the school community and its surrounding community.
- Developing shared goals between the school and broader communities.
- Building relationships with local community members, regardless of whether they are parents or not.

The majority of schools reviewed existing school information and statistics (88% during inception, 85% during maintenance – Principals survey) but community information and statistics were reviewed less frequently (62% during inception, 66% during maintenance – Principals survey). Importantly, however, the case study schools which did review community information and statistics considered this a valuable component of their inception because:

- It enabled a sound basis for understanding their community. In some cases, this had highlighted an area of concern for a particular school / community when compared to other schools / communities with similar characteristics. [22 and 23]
- It provided ‘hard numbers’ for integration to business cases, discussions with potential partners and discussions within the school community (for example, the school board, teachers, key parents etc).

The majority of schools will consult with the school’s governing body during the inception process (82% - Principals survey) and continue this throughout maintenance of their approach (74% - Principals survey). In some schools, this consultation was conducted to gain the support of the governing body as an advocate, however this was not always the case. In schools where the governing body was considered to have less influence, the consultation process was considerably more process driven.

"...in the past, they [School Council] had rubber stamped everything, but I needed them to be on board" (Principal, Case study 3)
Two thirds (64% - Principals survey) consult with other schools as a part of their original identification of need and planning process. Those case study schools which had consulted with other schools from the outset considered this a highly valuable component of their inception process because it had enabled them to learn from the experiences and knowledge of other schools, and equally avoid the inefficiencies associated with ‘reinventing the wheel’.

It was noted, however, that fewer schools continue this consultation once implementation has occurred and 47% of schools (Principals survey) stated they did not continue this consultation during the maintenance stage. The most commonly articulated rationale for this throughout the case studies was that the initial learning curve was considered the steepest, and therefore the most likely point at which advice and examples would be sought. Once this was achieved, it was felt that the school would have tailored their approach such that comparison between schools was considered less relevant.

The majority of schools undertake some consultation with key local stakeholders (84% - Principals survey) and local organisations (82% - Principals survey). In many cases, these were described as potential partners (such as the local youth organisation, local Government etc) and thus, consultation with these parties occurred in order to forge mutually beneficial arrangements and establish good working relationships. Additionally, this consultation was sometimes conducted to identify existing locally available programs and interventions that were accessible, as well as potential local advocates (such as local Members of Parliament).

The presence of consultation with students increases once the school’s extended service approach has been implemented. Seventy one per cent of schools consult with students during inception, but 88% of schools consult with students during maintenance (Principals survey). That is, students are more frequently used as a ‘yard-stick’ for monitoring, rather than in establishing, the approach. While Principals and school staff appreciated that children would have their own views on their experiences, it was considered more appropriate to undertake consultation with parents to advocate on their behalf during the inception stage.

While not captured in the Principal survey, an additional point of consultation identified in the case studies was that with potential advocates for the school. Some schools considered initial forging of relationships with advocates critical to their ultimate ability to implement a range of services as conceived by the school’s community. Some of these potential advocates included local politicians, influential parents within the school, the school’s governing body, senior members of Government agencies, senior business people, and philanthropists.
Chart 4: Consultation and communication during need identification and inception
Source: Principal Survey
Survey question: Through which mechanisms was the original need for providing additional services identified? Please select a response for each. The original need for providing additional services was identified by … (Q16).

Chart 5: Consultation and communication sources during implementation and maintenance
Source: Principal Survey
Survey Question: Please select the level of use / of involvement of for each of the below in terms of implementation and maintenance of the model. (Q17)
6.3.1. The communication tool-kit

For each stakeholder group, case study participants felt there were varying methods of communication that were appropriate to utilise and tailor accordingly. Below is a summary of the suite of tools that were discussed consistently throughout the case studies. These held equal validity in collecting feedback throughout implementation and maintenance. It was noted that the communication mechanisms currently used by schools focussed on utilisation of existing methods of communication and did not require additional resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting with school staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was broadly articulated that consultation with teachers in most schools should occur via <em>existing</em> mechanisms. These were inclusive of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- existing <strong>review sessions</strong>, or one-on-one catch-ups with individual staff members;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>informal discussions</strong> with individual staff members who may be considered potential drivers or advocates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- all of <strong>staff meetings</strong>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>school planning days / sessions</strong> - At these sessions, some schools suggested undertaking ‘visioning exercises’ to commence discussions, in which staff were asked to articulate what they felt the school would look like in ‘five years time’ if their current approach was continued. Following this, they were asked what they <em>would like</em> the school to look like in ‘five years time’. This enabled the introduction of the concept of extended service schooling in terms of how it could, in fact, assist in ‘bridging the gap’. In some schools, ‘teams’ of teachers were convened following these planning days / sessions who were charged with focussing on more specific issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>professional development</strong> on supporting topics, for example, the importance of 0-3 programs in assisting with brain development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>teacher training</strong> on the ethos and mission of the extended service schooling approach; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- discussions on extended service schooling within <strong>new teacher induction processes</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Consulting with parents / care-givers and community** |
| Consultation with parents, care-givers and community was also considered appropriate via existing mechanisms, including: |
| - informally targeting individual parents who may be considered potential drivers or advocates of the program through, for example, meeting them at the school gate when they deliver or retrieve their children; |
| - announcements, discussions, information sharing and progress reports during **school assemblies**; |
| - announcements, discussions, information sharing and progress reports at any **parent governing body meetings**; |
| - integration of discussion, information sharing and progress reports to the **existing school newsletter**; |
| - participation in broader **community forums** that may be on topics of community wellbeing / building social capital etc; and |
| - **culturally appropriate** consultation with Aboriginal community members which included techniques such as ‘door-knocking’ and establishing ‘yarn sessions’ at the local park for community to attend. |
Tools

**Reviewing information and statistics**

Common information and statistical sources accessed include:
- ABS Census summaries of the suburb;
- the AEDI index; and
- school performance metrics.

**Consulting with local stakeholders and advocates**

Relevant stakeholders with whom to consult were typically identified at a grass roots level and based on contacts that were already known within the school, rather than via a stratified process of identification. These initial contacts were then utilised to identify additional potential contacts to form a network.

Communication methods were relatively informal to discuss rationale and ethos, but sometimes included provision of a hard copy ‘business case’ for the school’s extended service approach.

---

### 6.3.2. Critical success factors in communication

Case study schools discussed critical success factors of a successful communication process. In summary, the consistently mentioned success factors relate to:

1. **Be consistent and inclusive.** Ongoing and consistent consultation with school staff to secure their support and participation was considered paramount to ensuring success and sustainability.
2. **Consult widely.** The parent community and local community should be consulted to secure initial support, and to ensure the school’s approach continues to iterate and evolve according to its community’s needs.
3. **Utilise advocates.** The ability to effectively engage advocates throughout the consultation process was considered a useful because these advocates could, in turn, communicate more widely about the school and its approach.
4. **Focus on building relationships.** Many schools felt that one of the key purposes of communication was to foster and build relationships rather than just inform. This meant that two-way communication seeking input and involvement, rather than simply communicating the school’s direction, was considered integral.
5. **Start small and expand.** Several case study schools indicated that that while the importance of communication, consultation and relationship building was significant, schools should expect to ‘start small’ in this process, work with existing networks and communication tools, and evolve naturally and iteratively.
6. **Develop written materials.** In some schools, the ability to provide some stakeholder groups with a ‘Business Plan’ was considered important as this not only provided a starting point for discussion, but also delivered a ‘leave-behind’ communication resource. This was considered of particular value for potential partners, but also for local Governments and agencies. Further information and guidance on ‘Business Plans’ is provided in the Recommendations section of this report.
7. Delivery methods and foci of extended service schooling.

7.1. The modes of delivery

Evidence of a mix of approaches is consistent with international case studies of extended service schooling (McKinsey, 2010) and exists because each school must adapt and determine its mode of delivery (or, level of physical integration on school grounds) according to that which is most appropriate to its school’s position, and it’s local community.

This research provides evidence that in Australia there are a range of delivery modes utilised (school-based, school-linked, and community-based) – and, most often, schools used a combination of each of these models rather than adopting one in particular. This research supports that there is no universal approach to the mode of delivery of services that should be recommended to schools. Rather, schools should adopt the approach that is best suited to their needs and available resources.

7.1.1. School based modality of delivery

As one of the main purposes of extended service schooling is to engage the community, schools generally sought to make linkage with, and access to, services as easy and as straightforward as possible for all concerned. It is this notion that leads to the desire for co-location of services and programs, or a ‘school-based’ mode of delivery. In Australia, many services (particularly those relating to children) are reported to be delivered via a school-based approach as shown in Chart 6.

Chart 6: The prevalence of school-based and school-linked models
Source: Principal Survey
Survey question: Where are these services primarily accessed / where are they physically located? (Q5)
7.1.2. Referral and coordination modalities

Despite the strong presence of school-based modalities evidenced via the quantitative survey, throughout the case studies it was noted that not all schools manage their extended service provision in this manner. Rather, they operate via ‘proactive referral’ to services that already exist within their community. In several cases, while the service was not co-located or based on the school property, the school considered the service to be school-based because the referral system (the initial access point) was accessed through the school.

Several schools use this approach in some form – either as the dominant delivery method, or in conjunction with co-located services. For some schools, this was a result of the philosophy that schools should focus on education rather than co-locating other services. For others, it was related to the challenges associated with co-location and management of services (discussed further in Section 7.1.3) as well as their availability within their community (particularly for remote schooling situations).

The quantitative research with Principals suggests that:

- In one third (36%) of schools, the role of the school is primarily about delivery of services rather than coordination.
- In one third (35%) of schools, the role of the school varies between delivery and coordination of services – that is, there is a mix of both approaches.
- In one third (29%) of schools, the role of the school is primarily about coordination of services rather than delivery.

7.1.3. The challenges of school-based delivery

Among those case study schools that had elements of school-based delivery, there were challenges that were articulated by both school and partner staff. It was noted that these were more frequently described as ‘challenges to consider and address’, rather than ‘barriers that derail’ an extended service schooling approach. Many schools considered the process of uncovering these challenges a ‘learning curve’ that was facilitated at a school level, rather than via a systemic or sectoral approach where set guidelines were followed. That is, a perceived absence of such guidelines was noted by the case study schools.

The most consistently mentioned challenges related to the physical logistics of inter-agency agreements; working within school ‘open-hours’; managing community access to the school grounds; and having appropriate physical space. These are discussed more fully overleaf.

“...we are about educating people to access [services], rather than being everything...”
(Principal, Case study 1)
Schools, and agencies that were co-located on the school, mentioned that the physicality of school based delivery could present challenges and these needed to be considered and designed into the model from the outset. These were primarily in relation to:

- **Building design** – In some schools, new buildings had been designed to accommodate the delivery of early childhood (0-4 years) services and programs. In jurisdictions where early childhood did not fall under their sector body, it was felt that this had presented challenges in that existing guidelines - such as those for building design - did not take into account essential design factors (one example given for this was the provision of ramps for pram access to buildings). This then posed challenges to have these elements included from the outset, or in some cases, included once the building works had been completed.

- **Network access** – Some agencies (outside the education system) delivering services within case study schools highlighted that accessing their own agency’s network remotely via the school had presented logistical challenges. Therefore, allowing sufficient time to establish the necessary connections and protocols for network access was considered important to the logistics of school-based delivery.

Some agency staff who were located within case study schools noted that the ‘opening hours’ of schools were different to that of their traditional working hours. This meant they needed to remain on school grounds after the school’s closing time, and also be on school grounds during school holiday periods. This presented potential safety concerns, but also potential personal impacts of feeling isolated in the workplace during these times. It is noted that internationally, extended service schooling approaches more frequently include school holiday services and programs. This is a potential difference between some Australian modalities of extended service schooling delivery and that observed internationally.

In case studies where services were provided to the wider community through the school, some noted challenges associated with people external to the school entering the grounds. One example of this [2] was where a community pantry was co-located on school grounds. This was described as a situation where it was felt protocols needed to be developed in terms of appropriate restriction of access to particular areas of the grounds.

Some schools noted the ability to access and dedicate appropriate facilities and spaces to deliver school-based programs a challenge. Equally, however, some case study schools discussed that an absence of existing spaces to dedicate should not be considered a barrier to establishment. These schools improvised with existing spaces until the model was sufficiently established such that a case for additional space could be articulated.
7.2. Prevalence and priority of services

The case study research and ‘principal survey’ indicate that Australian approaches to extended service schooling have a strong focus on:

1) Addressing students’ welfare needs and education engagement, and
2) Early childhood/early intervention and primary school readiness.

There are many serious issues which impact on children and prevent them from being able to participate fully in the education that is offered to them (refer Section 5.1) and therefore addressing student welfare was a common focal point. Many programs and strategies in existing models were aimed at increasing students’ connection to the school, with particular attention to those students who were most ‘at-risk’. It was noted that these needs vary greatly between different communities and schools and, as such, the nature of the programs and activities implemented by the schools also vary significantly. [8, 11 and 16]

Early childhood education and / or early intervention (0-4’s) was also commonly articulated as an area of focus for extended service schooling. In several case study schools, a focus on early childhood education and interventions was seen as a very important means of improving outcomes in the longer term because it connects both parents and children to the education system. [17, 20 and 23]

"……there is a need to look after kids before you can even get to education ..."
(Principal, Case study 1)

In addition, services and programs targeting parents were also considered important foci by case study schools:

- **Increasing parental engagement** – which was described as essential to the model being able to function adequately and deliver the outcomes that are desired. [7, 17 and 19]
- **Linking parents to services** – Somewhat connected to all of the above factors, the need to link parents to social services was important, as unless the social issues they face are addressed, they will be unable to adequately assist and support their children (students). [8, 23 and 24]
Chart 7 records the proportion of all participating schools providing extended services across the key areas (Column A) and the average of number of services schools provide in each (Column B). In addition, the relative priority allocated to each area is shown (Column C) based on a constant sum question whereby participants were asked to allocate ‘100 percentage points’ between the services they provide to indicate priority.

**Chart 7: Prevalence and priority of foci**

**Source:**
- **Column A/B:** Principal Survey - All completes (n=421)
- **Column C:** Principal Survey - Those with the service

**Survey Questions:**
- **Column A/B:** From the list below, please type in the number of services / activities you provide or access in each of the broad areas. (Q2a)
- **Column C:** We would now like to understand your school’s priorities for the 2010 calendar year in terms of the extended services you offer. For this question, imagine that you have “100 percentage points” to allocate between the areas you selected previously (shown below). For those that you consider to have been a ‘higher’ priority, allocate a higher percentage and, for those which you consider to have been a ‘lower’ priority, allocate a lower percentage. You will need to allocate all 100 percent between the areas below – it will automatically calculate the sub-total for you as you allocate your percentage points. Note that you can allocate ‘0’ percent, but all cells must have a number entered. (Q2b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>A % providing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extended services</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended service in...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student welfare and engagement</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/sports programs</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student health</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school readiness</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student retention and transition</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy/maths</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to further educ./employment</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition/homework clubs</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/family learning</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood learning and development</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family health</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3. The targets of the models

Not surprisingly, given the discussion above regarding the current foci, the most predominant target group for programs and services in Australia was **children**, namely those already at school (students) but also **infants and pre-school aged children**. This was articulated consistently in the case studies and supported by the Principal’s survey (refer Chart 8). Fundamentally,

- All schools (100%) have students (in one of the categories below) as a target audience of their extended service schooling (not shown on the chart below).
- Two in five (38.9%) schools target both at risk and all students (not shown on the chart below).
- One in five (22.2%) target only at risk students.

"......you can't do the literacy and numeracy without this other stuff..."
(Principal, Case study 8)

---

**Chart 8: Target audience of extended services**

**Source:** Principal Survey

**Survey question:** Who is the target of the services delivered by your school? (Q11)
7.4. The menu of program elements

The most common programs aimed at students included those relating to:

- **Behavioural and learning difficulties** via specialist programs and services.
- **Physical and mental health programs** accessed via specialist programs and service providers.
- **Learning facilitation programs** such as Homework, Reading and Spelling clubs to assist in lifting educational outcomes, and to aid in the development of good study habits.
- **Food provision** such as ‘Breakfast Clubs’ and ‘Hungry Lunches’ to meet some of the basic needs of students and to facilitate better educational outcomes.
- **Attendance initiatives** such as community ‘round-ups’ and ‘pick-ups’, provision of school clothes, incentive schemes to overcome some of the main barriers to attendance.
- **Personal and social / emotional development programs** such as Student Mentor programs, and Modelling clubs to provide positive role models and build self confidence.
- **After school sport and leisure activities** such as Active After School, interest and hobby group classes, After School Care programs to improve health, provide social interaction, and reduce the time available to undertake negative behaviours within the community.

Programs aimed at **infants and pre-school aged children** were mainly early intervention programs such as playgroups and pre-schools, to build familiarity with schools and educational activities and had a dual focus for assisting parental development.

Other targeted programs included:

- **Parents** - skills enhancement programs to encourage adult literacy and improved parenting skills.
- **Community** - programs to build community capacity, initiatives to engage the community in the school, acquisition of funding to build community infrastructure.
- **Staff** - professional development and specialist teacher training.

A menu of specific elements that were uncovered throughout the case studies is presented in Chart 9 overleaf. For each menu item, a reference to example case studies is provided such that additional detail can be referenced if necessary. It should be noted that this is not included as an exhaustive list of programs and services that are currently accessible through Australian schools. Rather, it is presented as an overview / a ‘menu’ of the broad range of services and programs cited by the case study schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 9: Menu of services / activities by target audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Figures in brackets refer to the Case studies where the program/service may be found and is explained in more detail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents and Families</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Aboriginal Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case management [3, 21]</td>
<td>Life Skills [21, 24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Development Program [10, 20]</td>
<td>Interest Groups/ sessions [10, 17, 24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups/ sessions [10, 17, 24]</td>
<td>School Bus [12]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccination clinic [3]</td>
<td>Speech Therapist [1, 12, 15, 16, 19, 22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Therapist [1, 12, 15, 16, 19, 22]</td>
<td>Occupational/ Physio Therapist [3, 12, 22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational/ Physio Therapist [3, 12, 22]</td>
<td>Hearing / Sight Specialists [12]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain [2, 15, 16, 19]</td>
<td>Pastoral care [2, 15, 22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling [2, 10, 13, 18, 20, 21, 22]</td>
<td>Behavioural Programs [8, 19, 21]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/ Spelling Club [2, 15]</td>
<td>Homework Club [8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Club [8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23]</td>
<td>Specialised Learning Programs [9, 12, 24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised Learning Programs [9, 12, 24]</td>
<td>Support Teachers [16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships [7, 12]</td>
<td>Mentor/ Buddy Program [8, 12, 17, 18, 20, 24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor/ Buddy Program [8, 12, 17, 18, 20, 24]</td>
<td>Transition Program [10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Program [2, 12]</td>
<td>Intervention/ support programs [21]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention/ support programs [21]</td>
<td>Vocational/ TAFE [21]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Mums Group [21]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline to Dept Housing Centrelink [12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Intervention Program [12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-English Speaking Support [15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loan Scheme [17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Networking [20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment/ support [20, 22]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Officer [7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Models of resourcing

The Stage one literature review highlighted the importance of resourcing to the inception and sustainability of extended service schooling. This research confirms the importance of resourcing to successful and sustainable extended service schooling in Australia. Three common elements of resourcing were identified: accessing funding; developing partnerships; and, allocation of full time equivalent (FTE) roles. In most cases, it was the combination of each of these elements that was considered best practice by the case study schools rather than the selection of, or reliance on, one in particular.

8.1. Funding to support models of extended service schooling

Schools accessed funding from a variety of sources, and most were not reliant on a single source. In general, the case study schools accessed as many funding sources available to them of which they had knowledge. There were no case study schools that were reliant upon one source. Most case study schools indicated they had ‘started small’ with their funding and had later pursued additional sources as the programs, activities and services they provided grew in scope and participation. In some jurisdictions (eg. Northern Territory and South Australia), the system allowed for individuals in overarching leadership roles to have funding as a core part of their role however, in others this role was fulfilled on a more ad-hoc basis at a school level. In these cases, it was integrated into an individual’s ‘assumed role’ as the leader or driver of the approach.

Most schools did not consider themselves to have ongoing funding at this point in time. Only one in five (22%) schools in the Principal's Survey stated a belief that they had ongoing funding. The Stage 1 literature review highlighted that extended service schooling can be hampered by short-term funding. This sentiment was echoed throughout the case study research and is discussed more fully overleaf.

The most frequently mentioned sources of funding were: National Partnerships funding; the Commonwealth Capital Grants Program; other government funding sources; private funding sources; and, funding from partner agencies.

National Partnerships (NP) Funding

It was widely acknowledged across the schools in the case studies that NP funding was of utmost importance to inception, and a key contributor to sustainability, of extended service provision. While schools consistently described a situation of its cessation as one that would likely signal the demise of many specific initiatives, it was rarely indicated that their entire approach would collapse.

This is because schools access funding from a variety of sources and while dependent on NP funding to support specific roles / functions within their model, this funding alone is insufficient to sustain the way many of the models are operating. Thus, out of necessity, many schools attempt to source funding and establish partnerships as widely as possible.

“...most of this would not be happening without the National Partnerships funding which has built on our capacity to take on these partnerships...”
(Principal, Case study 17)
This aside, case study schools place high value on NP funding and consistently mention that its presence has been one of the more significant facilitators of sustainability – having reinvigorated the school’s model of extended service provision in many cases. A key strength, and differentiator (relative to other potential funding sources), of the NP funding model was its flexibility to be utilised as considered most appropriate by the individual school, rather than prescriptive and/or restrictive guidelines on its use. [1, 7 and 16]

Commonwealth Capital Grants Program

The Stage 1 literature review highlighted the need for resourcing in the form of adequate site-related costs. In some cases, the Commonwealth Capital Grants Program had been used for this. Many case study schools discussed the Commonwealth Capital Grants program as key to the sustainability and success of their extended service provision and a core element of their funding. This is because it has allowed them the physical space to allocate partner agencies to conduct activities which, in turn, gave their model a sense of permanency and structure.

Other Governmental funding sources

Schools seek funding from those sources where they hold existing knowledge. Local or State Government programs such as Innovative Community Action Networks (ICAN) and the Flexible Learning Options (FLO) funding system in South Australia were examples where a flexible funding model was cited as key to the provision of extended service schooling. [20 and 21]

A number of schools reported applying for funding for specific programs such as After School Care, while others had attained special-purpose grants for one-off things like school gardens, facilities, equipment, etc. [4, 10 and 20] It was also reported in a small number of locations that local initiatives such as Neighbourhood Renewal programs augmented the funding provided under the National Partnership by providing new facilities. [17 and 18]

Private funding sources

A number of Principals reported they had successfully sought and attained funding from private sources for particular programs, ranging from simple sponsorship of events to large pools of funding for building works. [5 and 14]

Partner funding

Many partners contribute funding to extended service schooling approaches in Australia, and are therefore a critical component to many of the extended service models. Further detail on partnerships is provided in Section 8.2 of this report.

"External funding is fundamental ...and joint ownership is critical.”
(Principal, Case study 2)
The challenges of funding

The perceived challenges associated with funding were two of the most frequently agreed barriers to adopting an extended service schooling approach among schools that were not currently classified as extended service schools in the ‘Principals survey’. Nearly all of these schools agreed that the cost associated with implementation and maintenance (time and financial) was a barrier to their school’s provision of extended services (98%), and a similar proportion (96%) agreed that that the ability to source ongoing funding was a barrier.

Case study schools consistently articulated that funding was a challenge and described three challenges associated with this: competition for funding sources; the inconsistency of funding received; and the complexities associated with locating and applying for funding.

Some case study schools cited a perception that it was the same pool of welfare money being distributed across different agencies and schools. In turn, it was felt that this did not foster a collaborative approach as agencies and schools attempted to protect, and grow, their own pot of money. That is, this approach was described as one which fostered competition between schools, rather than collaboration.

Inconsistent funding was considered a critical risk factor by many Principals, and only one in five (22%, ‘Principal Survey’) indicated they had consistent funding. In the case studies, Principals articulated that the results of this inconsistency were not only an ad-hoc approach to managing the school’s services and activities, but a sense that the program lacked coordination and longevity. In turn, this was thought to potentially impact internal support for, and external participation in, the activities, services and programs.

The process of locating potential sources, and applying for funding, were considered complex and sometimes arduous by several Principals. It was noted that with practice and familiarity, the process did become easier. However, this is nonetheless suggestive that schools which are required to independently apply for funding may benefit from process assistance from within their respective sectors.

"...by the time you’ve done the application and everything else they want, you may as well have donated the money yourself..."

(Principal, Case study 9)

At the time of authoring this report, it is noted that there is an Australian Government review of funding (commencing in 2010 and concluding in 2011)*. Given that National Partnership funding is a finite resource, it may be appropriate for the Australian Government’s review to include consideration of the need for increased funding to support extended service schooling initiatives to address the needs outlined in this report – including integrated services that engage parents in the early education of students, and those which co-locate needed services to disadvantaged young children.

8.2. Partnerships to support models of extended service schooling

For the purposes of this research, partnerships were defined as “any collaboration with a Government or non-Government agency in order to deliver a service or activity. It does not necessarily need to be funded or have formalised objectives. It excludes partnering with a neighbouring school for sports carnivals, swimming carnivals etc.”

This research suggests that partnerships are a core component in the way extended service schooling is resourced in Australia. Nearly all schools (94% - ‘Principals survey’) delivering extended service schooling indicate they do so with partnerships as part of their approach. Such partnerships were considered essential by the case study schools because: they provided access to new and specialist skill sets, and therefore broadened the depth of potential services that could be delivered; they helped ease the burden of sole reliance on school staff to deliver the services; and, in turn, created an approach that was more sustainable.

Chart 10 illustrates that currently in Australia:

- Partnerships with community based organisations are the most prevalent.
- However, one third of schools providing extended services (32.4%) have partnerships with business and industry.
- Schools cite partnerships with local Government authorities more frequently than those with Commonwealth and state Government departments. However, this is potentially a function that funding arrangements with Commonwealth and state Governments (if referring to the respective education sector departments) are not considered ‘partnerships’ per se, as they exist within the same sector. It does, nonetheless, indicate the prevalence of partnerships with local Government authorities.

Chart 10: Types of partnerships
Source: Principal Survey

Survey question: And, does your school provide these services either fully, or in part via engaging in partnerships? (Q6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships with...</th>
<th>% of all respondents (n=421)</th>
<th>% of those with partnerships (n=207)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No partnerships and /or no extended services</td>
<td>51^</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No partnerships (among those with services)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based organisation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for profit agency</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and industry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further education providers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring schools</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other schools (not neighbouring)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community language schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ This assumes those respondents who do not offer extended services do not have partnerships.
Charts 11 through 18 provide examples of the types of agencies schools have established partnerships with in each jurisdiction. This is an indicative, rather than exhaustive, list of partner agencies and is populated from the case study discussions. These menus are not differentiated by sector because it was felt that the partnerships were similar between sectors.

### Chart 11: Menu of partnerships – Australian Capital Territory

**Source:** Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Capital Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and industry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further education providers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 12: Menu of partnerships – New South Wales

**Source:** Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and industry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education providers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 13: Menu of partnerships – Northern Territory

**Source:** Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and industry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further education providers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Chart 14: Menu of partnerships – Queensland**  
Source: Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Government</strong></td>
<td>Federal Government, Indigenous Schools Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
<td>State Government, Catholic Education Office, “Get Set for Work” Program,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
<td>Moooroobool Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</strong></td>
<td>St Vincent de Paul, Centrecare, Smith family, Anglicare,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and industry</strong></td>
<td>Westfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further education providers</strong></td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 15: Menu of partnerships – South Australia**  
Source: Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Government</strong></td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
<td>State Government, Catholic Education Office, Health Department, Department of Health and Ageing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education and Children’s Services, Child and Family Health Services, Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families and Communities, DECS, Child and Youth Health, Office for Recreation and Sport, [Area]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Services, Multicultural Youth Services, Aboriginal Early Years Liaison Officer, Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
<td>Local council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</strong></td>
<td>Foodbank, St Vincent de Paul, Save the Children, Anglicare, Uniting Wesley Care, Centrecare,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local Church, Western Futures, Boystown, Australian Refugee Association, Community Bridging Service,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart Foundation, Playgroup SA, Catholic Church Office, Wyatt Trust, Adopt a School, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sporting groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and industry</strong></td>
<td>Coles/Myer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further education providers</strong></td>
<td>Universities, TAFE, local Adult Learning College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 16: Menu of partnerships – Tasmania**  
Source: Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Government</strong></td>
<td>Federal Government, Centrelink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
<td>State Government, Department of Education, District Health Service, Department of Health and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
<td>Local Government councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</strong></td>
<td>St Giles, Ronald McDonald House, Northern Children’s Network, Youth Centre, Neighbourhood House,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smith Family, Anglicare, FUTI POP, local Churches, State Library of Tasmania, Aboriginal Elders,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotary Club, Police Citizens Youth Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and industry</strong></td>
<td>Local businesses, local bakery, Bedfords, Central Mission, EFM, WEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education providers</strong></td>
<td>Universities, Polytechnic College, neighbouring schools, local Early Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 17: Menu of partnerships – Victoria

Source: Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>Community Health, Autistic Service, FaHCSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>State Government, Department of Education, Victorian Ministry of Education, Child First, Department of Human Services, DEECD, Community Neighbourhood Renewal, School Focused Youth Service, VICSEG, Dental Hospital, CAMHS, North West Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Local council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</td>
<td>World Vision, Uniting Care, Anglicare, Salvation Army, St Vincent de Paul, Stewart House, Frankston Library, Ardoch Youth Foundation, Melbourne City Mission, Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden Foundation, Fusion Australia, Wellbeing Wendouree Inc., St Johns Ambulance, Noah’s Ark Inc., Variety Club, [Area] Community House and Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and industry</td>
<td>Safeway, Uncle Toby’s, Melbourne Symphony Orchestra, Foodworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further education providers</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 18: Menu of partnerships – Western Australia

Source: Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>DEEWR, ARACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Aboriginal Health Services, Department for Child Protection, CAMHS, Vision Education Services, [Area] Health Services, Health Department, Disability Services Commission, Strong Families, LotteryWest, Prisons, Department of Education, WA Police, Regional or Local Education Offices, Commissioner for Children and Young People, Child and Adolescent Community Health, Vision Education Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Local Government councils, Champion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based organisation and not for profit organisations</td>
<td>EarlyEd Support, Crossways, Wirrapinda Club, Community Development Foundation, Read Write Now, Fogarty Foundation, Foodbank, Minawarra House, Yorganoop, Therapy Focus, Parkerville, Save the Children, Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, Community Link and Network WA Inc, Protective Behaviours WA, Cancer Council WA, DSF Literacy Services, employment agencies, The Edge of Nowhere Foundation, The Jimmy Little Foundation, Bluearth Foundation, Communicare, Starick Services, Red Cross, Playgroup WA, Community Link and Network WA Inc (CLAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and industry</td>
<td>Local GPs, local orchards, Commonwealth Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further education providers</td>
<td>Universities, TAFEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management of Partnerships

Charts 19 and 20 highlight two key learnings in relation to the initiation and management of partnerships:

- **In many cases, schools initiate partnerships themselves** and thus, it is important that the challenges associated with forming partnerships at a school level are acknowledged. These are discussed further overleaf.

- **In addition, clearly defined objectives are not always created** during the formation process and therefore, the challenges associated with evaluation, accountability and review also need to be acknowledged.
Chart 19: Initiation of partnerships
Source: Principal Survey
Survey question: Were these partnerships initiated by the school or by the agency / partner? (Q8)

Chart 20: Defining of objectives within partnerships
Source: Principal Survey
Survey question: Are there defined objectives of these partnerships? (Q9)
The challenges of partnerships

The case study schools consistently expressed several challenges of partnerships. These included acquiring the staff skill sets to pursue and establish partnerships at a school level; finding the human resources required to form partnerships; the evolving nature of partnerships and; the low levels of awareness in some schools for departmental support structures in pursuing partnerships. These are discussed more fully below.

Several schools articulated that they / their staff were not trained in the pursuit and establishment of partnerships. This lack of training, it was felt, meant that the partnership process involved considerable time up-front to learn the new skills required, as well as ongoing time on their behalf. This was a challenge for schools as it meant they were necessarily juggling the day-to-day demands of their job descriptions with these additional tasks.

The model adopted in the Northern Territory (for schools in Remote Service Delivery Locations) was noted as an approach that alleviates this problem for schools.

Linked to the discussion above was the perception that schools actively pursuing partnerships often needed to do so at the expense of what has historically been considered their ‘core business’. In many case studies, the Principal, or a senior staff member, assumed this role in addition to their FTE responsibilities.

Partnerships were considered an element of most models which required continual evolution and exploration of new opportunities to address changing needs and new objectives of the model. That is, there is not a ‘set and forget’ mentality in relation to partnerships.

Because of this, they were not considered something for which an up-front investment in time would suffice. Rather, the demand on time resources to maintain and evolve them was considered ongoing.

Several case study schools articulated the perception of little Governmental support to assist schools in the identification and formation of new partnership areas. This meant that they were initiating, driving and managing the process themselves.

"Partnerships take a long time...they start small and build over time...they need to develop naturally."

(Principal, Case study 2)
8.3. School-level full time equivalent (FTE) resourcing to support extended service schooling

Many case study schools utilised funding and grants to finance FTE, or part FTE positions, within their schools that were linked to their extended service schooling approach. These were considered essential by many of the case study schools, and a key to sustainability of their approach.

Coordinator roles

One of the most common roles funding was used to finance was that of a coordinator role. Having an individual in a coordinator role was seen to have a number of benefits:

- **Sharing responsibility** between a coordinator and Principal for maintaining the model was felt to increase the likelihood of sustainability.
- Having a dedicated contact to connect with partner agencies, seek new partnerships, and submit grant applications to obtain funding was felt to increase efficiencies.
- A dedicated role was felt to provide a greater sense of permanency to school staff and to parents of the school’s long term commitment extended service schooling.
- The coordinator role was also described as one that facilitated building deeper relationships with parents and children, helping to bridge the gap between the home and school. In turn, this assisted in the identification of “at-risk” children and their families (oftentimes as part of a case management-style approach) through linking them with the services they need.

In most cases, this was not a 1.0 FTE position and ranged from 0.2 FTE to 0.4 FTE. This role was frequently funded via the National Partnerships allocations.

Specialist roles

A large number of the case study schools utilised relationships with partner organisations to gain access to various human resources, including healthcare professionals (e.g. nurses, occupational therapists), mental health professionals (e.g. psychologists), and student and family support (e.g. social workers, Chaplains). In some cases, it was used to increase a specific part-time role in the school that was already externally funded. One example would be the ability to have a Chaplain on site 0.8 FTE instead of 0.4 FTE.
9. Monitoring and evolving the approaches

Extended service schooling in Australia is evolving. Most case study schools articulated that their approach to extended service schooling had consistently and incrementally evolved since inception. Flexibility to evolve and respond to changing needs is considered central to success and sustainability. [7, 15 and 22] In most cases, the evolution of approaches occurred to:

- address changing student needs and/or address negative student behaviours;
- improve the school’s effectiveness;
- address changing community / family / parent needs; and/or
- address changing staff needs (e.g. addressing some students’ negative behaviours so that teachers feel better supported and better able to achieve education outcomes for all students).

Evolution was also linked to several factors other than dealing with issues:

- **serendipity** – for example, because a staff member had heard of, or brought with them, a new idea, strategy, program that might achieve something positive in that locality.
- **new partnership formation** - bringing different expertise, ideas or innovations to the model.
- **access to additional funding** - allowing refinement, extension or modifications.
- **new school Principal** - bringing different expertise.
- **school reclassification** - via changes to Government policies and programs resulting in a change in funding arrangements, or additional funding to address particular issues. [4, 5 and 15]

Importantly, throughout the case studies, it was evident that the ability to evolve was important, but only possible if the model had a clear leader and driver with sufficient time to employ proactive thinking to ensure the model continued to address the needs of the school and its community.

“......I have a page of thought bubbles that I continually add things to and cross things off ... it helps you to keep conceptualising and promoting to others.”  (Principal, Case study 2)
9.1. The role of review and evaluation

Ongoing review and evaluation was considered an important mechanism for ensuring the evolution of schools’ approaches which, as described previously, was considered critical to success and sustainability. In addition to this, the presence of review and evaluation was linked to the ability to form new partnerships and source additional funding via the creation of a ‘body of evidence’ surrounding the efficacy and outcomes of the approach.

Three quarters (76%) of participating schools in the ‘Principal Survey’ recorded that they have evaluated and reviewed the model. Chart 21 records the individual stakeholder groups that schools involve in the review and evaluation process. The most frequently cited source during the review and evaluation process were teachers (78% core component), followed by school information and statistics (60%) as well as parents (55%) and students (49%).

Chart 21: Involvement in review and evaluation process

Source: Principal Survey

Survey questions:

- *Is there review and / or evaluation of the model in your school? (Q18)*
- *Please select the level of involvement of each of the below in terms of review and evaluation of the model (Q19)*
The forms of review most consistently identified were relatively informal in nature. There were several reasons for this which most commonly related to the absence of clearly defined review processes; the differences in evaluation criteria between agencies; the challenges of measuring the impacts and outcomes of extended service schooling; and, the difficulties in achieving meaningful evaluations of longer-term objectives. Further discussion is provided below:

- **Absence of clearly defined review processes** – It was articulated that there were no set mechanisms for evaluation that could be easily utilised by schools and that evaluation mechanisms (if implemented) would need to be individually developed at a school-level. Given that schools typically do not have staff members with research and evaluation backgrounds, this presents a challenge for schools in terms of developing evaluation criteria that will capture their approaches efficacy and impact.

- **Differing evaluation criteria** – Those models incorporating FTE allocations from other Government agencies noted that the requirements for evaluation were different depending on the agency of employment. For example, a clinician funded at a school by the Department of Health would be required to submit health-level indicators, whereas the education sector would be more likely to require education-specific evidence. This was noted to complicate evaluation design by the case study schools.

- **Difficulty in measurement** – It was consistently mentioned that the use of NAPLAN as a primary indicator of success overlooked the long-term objectives of extended service schooling approaches and their expansive set of objectives are broader than NAPLAN testing. However, it was equally acknowledged that the very nature of the model’s objectives results in an intrinsic difficulty to accurately determine efficacy. Thus, getting the ‘measures right’ from the outset is critical, and schools acknowledge they do not possess the necessary skill sets to achieve this.

- **The long-term nature of the model’s objectives** – Many of the models would be considered long-term in relation to both their thinking and objectives. However, it was expressed that many funding opportunities require evidence-based data at more regular intervals linked to funding periods.

The literature on extended service schooling – both in Australia and internationally – supports this finding and describes the process of measuring their outcomes as a complex undertaking because of the multiplicity of issues they are trying to address and the breadth of objectives.

The challenges of evaluation aside, its importance was consistently articulated given its potential to influence future funding via existing partnerships, and the ability of evidence and data to attract additional funding. The development of guideline materials for schools to access in terms of evaluation methods and options should be considered a priority to ensure that schools are able to maximise the efficacy and sustainability of their extended service schooling approach.

"[NAPLAN] is to the exclusion of the need to look after the needs of the whole child...it's not wrong, it's just an over emphasis." (Principal, Case study 1)
9.2. Perceptions of success

The fact that there are no clearly defined review processes or evaluation criteria for extended service schooling; that different Government agencies involved will have different evaluation criteria; that the objectives of many extended service schooling approaches are both varied and complex and extend considerably wider than educational outcomes; as well as that extended service schooling is considered by many schools to focus on longer-term outcomes, impacts on a school’s ability to review and evaluate – and therefore, their ability to determine the ‘success’ of their model.

As shown in Chart 22, despite these challenges, the majority of schools participating in the ‘Principal’s survey’ (a range of 73% to 98% depending on the objective) subjectively considered themselves ‘successful’ (rating of 5-7/7) in achieving their objectives. This was echoed by the case study schools, which were able to cite many observed examples of the differences they were making to the lives of children, parents, school staff and their local communities. This is a heartening result in that schools providing extended services generally feel they are making achievements across their objectives, despite the challenges associated with evaluation.

Three objectives recorded a significantly higher proportion of perceived success than average and these were:

- **Student outcomes – education**: 30% rating ‘7/7’ – we have been highly successful on this objective
- **Transition to employment, further education or training**: 25% ‘7/7’
- **School culture and social capital**: 23% ‘7/7’

Chart 22: Perceived success in achieving objectives
Source: Principal Survey
Base: The schools who have that underlying objective
Survey question: For each of these objectives, to what extent – in your personal opinion – have they been achieved? (Q14)
9.3. Evidence of success

As discussed previously, most of the case study schools adopted a relatively informal approach to evaluation and clarified that their current approaches to measuring success were ad-hoc. These schools did not necessarily consider their approaches to evaluation ‘good’ or ‘best practice’.

It was noted that some schools commission more formal evaluations via external agencies for specific components of their extended service schooling and had developed ‘Evaluation Advisory Teams’ comprising school staff [3]. However, even the challenges of these were noted in that they lacked ‘baseline’ data as well as the difficulties experienced in identifying, and collecting data, on the ‘right’ measures to provide evidence of success. This, as described by schools, was experienced because they do not hold the necessary evaluation skills to design such research studies. Just as importantly, they do not have the necessary resources to up-skill, nor to implement, them.

In some cases [1], evidence can be provided for up-lifts in attendance or declines in behavioural management issues. However, even these sets of data were quickly caveated by discussions that there were almost certainly other external influences on these data sets. Therefore, isolating the impact of their approach was considered difficult, regardless of the evaluation technique employed.

In most cases, the indicators for success were considered ‘small’ and ‘individual’ rather than observations of sweeping changes in data – it was more about celebrating the ‘small wins’. Importantly, however, this was potentially because many of the approaches were in their relative infancy (most, less than 5 years) and the long-term nature of their objectives did not, therefore, enable significant and sustained data changes. Evidence of these ‘small wins’ was typically uncovered via discussions between teachers, case study teams, school leadership teams as well as from parental feedback. It occurred more consistently via an unstructured and qualitative manner, rather than via a more structured evaluation.

There were many of these examples given throughout the case studies which illustrated ‘success’. Some were linked to changes observed among specific children, however, there were also ‘school-level’ successes that were discussed by school staff and parents alike which related to children, parents, school staff and the broader community. Some examples are provided below.

“The breadth of perceived outcomes from these models are discussed in considerably more detail in Chapter 10. There are undoubtedly many enablers and barriers to the successes that are reported, and these are discussed in Chapter 12.”
As noted in the Methodology section of this report, a Path Model was developed from this data. The values in the model below indicate the explained variance of the particular components of the Path Model. For example, 54% of the variation in student outcomes is explained by the following path model. As referenced previously, with regards to the model’s overall significance, this model yields a chi-squared statistic of 10.56 with 5 degrees of freedom and a probability of 0.06 from the sample size of 221. This test statistic indicates that the fit of the data to the hypothesised model is adequate.

The model identifies the following direct effects which help to explain the relationships of success:

- The more successful a school considers itself in reducing the barriers to student learning, and building school culture and social capital, the greater its perception of success in student outcomes. That is, the more successful a school is in reducing learning barriers and building school culture the more likely they are to experience success in improving educational outcomes.

- The perceived success of building school culture and social capital is positively influenced by the perceived success of reducing barriers to student learning. That is, the more successful a school is in building school culture and social capital, the more likely they are to experience success in reducing learning barriers.

- The perceived success of services that reduce barriers to student learning, and of services that focus on building school culture and school capital are positively influenced by success of services that focus on building communities. That is, the more successful a school is in delivering services that build communities and school culture, the more likely they are to experience success in reducing student learning barriers.

- The perceived success of services that reduce barriers to student learning is positively influenced by the success of connecting the school to home, and perceived success of health and wellbeing services. That is, the more successful a school is in connecting the school to home and delivering health and wellbeing services, the more likely they are to experience success in reducing learning barriers.

In addition to these direct (unmediated) effects, this model has several indirect (mediated) effects. For example, the perceived success of delivering health and wellbeing services has an indirect effect on the perceived success of student outcomes via the perceived success of reducing the barriers to student learning and the perceived success of school culture and social capital.
10. Effectiveness / outcomes

The literature points to several outcomes that can be achieved via extended service schooling approaches. Most often, it suggests that the child is ‘at the centre’ of the benefits received and that the outcomes among children extend considerably beyond improvements in educational attainment. However, outcomes are reportedly also observed among parents and care-givers, schools and local communities.

As previously discussed in Section 9.1, measuring the effectiveness of extended service schooling has – to date - not been undertaken in any systematic way by the case study schools included in this research. The most obvious means of comparison for schools is tracking performance on curriculum-based measures such as numeracy and literacy achievements (NAPLAN) and measures such as enrolments, attendance rates and service encounters. Those data are readily available. What is not available is any evaluation of whether the strategies and interventions are effective at achieving what they were intended to achieve. Given the severity of the issues that some students need to overcome in order to attend to their schooling, it is obvious that it is likely to be a long time before real changes can be observed, or more pertinently, measured in a tangible, empirical way.

It is important to note here that the types of interventions that have been devised to address the issues identified throughout this research, are not curriculum based. It is therefore not easy to measure outcomes in a tangible, meaningful way. It should be reiterated that the outcomes reported in this section of the report are all anecdotal and observational. This aside, the most frequently reported outcomes by the case study schools are behavioural improvement of children; social skills development and school transition; educational improvements of children; parental access to services and capacity building; integration of the school to its local community; an improvement in the school’s reputation; and, improvement in teacher morale. There are discussed in more depth below.

1. Behavioural improvement of children

An improvement in student behaviour since implementation of their extended service schooling approach was widely reported by the case study schools (by 15 of the 24 case study schools). Some schools claimed this was evidenced in the classroom by students being less disruptive and resulted in teachers being able to better attend to their role as educators. Other schools reported an overall reduction in suspension rates and greater stability inside and outside the classroom. [5, 8 and 14]

In some case studies, it was noted that there was also an improvement in the behaviour of children while in their home and in their community, as well as while in school. [1, 9 and 19]

"The kids' behaviour is better because they have been given the tools they needed to express themselves and be heard."

(Parent, Case study 16)
More than half of the case study schools (15 of the 24 schools) cited an observation that their extended service schooling approach had resulted in improved social development of children.

In some schools, this was because their approach had provided existing students additional opportunities to socialise with each other, learn positive social skills and build social networks. In other schools, the sociability aspect related more to providing new students with avenues to quickly integrate into the school’s culture. In schools that provided early learning (0-3s) programs, this element was also referenced in relation to school readiness. [2, 14 and 24]

An improvement in educational attainment was also reported widely by the case study schools (14 of the 24 case study schools). For some schools this was not just performance in literacy and numeracy tests but also improved numbers of students completing higher levels at school when they would (or, so hypothesised) otherwise have left school. [1, 7 and 16]

Educational improvements in the case study schools also, however, included discussions around observing more positive attitudes towards learning which drove increased engagement in the classroom, a ‘levelling of the playing field’ among the student cohort and reaching “at risk” children, as well as learning life skills as a result of broader experiences and exposure to a variety of programs, services and adult role models.

Ten of the 24 case study schools discussed that their extended service schooling approach had increased the number of parents that were linked to services. In most cases (but, not all), it was also discussed that parents were also following up on their appointments. [2, 14 and 24] This increase in service access was related to an increase in the ease of physical access and, just as importantly, a reduction in the attitudinal barriers to access.

This access to, and participation in, the programs and services was felt to contribute significantly to capacity building among parents and this was also considered an important outcome of extended service schooling by the case study schools. [3, 16 and 18]

In addition to capacity building, increased access to services by parents was also felt to ultimately increase their engagement in their child’s school. [7, 11 and 19] The benefit of parental engagement in schools is a topic that is discussed frequently in education literature. Within this literature, there is general consensus that parental engagement yields considerable emotional, social and behavioural benefits to children which, in turn, influences their likelihood of educational attainment. It is noted that parental engagement is a part of the Australian Government’s National Partnerships.
Around half of the case study schools (11 of the 24 schools) discussed that their extended service schooling approach had assisted in integrating the school into the community by providing greater access, and by bringing resources ‘back’ into the community.

There were often strong views that the school had contributed to its local community, with some case study schools reporting they felt their extended service schooling approach had reinvigorated the local neighbourhood, community spirit and provided the community with a source of pride. [3, 11 and 23]

An improvement in the school’s reputation was noted in around half of the case study schools (10 of the 24 schools). An increase in the school’s reputation was felt to have a number of outcomes – from increasing its attraction as an employer, to increasing pride in the school and decreasing vandalism of the school, as well as increasing enrolments in the school. [7, 9 and 15]

It was reported that low staff morale is traditionally associated with stress and feelings of powerlessness. Engaging teachers in the development of extended service schooling and providing them with appropriate support and professional development opportunities as required was described as something that enabled ‘teachers to teach’, and encouraged innovation and job satisfaction.

A successful extended service schooling approach was described as one that enabled teachers to see improvements, thereby increasing morale and enhancing the positive school culture. [16, 18 and 23]
The discussion that follows provides a more detailed analysis of the perceived outcomes of extended service schooling. Chart 23 below summarises the breadth of outcomes that were observed by the case study schools as a result of adopting an extended service schooling approach. As with the broad objectives of extended service schooling, the child is most frequently at the centre of the outcomes. However, there are also benefits to parents, local communities, schools and their staff, as well as economic benefits.

Chart 23: Perceived outcomes of extended service schooling
Source: Case study research
10.1. **Student outcomes**

Not surprisingly the most often reported outcomes were student related, and these are discussed below.

- **Improved classroom behaviour**
  
  An improvement in classroom behaviour was noted by Principals, school staff and also parents. This was often supported by anecdotal discussion around reduction in suspension rates and detentions however schools often did not have these statistics readily on hand. [1, 5 and 11]

- **Improved behaviour at home**
  
  Some parents also noted that their child’s behaviour had improved at home as a result of their child’s (and their own) access to additional services and programs via the school. [1, 14 and 19]

- **Improved behaviour in the community**
  
  In the case study schools where there was an improvement in behaviour at home noted, there was also discussion of the perception that children’s behaviour had improved while in the community. [1, 9 and 19]

- **Social skill development**

  The social development of children was previously described as one of the more prominent perceived outcomes of extended service schooling. This was in relation to their ability to transition in to the school (for those in primary schools who had participated in early years programs); the ability to build social networks for new and existing students; and broad development of positive social skills.

  In a smaller number of case study schools, it was also stated that the extended service schooling approach had contributed to the development of improved relationships between students and teachers. [1, 9 and 19]

- **Improved educational outcomes**

  An improvement in educational outcomes was previously noted as one of the more frequently mentioned outcomes of extended service schooling by the case study schools. This related to improvements in reading, literacy and numeracy as well as school completion rates.

  On the whole, however, it was noted that significant changes in educational outcomes – such as those that may be observed through NAPLAN – would be a long-term objective for these schools, rather than something that could be reasonably observed in the space of one to two school years. Rather, schools were primarily discussing changes in individual students and their ability to attain higher levels than previously recorded.
In addition to improved educational outcomes, several schools noted an improvement in attitudes towards learning, motivation to learn and classroom engagement – even if this had not yet resulted in evidence of an increase in academic outcomes.

This was often linked to better preparedness to learn because the issues that individual children were dealing with – which were considered to impede the learning process – were being addressed via the services and programs they were accessing. [14, 17 and 21]

It was noted that the perceived improvements in learning and student engagement were not linked solely to academic attainment. In some schools, it was discussed that children had, through their access to a broad range of experiences, services and programs, learnt broader life skills which were considered equally important to equip children as positive members of their community and reach their full potential. [10, 19 and 22]

In several case study schools, particularly those which focussed on developing early intervention strategies for those considered ‘at-risk’, it was mentioned that there had been more equitable level of learning between students, and improved outcomes for at risk children as a result of their approach.

In many case study schools, an increase in confidence and self esteem of their children that was considered attributable to their extended service schooling approach. This was noted by school staff and parents. In some cases, this was attributed to a specific program, service or individual that was accessed by the child. In other cases, this was expressed as occurring because children were provided with opportunities to be involved in a range of different non-academic programs and express ‘other’ sides of themselves. [10, 11 and 18]

Several schools noted an increase in attendance. While they felt this was attributable – in part – to their extended service schooling approach, it was equally couched with the reality that there were often many other external variables which influence attendance levels. Some parents noted an increased desire among their children to attend school more regularly. [5, 8 and 12]

“...if you pick it up early enough, quite often you can fix it very easily. But if you leave it too long it becomes quite an issue for the child.”
(Partner, Case study 23)

“They pick up on kids who need help and focus on their individual weaknesses. They pushed my child to the right level which has increased his confidence a great deal.”
(Parent, Case study 11)

“The kids actually want to come to school more.”
(Parent, Case study 1)
There were several emotional benefits for children that were noted throughout the case studies. These related to the sense that children felt ‘nurtured’ and ‘cared for’ because the school had tailored specific programs and activities to them, and catered to meeting their health and wellbeing needs as well as educational needs.

In addition, several case study schools noted that an extended service schooling approach had the ability to deliver a sense of security to children. This was identified by school staff and parents alike. The reasons for this were two-fold. The first being that it created a sense of security upon school commencement (if the child and parent had participated in early years programs attached to a primary school) because the child had developed familiarity with the school. The second, that the school was considered a place that ‘solved’ problems. [1, 19 and 23]

Several case study schools also described that their approach had provided children with greater capacity to deal with personal issues and build resilience – both inside, and outside the school. [4, 8 and 9]

As a result of many of the factors referenced above, case study schools considered their students’ future prospects enhanced, because some of the inequities were being redressed to enable them to attain better outcomes. Improved educational attainment meant they were more capable and more able to proceed into a formal employment-linked educational pathway thereby entering the workforce and breaking the cycle of welfare dependence. [1, 19 and 22]

Stakeholders agreed with this claimed outcome citing a reduction in youth offending and, longer term, involvement in crime as an adult. The early intervention that extended service schooling provides was seen as the key to effecting sustained change in this regard. However, at this relatively early stage of extended service schooling in Australia, this would be considered an aspirational – rather than observed – outcome at this stage.

"My oldest daughter received help from the school counsellor and the teachers and now she’s at high school and doing really well in her exams..."  
(Parent, Case study 20)
The ‘Parent Survey’ (Chart 24) broadly supports these results. This shows that **parents who accessed extended services through their child’s school recorded significantly higher levels of perceived engagement of their children.** For example, among parents who currently access extended services through their child’s school, 72% agreed (rating of 5 to 7 out of 7) that their child was very engaged in the school. This compares to 53% agreement among parents who were not currently accessing extended services through their child’s school and 59% agreement among parents who were classified as lapsed users of extended services.

The same chart records a number of additional dimensions related to perceptions of their child’s experience at school which indicate significant differences between parents who currently access extended services from their child’s school and to those who do not. It is noted, however, that this is parental perceptions of their child’s engagement, rather than a self-assessment or external assessment of children’s engagement. This is nonetheless, suggestive of a positive relationship between access to extended services in schools and parental perceptions of their child’s engagement in school.

**Chart 24: Parental perceptions of student engagement**

Source: Parent Survey, By sub-group

Survey question: *For each of the statements below, please select which one you personally feel applies to your child’s school the most …you can select any number between 1 and 7 and will need to respond to each statement. (Q3a)*

Note: If the participant had more than one child aged 4-17 years, they were instructed to answer these questions from the perspective of the child who had the next birthday.

Note: The ‘agree’ scale points (5, 6 & 7 out of 7) are shown only;

---

[The chart shows a comparison between parents who currently access extended services, those who never accessed, and those who lapsed. The chart highlights significant differences in parental perceptions regarding various aspects of their child’s school experience.]

---

6 Standard t-test at 95% confidence interval

7 Lapsed user defined as had previously accessed services through their school, but no longer do
10.2. Parent and care-giver outcomes

Throughout the case studies, there were also many benefits discussed that related to parents and care-givers. These include: capacity building; increased access to services; reduced social isolation; increased engagement with the school; fostering reciprocity; and, improved relationships with teachers. These are discussed in full below.

There was regular discussion that an outcome of extended service schooling was parental capacity building. [8, 16 and 23] Discussions in this context covered three aspects:

1. Development of parenting skills – through their participation in specific parenting programs that were a part of the extended service approach. This was also achieved via greater levels of parental engagement in the school facilitating adult interactions between parents, and between parents and school staff.

2. Increasing personal skill sets and education levels – through their participation in specific training and development programs for parents which were accessible through the school (for example, short computer literacy courses, or reading programs). It was also discussed that parents had developed personal skills as a result of their participation in programs designed for children. One example of this was the participation of parents in their child’s ‘reading days’ at school in which it was noted that the reading levels of these parents had improved as a result.

3. Confidence building – through their interactions with other parents and school staff and their engagement in the school. Some examples given for this were increased confidence in talking with teachers; increased confidence participating in their child’s education; inspiring confidence to pursue additional training and/or personal development outside of the school; and inspiring confidence to re-enter the workforce.

“My involvement at the school gave me confidence to go back and study for my diploma... without the school this would never have happened.”

(Parent, Case study 17)

There was frequent discussion across the stakeholder groups that extended service schooling facilitated greater access of services by parents. This was often attributed to a reduction in the physical barriers to access via central modalities of delivery, but also included discussions of reductions in the barriers of low awareness and knowledge of services (what is available, how to access, where to access, cost of access), as well as a reduction in attitudinal barriers (aversion to access). [14, 18 and 23]
Many parents felt that their school’s extended service schooling approach was one that represented a coordinated approach to service delivery, rather than fragmented. These parents also described their referral and access to, services as being one that was more personalised. [16]

Discussions around accessibility of services were also frequently linked to the speed with which services could be accessed. In some case studies, parents commented that accessing services through more traditional mechanisms would result in long waiting lists, whereas referral through the school could mitigate this. [2, 17]

Improved social inclusion for parents was an often discussed outcome of extended service schooling by school staff and parents. This was referenced to the increased level of socialisation observed between parents and their ability to develop social networks, connections and peer support. [9, 15 and 22]

Many case study schools cited greater parental engagement in the school, and their child’s education as outcomes of their extended service schooling approach.

Some schools referenced this to an observed increase in parent attendance at school assemblies and parent and teacher meetings, or increased levels of involvement in school activities. [11, 19] There were also references to increases in parental participation in children’s education in the home. [8, 15 and 24]

In several case study schools, the development of reciprocity and a sense of responsibility, rather than dependency, as an outcome of extended service schooling was noted. It was felt that this was achieved by providing parents support such that they were empowered to be more involved in their child’s education, participate in their child’s education and rationalise responsibility. [2, 3]

Several case study schools noted an observed improvement in parental communication with teachers, as well as an improvement in parent-teacher relationships. This was attributable to the greater level of parental interaction with the school – and therefore development of familiarity – as well as a sense among parents that the school, and teachers, genuinely cared for their students which had been fostered via the extended service schooling approach. [16, 17]
The ‘Parent Survey’ helps to validate some of these claims. As shown in Chart 25 below, ease of service accessibility within the community is consistently significantly higher among those who are currently accessing extended services through their child’s school (shown in the first column of data below) relative to those who are not currently accessing (the second and third columns of data). This suggests a positive relationship between access to extended services in schools and parental perceived ease of access within their community.

**Chart 25: Accessibility of services**

Source: Parent Survey, By sub-group

Survey question: Next, for each of the services listed below, please indicate how easy they are to access in your community. (Q2)

Note: The ‘agree’ scale points (5, 6 and 7 out of 7) are shown only;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Currently access (n=2437)</th>
<th>Never accessed (n=93)</th>
<th>Lapsed access (n=2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family health services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare and early childhood programs (for children 0-3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls/meeting areas etc used for community activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school child-care services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student transition services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school child-care services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening classes for adults</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to further edu./ employment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult / family learning services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education support for school-age child/children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol related services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services / programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student welfare and engagement programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency food provision services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

Significantly lower vs. those currently accessing at 90% confidence interval

Significantly lower vs. those currently accessing at 90% confidence interval

Significantly lower vs. those currently accessing at 90% confidence interval

Significantly higher vs. those currently accessing at 95% confidence interval

Significantly higher vs. those currently accessing at 95% confidence interval
The ‘Parent Survey’ also suggests that parents who are accessing services through their school, record higher ratings of engagement with the school itself. This suggests a positive relationship between access to extended services in schools and parental engagement in school. Chart 26 below shows that parents who currently access services through their child’s school record significantly higher levels of agreement that *the teachers in their school are easily accessible by parents and they have good relationships with teachers; that they are provided opportunities to participate, are consulted, have opportunities to interact and are communicated with; and that they feel involved in the school.*

**Chart 26: Parental engagement**

Source: Parent Survey, By sub-group

Survey question: *For each of the statements below, please select which one you personally feel applies to your child’s school the most … you can select any number between 1 and 7 and will need to respond to each statement.* (Q3a)

Note: If the participant had more than one child aged 4-17 years, they were instructed to answer these questions from the perspective of the child who had the next birthday.

Note: The ‘agree’ scale points are shown only

![Chart showing parental engagement](chart.png)
10.3. Community outcomes

Throughout this research, outcomes for community were regularly discussed by case study schools and stakeholders. The outcomes included: increased community access to services; community redevelopment; and, an increase in community safety. These are discussed in more depth below.

Many schools noted that the provision of services via the school had increased accessibility of services by the whole community via greater integration of the school and community.

In some communities, it was felt that the extended service schooling approach had even brought resources back to the community. [3, 18, and 23] This was particularly evident in regional and remote locations.

Extended service schooling was considered contributory to the development of a sense of community by the case study schools and stakeholders alike. In many cases, the school’s approach was viewed as having enhanced community cohesion and pride; that the partnerships had provided parents with training and educational opportunities that were not previously present; and had given families and community members opportunities to be more involved in broader community life. [4, 17 and 21]

In several case studies, there were strong views that the school contributed to the community in a sustainable way by increasing local capacity through provision of skills, training and improved confidence among parents.

Parents in some case study schools, indicated they felt a safer in the community since the school had adopted its approach. This was only possible to understand in case study schools where the model was relatively new and was a result of perceptions that children were less likely to be ‘on the street’, as well as a perceived reduction in the levels of graffiti and vandalism in their community. [9 and 21]
The ‘Parent Survey’ helps to validate some of these claims. As shown in Chart 27, the proportion of parents who consider their school a central part of the community was significantly higher among those currently accessing one or more extended services through their child’s school (65% agree the school is a central part of the community) relative to those who have never used extended services (43%) and those who are lapsed users (50%).

In fact, those who currently access extended services through their schools are significantly more likely to agree with all of the community perception statements than those who have never accessed extended services and those who are lapsed users. This suggests a positive relationship between perceptions of school centrality to community, and community connectedness.

**Chart 27: Perceptions of the community / community connectedness**

*Source: Parent Survey - By sub-group*

Survey question: Below are a series of statements. For each one, there are two different ways of describing it…for example, “I do not feel connected to my local community” (on the left) compared to “I feel a strong sense of connection to my local community” (on the right). For each statement, please move the slider to which one personally applies to you the most …you can select any number between 1 and 7 and will need to respond to each statement.  (Q1)

Note: The ‘agree’ scale points are (5, 6 & 7 out of 7) shown only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Currently access (n=2437)</th>
<th>Never accessed (n=93)</th>
<th>Lapsed access (n=2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I generally feel safe in my community</td>
<td>17 33 18 68%</td>
<td>15 26 17 56%</td>
<td>16 33 15 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy living in this community</td>
<td>15 31 20 66%</td>
<td>10 22 16 48%</td>
<td>16 29 17 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school my children attends is a central part of the community</td>
<td>18 30 17 65%</td>
<td>14 15 14 43%</td>
<td>17 22 11 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lots of different activities you can participate in /do within the community</td>
<td>8 22 19 49%</td>
<td>6 20 6 32%</td>
<td>18 17 7 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people in my community can be trusted</td>
<td>20 26 7 53%</td>
<td>10 19 11 40%</td>
<td>20 21 6 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance my family and other commitments</td>
<td>17 21 8 46%</td>
<td>10 11 11 32%</td>
<td>17 18 7 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lots of people working together to achieve common goals in my local community</td>
<td>21 20 7 48%</td>
<td>8 23 8 39%</td>
<td>18 16 5 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know a lot of people in my community</td>
<td>17 17 9 43%</td>
<td>12 14 7 33%</td>
<td>16 14 7 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of connection to my local community</td>
<td>19 17 8 44%</td>
<td>17 10 3 30%</td>
<td>17 12 5 34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The bars represent the percentage of respondents who agree with each statement. The percentages are calculated based on the total number of respondents who answered the question. The chart shows the percentage of respondents who agree with each statement on a scale from 1 to 7, with 7 indicating the highest level of agreement. The chart also includes a note on the scale points used for the ‘agree’ responses, which are 5, 6, and 7 out of 7.
10.4. School outcomes

In all case studies, there was anecdotal evidence of tangible outcomes at a school level as a result of extended service schooling approach and these generally categorised into areas of: improved reputation; a reduction in school vandalism; increased enrolments; increases in the number of parent and community advocates; improved teacher interaction and retention; and, the ability to be proactive in approaches.

**Improved reputation**

Many schools felt that their school’s reputation within its community had improved as a result of their extended service schooling approach. The evidence was generally linked to the factors discussed below. [7, 9 and 10]

**Reduction in school vandalism**

A reported reduction in school break-ins and vandalism of the school after hours was indicated by many of the case study schools. This was considered attributable to the respect held for the school by the local community as a result of their integration and commitment to it. [1, 11, 12]

**Increased enrolments**

An increase in enrolments was noted by several schools since implementation of their extended service schooling approach. This was thought to be a result of their approach increasing the ‘relevance’ of the school and generating higher levels of awareness within the community. [2, 7 and 22]

**Increase in parent and community advocates**

In several case studies, an increase in the number of parent and community advocates since commencement of their extended service approach was noted.

A cited benefit was that these parents, and community members, would help drive support more widely in the school and could also result in contributions of time or workmanship from within the community promoting a two-way flow of services. [3 and 20]

**Teacher attraction and retention**

At a school level, it was often described that there had been increased levels of teacher attraction and retention of high calibre teachers as a result of the extended service schooling approach. [3, 5 and 16] In several schools, extended service schooling was also felt to have contributed to a reduction in teacher sick leave and therefore a reduction in the cost required for relief teachers. [1, 21]

**Ability to be proactive**

Greater ability to be more proactive in their school was noted by some case study school staff. This was thought to increase the ability to quickly respond to problems. It was also considered to facilitate a ‘solutions’ rather than ‘problems’ focus, and to enable schools to be strategic in their direction rather than reactive. [1, 9 and 17]
10.5. Staff outcomes

A number of staff outcomes were reported by interviewees in the case studies which related to enabling teaching; development of skills; and, an increase in school pride.

In many of the case study schools, there was discussion around the ability of extended service schooling to support teaching by enabling teachers to focus on their 'core business'. This was attributed to a reduction in classroom behavioural issues, an increase in the number of classroom volunteers, and development of a ‘level playing field’ via programs for “at risk” children.

This was raised by school leadership as well as partner agencies and often also articulated by teachers. [2, 10, 22] Teachers frequently articulated feeling more supported by the school because there were processes to manage “at risk” children which facilitated their role as educators. [7, 16]

Many teachers who participated in case study discussions saw personal benefits in the extended service schooling approach. This was because it could be considered at the centre of their own professional development through their experience and exposure in less traditional schooling methods and their development of additional skills and competencies. In addition, they were often afforded professional learning opportunities to assist in their development.

In many case study schools, teachers noted a feeling of shared involvement and reward, and a sense of achievement as a result of participating in the extended service schooling approach and observing the positive outcomes. [7, 9, and 23]
It should be noted, however, that some schools reported that teachers can struggle with the challenge of finding the time to actively participate in an extended service schooling approach. This was in particular reference to the extra-curricula activities they are sometimes required to engage in as part of their extended service schooling and highlights the importance of achieving an appropriate balance. [14 and 15]

Chart 28 below indicates that parents accessing extended services recorded significantly more positive perceptions of school staff in terms of their leadership and accessibility. This suggests a positive relationship between access to extended services in schools and parental perceptions of the school’s leaders.

Chart 28: Parental perception of school leaders
Source: Parent Survey, By sub-group
Survey question: For each of the statements below, please select which one you personally feel applies to your child’s school the most … you can select any number between 1 and 7 and will need to respond to each statement. (Q3a)
Note: If the participant had more than one child aged 4-17 years, they were instructed to answer these questions from the perspective of the child who had the next birthday.
10.6. Economic outcomes

In addition to these benefits, stakeholders also discussed several outcomes relating to economic benefit. These were, however, considered long-term benefits that were potential, rather than observed. Nonetheless, they related to extended service schooling approaches being considered cost effective interventions; and, improved career pathways; improved local economies; increased parental employment; improved business opportunities; and, school resource generation.

Extended service schools were considered by many stakeholders as a cost-efficient method of tackling social issues in the long term. It was recognised that there needed to be a significant level of financial investment at the beginning, but that this would be small compared to the costs incurred if these social issues were not addressed. For example, it was cited that the cost of a person going through the justice system was many times greater than the cost of early intervention procedures to break the cycle of crime.

Extended service schooling was felt to improve potential career opportunities for students and “prevent kids from slipping through the net when they won’t be educated or get a job” (Education Union). This not only helped to reduce social inequality in the longer term but also to break the cycle of welfare dependency.

With a better-skilled workforce it was felt that local businesses benefited and thus improved the economy in the local area.

A largely unintended outcome of extended service schooling cited by some stakeholders was the increased skills and employment of parents who volunteered at the school through extended services who subsequently gained skills and accreditation which led to paid employment. This was viewed as an especially positive outcome in small and remote communities where employment opportunities were scarce.

The involvement of local businesses with extended service schooling, e.g. providing sponsorship, work placements, mentoring etc, was considered to drive greater connections with the community and therefore improve business performance.

It is also worth noting that several stakeholders reported that some extended service schooling enabled the school to generate an income which was able to boost school funds and provide additional services and resources. For example, Out of Hours Care, catering and the hire of facilities were examples cited of revenue generating services some schools had developed which had become profit making initiatives – even if that was not the intention at the outset.

“The social cost of intergenerational poverty, unemployment and poor health is huge.”
(State Education Union, Stakeholder Report)
11. **Sustainability of approaches**

With the range of potential positive outcomes for children, parents and care-givers, community, schools and school staff, and the economy, it is essential that consideration is given to whether extended service schooling is sustainable, and develop a comprehensive understanding of the factors that will enable and impede its sustainability and success. The following chapters explore this in detail.

When asked to consider the sustainability of their school’s approach, the majority of schools (66%, ‘Principal Survey’) currently providing extended services anticipate that their extended services will expand *within the next three years* (refer Chart 29).

**Chart 29: Anticipated future movement in extended service provision**  
Source: Principal Survey, Those who offer extended services (n=221)  
Survey question: In your personal opinion, what do you think your extended service provision will look like in the next three years?

- It will expand: 66
- It will stay the same: 28
- It will contract: 6
Chart 30 below confirms that this intended expansion voiced by Australian Schools is, well placed as many of the prompted services were considered *more desirable to access via their child’s school* and a relative minority considered the services *less desirable to access through the school* by parents (‘Parents Survey’).

**Chart 30: Service desirability**
Source: All respondents (n=4568)

Survey question: Please select whether each of these services would be - ‘considerably less desirable’, ‘no difference to you either way’, or ‘considerably more desirable’ for you to be able to access them through your child’s school even if you currently do not / can not). Note that the school would not necessarily need to ‘run’ these services / activities, just provide access to them via the school / on the school property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1 (Considerably less desirable)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 (Considerably more desirable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services for your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student transition services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education support for school-age children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to further education / employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student welfare and engagement programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls / meeting areas etc which can be used by community</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school child-care services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school child-care services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services / programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol related services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare and early childhood programs (0-3s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening classes for adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult / family learning services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency food provision services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent spontaneously mentioned reasons for this greater desirability for access of services via schools are shown in Chart 31 on the following page, and relate to ease of accessibility; the familiarity of schools with children; the familiarity of schools to families; and the potential to contribute to community development. These are all in-line with the philosophy that underpins extended service schooling approaches.
Chart 31: Reasons for desirability of access via schools
Source: Parent survey

Survey question: For several of the programs / services in the previous question, you selected that it would be more desirable to access them through the school. In the space below, please type in all the reasons why you feel it would be more desirable to access them through the school.

Note: This was only asked of parents who selected ‘more desirable’ for more than four services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for desirability</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be closer to home / you go to school anyway</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easier / more convenient (general)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easier to access because the school is centralised</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easier to find out about things through the school</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is a trusted / familiar / safe place</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are familiar with your child and can help best</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for schools to deliver more than education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It can help generate community spirit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 32 below highlights that parents fundamentally believe schools should provide more than just education (77% agree). Additionally, 85% agree that schools should be supported by Government so they can provide more than just education. This indicates in principle support from parents for the philosophy that underpins extended service schooling.

Chart 32: Parental attitudes
Source: Parent survey

Survey question: Please select the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total disagree</th>
<th>Total agree</th>
<th>Varies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools should be appropriately supported by Government so that they can provide more than just education</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should be supported by their surrounding community so that they can provide more than just education</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should provide more than just education</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes an entire community to educate a child</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families can learn a lot from schools</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is a major resource to the local community</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the school-level expected continuation and expansion of extended service schooling, it is imperative to understand the potential inhibitors and enablers of sustainability. These are discussed in detail in the sections which follow.
12. Enablers and inhibitors

12.1. The most common enablers

The six most consistent themes that emerged throughout the case studies in terms of enablers related to the ability to access to multiple and consistent funding sources; having a school culture and team of staff that were committed to the model’s success and sustainability; engaging and involving parents and the local community; having sufficient human and physical resources to support the model; forming meaningful partnerships; and having a broader ‘systems thinking’ approach. Schools that are considering, or have already implemented, an extended schooling approach need to consider these areas to assist success and sustainability.

1. Multiplicity and consistency of funding sources

The ability to secure consistent funding was considered essential to the ongoing viability of extended service schooling by almost all of the case study schools. As noted previously in this report, the case study schools considered a successful model of funding one that drew from a variety of areas, rather than being reliant on a single-source. Most case study schools had sought additional funding sources to that of the National Partnerships as a means of ensuring continuity and increasing sustainability.

2. A committed school culture and team

Having a school culture that was committed to the success and sustainability of the approach by actively driving it forwards was considered paramount to ensuring the success of extended service schooling by the case study schools. This included having a Principal that advocated for the model; having a clear leader and driver of the school’s model; having a team of passionate people central to the model; and ensuring that teachers were supportive of the model. Case study schools felt that the ideology of extended service schooling needed to be inculcated throughout the school.

3. Engaging the community

Meaningful engagement of the local community was considered a key enabler to implementation, sustainability and success among the case study schools. This included allowing time to understand the community and its needs from the outset such that the model could be tailored and continually evolved to address these needs; identifying and building relationships with key community advocates; understanding community networks and utilising these; and also included the engagement of parents.

4. Appropriate physical and human resources

Case study schools frequently discussed the importance of physical resources and human resources to enable their models. This included having dedicated physical spaces within the school that supported the long-term focus of the model and enabled spaces for partners. In addition to this, the schools highlighted the importance of a dedicated human resource (although, not a full-time role) to deliver coordination and structure to the model.
Most case study schools considered the development and integration of partnerships to their extended service schooling an enabling factor. The importance of partnerships included the ability to find and form partnerships as well as continually evolve and refine them; ensuring the joint development of goals and objectives; and having mechanisms to foster good communication between partners and the school.

Many case study schools discussed the importance of access to system level support for providing extended service schooling within their jurisdiction or sector as a critical enabler. For some schools, this meant that the Government, or their sector, had greater involvement in the community itself (ie. not just the school); or, that there was a supportive policy structure which meant that extended service schooling fit within a broader program – rather than being considered ad-hoc. For others, it meant that their Department or sector actively forged relationships with other agencies to ‘pave the way’ for schools to access them more easily.

These are discussed in more detail in the sections that follow as well as additional enablers that were raised throughout the case studies which relate to the system, the community, parents, the school itself, the school’s staff and partners.
12.2. The most common challenges and inhibitors

It is equally important to identify the major inhibitors or barriers faced by schools in adopting extended service schooling approaches, because it is claimed by interviewees that these will need to be accounted for in order to achieve success and foster sustainability.

There were nine frequently cited challenges throughout the case studies which related to the continuity of funding; engaging parents; the complexities of processes and the system; the potential negative stigma associated with accessing services through schools; establishing and managing partnerships; staff retention; resources; the potential impact on the school’s core business; and, the lack of definition in extended service schooling approaches. These are summarised below.

1. The continuity of funding

The continuity of funding was a major concern expressed by almost all case study schools and it was apparent that the level of servicing provided through the schools could not be sustained without funding. Case study schools mentioned three challenges associated with funding which related to competition for funding sources; the inconsistency of funding received; and the complexities associated with locating and applying for funding.

2. Lack of parental engagement

Literature that investigates the influence of parental engagement on child and adolescent education confirms the value of engaged parents on a child’s educational experience. It was frequently noted throughout the case studies included in this research that lack of parental engagement reduced both child and parental likelihood to participate in the school’s extended service schooling approach. [1, 4, 17 and 24] It is noted that there are a range of variables that will influence parental engagement – including demographics (such as parental educational background) and process (such as their personal historical experience at school).

This research suggests that programs which seek to help parents overcome those variables are required as a part of the extended service schooling approach in Australia. It is noted that at the time of authoring this report, there is a separate project funded through the National Partnerships Program related specifically to understanding, and enhancing parental engagement in schooling – the Parental Engagement Project. Parental engagement programs need to be integrated to extended service schooling approaches to facilitate their success.

There are a number of factors that will impact on parental engagement in these models in addition to the demographic and process variables usually present in the literature. These include the perceived ‘stigma’ associated with accessing services through the school, perceptions around levels of privacy, the extent to which the program is tailored to the individual school’s needs and the accessibility of parent specific programs and services.
The apparent complexities of the system itself were considered an inhibitor to successful extended service schooling by many case study schools. This was in relation to the perceived complexity for administrators and teachers to understand and navigate the system; the alleged presence of ‘red tape’ in paperwork (for example, that required in grant applications); as well as perceptions of changing policies, approaches and program availability.

Case study schools felt these inhibited their ability to move ‘effortlessly’ through the process of establishing and maintaining an extended service schooling approach. Some Principals acknowledged that their perceptions of complexity were influenced by the steep learning curve that must be undertaken to start an extended service schooling approach. None of these schools referenced use, or knowledge of, system guidelines and support systems to establishing extended service schooling.

In many case studies, there was discussion around perceptions of a negative stigma associated with accessing services from the local school. This was mentioned by school staff, but also by parents themselves. In several cases, this was borne from a sense of reduced privacy whereby it was felt that school staff, and other parents, would be aware of the parent and / or child accessing particular services. This lack of privacy was mentioned in metropolitan, regional and remote school locations and was considered an inhibitor to accessing, and participating in, services and programs through the school. As extended services schooling approaches increase in prevalence, and become more normalised in Australian communities, these concerns may dissipate.

Several schools considered the establishment and maintenance of partner relationships a challenge of the extended service schooling approach. This was discussed previously in Section 8.2 of this report and primarily related to their ability to source potential partners and establish relationships with them; low awareness of the system level support structures available to help schools pursue partnerships; and the physical practicalities of some partnerships.

A high level of staff turnover was considered an inhibitor because it was felt to weaken the extent to which the approach would become embedded in the school’s culture. It was felt that successful extended service schooling required a core of stable long-term staff. It was not apparent which was the precursor, that is, whether system instability caused staff to leave or staff changes increased instability. However, many schools cited the challenges of staff retention, particularly those in regional and remote locations but also in metropolitan schools. [1, 5 and 11]

Case study schools identified that the ability to address some of the presenting issues, particularly the most serious, requires the school to be adequately resourced otherwise any interventions will be ineffectual and may even become counterproductive. Resourcing included funding for service provision, but also access to facilities and physical space. In regional and remote locations, this also referred to the availability of specialist resources which were sometimes considered difficult to access in regional and remote locations.
Many case study schools identified that an extended service schooling approach could drain the school’s human resources in terms of the Principal’s time, and the time of other school staff. This was expressed in terms of drawing the Principal and teaching staff away from the core business of education (in its more traditional meaning — refer to the quote alongside this paragraph), and the challenge of achieving the right balance in this regard. In some case study schools, it also related to the impact that delivering additional services and programs could have on the work-life balance of school staff.

The provision of extended services schooling was considered by many schools a complex, evolving, and often new, approach to schooling. This meant that many school staff members (including Principals) found it difficult to describe their school’s approach and clearly articulate what it comprised (a consistent observation of the researchers).

It appears that the ad hoc nature of local programs and strategies has blurred the parameters of many school’s approaches. This is a potential inhibitor to sustainability and success as the problems in articulation may impede the process of gaining all of the school and its community’s support, as well as the ability to form meaningful and beneficial partnerships. It may also impede the longevity of the school’s approach if the primary driver within the school leaves because the knowledge typically rests with one or two key individuals.

As shown in Chart 33, among schools not currently providing extended services, the most frequently cited perceived barriers related to the investment involved, by way of human resources (time), financial resources (money), as well as the challenges of securing funding and the potential for this to impact sustainability. These aligned to the barriers perceived at schools already providing extended service schooling.
Chart 33: Barriers to school’s provision of extended services
Source: Principal survey, Those who do not offer extended services (n=186)
Survey question: What do you believe are the barriers to your school’s provision of these services? (Q24)

The range of challenges and inhibitors are discussed in more detail in the sections that follow and relate to the system, the community and parents, the school itself and the school’s staff and partners. In most cases, challenges and inhibitors were expressed equally as enablers and thus, the discussion which follows is also combined.
12.2.1. **System enablers and inhibitors / risk factors**

The system enablers and inhibitors discussed in the research related to both national and state Government and sector policies and procedures. Schools in jurisdictions with a greater level of support at this level for extended service schooling (either via funding structures and resource allocation, and/or via supporting structures), were considered better able to provide sustained services and programs. However, they still describe many of the factors, throughout this section summarised.

The model below is a framework of the range of system enablers and inhibitors raised in the research. The key system factors that will either enable or impede extended service schooling are: funding; resources; program availability; the presence of, and mechanisms supporting, policies; and, collaboration.

**Chart 34: Summary of system enablers and inhibitors / risk factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements that inhibit / risks</th>
<th>Elements that enable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent funding</td>
<td>Consistent funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single source funding</td>
<td>Multiple sources of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No centralised, accessible support resources</td>
<td>Centralised, accessible support resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No existing programs accessible</td>
<td>Existing programs of relevance to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No guiding documentation available</td>
<td>Availability of guiding documentation around process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No guidelines for early years (0-3s)</td>
<td>Specificity of guidelines for early years (0-3s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforced rigidity of approach</td>
<td>Flexibility to tailor and evolve the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant policy changes and shifts in sector focus</td>
<td>Consistent policy and sector focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No access to evaluation tools</td>
<td>Established and accessible mechanisms for evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow and restricted focus within sector</td>
<td>Broader focus enabled within sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination and collaboration between agencies</td>
<td>Strong interagency collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each element is described in further detail in the pages that follow.*
The following is a more detailed discussion across the individual system related elements which can either enable or impede.

Funding and resources were seen equally as a potential barrier and enabler to successful implementation and sustainability of extended service schooling. Case study schools felt that where systems supported extended service schooling with on-going, guaranteed funding and access to resources, those schools were better able to provide services and programs which made a difference in the long-term.

While schools are able to access a wide range of funding from a variety of sources, the system-level funding was often the source that provided schools with a greater sense of support, stability and security.

The perceived ease by which centralised support systems could be accessed was considered an enabler, and equally a barrier, by many case study schools. In the quantitative survey of Principals, close to half (46%) stated they did not feel supported by their state’s sector in delivering extended service schooling. A similar proportion (49%) stated they did not feel supported by the Federal Government. The case study research can clarify this, consistently indicating two factors driving this result:

- **Principals were often not aware of the various support mechanisms and structures** available to them at State or Federal levels and/or were unaware of how to investigate the potential support structures in existence within their sector.
- **Extended service schooling is a new area to many Principals** and they therefore, have a strong desire for guidance and assistance during the early stages of inception and implementation.

This lack of awareness, and access, of centralised support systems contributed to a sense of system / sector complexity. The mechanisms by which sectors can support schools moving forwards are therefore included as discussion in Chapter 15 where recommendations are provided.

“I’ve never met a kid in 25 years who didn’t actually want to learn something – it’s just that school systems don’t sometimes support that”

(Neighbouring school Principal, Case study 21)
Case study schools considered the ability to identify and access the many pre-existing programs available throughout the system paramount as this enabled them to adequately address the range of issues many students face.

While schools can achieve a lot with local initiatives and agencies, the availability of multiple and varied programs from different sources makes it easier to address issues quickly, appropriately and consistently. [5, 18 and 21] Schools currently providing extended service schooling generally had high levels of awareness of these programs and the avenues by which to access them. The provision of targeted programs was also valued because they concentrate on one aspect of behaviour or need.

Frameworks, guidelines and related documentation make it easier for those referring to, or administering the programs and initiatives, to be aware of and understand the specific purposes of the programs. Importantly, documentation also provides clarification of roles. [7, 14 and 19] Some case study schools describe these guiding structures as evidence that extended service schooling fits within a ‘broader program’, displaying sectorial and governmental commitment. [13, 14 and 15] The absence, or lack of awareness, of such guiding documentation was considered a barrier to successful implementation and sustainability.

In jurisdictions where early years (0-3s) was not included in the same agency’s remit as school aged children, some case study schools (which included primary years) noted the importance of guiding structures on how to include this area within extended service schooling. [3, 20] The absence of specific guiding structures for programs and services relating to early years was considered an inhibitor to the ability to successfully address the need for early intervention.

Many case study schools noted that the current level of flexibility within extended service schooling at a system level enabled the design, implementation and sustainability of their approach. This was because this flexibility allowed schools to individually tailor their approach from the outset according to their community and their school’s needs. In addition, because of the nature of the issues that were being dealt with, the system’s current flexibility to allow schools to adapt or change direction as needed was also noted as an enabler to sustainability. [2, 12 and 21]

Because co-location of services was a core element of many school’s approaches, system level facilitation of the ability to provide services directly from the school was considered, by many case schools, an enabler. Some schools felt that development of some common guidelines around co-location would be beneficial as this was considered by some, a ‘grey area’ in terms of lines of responsibility and ownership. Case study schools considered that these guidelines should include areas such as ‘whether the facilities are accessible after school hours / during school holidays’, as well as ‘building design structures’ etc.
In a number of case studies, the processes involved in establishing and maintaining an extended service schooling approach were noted as complex and often thought to involve a high amount of administrative paperwork. These perceptions were exacerbated because:

- it assumed existing knowledge, and required detailed understanding of the services available and the various access points by school staff;
- it often required dealing with multiple external agencies and there were no standard practices in place for this; and/or
- there was limited understanding of how to establish and maintain relationships with partners.

Each of these factors were felt to make the administrative processes time consuming, requiring additional staff resourcing time, thereby impeding their ability to move effortlessly through the process of establishing and maintaining and extended service schooling approach. Feedback indicated that this could compromise educational outcomes if not anticipated from commencement.

In several case studies, it was claimed that policy changed as state and Federal Governments changed, and new programs unfolded. In these case study schools, changes in Government and/or sector policy and foci were expressed as a potential inhibitor to the sustainability of extended service schooling as this would add to the complexity and management of their approaches. [5, 7 and 17] This was also discussed in relation to the impact that potential changes in Governmental, or sector focus, could have on funding allocations. [12]

Some case study schools indicated the importance of accessibility to evaluation tools to assess the impacts and outcomes of the programs and services that were accessed or implemented. Among these schools, there was a perception such tools were not currently available. It is highly likely that ongoing tracking and monitoring will play a critical role in future Government and non-Government funding allocations and the continuation of partnerships, and this should therefore be an issue of some concern.

In schools which indicated this importance, there was a perception that without established and accessible tools and strategies for evaluation, there would be a tendency to rely on NAPLAN as an indicator of success. This was considered an inhibitor because the foci of NAPLAN did not match the breadth of objectives that are often encompassed in extended service schooling. In turn, it was discussed that this limited focus would potentially mean that schools were unable to prove the efficacy of their approach. [1, 3 and 20]
Some stakeholders and case study schools were of the opinion that the high focus of resources on the provision of services to schools in lower SES communities could be detrimental to the middle band of ‘average’ schools and the communities they serviced. [1, 10] These participants noted that extended service schooling could be beneficial to all communities and felt that it should not be restricted purely to low SES areas. The prevalence of, and interest in, extended service schooling among schools (‘Principal Survey’) cited previously in this report supports this.

Interdepartmental, or interagency, collaboration was expressed as both an inhibitor and a vital enabler in several of the case studies. Several expressed concern that when a number of agencies worked in parallel to provide various services as part of the model, there was a tendency for the agencies to work in ‘silos’ towards their own goals rather than collaboratively. This, in turn, was felt to impede the model working to achieve goals collaboratively and build off the strengths of all agencies involved.

Support at Commonwealth and state Government level was seen as vital to the sustainability of extended service schooling – not just via funding, but also through policies, procedures and systems that work in harmony to support collaboration across agencies, sectors and Governments as required.
12.2.2. Community and parent enablers and risk factors

There were a number of enablers and inhibitors identified throughout the case studies and stakeholder interviews which related specifically to local communities. These were often at a broad level and were evident across the majority of communities, but most prevalent in remote schools and those with high Aboriginal populations. The key community factors that will either enable or impede extended service schooling are; the relationship between the school and its community; centrality of the school; normalisation of access via the school; and, stability of the community itself.

Chart 35: Summary of community enablers and inhibitors / risk factors

- Elements that inhibit / risks
  - Distrust between community and school
  - A history of non-participation of community within the school
  - No existing links with community and school
  - No existing links with community elders/opinion leaders
  - Inability to source volunteers
  - No communication mechanisms within the community

- Elements that enable
  - Trusting culture between community and school
  - A community that participates in the model
  - Existing links with community and school
  - Existing links with community elders/opinion leaders and school
  - Ability to source volunteers to support the approach
  - Existing communication mechanisms with community
  - School is one of many access points for services - high overlap
  - School is a central access point for services - no overlap
  - Perceived stigma associated with accessing services through school
  - Normalisation of accessing services through school
  - Transient community
  - Stable community
The following is a more detailed discussion across the individual community-related elements, which can either enable or impede.

**Engagement, participation and trust of community**

Having an engaged and participative local community was described by the case study schools as an enabler to both implementation and sustainability of their approach. Some schools noted that this could be difficult to achieve, particularly if there was scepticism or insecurity of the school within the community. [7, 8 and 22] Therefore, the extent to which the local community is trusting of the school will either impede or enable its adoption and delivery of an extended service schooling approach.

In order to ensure that communities are engaged and participative, it was considered important to ensure that the extended service schooling approach was designed from the outset to take into account community need, and to evolve to address changing needs. This meant that a part of the community engagement process needed to include developing an understanding of the community and its networks.

**Presence of existing community links**

Many of the case study schools referenced the benefits of leveraging existing, or known, links which staff within their school (permanent and / or volunteer staff) may already hold within their community in order to engage community, source potential volunteers [5, 22 and 23], and identify potential partnerships.

Those schools in small centres or those with Aboriginal teaching assistants, found this particularly useful as staff members could often provide links to local community through their own extended family connections. This worked in two ways: it enabled the two-way flow of information between the school and its community, and it smoothed the passage of parents’ or community members’ dealings with school staff (i.e. it is sometimes easier to deal with an issue through an intermediary). [7, 15 and 20]

**Connecting with community elders**

Related to community engagement is the degree to which community elders interact, and are involved, with the school. For Aboriginal students, parents and care-givers, this communicates that the school is not only willing to work with the community but also supports Aboriginal culture, and is an enabler to extended service schooling – particularly for schools with high proportions of Aboriginal students. [12 and 19] Some schools had access to a community liaison officer to facilitate this and this was referenced as a resource that enabled their school to connect with their community’s elders.

**Sourcing volunteers**

Case study schools often considered the ability to source volunteers important to the sustainability of extended service schooling. This was particularly true during inception where there may be fewer school-level resources available to implement and run the services. Sourcing volunteers was noted by most schools as a challenge. This was, however, noted as a challenge for schools in terms of developing these relationships, and in finding meaningful ways to recognise and reward volunteers such that relationships could be maintained. [23]
The presence of existing communication mechanisms used by the school from which it could proactively communicate and consult with its local community was also raised by the case study schools as an enabler. Community consultation was an essential element of design and implementation and the presence of existing structures would enable this process.

The ability of the school to provide access or direct links to various services means that the school can become the centre of focus of the community. This results in parents and other community members becoming increasingly habitualised to attend the school, and deal with school staff, in the process of utilising various services. [16, 17, 18 and 22] An approach whereby the focus was on services that were considered difficult to access outside the school, or less prevalent, was considered an enabler to success.

The extent to which accessing services through the school was a normalised behaviour in the community was also considered an enabler by the case study schools. A finding in most of the case study schools was that there was potential stigma from accessing services through the school via loss of privacy and lack of anonymity. This was true in metropolitan, regional and remote locations. The extent to which schools are normalised as access points for service delivery will therefore inhibit (with lower levels of perceived normalisation in the community) or enable (with higher levels of normalisation in the community) successful extended service schooling throughout Australia. [3, 11 and 23]

Some of the case study schools – particularly those in remote locations – noted that the stability, or transience of the community was an important consideration in determining and maintaining an extended service schooling approach. This meant that the less transient the community, the easier the development and facilitation of the model. [8]
12.2.3. School and staff enablers and risk factors

The school itself – its human resources, communications, culture, physical resources and foci – was a core enabling factor in the provision of extended service schooling with a number of individual elements discussed as key facilitators. The below is a summary of these factors.

Chart 36: Summary of school and staff enablers and inhibitors / risk factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements that inhibit / risks</th>
<th>Elements that enable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No individual with primary responsibility and ownership</td>
<td>A school-level driver / individual with primary responsibility and ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient personnel to manage and run the approach</td>
<td>Sufficient personnel to manage and run the approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the Principal</td>
<td>Advocacy of the Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High staff turnover</td>
<td>Low staff turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion of parents</td>
<td>Inclusion of parents throughout design and evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of (ongoing) communication of the model throughout the school</td>
<td>Ability to communicate the model (ongoing) throughout the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School does not market its approach within the community</td>
<td>School proactively markets its approach within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistant, non-supportive school staff</td>
<td>Committed, participative and supportive school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No understanding of the school's surrounding community</td>
<td>Sound understanding of the school's surrounding community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low focus / lack of prioritisation within the school</td>
<td>High priority and focus of extended service schooling within the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parent advocates within the school</td>
<td>Parent advocates within the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempting to commence with a large-scale approach</td>
<td>Recognition of the need to start small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No focus on evolving the approach over time</td>
<td>Recognition of the need to evolve the approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No physical spaces</td>
<td>Appropriate physical spaces that can be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No access to relevant professional development opportunities for staff</td>
<td>Access to relevant professional development opportunities for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow focus on a minority of students</td>
<td>Breadth of service focus and school delivery to all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No culturally specific programs</td>
<td>Provision of culturally tailored programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This research suggests that the ability of one person to ‘make or break’ an extended service schooling approach is startling. The case study locations which appeared to consider themselves most successful were those in which there was a keen ‘driver’ and advocate for extended service schooling.

While many schools had leadership and / or case management teams, the presence of someone who kept the ‘vision’ in mind and had a strong desire to enact change, was a frequently noted key to success. [1, 21 and 24] Notably, this did not necessarily need to be the school’s Principal. And, in some jurisdictions and sectors, this ‘driver’ is appointed at a system-level.

Several case study schools had a dedicated resource (albeit not in a full time role) in a coordination role and this was discussed in Section 8 of this report. The extent to which schools can appoint staff in these coordination roles was considered a school-level enabler.

The ability to appoint staff members who fill special requirements means that additional skills and strengths can be utilised in dealing with issues as they arise. In some cases, many issues can be circumvented. An example includes the presence of Aboriginal Teaching Assistants in Aboriginal community schools which means that issues related to comprehension or understanding of the purpose of services, or the school’s approach, can be immediately addressed. [5, 8 and 12]

Advocacy and involvement of the Principal was considered critical by many. It should, however, be noted that the Principal does not necessarily need to be the leader and primary coordinator of the school’s approach. Strong, stable leadership from the Principal was, however, essential and they were often the facilitator of embedding a culture of support for the model throughout the school’s staff cohort. [3, 19, 21 and 24]

Staff turnover, with high attrition was considered by schools a threat to sustainability. While it was considered unavoidable, its effects were considered to potentially result in a break-down of relationships between staff members and students or parents / care-givers; loss of knowledge, loss of skills and capacity resulting in a need to retrain new staff members; and, could even create perceptions of instability of the school and its extended service schooling approach. [1, 9 and 11]
Many of the case study schools noted the importance of being able to meaningfully involve parents such that any achievements made by the school with children were continued and reinforced at home. Supporting continuity between the school and home was considered an important element in success at an individual child level – and therefore to the extended service schooling approach. [1, 5]

In addition to involving parents in the progress of their child, it was considered important to involve parents in decision making and to encourage their participation / volunteering in the model, and their personal access of services or programs targeting parents. [16, 17 and 19] Active participation of parents felt to increase the likelihood of success and sustainability of extended service schooling.

The process for involving parents was acknowledged as needing to be tailored to the individual school and its community, to be incremental and to build over time once trust and belief in continuity of the approach was established.

Establishing strong internal and external processes for communication was considered an important school-level enabler to successful extended service schooling by many of the case study schools. Communication processes were required between school staff, with existing and potential partners, with parents, and with the community. Communication was discussed in detail in Section 6.3 of this report and is therefore not repeated here.

The ability of school staff to promote the objectives of extended service schooling was considered a key enabler - sustainable change needed to occur across every facet of the school. [11, 18 and 21]

In several case studies, it was recognised that this may involve a cultural change within the school because extended service schooling required a broader focus. The international literature on extended service schooling supports this as a critical enabler, highlighting that there needs to be a collaborative culture at a school level in order for the approach to be sustainable.

“There is a boy who’s in year 2 and he’s still wearing nappies … first referred to us through the school nurse and psychologist, we then referred to a paediatrician … we implemented a toileting program at school … it now works at school, but it hasn’t been implemented at home.”
(Case management team, Case study 1)
Case study schools considered the support of teachers paramount to ensuring the success and sustainability of extended service schooling. Teacher support enabled inculcation of the ideology of the programs into the culture of the entire school. Teachers need to be convinced the program(s) will work, and some case study schools highlighted the importance of communication throughout inception, implementation and maintenance in order to gain their support and participation. The mechanisms by which school leaders facilitated communication with teachers were previously noted in Section 6.3.1 of this report.

In addition to gaining the in-principle support of school staff, many case study schools noted the value of school staff having a form of active participation in the model. This often meant fostering a culture whereby knowledge was shared between teachers and the case study team (if there was a ‘team’ component within the school’s approach); teachers and partners; as well as teachers and the school’s leadership team. That is, teachers did not necessarily need to be involved in program delivery, but were an essential conduit for measuring the progress of individual children because of their direct, and daily interactions with them. [1, 7, 11 and 19]

Some case study schools did, however, note that the passion and dedication of staff to be involved in their own time provided invaluable support and contributed strength to the model. This was more frequently observed in smaller schools and remote schools.

In general, teachers agreed with the philosophy of seeking and providing their input and maximising their detailed knowledge of the children. This enabled them to feel a valued part of the school’s approach, empowered them to provide input to the model, and to raise and develop ideas.

“Teachers are not trained for this because they don’t learn about it at uni …it’s a very different way of thinking …not all teachers will be on board at first”

(Principal, Case study 3)

“You feel like you are part of a team and your contributions and hard work are valued”

(Teacher, Case study 19)
Having an engaged and participative community was noted previously as a community enabler of extended service schooling. Case study schools considered it crucial that all school staff had a clear understanding of the complexities of the surrounding community. This was considered important in delivering an understanding of the needs of individual students and thereby better identification and delivery of the services they required. [10, 16 and 17]

Many schools reported various efforts made locally to engage the community (and more specifically, parents) in school activities. The wider social events were usually considered more effective than narrower education focused meeting approaches. For Aboriginal communities, events with a cultural focus were reportedly more effective. [5, 7 and 11]

Establishing a clear vision for the approach from the outset is important for schools undertaking an extended service schooling approach. It was believed that this vision should be revisited and adapted as necessary over time. These schools discussed that this vision allowed them to prioritise their approach as a school and was a key contributing factor to both its day-to-day success and overall sustainability. [1, 12 and 19]

Forming relationships with people inside the school who could act as advocates (such as the school’s governing council, students themselves, and the parent representative body) was considered an enabler by some case study schools. These internal advocates were felt to be important in gaining and maintaining wider support for the approach.

Some case study schools referenced the perceived benefit of starting small, and evolving the extended service schooling approach post implementation. This was considered an enabler to the initial implementation of the approach, as well as its eventual sustainability because it allowed the concept to be introduced slowly, and grow collaboratively within the school and its local community. [2, 3, and 10]
Appropriate physical space for extended service schooling was considered important to its sustainability. Having dedicated spaces indicated to many - both within the school and the local community - that the approach adopted by the school had permanency and longevity, thus creating a sense of stability. [1,16]

However, it should be noted that some case study schools did not consider the absence of dedicated physical spaces an insurmountable barrier to starting an extended service schooling approach. These schools commenced their approach to extended service schooling utilising only their existing physical spaces, and had been able to secure additional physical space as the delivery of extended services grew. In some cases, additional buildings were secured via the Federal Capital Grants program, but new buildings on school premises had also been funded via grants and partnerships within the private sector.

The importance of physical space lays in school’s anticipation of growth in their extended service schooling approach. It was felt that having available physical space meant they would be better equipped to facilitate new partnerships and additional service delivery as both the need, and opportunity, arose.

Having dedicated physical space was considered particularly important if the school’s approach was to include facilities or services for the local community to access. [7,8, 17]

Some case study schools noted the benefits of enabling teachers to access professional development opportunities on topics that held broad relevance to extended service schooling. Some examples of topics cited related to ‘development during the early years (0-3s) / the impact of trauma during the early years’ (for primary schools) and ‘understanding poverty’ (primary and secondary schools). The case study schools included in this research were not aware of any professional development opportunities that related specifically to extended service schooling.

The benefit of on-topic professional development was that it was felt to ensure clear understanding of the origins and governing philosophy of extended service schooling, what resources it enables and how it operates. It was also claimed that staff training engenders ownership, builds dedication and commitment, and ultimately increases staff morale as it illustrates that they are valued and supported. [13 and 19]
The provision of culturally appropriate curricula and programs – content and language - was seen as integral to the success of Aboriginal education and to extended service schooling approaches in schools with high Aboriginal populations because, without cultural relevance it is difficult to engage Aboriginal students. [4 and 5]

In some case study schools, parents indicated the importance of the extended service schooling approach being one that was balanced. That is, targeting ‘all children’ as well as marginalised and at risk children; providing academic and non-academic services and programs; and, in cases were incentivisation was integrated to the approach, assuring that all students had equal opportunity to receive such rewards and recognition.

The ability for the model to provide breadth and balance across these dimensions was considered an enabler because it did not alienate or target individuals and, instead, could be considered an ‘all of community’ approach. In turn, this approach was considered to have greater potential to normalise access of services and programs through schools.
13. Learning from good / best practice

Taking into consideration all that has come before, what does good / best practice look like? Given that one of the key factors in the success of extended service schooling is a high degree of flexibility to allow schools to meet the differing and changing needs of their diverse communities, it is clear that there is not one single model – or even several – which would ‘fit’ for all schools. This inherent attribute observed throughout all stages of the research makes it difficult to define what ‘good’ looks like – but there are a number of common attributes identified as essential to success.

Much of the discussion here is a version of the enablers and reversals of the inhibitors revealed in previous sections, so detailed descriptions are not repeated. Instead a topline overview is given of the common attributes observed that contribute to a successful extended service school.

13.1. Identify an appropriate starting point, and evolve

The philosophy of ‘starting small’ and continual evolution appear to be critical elements of good practice. This recognises that extended service schooling is complex and often undertaken in addition to the Principal's role. Allowing the model to grow naturally creates less initial impost on the school and its Principal.

Throughout the inception process (the ‘starting point’), feedback indicates that it is considered of utmost importance to access what is already available within the community, rather than reinventing the wheel. This means schools should consult with local government and non-government agencies to understand the programs and services which either are available, or could be provided, to their community.

Continual evolution of the model was considered critical – not only during establishment, but throughout implementation and maintenance. This was in recognition of the changing needs of children and student cohorts, and communities. A best practice model does not ‘stand still’, rather it evolves over time.

13.2. Integration of consultation and re-consultation

The need to continually engage multiple audiences was considered essential by many of the case study schools and is therefore identified as an element of good / best practice in extended service schooling.

The critical stages in which to consult include:

- inception and establishment (from the outset);
- implementation;
- maintenance; and
- evaluation and review (to its evolution).

That is, engagement is critical from the outset and remains important throughout the life of the extended service approach. It is not a ‘one-off’ process that occurs during inception. It is ongoing, consistent and purposeful.
This research reveals a variety of stakeholders to consult, and information sources that are considered important, namely:

- **Teachers and staff**: The broad guidance given here is for schools to expect that not all teachers will be supportive from the outset. Some will require additional information and evidence as to the theory of extended service schooling and its prevalence in Australia. Others will require time to experience the model before accepting its worth. The ultimate goal, however, should be to achieve a staff cohort who are fully supportive of the model.

- **Parents and care givers**: can help schools identify the key areas of need and priority and provide valuable feedback on their perceptions of the model’s efficacy and impact.

- **The school’s governing body**: It is beneficial to secure the support of the school’s governing body throughout all stages and gain their advocacy for the approach.

- **Local stakeholders / potential partners**: should be consulted – particularly during establishment, but also throughout maintenance. If there are known contacts within the school, these are credible starting points from which this can occur.

- **Potential advocates**: should also be identified and sought. These can include local politicians, senior members of government agencies, senior business people, philanthropists etc.

- **Other schools**: can provide good examples of how to implement and are worthwhile consulting.

- **Students**: can be consulted once the model has started, but are not considered as critical to consult during establishment.

- **Use existing data**: Maximise the use of school-level data to understand the school’s position from the outset and monitor changes. Refer to community data (such as ABS SES indicators, and AEDI) to profile your community. These are valuable tools in communicating to people outside the school.

Both formal and informal methods of communication are appropriate. Most schools are utilising existing communication methods, including:

- discussing the model / its inception / its progress at school assemblies.
- discussing the model / its inception / its progress in the school’s newsletter.
- talking directly to the school board / school governing bodies.
- talking directly to key parent drivers – either via personal invitations to a discussion, or via meeting them in the car-park (or similar)
- using ‘open days’ when parents are already invited to the school to communicate about the model / its inception / its progress.
- using staff meetings to communicate about the model / its inception / its progress.
- talking directly to key local stakeholders and businesses. Some schools recommend the use of a ‘Business Plan’ within these discussions and guidelines for this are provided within the ‘Recommendations’ section of this report. Many schools utilise stakeholders and businesses as referral points to locate other potential partners.
This engagement process was considered one that was time-consuming, but critical, by most schools. In the Northern Territory, this is the role of the ‘Business Coordinator’ and is not undertaken by the school’s Principal. However, in other jurisdictions, most recommended that a coordinator be responsible for managing, driving and delegating the engagement process.

13.3. **Balancing the need for of formalisation of the approach**

Schools recognise the importance of formalising objectives / partnerships / evaluation criteria etc. However, it was equally stated that there is a considerable risk in over-formalising arrangements as this essentially locks the model into a situation of ‘status-quo’. Rather, there needs to be an appropriate balance achieved whereby the model is formal enough such that the school, its stakeholders and partners have clarity on the model and it’s impact, but informal enough such that growth and evolution are facilitated.

13.4. **Identification of a passionate leader**

School level leadership of the approach is critical to achieve best practice. Many schools discuss the importance of having a leader who is committed to the model and its success. This leader has the ultimate responsibility for driving the model forwards, and it becomes a key part of their role. This leader does not need to be the Principal, however the Principal must provide full support and advocacy to this leader. Small leadership teams can also be appropriate.

13.5. **Securing a ‘critical mass’**

While a leader / driver is important, it is also considered best practice for there to be a team of individuals who are committed to the model. This is particularly true for schools where staff retention is an issue as increasing the familiarity and ownership of the model among multiple staff members will help reduce the risk that if the leader / driver leaves the school, the model will collapse.

13.6. **Accessing a variety of funding**

Most schools are not reliant upon a single source of funding. Rather, they rely on multiple sources to ensure the sustainability and growth of their model. Sourcing this funding – in jurisdictions where this is not a specified role – becomes a shared role of the leader / driver and the Principal. Generating funding opportunities was considered something that evolves naturally over time and was not always considered necessary for establishment. Commonly, the starting point for garnering funding would be a known agency or an existing contact.

13.7. **Garnering sectorial support**

Most schools agree that the ‘learning curve’ for establishing an extended service school is considerable. However, they equally agree that schools should seek the support of their central agency or office. Recommendations are provided in this report for the type of support that needs to be provided to schools.
13.8. Resourcing the model appropriately

Many best practice models have a staff member allocated to the role of coordinating the model – and this is sometimes separate to that of the leader / driver (discussed in 13.4). These schools utilise a variety of funding sources to facilitate this. Few models appeared to rely solely on volunteers to sustain their model.

13.9. Setting long-term goals

Best practice models understand that their objectives are long-term from the outset and are clear about the ability of hard statistics (such as NAPLAN) to effectively evaluate the school’s model. Rather, they have alternative evaluation mechanisms (refer 13.10) which can be accessed. Further, these schools operate under the premise that schools should celebrate ‘small wins’ – wins that are about individual students / parents / community members, rather than entire student cohorts / entire communities etc.

13.10. Inclusion of evaluation

One of the essential tools to secure and maintain funding is evaluation data – to identify whether, or in what ways, the model is effective. In order to achieve this, it is important that the measures and methods for collecting data are sound from the outset. Some guiding principles for this can be found in the Recommendations section of this report. However, some of the fundamental considerations for achieving best practice in evaluation include:

- collecting baseline data;
- developing or enhancing systems to monitor individual student level data (attendance, behavioural, academic attainment);
- including all relevant target audiences in the evaluation process; and,
- disseminating the evaluation results.
14. Conclusions

14.1. Reflections from the Literature Review

The review of literature under Stage 1 of this project noted that the concept, terminology and implementation of extended service schooling has developed considerably over the last two decades in Australia, as it has internationally in the United Kingdom and the United States. Despite this development, there remains considerable differentiation in terms of the definitions and parameters of extended service schools. This has made knowledge sharing, and learning from, models of best practice difficult for both schools and Governments.

Despite this variability with the overarching definition, there is more commonality in the starting points associated with their implementation which are consistently articulated as relating to the needs of children and the difficulties of current education systems around the globe to adequately account for and address them. It is largely agreed that these needs are both evolving and complex and that there is a fundamental requirement for them to be met in order to enable children to function at optimal levels throughout their years in the education system, and consequently throughout their adult lives.

The literature review found that extended service schooling, both in Australia and globally, has been characterised by approaches that are flexible and tailored to specific community, student cohort and school needs. Because of this, they take a variety of forms in terms of their delivery (for example, school-based or school-linked); their goals (for example, from those centralised on children, to parents, to community and school staff); their depth (for example, from extended practice to full service); as well as their management, source of practice, extent of collaboration and resourcing (for example, central steering or local entrepreneurship).

This uniqueness of approach means that there is no single blueprint for the way extended service schooling is initiated, implemented, managed nor sustained. The need for primary research to explore the nature of extended service schooling within the Australian context was thus significant. This finding aligns with key findings of the Stage 2 research which is presented in the following.
14.2. The focus of practice to date in Australia

This research suggests that around half (53%, ‘Principal survey’) of Australian schools are delivering extended services in some form and this is largely uniform by jurisdiction, sector and location.

There is generally a high level of consistency between schools in terms of the starting points for extended service approaches. While the complex needs of children are frequently central to the identification of need and inception, the development of the approach usually reflects a broader scope which includes school-level, parental/care-giver and community needs in the equation.

The case studies explored this in depth, with the centrality of children being in relation to reducing barriers to learning and improving educational outcomes; the health and wellbeing of children; addressing attendance and behavioural management issues; fostering ambitions and expectations; developing customised solutions for “at-risk” students; transitioning children through school and post school; as well as promoting a positive sense of culture and identity.

The below is a summary of the commonly articulated areas of foci in Australia (from the ‘Principal survey’ and the case studies).

Areas of need / overall foci
(BASE: Schools providing extended services, n=221)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of need / overall foci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student outcomes – education (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing barriers to student learning (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to employment, further education or training (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“...allowing the potential child to be maximised”</em> (Teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School culture and school capital (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and support staff (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“...it’s holistic, so the teachers can focus on teaching”</em> (Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents / Care-givers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental engagement (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting the school to home (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and care-givers (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“...people and service working together for the common good of families and children”</em> (Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting the school to community (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building communities (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“...the school can be a catalyst for community change”</em> (Principal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with the overall foci of extended service approaches in Australia, the most prevalent types of services delivered by, and through, schools are those focussed on the child (child welfare and engagement – 35% of schools; recreation and sports programs – 31% are the most frequently mentioned), as well as the family (family support – 32%). However, in many approaches there is additional depth of service delivery, extending considerably further than these one or two areas, to be inclusive of to the community.

Importantly, in many cases, the services being delivered by Australian schools are considered ‘new’ services by the schools in that they would not otherwise be accessible within the community. This is particularly true of services relating to early childhood learning and development (where half, 49%, of schools providing access to this service consider it to be new) and adult / family learning (46%).

Those schools not currently providing extended service schooling are not doing so because of a perceived lack of need – 100% of these schools consider there to be a need. The most frequently cited barriers to undertaking an extended service schooling approach relate to the investment involved (by way of human resources and financial resources), as well as the challenges of securing funding and the potential for this to impact on sustainability.

Their specific areas of perceived need are largely consistent with the areas of foci among schools providing services. Family support is the most frequently mentioned area of need (82% of those not providing extended service schooling consider this an area of need). The areas of student health and student welfare / engagement (66% and 69% respectively); adult/family learning (69%); as well as primary school readiness (63%) and early childhood learning and development (61%) are also consistently mentioned.

14.3. The growth of extended service schooling in Australia

The impetus for the development and adoption of extended service schooling throughout Australia is most frequently attributed to a recognition among schools and stakeholders alike, that the education system and schools need to evolve in order to maintain relevance. Their potential to impact today’s children was noted.

In many cases, the driving force for the model’s inception and maintenance is an individual – most frequently the Principal. This invariably highlights the centrality and importance of Principals in driving extended service schooling in Australia. However, there are also alternative models in existence which are more ad-hoc in their implementation and maintenance, those which are managed via a case-management or school leadership team and others which are sustained via inter-agency collaboration.

This research suggests that partnerships have been central to the evolution of extended service schooling in Australia, with only 6% of schools providing extended services, doing so without partnerships. Partnerships most frequently occur with community based organisations (39% of schools with extended services in the ‘Principal Survey’ have partnerships with) and not-for-profit agencies (26%). All case study schools considered partnerships central to the sustainability of their model.

The recent Australian Government funding cited by schools (the National Partnerships Funding and Federal Capital Grants program) has also undoubtedly assisted in the evolution and sustainability of extended service schooling in Australia. Australian schools access a variety of funding and partnership sources to maintain their delivery of extended service schooling and it is unlikely that any school is reliant upon a single-source. However, the Federal Government’s funding programs are considered to have
reinvigorated the approaches of schools already providing extended services, and greatly assisted those schools within which extended service schooling has only just commenced.

14.4. The outcomes of extended service schooling

This research suggests that the reported outcomes of extended service schooling in Australia are diverse, and extend considerably further than just academic results. The child is frequently at the centre of the perceived outcomes of extended service schooling and the three key areas relate to behavioural improvement of children; social skill development and school transition; and educational attainment. The chart below summarises the range of outcomes uncovered through this research. It is, however, noted that these outcomes lack school-level quantitative data to support.

Chart 37: Perceived outcomes of extended service schooling
Source: Case study research
This research provides some quantitative evidence to support the presence of these outcomes, however it is acknowledged that this is not an experimental design which monitors the strength of impacts. As summarised in Chart 38, in the Parent Survey, those who accessed extended services (blue line) through their child’s school were significantly more likely than those who did not (black line) or were lapsed (yellow line) to:

- be connected to their community (statements 1-9 in chart 38, which relate to community connectedness of parents);
- be engaged in their child’s school (statements 10-16 below);
- consider their child to be engaged in their school (statements 17-23 below); and
- have positive perception of their child’s school leaders (statements 24-27 below).

Chart 38: Perceived outcomes of extended service schooling
Source: Parent survey
Survey question (Q1, Q3): For each statement, please move the slider to which one you personally feel applies to you/your child’s school the most. You can select any number between 1 and 7.
Stakeholders qualitatively identify broader outcomes which relate to the economic benefits of extended service schooling:

- Extended services are considered a cost-effective intervention for tackling social issues in the longer term when compared to the financial cost of dealing with social issues in adulthood if they are not addressed in early years.
- Facilitation of student employment and career pathways by improving potential career opportunities, thereby reducing social inequality and helping to break the cycle of welfare dependency.
- Improving local economies via a better-skilled workforce.
- Employability of parents through increasing the skill set of volunteering parents.
- Improved performance of local business by cultivating opportunities for work placements, mentoring and sponsorships etc.
- Generation of school income via provision and accommodation of additional outside school activities.

14.5. Key findings relating to sustainability and success

This research has provided considerable clarity around the current status of extended service schooling across Australia (in terms of the extent of practice and its evolution – summarised previously) as well as identifying many of the essential components for the inception, implementation and ultimate sustainability for high quality successful models of extended service schooling.

These ‘essential elements’ discussed below are core considerations for schools that are either currently, or considering, providing extended service schooling. Fundamentally, it is felt that these factors are each of critical importance and that failure to acknowledge one or more in this suite will impede implementation, sustainability and ultimately success.

Consistent funding and partnerships are essential components of sustainable extended service schooling.

Schools are accessing a variety of funding sources and are not reliant solely upon the Federal Government. The search for, and securing of, a variety of funding sources and partnerships is a key enabler of sustainability.

Importantly, securing funding and partnerships, is most often described as a process that is iterative and continually evolving. The importance of this factor therefore resides not only throughout inception but also during maintenance.

The support of teachers is seen as paramount to ensuring the success of extended service schooling.

Teacher support is essential to inculcate the principles of the programs into the culture of the entire school. For this to happen, teachers need to be fully supportive of the approach and aware that it is considered a joint responsibility across school and Government.

The support of the majority (rather than a minority) of school staff will also reduce the negative impact that staff turnover can have on the continuity of extended service schooling.
Community engagement in this context refers to involvement at a broader level than individual parents and is critical if the model is to be embraced more broadly and gather support, momentum and achieve sustainability.

In some communities, community support for the actions of the school has the capacity to bring about watershed changes. While many of the initiatives and strategies in the case study schools were focused on increasing community involvement / engagement, and positive progress was reported, albeit slow, in some communities this remains an ongoing challenge.

Equally, a lack of community involvement is noted as an inhibitor to sustainability and success. That is, its presence can drive and its absence, impede, extended service schooling.

Parental engagement brings advocacy and support for the model, and often extends more broadly to fostering active participation in, and access to, services themselves.

Engaging parents positively remains one of the key challenges for many schools. While many schools note that positive engagement of parents in their children's education is a challenge, it is equally considered a key enabler to the success and sustainability of extended service schooling.

This is evidenced by the suggested impact that lack of parental engagement has on children disengaging from the school, and more importantly from the entire educational process.

The ability of one person to make or break the model is startling, but was noted in a number of the case study schools.

Thus senior staff changes can signal either the beginning of great things or the probable future decline of existing programs and approaches.

The ability to identify, and link with, existing programs was paramount for schools to be able to adequately address the range of issues students face. It is not necessary to ‘re-invent the wheel’.

The range of programs available and utilised is diverse. These programs support schools in addressing specific needs quickly, and in minimising impost on school staff time and resources. While schools can achieve a lot with local initiatives and agencies, the existence of multiple and varied programs available from many different sources makes it easier to address issues quickly and consistently.
Those driving extended service schooling (usually Principals) face competing demands in terms of their time and focus. Extended service schooling programs comprise only a portion of the scope of their responsibility and sectoral support is essential.

This was described as sector-specific assistance to navigate the complexities of external systems such as the legal system (restraining orders and subpoenas) or the health system as well as assistance in navigating and forming funding and partnership arrangements.

The majority of partnerships are initiated by schools themselves. However, schools are quick to acknowledge that they receive little training or professional development in the skills required to initiate and maintain partnerships. This lack of knowledge will inhibit some schools from seeking partnerships, and could negatively impact the sustainability of existing partners if the relationships are not managed according to best-practice.

Schools need to seek this support from within their jurisdictions, but Government also needs to raise awareness of the mechanisms by which support can be accessed and ensure that information is widely shared.

The capacity for schools to appoint new staff members is often a key enabler.

Being able to appoint staff members who fill special requirements means that additional skills and strengths can be utilised in dealing with the issues that arise, and in fact many issues can be circumvented e.g. the presence of Aboriginal Teaching Assistants in Aboriginal community schools means that issues of comprehension and understanding can be addressed immediately.

Additionally, the allocation of funding to a proportional FTE position of an existing role in a coordinator role can facilitate sustainability in some cases.

Generating awareness within schools of extended services as a means of developing a new way of thinking is considered an important enabler.

Many schools operating as extended service schools are unable to articulate and accurately define their model. This is, in part, due to the evolving nature of their models however, is also partly a function of the lack of clarity around extended service schooling throughout the education sector. The more solid the understanding base, the greater the chance of sustainability and success.

The importance of flexibility, adaptability and the ultimate continual evolution of extended service schools should not be underestimated.

Extended service schooling is not articulated by schools as a ‘set and forget’ approach. Rather, it is something that requires consistent review, appraisal and adaptation to ensure it remains relevant.
The ‘success’ of extended service schooling is difficult to both define and evaluate because the sphere of influence is far-reaching (often outside the school) and impacts and outcomes are often long-term.

This aside, it is important that schools are able to articulate and provide evidence of the success of their approach in order to maintain and / or extend the provision of services; to strengthen partnerships and funding arrangements; and to effect long term positive outcomes for children and students.
15. Key themes and potential solutions

In light of this research and its findings, the following section provides an overview of the key themes, and potential solutions that schools believe will enhance successful implementation and sustainability of quality models of extended service schools in Australia.

It is noted that these themes and suggestions emerge from school-level discussions and may therefore present ideas that would be considered difficult to implement at a broader Governmental level. It is important to note, however, that this discussion is nonetheless reflective of the environment in which jurisdictions will be operating in terms of the perspectives of schools, the issues they deal with, and the support they seek.
**Theme 1: Maintaining flexibility in extended service schooling such that it remains adaptable to changing needs of the school community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Potential solutions and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This research confirms that extended services offered within schools are not a 'one size fits all' approach. Policies and structures that provide flexibility for schools to be responsive to the needs of their local community and their school community and to offer relevant and appropriate services are essential.</td>
<td>At a system level, maintaining flexibility is critical. Jurisdictions and sectors need to continue to acknowledge that flexibility is a core component of successful extended service schooling and support schools in this regard. Flexibility enables synergy between the needs of the school and its local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-defining what and how services are offered will impede the natural evolution of extended service schooling and its ability to adapt to changing needs.</td>
<td>This research suggests that system/sector policies need to remain broad enough to encourage innovation and flexibility at the school level while still providing guidance to support informed decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools need to acknowledge that to engage the cooperation and involvement of students, staff and parents, they need to identify their needs, the services available, and then ensure that the services are adequately directed towards addressing the school's priorities.
**Theme 2: The importance of providing funding, and supporting schools to access alternative funding sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Potential solutions and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability for schools to secure ongoing and consistent funding is considered one of the primary enablers (and conversely, inhibitors) to the sustainability, and success, of extended service schooling in Australia.</td>
<td>1. National Partnership funding is important, and should ideally continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools currently access a wide variety of funding sources, including National Partnership funding, and express challenges associated with this as well as concern regarding the potential negative impact of inconsistent and / or one-off funding sources.</td>
<td>The National Partnership funding is an important part of funding extended service schooling in Australia. Although the research indicates that extended service provision would continue if National Partnership funding ceased, it would likely result in a reduction of scope of extended service delivery. The level of resourcing currently available through the National Partnership funding is considered important to maintain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating funding opportunities in terms of applications and grants procedures can be difficult, and schools frequently acknowledge this lies outside their core skill set as educators. In addition, some schools refer to a low desire to develop this skill.</td>
<td>2. Schools would benefit from assistance – particularly during the implementation stage – in identifying, securing and maintaining, additional external funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given that securing funding is an ongoing process for schools, it is considered a continual administrative burden on the provision of extended service schooling.</td>
<td>School Principals, in sectors where funding and partnerships are pursued at a school level, would benefit from communication from their sectors to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall, NP funding is considered important but insufficient in isolation. Raising awareness and assisting in the securing of additional funding sources will decrease school reliance on a single source and increase the likelihood of sustainability of models of practice.</strong></td>
<td>- build <strong>awareness</strong> of existing internal sector/systemic roles that are designed to assist schools with this process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- provide schools with assistance in discovering the variety of funding / grant <strong>opportunities</strong> in their jurisdiction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- create and disseminate <strong>materials</strong> that provide schools assistance in writing / navigating funding grants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- encourage and generate participation in any <strong>professional development</strong> opportunities related to funding / grant application processes; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>develop guidelines</strong> to support schools in communicating their school’s profile and its achievements to funding partners to build and maintain strong relationships with funding partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Refer also Theme 5]
Theme 3: Maintaining, and/or establishing dedicated roles to provide ongoing support in the implementation and maintenance of extended service schooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Potential solutions and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective and stable leadership and governance are noted as key factors in successful models of practice. This leadership is often (but not always) provided by the school and frequently, undertaken by the Principal. There is a significant amount of time involved in developing and delivering extended service schooling and the impost on a Principal's already full workload can be an issue. Some schools are using funding to fund 0.2 or 0.4 FTE coordinator/leadership roles to take on this important task, and assist the main driver of the model of extended service schooling. This coordinator role was consistently described as essential to the sustainability and ongoing evolution of the model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In jurisdictions where this does not already exist, schools would benefit from dedicated roles that provide ongoing support in the implementation and maintenance of extended service schooling. The National Partnership funding has, in part, facilitated this. If continued, it is recommended that schools are made aware that utilising the funding to finance this coordinator/leadership role is a viable option. In jurisdictions where there is a dedicated role for this (for example, in the 29 Remote Service Delivery locations in the Northern Territory and in South Australia via ICAN), this must continue to be supported.
Theme 4: Establishing and articulating processes for effective interagency collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Potential solutions and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For schools that are accessing services and collaborating with different agencies as a part of their extended service provision, interagency collaboration was discussed as an inhibitor, and equally a vital enabler. This was also expressed by stakeholders.</td>
<td>A holistic Governmental approach would simplify the process for schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving a model of effective interagency collaboration will contribute significantly to the ease of implementing and managing extended services within schools.</td>
<td>At the agency level, development of shared memorandums of understanding regarding participation in extended service schooling would benefit schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the school operational level, collaborative decision making is required in considering such matters as the co-location of staff (desk space etc), joint systems of reporting and accountability, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This collaboration should be initiated at a governmental level and not create an impost on individual schools or agencies during its inception, and its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If memorandums are developed, they should be easily accessible by schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The resulting structure would need to incorporate elements of flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As evidenced throughout the report, extended service school models are not a 'one-size-fits-all' approach and any overarching joint memorandums understanding across agencies will need to incorporate elements of flexibility. An overly prescriptive memorandum will create complexities and barriers of delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theme 5: There is a desire, and need, for targeted professional learning opportunities for school leaders, teachers and other staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Potential solutions and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This report acknowledges that extended service schooling is a relatively new area to Australia and thus, new to school leaders and teachers. The limited awareness and understanding of extended service schooling as a concept may impede the likelihood it will be embraced and supported at a school level.</td>
<td>Schools would benefit from professional learning opportunities relating to extended service schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals invariably need to communicate to teachers and other staff about extended service schooling, the potential models and their efficacy during the inception stages.</td>
<td>If provided, such professional learning should include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a short history of extended service schooling and its adoption within education globally;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• examples of ‘common starting points’ (Section 4);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• methods of implementation (Section 5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• best practice guidelines (Recommendation 5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• funding and partnerships;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• review and evaluation; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• developing a business plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theme 6: A suite of online resources is developed to guide and support schools in extended service schooling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Potential solutions and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need for flexibility does, however, create difficulties for schools in the process of establishing and sustaining a successful model of extended service schooling. Many will seek clarification and guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While approaches should not be over-defined or prescribed, it would nonetheless be beneficial to develop accessible materials that will guide schools in the implementation, maintenance, monitoring, evaluation and communication of extended service schooling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools would benefit from easy access to a suite of <strong>online information resources</strong> to guide and support them [further details are provided in Appendix A. These could include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A package providing key information in relation to the <strong>process</strong> of establishing, implementing and sustaining a model of extended service schooling;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Materials that outline to schools how to draft a ‘<strong>Business Plan</strong>’ that can be utilised in securing appropriate resources and for communicating with potential partners – should they consider this a necessary process within their school;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Best practice guidelines</strong> for schools to facilitate consultation, work with external agencies, tailor programs, provide options for professional development, share learnings and methods of evaluation, particularly for those schools implementing a model of extended service schooling for the first time; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Evaluation tools</strong> to provide advice on designs, methods, frameworks and communicating data to stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Theme 6:

A suite of online resources is developed to guide and support schools in extended service schooling, including:

6.1 A package providing key information in relation to the process of establishing, implementing and sustaining a model of extended service schooling should be accessible to schools and include information in relation to:

- **Inception** – initial consultations, engaging parents / community / stakeholders. This should include discussion on areas such as:
  - Engaging teaching staff and nominating a driver / lead individual.
  - Engaging the school community (school council / parent bodies / parents etc).
  - Engaging the broader community.
  - Finding local advocates.
  - The processes for developing a shared philosophy and participation.
  - Maintaining awareness of the model.

- Forming and maintaining **partnerships**;

- **Funding and grant applications** (referenced earlier);

- The **variety of services / activities / programs**;

- The **range of outcomes and impacts**;

- Options for **research and evaluation** (discussed further in this section);

- **Case study publications**. (Overall, while the case study templates that were used for this report are quite long, it is felt that this level of detail is necessary for schools who may be initiating extended services in their school.)
**Theme 6 (contd):**

**A suite of online resources is developed to guide and support schools in extended service schooling, including:**

**6.2** Best practice guidelines for schools, particularly those embarking on extended service schooling for the first time, to support the development of a **business plan** to guide consultation, working with external agencies, tailoring programs, professional development options, the sharing of learnings and methods of evaluation.

As mentioned throughout this research, some schools that are currently providing extended services find it difficult to articulate their model in terms of its goals, its design and its outcomes and in order to author the case studies, the researchers were ‘piecing together a puzzle’.

The difficulty and complexity in describing the models at a school level (if experienced) will impede their ability to source external funding as funding partners will require clarity across these areas. This is of particular relevance for schools where there is no over-arching sector-level structure that guides extended service schooling (such as ICAN in South Australia).

Materials need to be developed that outline to schools how to draft a ‘Business Plan’ that can be utilised in funding applications, communicating with potential partners and clarifying the approach at all levels of the system/sector.

This could be provided via:

- Online communication materials to assist schools – either in written format, via webinar sessions, or through professional development. Some guidance on this is provided below and overleaf.
- Assistance in the identification of potential partners that could participate in assisting schools to develop their business plan.

This research suggests that the essential elements for inclusion in a business plan include:

- An overview of the **school’s vision** – what the school is trying to achieve.
- A description of any **progress** of the model/approach to date.
- How the proposed model/approach will support the school’s vision and the **objectives of the model/approach**.
- The perceived and / or actual (if evaluation data exists) **outcomes** of the model for children, parents, teachers and staff and community.
- The **funding** requirements and opportunities to sustain the model – what the school is seeking.
- **Accountability** - the mechanisms in place to evaluate and monitor the model and the school’s proposed way for communicating this to partners.

Further guidance is provided overleaf to assist schools. Of note, it is recommended that the Business Plan will need to include evaluation data (as it becomes available) and therefore, this Business Plan will need to be updated to maintain its currency. The Business Plan will need to be a concise document – it is recommended a length of no longer than 8-12 pages is adopted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of business plan</th>
<th>Questions to guide potential content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1: Your school and its vision</strong></td>
<td>At an overall level (that is, not limited just to the additional services your school currently / is seeking to provide), what is your school trying to achieve? What is your school’s mission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2: Background to the model</strong></td>
<td>Who is your school and your community? What are their needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was the starting point for the need for this model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was the catalyst for its inception? Why do you have extended service schooling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is already in place / what are you trying to start with? What have you implemented to date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3: Link to the school’s visions</strong></td>
<td>What is the overarching strategy of the model within your school – what are you trying to achieve? Who are you targeting? How are you targeting them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do these objectives fit with your overarching school vision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do these objectives fit with the needs of your community more broadly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4: Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>What do you believe the successful implementation and continuation of this model will achieve – among children, parents, teachers, staff and community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have any evidence of this which could be included – either anecdotal or numbers-based? Note that the inclusion of specific vignettes will be beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5: Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>What do you need from partners / potential funders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are you seeking and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 6: Accountability</strong></td>
<td>How will you keep them abreast of the model and your school? What measures do you have in place to evaluate the model which you can communicate to them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 6 (contd):

A suite of online resources is developed to guide and support schools in extended service schooling, including:

6.3 Best practice guidelines to assist schools in sharing learnings need to be provided, particularly to support those schools introducing extended service schooling for the first time. This report has discussed the range of extended service schooling provision and the differing appearances it can take in individual schools, according to the needs of students and the community.

Thus, it is clear that there is not one single ‘best practice’ model or example which would fit all schools. However, there are a number of common attributes identified through the research as critical to the success of extended service schools.

Both schools that are new to extended service schooling and those who are more established, would benefit from understanding the experiences and critical learnings of other schools. Best practice guidelines need to be developed for schools to facilitate shared learnings and assist schools who are introducing extended services for the first time.

Aligning to the business plan detailed above at 5.2, guidelines to facilitate shared learnings should include advice or best practice examples regarding:

- ways to effectively consult with, involve and engage the community, staff, students and their families;
- ways to access the range of programs and relevant funding sources;
- relevant/ suitable partner organisations and strategies to initiate and build collaborative partner relationships;
- frameworks for effectively working with other agencies and organisations, developing communication networks, facilitating feedback and fostering collaborative partnerships;
- ways in which services and programs can be tailored to meet the specific student and community needs;
- options for professional development which can assist teachers and other staff to implement extended services.
- methods of evaluation, review and the monitoring of services and programs to measure change and progress.

This set of guidelines will better enable schools to develop the services they provide and ensure the avoidance of some common ‘pitfalls’.
Theme 6 (contd):

A suite of online resources is developed to guide and support schools in extended service schooling, including:

6.4 A suite of **evaluation tools** should be developed providing advice on designs, methods, frameworks and communicating data to stakeholders. Without the creation of guidelines for the effective evaluation of models of practice, there is a risk that their evaluation will rely solely on hard statistics such as NAPLAN. As evidenced throughout this research, this will almost certainly mask the plethora of benefits extended service schools can provide.

Good evaluation data will be invaluable to schools moving forward as it will provide assistance in maintaining and strengthening the relationships of funding / partners, guide the evolution of the model, build confidence in the purpose of the approach and provide invaluable information to guide informed decision making. However, schools do not always have the skill sets to develop their own evaluation criteria.

These tools should provide guidance on:

- the **importance** of evaluation – what it can provide schools;
- potential **audiences** for inclusion in the research (for example, researching parents rather than children);
- potential **designs** (for example, pre and post inception collection of data, annual collection of data once established);
- potential **methods** of data collection for individual target audiences;
- potential survey **questions**, or at least constructs and measures;
- potential **frameworks** for analysis / examples of outputs; and
- appropriate **ways to communicate** evaluation data to stakeholders / partners / funders.

Some guidelines for this are provided overleaf. However, it is critical to note that any evaluation framework must be tailored to the individual school. These guidelines should not, therefore, be viewed as prescriptive and rather as a starting-point for schools to utilise, discuss and contextualise. Guidelines are provided for:

- Teachers and school staff
- School boards / school governing bodies
- Parents
- Children under case management / children
- Partners
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Data collection options</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and school staff</td>
<td>In most schools, the recommended approach for consulting with teachers and school staff would be qualitative techniques rather than, for example, structured surveys.</td>
<td>Highlights: What is working well? What should we maintain?</td>
<td>These discussions should be summarised by the Principal and communicated back to school staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that school staff remain supportive, and a central part of the model’s evolution.</td>
<td>The key questions should be utilised as discussion points to frame the sessions and it is envisaged that a mixture of individual interviews would be conducted (for example, with more senior staff or those integrally involved in the model), to smaller group discussions with teachers.</td>
<td>Opportunities: What could we improve on? What could we do differently?</td>
<td>It is recommended that this be done relatively informally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A dedicated time to conduct this discussion should be allotted such that it receives the necessary priority and importance within the school.</td>
<td>Risks: What are our potential risks that we may need to flag and consider over the next six months? How can we address these?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board, school governing bodies, parent governing bodies</td>
<td>In most schools, the recommended approach to these target audiences is one of consultation, rather than evaluation and thus, it is qualitative in nature.</td>
<td>Expansion: Do we want to expand our model – are we looking to change or maintain our position? How can we grow / maintain?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure they remain abreast of the model and its objectives.</td>
<td>Similar discussion questions could be asked as noted for teachers / school staff above.</td>
<td>Assistance: Are there any areas we feel we need additional assistance with?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Successes: What is this contributing? What have we achieved? What are our successes? If we did not continue, what would happen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These discussions should be summarised by the Principal and communicated back to school staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Data collection options</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>If the school conducts a parent satisfaction survey, it is recommended that some additional questions are placed on this existing data collection mechanism.</td>
<td>This research suggests that it will be important to capture both rational and emotional elements of the school to sufficiently understand the impact of the model.</td>
<td>The results of these surveys should be disseminated to teaching staff, school governing bodies as well as partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To understand perceptions of the school, its extended service schooling and maintain parental inclusion.</td>
<td>If the school does not conduct a parent satisfaction survey, or the existing parent satisfaction survey can not accommodate additional questions, then consideration should be given as to whether this is possible.</td>
<td>There are several questions that are highly recommended for inclusion (that were utilised in the Parent Survey of this research), namely agreement/disagreement that:</td>
<td>In addition, they should be communicated back to parents (where appropriate) via existing school communication methods (such as school newsletters, or school assemblies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In schools where a quantitative survey is not culturally appropriate, these could be done on a more informal basis by school staff speaking one-on-one with parents.</td>
<td>- My child is very engaged in this school&lt;br&gt; - I would recommend this school to other parents like myself&lt;br&gt; - This school really understand the needs of its students&lt;br&gt; - I feel very involved in this school&lt;br&gt; - This school is very coordinated – teachers and administrators are all ‘on the same page’ working towards common goals&lt;br&gt; - This school understands its community well – the characteristics, local issues and resources available within the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring progress across these dimensions will assist schools in their understanding of their model’s potential impact.</td>
<td>These questions should not override any standard satisfaction questions, but rather complement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target audience</td>
<td>Data collection options</td>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with children participating in early childhood interventions</td>
<td>An option for collecting data among parents with younger (prior to school) age children is for parents to rate their perception of their child’s development across key indicators on commencement of their participation with the services, and then 6-12 months post to enable observation of change post participation.</td>
<td>If there are existing jurisdiction-level measures of child development then these should be utilised.</td>
<td>The results of this data should be analysed no more than annually with the goal to observe whether there are any changes across key developmental indicators on commencement to one year post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Importantly, the same questions should be answered on the child’s commencement in the program, and then one year post their commencement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All surveys that are on ‘commencement’ should be marked as such so that they can be separated in analysis and “pre” / “post” analyses tabulated.</td>
<td>This information should be communicated to teaching staff, school governing bodies as well as partners where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency tabulations are all that are required at a school level and these can be done in Excel with no requirement for specialist software.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To understand the potential impact prior to entering school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rather than using this method, therefore, any observational data of young children should be recorded by the individuals running the early learning centre (or similar) once parental permission is obtained. While this is still qualitative and anecdotal information, it will be the most efficient to collect and potentially more accurate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These parents can still be asked similar questions to that above for ‘all parents’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target audience</td>
<td>Data collection options</td>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children under case management</strong></td>
<td>It is recommended that existing tools for monitoring academic, behavioural and attendance data are maximised rather than creating new measures.</td>
<td>Where a case management model is employed, it is recommended that individual students under case management are tracked across key behavioural, academic and attendance data.</td>
<td>The results of this should be available to teachers who have a child under case management so they are able to observe and comment on any progress – or, lack of progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To understand the impact of case management children.</strong></td>
<td>Rather, it may be the development of ‘ways’ to capture and use this data which will be of more benefit to schools.</td>
<td>Where possible, this should be collated before they enter case management and during their case management. It should capture and monitor attendance and behaviour by week such that progress can be tracked.</td>
<td>These tools should be used to assist in the understanding of both where models appear to, and not to, impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that academic data be recorded at an individual level for these students and this should be provided by term.

It is noted that this does require additional work from schools, however, the benefits it will potentially provide in terms of monitoring the efficacy of interventions is potentially significant.

*An example is provided overleaf.* This shows how simple data collection can enable automatic reporting across key measures. Thus, once the template is agreed and designed, the analysis is generated automatically.
**Example only**

Blue shading denotes “pre-case management”, Yellow shading denotes “during case management”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Student A</th>
<th>Student B</th>
<th>Student C</th>
<th>Student D</th>
<th>Student E</th>
<th>Student F</th>
<th>Student G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Term 1 Weeks 1-5**

- **Days absent**
  - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Running average of remainder**

- **Exclusions**
  - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Running average of remainder**

- **Numeracy result**
  - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Running average of remainder**

- **Reading result**
  - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Running average of remainder**

**SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: Days per week absent**

- **Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Exclusions: Times per week**
  - **Numeracy result**
  - **Reading result**

**Case Management**

- **Before entering case management**
  - **Term 1**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

- **After entering case management**
  - **Term 2**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

- **Term 3**
  - Days absent:
    - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
    - **Running average of remainder**

**Graphs**

- **Chart Filter:**
  - **Base:** All students under case management
  - **Control:** None
  - **AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT PER WEEK**

**Days absent ranges:**

- **Week 1:** 0-2
- **Week 2:** 2.5-3.5

**Case Management**

- **Before entering case management**:
  - **Term 1**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

- **After entering case management**:
  - **Term 2**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

**SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: Days per week absent**

- **Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Exclusions: Times per week**
  - **Numeracy result**
  - **Reading result**

**Case Management**

- **Before entering case management**:
  - **Term 1**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

- **After entering case management**:
  - **Term 2**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

**SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: Days per week absent**

- **Terms 1 and 2**
  - **Exclusions: Times per week**
  - **Numeracy result**
  - **Reading result**

**Case Management**

- **Before entering case management**:
  - **Term 1**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**

- **After entering case management**:
  - **Term 2**
    - Days absent:
      - **Average of Students A - G Terms 1 and 2**
      - **Running average of remainder**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Data collection options</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>As referenced throughout this report, monitoring the impact on an entire student cohort is a complex issue. A pseudo-measure of child engagement in school is recommended for inclusion in the parent survey – however, this is reflective of the parent’s perspective rather than the individual child. Collecting student-level survey data would be a considerable impost on schools and is therefore not recommended. Rather, it is recommended that existing tools for understanding school and student performance are utilised. However, these need to be caveated with the understanding that impacts observed at a school level will be long-term.</td>
<td>Existing academic indicators (ie. NAPLAN, AEDI) should continue to be monitored at a school level. However, this is a long-term evaluation tool and should not be utilised as a hard indicator for the model’s success either over short or long-term periods. It should also be noted that using a data source such as this will potentially ‘muddy the water’ as students may leave the school and enter the school. Thus, monitoring a school’s cohort of, for example Year 3’s, through the years will need to include the proportion of students who have remained in the school throughout the waves of data collection and reporting.</td>
<td>These indicators are already publicly available at a school level. As these are more likely to be useful as a longer-term indicator, it is not recommended that any additional analysis of these statistics is necessary in the short to medium term. Rather, these are tools for the school to monitor over longer periods of time as their model becomes more established and entrenched within the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target audience</td>
<td>Data collection options</td>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Maintaining and building on partnerships is a critical element of successful extended service schooling.</td>
<td><strong>Highlights:</strong> What is working well? What should we maintain? <strong>Opportunities:</strong> What could we improve on? What could we do differently? <strong>Risks:</strong> What are our potential risks that we may need to flag and consider over the next six months? How can we address these? <strong>Expansion:</strong> Do we want to expand our partnership – are we looking to change or maintain our relationship? How can we grow/maintain? <strong>Assistance:</strong> How can this school help you? Is there anything you need from us in terms of reporting etc? <strong>Successes:</strong> What is this contributing? What have we achieved? What are our successes? If we did not continue, what would happen?</td>
<td>Ideally, the same individual within the school would conduct these interviews such that they can synthesise any commonality of discussions between partners. This information should be made available to partners, school governing bodies and school staff on request. The reporting of this does not need to be a significant undertaking – rather, it should highlight one or two consistently points across the key questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>