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SECTION ONE: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The New Opportunities for PE and Sport initiative (NOPES) is a £751 million sports investment across the UK with intended key outcomes of:

- improving physical education and sport in schools;
- higher standards across the whole school;
- increased physical activity in the school age population and their communities;
- improved collaboration co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities;
- promotion of social inclusion and;
- innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities.

Across the UK the programme is predominantly capital in nature, proving funding for new sport facilities. However, in Scotland there is a revenue funded Activities Programme which is split into two strands, Out of School Hours Activities and Active Steps, which have their own particular key outcomes.

This report details the progress and findings of the evaluation of the NOPES programme for the 12 month period from February 2004 to January 2005. The evaluation is being conducted for the Big Lottery Fund by the Loughborough Partnership, led by the Institute of Youth Sport.

Update on research methods.

The selected research methods facilitate the collection of quantitative and qualitative data relating to the three key evaluation dimensions of partnership effectiveness, participation and wider social outcomes. Progress has been made during the last 12 months in the distribution of Baseline Surveys, the selection and evaluation of core case study areas and fast track projects and in the provision of assistance with self-evaluation for projects and local authorities:

- to date 691 Facilities Baseline Surveys\(^1\), which collect quantitative data prior to the opening of NOPES projects, have been distributed cross the UK with an overall return rate of 44%;
- in Scotland, an Activities Baseline Survey has been distributed to all local authorities with a return rate of 52%;
- initial evaluation visits have been undertaken to 10 of the 11 core case study areas across the UK and pre- and post-opening visits have been conducted in 6 of the 7 fast track projects;
- 7 of the planned 14 self-evaluation seminars for local authorities have been held across the UK, self-evaluation handbooks have been distributed to projects, a web-site has been completed (which provides a

---

\(^1\) There are two versions of this survey, the Baseline Survey and Baseline (Extended) Survey. Projects completing these surveys are referred to as smaller and larger projects respectively in this summary. However, it must be noted that projects over £125,000 that are not based at a single school site are required to complete the shorter Baseline Survey.
valuable resource for information, assistance and the sharing of effective practice) and a telephone help-line established.

Fast Track Case Studies

Seven fast track projects, supported in England and Scotland only, have been selected for separate evaluation. The fast track projects are designed to provide examples of effective practice and demonstrate innovative approaches or designs. In addition, the evaluation team have been able to trial methods for the core case study areas and identify early issues for continued roll out of the NOPES initiative by the Fund.

The major issues arising from the fast track projects are:

- at 6 months post-opening it is already clear there has been a dramatic impact on the quantity and quality of school curriculum physical education, on the quantity, range and quality of extra-curricular opportunities and on the take-up of those opportunities by young people;
- increasing community usage in appropriate target groups is proving to be more difficult for some schools at this early stage as they focus on operational issues in the first few months of opening;
- while project staff have strongly held beliefs concerning the benefits of physical education and sport in achieving wider social outcomes, there are few specific programmes at the fast track projects in England to address these issues.

Main Findings from England

A total of 505 Baseline Surveys have been distributed with a return rate of 44%. All of the larger projects were designed to deliver NOPES Outcome 1 of improved physical education and sport in schools, whereas only 50% intended to meet key Outcome 6, innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities. At both large and small projects, staff rated the quality and suitability of their current facilities for both pupils and community users as below average. At the smaller project sites prior to the opening of the NOPES projects there was an average of 29 community users per facility per week. In fact 52% of smaller projects had no community use prior to the opening of the NOPES project, showing the potential for improvement. The average curriculum PE time is highest in year 9 with 123 min (small projects) and 114 min (large projects) and lowest in year 11 with 111 min (small projects) and 88 min (large projects). Across all schools, 73% of boys and 70% of girls receive the 2 hour PE and sport entitlement, but the percentage receiving the entitlement drops from 84 and 83% of boys and girls in year 9 to only 57 and 52% of boys and girls in year 10. On average, 30 boys and 32 girls do not take part in curriculum PE each week due to sick notes and other excuses. Of those projects that specified target groups, 93% are targeting girls and women, with 43% targeting people with a disability and 43% targeting young people at risk. These baseline data (and the further information provided in Section 6 of the report) provide the basis for comparison with the annual data to be collected 12 months after the facilities open.
Four out of five initial visits have been undertaken to English core case study areas, during which interviews were undertaken with portfolio managers, a range of local authority staff and with other key stakeholders. Issues arising from the English core case studies include:

- there was great diversity in the roles assigned to partnerships ranging from a brief to select and build the projects to more clearly defined roles in ensuring the delivery of the portfolio and of the NOPES outcomes;
- there was great variety in the methods used for the selection of projects, but where the process was open, clear, robust and well-communicated the make-up of the final portfolio was well-received;
- sustainability is a major issue for all responsible for the delivery of the NOPES initiative, with potentially crucial factors identified as effective partnership working, linking with other initiatives such as the School Sports Partnership Programme and clear realistic business plans;
- monitoring and evaluation requirements of local authorities and individual projects were not generally well understood by those interviewed;
- staff were confident that the NOPES initiative would have a dramatic impact on the quantity and quality of PE and extra-curricular activities and often viewed the NOPES initiative as a catalyst for cultural change, with schools becoming more ‘outward looking’ and becoming the hub of their community;
- those responsible for delivering NOPES in schools are looking for assistance in overcoming barriers to increased community use, including inexperience in attracting community users, the lack of expertise or capacity to run large-scale leisure facilities and the inherent contradiction between the need to raise revenue in order to be sustainable and yet to attract members of identified target groups.

Main Findings from Scotland

A total of 54 Facilities Baseline Surveys have been distributed in Scotland with a 52% return rate. All large projects were designed to improve the range of activities, improve links with the wider community and to support the delivery of curriculum PE for pupils. Fewer small projects (57%) intended to improve links with the wider community. Projects ranked their existing facilities as generally poor with 94% of small projects giving their facilities a rating of between 1 and 3 based on scale of 1 Highly Unsuitable to 5 Highly Suitable. The average number of community users per week at existing small project facilities was 53. The average amount of time-tabled PE in secondary schools was highest for S1 in the large projects at 116 min and lowest in S6 at zero. The School Sports Co-ordinators and Active primary Co-ordinators Programmes were seen as very important by 100% of the larger projects in contributing to the success of the NOPES programme.

Activities Baseline Surveys were distributed to projects funded through the Activities programme of which 52% were returned. Activities projects, and in particular OSHA projects, were most commonly designed to achieve Outcomes 1 (68%) and 3 (70%) involving the creation or improvement of opportunities for physical activity. Active Steps projects were more likely to be designed to
impact on criminal activity (94%), exclusion and truancy (89%) (Outcomes 5 and 6). All Active Steps projects (100%) identified target groups with 79% targeting all of the following 3 groups: young people at risk of offending, young people at risk of being excluded and young people who truant. The two most common age groups for OSHA projects are P6-7 (69%) and S1-2 (61%). Active Steps projects most commonly work with pupils in S1-4 (91%). Overall few projects (24%) work with P1-3. Most projects (69%) organise activities in all 4 terms. However, only 12% organise activities in all school holidays, although 50% do offer activities during the summer holidays.

Initial and second visits have been undertaken to both core case studies in Scotland which encompass the facilities and activities programme strands. Key issues arising from the Scottish core case studies are:

- at this early stage local authorities see the Activities Programme as the major avenue for the early impact of the NOPES programme;
- projects have been specifically designed to address strategic needs and meet existing gaps in provision;
- projects are aware of potential sustainability problems generated by revenue funding for 3 years and are moving to address these issues;
- there is a great variety of project types and ways of working, ranging from projects that are open to all, to those which are sharply targeted on a very small number of young people.

### Main Findings from Northern Ireland

A total of 56 Baseline Surveys have been distributed mainly to small NOPES projects with a return rate of 52%. All of these projects were designed achieve NOPES Outcome 1 (improved physical education and sport in schools) with between 96% (higher standards across the whole school) and 46% (social inclusion) of projects designed to achieve other NOPES outcomes. Prior to the opening of the NOPES projects only 7 community users were accessing each smaller project site. Although there is less onus on small projects to enhance community use in Northern Ireland, these data suggest a lack of tradition of community use of school sites for sports activities which larger projects may have to overcome. It is of concern that some primary school pupils are only receiving 30 min PE per week, although all secondary age children in the small sample returned to date are achieving the Northern Ireland target of 90 min per week.

The two Northern Ireland case studies are located in largely rural and largely urban areas respectively. In one case study area partnership working arrangements for the NOPES portfolio were based on existing collaborations, whereas in the other case study area a completely new partnership had been formed. Partnerships had taken great care in their selection of projects resulting in well-balanced portfolios in which, for example in one case study, small rural projects were already open to provide immediate impact. For larger projects, there was a much longer lead in time with extensive community consultation in order to maximise impact once facilities open.
Main Findings for Wales

A total of 76 Baseline Surveys have been distributed in Wales with a 32% return rate. All of the projects were designed to achieve NOPES Outcome 3, better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity amongst the school age population and their communities and at least 71% of projects were addressing each of the other key outcomes. Individuals completing the questionnaires generally rated their existing facilities as below average with 55% rating the quality of existing PE and Sport facilities as 1 or 2 on a scale between 1 poor and 5 excellent. The average number of community users per week for small projects was 192 with 82% of projects having some community use. Curriculum PE time was highest at 114 min (small projects) and 123 min (large projects) in years 7 and 8 and lowest at 78 min (small projects) and 86 min (large projects) in year 11. At each school project site an average of 43 boys and 43 girls did not take part in PE each week due to sick notes and other excuses. Two-thirds of projects were involved with Dragon Sport and 56% with the Welsh Network of Healthy schools. Of those projects specifying target groups, 88% were targeting girls and women and 25% targeting people with a disability, people living in an area of high deprivation and young people at risk.

The initial visit to one of the Welsh case studies showed a co-ordinated approach to PE and school sport, in that the Portfolio Management Board was to oversee all PE and sport initiatives for the local authority. In addition, project boards were in place to support best practice and to monitor and evaluate projects. It was considered that the portfolio had a high chance of successfully meeting the NOPES key outcomes due to:

- the care taken with project selection on the basis of local need and NOPES outcomes;
- the very close links with the PE and School Sports Programme which would facilitate improvement in the quantity and quality of PE and;
- well-developed plans for monitoring and evaluating the portfolio.

Recommendations for Local Authorities and the Fund.

Monitoring and evaluation by project sites and local authorities is generally an underdeveloped area at this stage. Given the need not to overburden schools it is recommended that local authorities take advantage of as much existing data collection as possible including the opportunity for the Loughborough Partnership to write a report for the local authority if more than 50% of projects return the Baseline and Annual Surveys.

At some of the fast track projects operational issues in the opening of the facility have taken precedence over the broader strategic objectives. It is recommended that local authorities consider how best to support projects through the opening period, especially in schools with little prior experience of managing new sports facilities. Sharing practice and expertise between projects is likely to be very beneficial to maximising the overall impact of the NOPES initiative. It is recommended that local authorities could have a key role in bringing together project staff for networking and sharing of effective practice.
It is recommended that the Fund:

- shorten and simplify the application process for any similar subsequent initiatives;
- clarify the Fund role in supporting local authorities to deliver the NOPES programme once facilities are open;
- continue to be involved with both identifying and disseminating effective practice and;
- publicise their monitoring and review process at the earliest possible date and clarify for individual projects and local authorities their respective roles in the monitoring and evaluation process.

In addition, the Fund should not under-estimate the very positive anticipated impact on school PE and Sport which if confirmed by post-opening data, could be publicised and celebrated.

**Future Plans for the evaluation.**

During 2005 the evaluation team will:

- continue to identify those factors which impact most favourably on the delivery of the NOPES outcomes and to disseminate examples of effective practice;
- develop a participant survey for use in core case study areas and commence core case study visits at the level of the project;
- finalise and distribute the Participant Survey for the Activities programme in Scotland;
- select the cases for the Football Foundation Case studies and commence the case study visits;
- pilot and conduct the telephone case studies;
- undertake further distribution and collection of the Baseline Surveys in all four home countries and undertake distribution of the first Annual Surveys (12 months after project opening);
- Complete the series of evaluation seminars and continue to update the website and;
- Continue to circulate newsletters outlining the progress of the evaluation and sharing examples of effective practice.
SECTION TWO: INTRODUCTION

Since the presentation of the first annual report there has been substantial progress both in the rolling out of Big Lottery Fund’s New Opportunities for PE and Sport (NOPES) programme and in the evaluation of the programme by the Loughborough Partnership. This report details the progress of the evaluation over the last twelve months.

Progress has been made in four main areas:

- evaluation of case study portfolios and projects (including fast track projects)
- the agreement of Baseline Survey protocols in each of the four home countries and the commencement of survey distribution
- the refinement of the methodology for the evaluation
- the provision of support for local authorities’ self-evaluation activities

The completion of the initial evaluation of the fast track projects has been extremely beneficial for the evaluation. Six of the seven fast track projects chosen for evaluation have now been visited pre- and post-opening. These projects have provided initial evidence as to the impact of the NOPES initiative as well as allowing important emerging issues to be identified. Furthermore, evaluation of the fast track projects has been helpful in the development of the evaluation methodology now being used for the core case studies.

With regard to the case studies, during the year, desk studies of the application documents for the eleven core case studies were completed as were the initial visits, at portfolio level, in nine of the cases. Due to the advanced progress with the NOPES Activities programme in Scotland, second round visits and interviews have also been undertaken in the two Scottish case studies. A fuller description of generic case study methodology is given in Section 4.4 while initial findings from the case studies themselves are given in the respective home country sections.

Design of the Baseline Survey was completed early in the year. Subsequently, the protocol for survey distribution has had to be negotiated separately with the Fund in each home country to fit with the slightly different operation of the NOPES programmes in each country. Baseline surveys have now been agreed and distributed in regular batches throughout the UK as projects near completion and opening. The response rate so far has been, in the main, encouraging and higher than anticipated. An important factor in explaining the encouraging response rate is the ongoing series of regional seminars where members of the team are able to explain the evaluation process and the contribution that the survey data will make to the overall assessment of the NOPES programme and to the impact of their portfolio of projects. Progress with the distribution of the surveys and analysis of the early survey responses is discussed more fully in the sections for each of the four home countries.

Mention has already been made of the positive impact of the local authority seminars on the response rate for the questionnaires and their role in informing
local authority lead staff of the nature and process of evaluation. The seminars also have the purpose of supporting local authorities and projects conduct their own self-evaluation. To date seven seminars have been held across the country out of a planned total of fourteen. The seminars have generally been well received and, in addition to informing local authority staff about the evaluation process, have proved an important opportunity for portfolio managers to exchange experiences and ideas. However, the seminars were one element in a pattern of support provided for local authorities by the Loughborough Partnership. Other elements include the self-evaluation handbook which is distributed to all projects with the Baseline Survey and the Loughborough Partnership NOPES website which went live in August 2004. Progress in developing the infrastructure of support for local authorities is outlined in more detail in Section 4.7.
SECTION THREE: UPDATE ON THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THE EVALUATION

3.1 Evaluation of Partnership

In the previous annual report, it was stated that the investigation of partnership literature was at an early stage. This section provides a more extensive examination of concepts that could be utilised in the evaluation.

The emphasis of the NOPES initiative on building effective partnerships echoes a similar emphasis in many other areas of social policy. As such it is a generic concern that is the subject of increasing theoretical scrutiny from policy analysts. It is, therefore, clear that the literature on collaboration and partnership has a great deal to offer the evaluation. In particular, three concepts may be useful to the evaluation of the NOPES initiative: governance, policy networks and regime theory. Each of the three will be considered in turn.

3.1.1 Governance

The concept of governance has become the ‘defining narrative of British government at the start of the new century’ (Rhodes, 2000a, pp6). In its broadest (and simplest) sense, governance refers to the methods of governing any entities be it a school, business or local and national government (Newman, 2001). Thus the concept has the potential to be applied at both the project and strategic levels of the NOPES evaluation. Beyond Newman’s definition, in the realm of public policy, the concept of governance is widely accepted to refer to ‘the development of governing styles in which the boundaries between public and private sectors have become blurred’ (Pierre & Stoker, 2000, p32). Implicit in this definition is a recognition of changing modes of governing where the government no longer has the means or authority to achieve its ends in isolation (Stoker, 2000, p3).

Therefore, within these new governance structures relationships between organisations from the public, private and voluntary sectors are characterised by power dependence (Stoker, 1998). Much of this power dependence is based on the need to share individual organisations’ resources, be they financial, information or authority based for example (Leach & Percy-Smith, 2001). Due to the uneven distribution of resources, no one organisation dominates new governance structures. However, authors have suggested that government may try to ‘steer’ the direction of policy using different techniques. Steering techniques suggested by authors include using institutional power to shape governing structures, employing financial resources to prioritise particular outcomes and also the utilisation of negotiation and persuasion skills (Rhodes, 2000b; Stoker, 2000). Within the NOPES evaluation, some of these techniques may be more applicable at a strategic, rather than project, level.

One perspective adopted within the governance literature is that of ‘good governance’. This perspective corresponds well with the partnership dimension of the evaluation as it examines and suggests features of new governing
structures which may or may not be effective. Bovaird & Loffler (2003) suggest that the advent of new governance arrangements has raised issues such as stakeholder involvement, transparency, equality, ethics, accountability and sustainability. Furthermore in the more general partnership literature emphasis has been placed on identifying factors which underpin successful partnerships. For example, the Health Development Agency (2003) describes the following elements as central to effective partnership working: leadership and vision; organisation and involvement; strategy development and coordination; learning and development; resources; and evaluation and review. Such factors, and others, will be used to inform the evaluation of partnerships in the case studies.

3.1.2 Policy Networks

As a theoretical concept, policy networks are viewed as an example of the governance structures described above (Rhodes, 2000b). Policy networks involve a range of actors involved in collaborative arrangements. The characteristics of the actors and the type of collaborative arrangements varies across different types of policy networks identified by Rhodes & Marsh (1992). At one extreme of their typology, policy communities are typified by stable, close knit relationships between a small number of actors who share common values. Conversely, issue networks are diffuse groupings with a large membership encompassing a range of affected interests and values (Rhodes & Marsh, 1992).

The concept of policy networks does offer the evaluation greater explanatory power than is present in the governance literature. Policy network theory is more explicit in its description of the relationships between the individuals involved in the network, the structure of the network and the resultant outcomes. As in the governance literature, the influence of organisations and individuals upon policy network outcomes may be dependent on the resources which they control and the skill with which they are deployed in the policy network context. However, the structural impact of policy networks is also emphasised by a number of authors. For example, Marsh & Stoker (1995, pp293) writes ‘networks are political structures which constrain and facilitate, but do not determine policy outcomes’. The relationships briefly described here may be particularly useful in understanding how the partnerships involved in the NOPES initiative influence the impact of the initiative on participation and wider social change.

Policy network structures, however, are not static arrangements and the literature does identify a number of reasons why policy networks change. External changes in wider economic and political contexts may result in changes in policy networks (Rhodes & Marsh, 1992). It could be speculated that the NOPES initiative itself may result in changes to existing policy networks. Internally the structure of policy networks may be also altered by the individuals and organisations that constitute them. Furthermore, the outcomes of a particular policy network may affect the structure of the network itself (Marsh & Smith, 2000). These may be issues relevant to the analysis of partnerships over time.
3.1.3 Regime Theory

Another theoretical concept that may be of use to the evaluation is that of regime theory. Regimes can be considered as a particular type of policy network, sharing a number of features with Rhodes & Marsh’s (1992) description of policy communities. Mossberger & Stoker (2001, p829) provide a useful description of what they believe are the core properties of regimes:

- partners drawn from government and non-government sources, requiring but not limited to business participation
- collaboration based on social production – the need to bring together fragmented resources for the power to accomplish tasks
- identifiable policy agendas that can be related to the composition of the participants in the coalition
- a longstanding pattern of cooperation rather than a temporary coalition

As with policy networks, Mossberger & Stoker’s (2001) second property which highlights the importance of collaboration to achieve particular outcomes may be of particular relevance to the evaluation. Stone (1993), in one of the key texts on regimes, emphasises the aspect of negotiation within regimes towards development of a shared policy agenda in areas where the aims of individual regime members overlap. The overall aims of a regime, therefore, may be limited to what is viewed as achievable rather than the explicit goals of member individuals and organisations (Stone, 1993).

3.1.4 Conclusion

Each of the three concepts briefly described above may be valuable to the evaluation of partnerships in the NOPES initiative. As concepts they could support the descriptive analysis of partnership structures. Furthermore, policy networks and regimes may provide tools for the analysis of the impact of partnership arrangements on the achievement of NOPES outcomes.

However, the context in which these concepts have been utilised previously may suggest some caution should be adopted before automatically attempting to apply them on a widespread basis. In general all three concepts have been employed at a national or local government level or, in the case of policy networks, in the study of particular policy issues. Therefore, at present it is difficult to speculate what use these concepts may be at a project level although the generality of governance literature may offer it increased scope for use at project level.
3.2 Logic Model development for Scottish Activities programme

The previous annual report (January 2004) included a section entitled ‘Theories of change and a logic model for NOPES’. Included in the section was a basic logic model which attempted to outline how the NOPES programme operated and what it aimed to achieve. In this section the logic model is adapted for use with the Scottish Activities programme. The basic logic model will be utilised and aid the evaluation of the whole activities programme.

Furthermore, the data from the Scottish Activities Baseline Survey (see Section 7.2) allows for the completion of the activities section at a generalised Scotland-wide level. This section was left blank in the annual report as it was suggested that, for the facilities programme, activities could only be identified at a local level.
Figure 1 - NOPES Activity Programme Basic Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Lottery Fund resources</td>
<td>New and/or expanded sporting and cultural activities in areas of low provision</td>
<td>Increased participation in sport and physical activity</td>
<td>(All projects)</td>
<td>Wider Social Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA resources</td>
<td>Coaching and taster sessions in a wide range of sports and activities</td>
<td>Young people finding suitable activities for themselves</td>
<td>• Provide more opportunities for children and young people to develop their personality, talents, and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential by promoting effective links between learning and sporting and cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td>Integration of physical activities as part of a wider citizenship programme to promote active citizenship and social responsibility</td>
<td>Young people accessing wider social outcome programmes</td>
<td>• Promote social inclusion through the provision of sporting and cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active Steps Only)</td>
<td>Integration of physical activities as part of a wider citizenship programme to promote active citizenship and social responsibility</td>
<td>Young people developing particular skills</td>
<td>• Improve opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active Steps Only)</td>
<td>Outdoor adventure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish new links between schools and their communities that encourage young people to enjoy lifelong involvement in sport and cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active Steps Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Active Steps Only)</td>
<td>Wider Social Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people accessing wider social outcome programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use sport to divert young people from criminal activity or behaviour likely to lead to such activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people developing particular skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote positive behaviour to aid in the reduction of truancy and exclusion from schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Generalised from the Scottish Activities Baseline Survey
SECTION FOUR: UPDATE ON RESEARCH METHODS

4.1 Introduction

Over the past year, the evaluation team have made considerable progress finalising the research methods to be used throughout the evaluation. Furthermore, in the majority of cases the process of using these methods has begun. Section Four, therefore, outlines the progress with the development and implementation of the evaluation’s research methods.

4.2 Baseline Survey

The development of Baseline Surveys has been completed during the year. Each of the four countries in the UK has separate Baseline Surveys. All school based projects over £125,000 in England, Scotland and Wales will receive the Baseline Survey (Extended). In Northern Ireland the cut-off point is £75,000. Projects under £125,000 or those not based at a single school site receive a much shorter Baseline Survey.

Versions of all the surveys designed in Excel for electronic completion are available if projects request them. Welsh language versions of the survey are also being distributed in Wales.

Different protocols for the distribution of the surveys have been designed and agreed for each of the four home countries. The different forms of information received by the evaluation team about projects in each of the four countries, and the differences in operation of the programme, have necessitated the different approach in each of the home countries. The protocols for distribution cover:

- when surveys are sent out and to whom
- when reminders are issued
- how the local authorities (and Education & Library Boards in Northern Ireland) are kept informed of the distribution process
- what incentives are offered for completion of the survey.

The progress of distribution of the surveys is included in the Baseline Survey section for each of the four countries. (Sections Six to Nine)

4.3 Scotland Activities Surveys

4.3.1 Baseline Surveys

Analysis of the returned Activities Baseline Surveys has been conducted. The results of this analysis are presented in Section 7.2.

4.3.2 Annual Surveys

For the Activities programme data collected through sportscotland Active Schools monitoring will support that collected through the Activities Annual Survey which is combined with the Fund’s Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
The first batch of Active Schools data has recently been received for the school year 2003/04. Unfortunately, for initial examination, it is believed that schools have had difficulty accurately identifying NOPES-funded activities in their schools. The quality of the data received is therefore in doubt. To verify, if indeed, the data is inaccurate across Scotland, the two case studies have been asked to comment on the quality of the data that sportscotland have collated for the schools in their area. Upon receiving feedback from the case studies, further decisions will be taken as to how the analysis of data is to proceed.

Data is also received through the Fund’s AMR. So far, the evaluation team have received the data from six local authorities. The quality of the data from this source appears to be reasonable. Data from the AMR submitted by the other 26 local authorities is anticipated by the end of March 2005.

4.3.3 Participant Surveys

The participant survey is intended to measure new and extended participation in sport and physical activity due to the NOPES initiative. The design of the participant survey tool is now complete. Procedures for distribution through local authorities will be developed in early 2005.

4.4 Case Studies

4.4.1 Selection of the case studies

The eleven core case studies are a key strand of the evaluation. Five cases have been selected in England, two in Scotland, two in Northern Ireland and two in Wales. The basis for the selection of these cases is outlined in the Loughborough Partnership Annual Report (Year One).

The findings from the case studies are included in the sections of the report for each of the four home countries. A summary of the main issues arising from the case studies is included in Section Ten of the report.

4.4.2 Case Study Design

Following selection of the cases each local authority\(^1\) was contacted by the Fund by letter. The letter outlined what being a case study authority would entail. The letters were followed by a telephone call from a member of the evaluation team. The telephone call allowed the opportunity to address queries and gain confirmation that the local authority were willing to become a case study.

\(^1\) Throughout the report the term ‘local authority’, used in relations to case studies, includes Education and Library Boards in Northern Ireland as appropriate.
The experience with the fast track projects informed the development of the case study design which initially involves three steps as shown in Figure 1 below:

**Figure 1: Core Case Study Design (Year 1)**

1. Desk studies of bids and interviews with big lottery fund grant officer interviews
2. Initial Visit to Case Study Authority (Key stakeholder/ ‘insider interviews’)
3. Follow-up visit to Case Study Authority and Projects (‘Insider and Outsider interviews and project visits’)

Following agreement by the local authority to become a case study a desk study was undertaken. This involved visiting the Fund offices and examining the case files. Interviews were also conducted with the grant officers where appropriate. (In some instances the grants officer was new to the case and therefore had little experience of the case).

The purpose of the desk studies was therefore to identify:

- The aspirations of project managers
- The aspirations of key stakeholders
- The partnerships
- Possible innovations and examples of best practice
- How local authorities and projects intend to achieve the remaining outcomes
- Identify issues relevant to the portfolio or particular projects that require further investigation in interviews

One of the key functions of the desk study was also to identify the individual projects within each case study which may be of particular interest to the evaluation.

Following the desk study it was originally anticipated that an initial visit would be made to speak with a number of relevant stakeholders. This has not been possible with all cases and therefore the initial visit has been conducted over more than one visit.

Initial visits to the case study are then supplemented by a follow-up visit. In the two case studies in Scotland these have already been conducted due to the progress made with the Activities programme in Scotland. A summary of the progress made to date in each of the case study areas is included in Table 1 below.
### Table 1 - Summary of Case Study Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Desk study</th>
<th>Initial visit</th>
<th>Year 1 visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>BH/IL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1 conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Another Planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>MN/IL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Planned 21/02/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>KA/IL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed 1/12/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>LA/CM</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed 25/01/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SR/AC</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>16th December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>IL/CM</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Jan 04</td>
<td>Conducted November 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>IL/CM</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>March 04</td>
<td>Conducted Jan 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>MN/CM</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed 4/10/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>MN/RJ</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed 29/01/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>IL/FC</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed 17/18 Jan 05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4.3 Project choice

There is a great deal of variation between the cases in terms of the number of projects included within each portfolio. Originally it was anticipated that up to 100 projects in total would be examined in detail. In five case studies all of the projects will be included in the evaluation. In the other case study areas a selection of projects for evaluation is required. It was agreed that these projects should be selected, firstly, to adequately reflect the diversity of the case study NOPES portfolio and, secondly, to ensure that all project types within the initiative are represented adequately across the evaluation as a whole. The selection of projects for evaluation may be particularly difficult in Northern Ireland where the portfolios are particularly large. Selection of the projects has been based on a number of factors including:

- interest of particular projects.
issues that may affect the choice within particular portfolios may vary across different cases e.g. rurality

balance of projects across the following classifications:-
- Type of projects (including umbrellas and outdoor adventure)
- New and upgraded capital projects
- Location of projects (primary, secondary and special schools & other venues)
- Large and small Projects

The timing of completion of projects is also important. Those that are already complete will not be ideal and projects that are not completed until well into the evaluation may also be problematic.

4.5 Football Foundation Projects

The Loughborough Partnership intend to report on the impact of the NOPES funds distributed through the ‘Grass Roots’ strand of the Football Foundation separately. Originally it was anticipated that the data collection for this process would occur through the core case studies. Further investigation of the Football Foundation Projects has led to the decision by the team to pursue an alternative evaluation strategy for a number of reasons.

Unfortunately Football Foundation projects are not well represented in the case study areas in terms of number of projects. It would therefore not be possible to do justice to the evaluation of this strand of the initiative through the case studies.

It is also apparent that whilst the Football Foundation aims are closely aligned to those for the main programme they are not identical. Whilst the Big Lottery Fund outcomes are referred to in the application documents they are not outlined clearly as required outcomes. For this reason the Baseline Survey will not be suitable for use with Football Foundation projects.

The Football Foundation already has an established evaluation and self-evaluation approach and it is thought important by the evaluation team that the strategy developed for the external evaluation complements the systems already in place. Contact has been made with the relevant individual based at the Football Foundation and a strategy for this aspect of the evaluation has been agreed.

The evaluation will focus on the six NOPES outcomes and the three key evaluation dimensions (Partnership, participation and impact on wider social outcomes). Other issues which would be interesting to explore are:

- The impact of the FA community development officers in assisting the application process
- The impact of the FA community development officers in developing projects
The two main data collection methods for the football foundation projects will be surveys and project case studies.

4.5.1 Survey data

The Football Foundation has already established survey data collection procedures. The data gathered by the Football Foundation will be made available to the evaluation team. In addition the Football Foundation have agreed to include additional questions in the survey in order to ensure that the NOPES six key outcomes are reflected adequately.

4.5.2 Project Case Studies

In addition to the quantitative data being collated by the Football Foundation it has been agreed that ten project case studies will be selected for in-depth evaluation. The framework for evaluating these project case studies will be based on the model for the fast track projects:

- One initial visit prior to completion of the project
- One visit six months after completion
- One visit three years after completion

Initial visits will be restricted to the staff at the school whilst subsequent visits will involve interviews with other key stakeholders.

4.5.3 Project Selection

The following criteria will be used to select projects:

- Project size
- Project type
- Project location and level of deprivation

4.6 Telephone Case Studies

Twenty telephone case studies will be conducted during the early months of 2005. The purpose of the telephone case studies is to explore the partnership dimension through twenty additional cases in order to identify examples of effective practice.

Specifically the telephone case studies will explore:

a) Partnership effectiveness

- The composition and terms of reference of the partnership/management group
- Strategy
- Links with other initiatives
Monitoring and evaluation

b) Impact on participation and wider social outcomes
   - Target groups
   - Most successful projects
   - How will the portfolio achieve the impact on:
     o Young people?
     o Wider Community?

Two local authorities have been selected initially. The research design for the telephone case studies will be piloted before selection of the other 18 cases is made.

4.7 Self-Evaluation

The Loughborough Partnership believes that they have an important role to play supporting local authorities and individual projects through both the dissemination of effective practice and also sharing self-evaluation expertise. In order to meet this obligation the evaluation team have undertaken a number of developments.

4.7.1 Website

A full evaluation website was launched August 2004 at www.nopesevaluation.org.uk. The website contains an overview of the evaluation, examples of effective practice, all surveys materials and various other resources designed to be of use to those delivering the NOPES initiative. This is intended to be an evolving and responsive site and is therefore updated as the evaluation progresses.

4.7.2 Handbook

In order to assist projects in undertaking self evaluation the evaluation team have produced a New Opportunities for PE and Sport Self Evaluation Handbook. Three versions of the handbook have been developed relating to the following groups of projects:

- projects completing the Baseline Survey (Extended)
- projects completing the Baseline Survey
- Scottish activities projects.

A Welsh version has also been produced.

The handbook contains a step-by-step guide to self-evaluation and guidance for completion of the Baseline Survey. The handbook is distributed to projects with the Baseline Survey and can also be downloaded from the evaluation website.
4.7.3 Telephone Help-line

The surveys that are distributed to projects all include a telephone help-line number. This number can be used for any individual needing support in completing the Baseline Surveys. Furthermore, support for projects or local authorities in self-evaluation can be provided through the help-line. This number is also publicised on the website.

4.7.4 Evaluation Seminars

A series of evaluation seminars have taken place across the UK over the last year. At the request of Essex County Council, a workshop was held in Chelmsford which offered a chance to pilot presentations on topics to be addressed in the evaluation seminars.

During February 2004 The Loughborough Partnership presented on the evaluation at two seminars in Scotland attended by local authority representatives working on the activities programme. Subsequent to the workshops for the Scottish activities programme the Loughborough Partnership were invited to give presentations at two workshops organised by the Fund on the facilities programme in Scotland. The workshops were held on 8th and 11th June in Dundee and Glasgow respectively. Both workshops were viewed positively and led to further refinement of the Facilities Baseline Survey for Scotland.

Evaluation seminars have taken place Loughborough, London, Manchester and Birmingham. The remaining seminars are planned as follows for 2005:

- 2nd February    South East England
- 23rd February   South Wales
- 29th February   Yorkshire & Humber
- 16th March      North East England
- 23rd March      Northern Ireland
- 14th April      South West England
- 18th April      East of England
- 20th April      North Wales

The evaluation seminars include an overview of:

- the programme evaluation
- self-evaluation
- the Baseline Surveys
- the Fund’s monitoring requirements

Those who have attended the seminars have been given the opportunity to feedback on their experiences. One of the most important outcomes that they have benefited from the opportunity to meet and share experiences with other local authorities.
4.7.5 Newsletters

During the past year the evaluation team have distributed four Evaluation Newsletters. All newsletters are available in English and in Welsh on the evaluation website. The newsletters have included articles on the following topics:

- programme evaluation progress
- distribution procedures for the Baseline Survey
- support available for self-evaluation including the evaluation seminars
- results from the fast track projects and Scottish Activities Baseline Survey
- guidelines for conducting focus groups
- effective practice in community consultation and self-evaluation
SECTION FIVE:  FAST TRACK CASE STUDIES

5.1 Introduction

Fast Track projects, supported in England and Scotland only, are designed to provide examples of effective practice and demonstrate innovative approaches or designs. The evaluation of seven fast track projects has been ongoing for more than 18 months. During this period, the evaluation of the fast track projects has been invaluable for the evaluation team for a number of reasons.

The complexity and diversity of the NOPES initiative is well-documented. Evaluating the fast track projects has allowed the team the opportunity to begin to make sense of the challenges ahead and to identify early learning issues for the evaluation and the Fund. In particular the fast track projects have provided the opportunity to trial and refine the evaluation methods which will be adopted throughout this longitudinal evaluation. The Baseline Surveys have been piloted with the fast track projects. In addition the approach which will be adopted within the core case study areas has also been trialled and refined as a result of the experiences with the fast track projects.

This section provides an update on the progress of the each of the fast track projects. Follow-up visits, approximately six months after opening, have been made to each of the five projects in England and are reported on in this section. In Scotland, fast track projects are at an earlier stage of development compared to the projects in England. At South Lanarkshire Lifestyle, two follow-up interviews have been conducted while two remain outstanding. The Haghill Primary School follow-up visit is due in February 2005. The reports on the Scottish fast tracks, therefore, detail findings from the pre-opening visit only.

The fast track section concludes with a sub-section which considers how the fast track projects reflect theory on partnerships and the concept of governance in particular. This leads to the identification of issues for the evaluation as a whole. Wider conclusions on the fast track projects are given in Section 10.2 - Emerging Issues from the Fast Track Projects.

5.2 Methodology

A summary of the timing of the fast track case study evaluation visits and project opening dates is included overleaf.

5.2.1 Initial Visits

The initial visits to the fast track projects involved interviews with a variety of individuals who had been involved in developing the fast track projects. The number of interviews varied between projects, but each visit used the same
evaluation framework which reflected the overall evaluation approach. The three key stands of the interviews explored:

- The effectiveness of partnerships
- The impact of projects on participation
- The impact of increased participation on wider social outcomes

### Table 2: Fast Track Projects
Summary of evaluation visits and opening dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Visit</th>
<th>Facility Opening Date</th>
<th>Follow-up Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fullhurst Community College</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>December 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon Community school</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Guest High School</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>January 2004</td>
<td>July 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The St Christopher School</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
<td>April 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paignton Community and Sports College</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire Lifestyle</td>
<td>January 2004</td>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>November 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haghill Primary School Community Sports Facility</td>
<td>June 2004</td>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2.2 Follow-up visits

The purpose of the follow-up visits was to build on the data gathered at the time of the initial visit. Interviews were again conducted with a variety of individuals as appropriate to the particular setting. Interviewees included:

- Project manager
- Facility manager
- Head teacher
- School governor
- PE and other staff at the school
- Representatives from clubs using the facility
- Local authority representatives
The interview schedules were based around the three key strands of the evaluation.

Interviews were supplemented by focus groups with pupils where appropriate. Six focus groups were conducted in total.
5.3 Case Study 1 - Fullhurst Community College Sports Hall

5.3.1 Introduction

Fullhurst Community College Sports Hall is based at the school of the same name which resides within a multi-cultural, multi-deprived inner-city area in the city of Leicester. The project consists of a new four court sports hall, changing facilities and classroom located on the school site but detached from the main school building. The Fund has granted the project a total of £968,276 from a total cost of £1,328,276. The remainder of the money for the project came from school funds. The project was completed in May 2003 and the official opening ceremony on was held on 10th July 2003.

It was anticipated that the new purpose built facility would allow both school and community groups to participate in a far greater range of activities at the site. This development would allow Fullhurst Community College (Fullhurst) to offer all pupils 2 hours of PE within curriculum time. A new Community Sport Co-ordinator employed by the school has been employed with the aim of developing community usage and building links with relevant groups and organisations.

A preliminary visit to the site by the whole evaluation team was undertaken on 14 May 2003 but did not form part of the evaluation. The first visit, for purposes of evaluation, was made on 5 June 2003.

Return visits were made to Fullhurst in December 2003 and January 2004, six months after the official opening of the facility.

5.3.2 Partnership effectiveness

The Community Sport Co-ordinator is responsible for the day-to-day management of the facility. The Community Sport Co-ordinator is ultimately responsible to the school governors and is line managed by the Fullhurst Business Manager.

A management committee has now been set up by the Community Sport Co-ordinator. The first meeting of this committee was held in October 2003 and it was anticipated that the committee would meet quarterly. The committee consists of representatives from:

- The PE department
- Braunstone Sports Action Zone
- Positive Futures
- Braunstone Community Association
- Senior members of the school management team

This committee is chaired by the Community Sport Co-ordinator. The committee’s main purpose will be to serve as a focus for development of sport for the local community with the breadth of membership hopefully bringing a range of resources and skills to the partnership. Young people were not
represented directly on the committee although the school is considering developing a youth council which may provide an avenue through which young people could be represented.

The Community Sport Co-ordinator delivered an extensive ‘Sports Hall Plan’ at the first meeting of the management committee. The plan outlined the following objectives for Fullhurst:

1. Provide a sports programme aimed at encouraging all students, staff and local community members to participate in regular exercise and competition regardless of ability, which are diverse in nature and reflect the needs of the local community
2. Maximise the potential of the facility and the income without discouraging ‘minority groups’ e.g. low income, ethnic minority, disabled, female and girls
3. Place Fullhurst on the map as a key provider for various sports activities
4. Improve the provision of P.E. and sport across a family of schools both within and beyond the normal curriculum in order to raise standards
5. Provide a comprehensive range of vacation based courses for children between the ages 5-14 from foundation to excellence
6. Structure community sports clubs to a high standard allowing all participants to maximise their potential
7. Provide opportunities for sports centre users and local residents to qualify as coaches in a chosen sport in conjunction with NGB’s
8. Promote sporting excellence through the provision of extra curricular opportunities and specialist coaching, currently unavailable for identified gifted and talented pupils

(These aims are quoted directly from the Fullhurst Community College Sports Hall Plan)

It is apparent from the ‘Sports Hall Plan’ that the Community Sport Co-ordinator has been responsible for all aspects of the operation of the new facility including:

- Recruiting and inducting staff
- Developing cleaning plans, staff rotas, equipment inventories,
- Developing a lettings policy
- Acquiring additional sponsorship
- Marketing the facility
- Developing monitoring and evaluation systems
- Developing and implementing the facility timetable
- Writing an action plan complete with costings

In addition to the operational responsibilities responsibility for ensuring partnership working also falls within the Co-ordinator’s role. The Co-ordinator plans to meet with clubs using the facility on a bi-annual basis and is also attempting to establish links between clubs. The Co-ordinator finds it difficult to do community development work because of all the other pressures placed
on her. She is very optimistic that Positive Futures will have a huge impact on the community use of the facility as their staff will have the opportunity to work directly with particular members of the community.

During the initial evaluation visit to Fullhurst evidence was supplied of initial links having been made with a variety of other organisations and programmes, including National Governing Bodies, Active Sports programmes, Sports Action Zones and with relevant sections within Leicester City Council. At this time it was recognised by an interviewee that some of these partnerships were likely to be more important to the success of the project than others. However, in the initial stages all partnerships required a considerable time commitment from the Community Sport Co-ordinator. A comprehensive analysis of local needs undertaken by the Braunstone Sports Action Zone has been informative for the project.

There is a group who are meeting regularly to discuss the timetabling of the facility. This group involves the Youth Wing, the community department of the school and the School Sports Co-ordinator.

5.3.3 Impact on participation

At the time of the initial visit it was anticipated that the new facility would allow the time allocation given to PE in the curriculum to be expanded significantly and that the quality of PE would be improved by the far greater range of activities that can be accommodated. It was therefore anticipated that there would be an impact on both the quantity and quality of PE for the pupils of Fullhurst. These anticipated changes had occurred by the time of the follow-up visit with PE lessons being described as ‘changed big-time’ by the PE staff.

Quantity and quality of PE

Key Stage 3 pupils (Years 7, 8 and 9) now all receive two hours of curriculum PE. This contrasts with the situation before the new facility where some year groups only received half an hour of PE. In Key stage 4 only the pupils who opt to do GCSE PE receive 2 hours of PE.

Staffing for the PE department has traditionally been a problem at Fullhurst. The school have been forced to rely on supply staff to supplement the staff team and this has not been considered effective by the school. Recruiting PE staff has been difficult because it is an inner city school with very poor facilities and some difficult pupils. This is compounded by a limited supply of qualified candidates. The school has recently recruited one additional member of staff which means that the school now have three members of staff in the PE department. The new member of staff is a basketball specialist. Basketball was not played at Fullhurst prior to the new facility. It has now become very popular at the school and the school have competed against other schools in basketball for the first time. Outside agencies are involved in promoting basketball at the school. Around 30 pupils attend basketball sessions at lunchtime and after school where they have set-up their own teams.
Due to both lack of staff and lack of facilities it was very common for pupils at Fullhurst to spend PE lessons in a classroom. Often this classroom was not timetabled and therefore pupils would spend a proportion of the lesson seeking out a location for the lesson. This clearly had a significant impact on both the quantity and quality of PE the pupils engaged in. The new facility has allowed classes to double up as there is now room for more classes to participate at the same time. There is also a classroom in the facility overlooking the sports hall which allows pupils to undertake observation work and which pupils can use effectively in their PE lessons.

The focus groups with pupils confirmed this negative view of PE before the new facility:

- There was a consensus of both boys and girls that PE lessons were previously of very poor quality.
- Much of the PE was done in the classroom. The girls noted that many girls did not bother to bring their kits because they knew that the PE lesson would probably take place in the classroom.
- Both boys and girls stated that most of the PE lessons prior to the opening of the new facility were spent waiting for a turn to participate as the old facility was only one quarter size of the new sports hall.
- They also commented that the range of activities was severely limited.

Pupils were asked to comment about their PE lessons since the opening of the new facility. Again there was consensus between the two groups over the improvement in PE lessons since the opening of the new facility. Both groups were very impressed with the new facility. One year 10 boy commented that he was unhappy that he would be leaving the school and would therefore not benefit from the new facility. He stated that the school had been planning the facility ever since he had been at the school.

Positive aspects of the new facility included:

- All the young people in the class being able to take part in PE at the same time
- The range of activities that they are now able to participate in
- The quality of changing rooms which was mentioned by the girls as being particularly important.
- The new classroom in the sports hall as it allowed a dedicated space for certificated PE classes

Negative aspects of the new facility suggested were:

- There are no lockers for the young people who do GCSE PE. These young people are required to bring their PE kit to school everyday. The girls noted that carrying the PE kit around with them all day causes them problems.
The lack of PE staff is also noted as a problem as this impacts on PE lessons especially if one of the existing staff is away from the school for some reason.

Fullhurst now have single-sex PE lessons. This decision was taken as a result of feedback from a survey conducting as a result of the school’s involvement in the NIKE project ‘Girls in Sport’. The PE staff believe that this has had an impact on both the quality and quantity of PE. This has been possible because of the new facility which can be broken down into three separate sections to accommodate different groups.

When asked about the single-sex PE lessons the boys were unanimous that this was a positive improvement. The girls were not so conclusive. The girls could see that for some girls this was a positive move. This was considered true for girls who were less ‘sporty’.

Four of the girls who participated in the focus group were taking GCSE PE. They commented that for them not participating in PE with the boys was not a positive improvement. Only nine girls in one year group and 12 girls in the other year group had selected to take GCSE PE. This severely limited the team games the girls could participate in. These girls also felt that they could compete well with the boys and that they would have benefited from having the opportunity to compete.

A member of the PE staff confirmed that the number of excuses amongst girls has fallen dramatically since the new facility opened with pupils being ‘keen to do it even if they haven’t got their kit which is a big change for girls especially’. The staff member believes this is due in part to the pupils being able to ‘see what they are missing’ through non-participation.

It was also noted that the staff within the PE department ‘have started thinking about your own training as well’. Prior to the new facility there was very little opportunity for PE staff to develop their own skills. The new facility means that they can now deliver new activities, in new ways and thus developmental opportunities are arising which will impact on the quality of teaching at Fullhurst.

Extra–curricular activity

The range of activities offered to pupils is said to have increased dramatically. Whilst football has traditionally been popular for both girls and boys the new facility has allowed other sports to be offered for the first time which the PE staff noted the pupils ‘have never, ever had the opportunity to try.’

Leicestershire Cricket Club and Leicester City Football Club visit the school to work with pupils and the new facilities will be instrumental in helping the clubs to achieve more with the young people.
A number of the boys felt very strongly that there were no activities for them, frequently blaming outside users’ use of the facilities. Two of the less vocal boys in the group participated in the trampolining club. Another was a member of the basketball team. The other boys felt that there should be more football and more clubs just for them. They claimed to be unaware of or ineligible for the current activities. Some concern was expressed about the prevalence of particular sports e.g. basketball.

There appeared to be barriers to communication between staff and the young people about the extra-curricular activities. The young people clearly do not recognise the financial need to allow external users to use the facility.

When asked what would be the best way for staff to communicate with the young people about extra-curricular activities they stated:

- Through form tutors
- Through assemblies
- Through publicly available timetables

The girls seemed happier with extra-curricular provision. Some of the girls were involved in extra-curricular activity but the majority did this at clubs away from the site. When asked what other activities they would like to see one girl noted that she was tired at the end of the day and that she just wanted to go home. Other girls agreed with this.

A local dance group use the facility one evening a week. The girls were asked whether they attended this. They did not and expressed that this was an external club and they did not feel that they were a part of this. Some of the girls talked favourably about their experiences of teaching other girls to dance within PE lessons.

Recognition that the local community included many different target groups, including ethnic minorities and people on low-income, was apparent both in the application process and from information given during interviews. Two particular target groups, women and disabled people were identified during the initial visit to Fullhurst. Girls, and particular older girls, remain a key target group and specific strategies to encourage participation amongst girls include:

- Single sex PE lessons
- An established dance club have recently re-located to Fullhurst and are attracting new members from the local community
- Outside agencies have been invited to do special workshops
- Girls-only activities and tournaments run by women

The new changing rooms were noted as being particularly important for encouraging girls to participate. The opportunity to have individual showers in a pleasant environment was identified as being an important factor in girls' decisions to participate in sport.
Impact on Community

Fullhurst has a tradition of working with the local primary schools and in supporting the transition from primary to secondary. The new facility has aided in this process by allowing Fullhurst to offer both the facilities and taster days to primary pupils.

The timetabling of the facility was still developing at the time of the second visit and local community use of the hall had been limited. Scheduling the twilight sessions between the end of the school day and the evening is particularly problematic as noted by the PE staff:

‘We want to capture that kind of bracket so children have the opportunity to lead into adult sport so they don’t just see it as school…..We need to develop that link from sport in school into adult life.’

When the Community Sport Co-ordinator took up her post she believed that the local community did not participate in sport because they did not have facilities available locally. Her beliefs were supported by Sports Action Zone research which highlighted the lack of local affordable facilities. Recent experience in post suggests that sport is not valued as a high priority in spending finite resources within the local community. To date the Community Sport Co-ordinator feels that the new facilities seem to have had very little impact on the local community.

5.3.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

Evaluating the impact of the new facility on wider social behaviour is a long term objective. During the focus groups the pupils of Fullhurst demonstrated a sense of ownership of the new facility. The young people stated that the facility did make them proud of their school. The boys felt that the facility gave the school some credibility. Some boys also stated that the school used to be perceived negatively but the new facility gave them something to be proud of. However, this was not a unanimous feeling.

Both boys and girls felt that the sports hall was theirs and that they did not like outside users using the facilities.

The boys felt particularly strongly that the timetable for the facility was all taken up by outside users and was thus taken away from Fullhurst pupils. The boys felt that at the very least outside users should be involving Fullhurst pupils in their activities and they did not feel that this happened currently.

Girls appeared not to feel as strongly as the boys about outside users but it was still an important issue. Again the girls felt that the facility was theirs as pupils of the school. One girl remarked that outside users didn’t take such good care of the facility when they used it because they were just paying for it. The young people saw the facility as belonging to them and resented its usage by ‘outsiders’ who did not value it in the same way as the Fullhurst pupils.
When asked whether the facility had impacted on behaviour in the school the general feeling was that it had not. When asked about vandalism the young people confirmed that the lack of vandalism was due in part to the pride in the new building and in part to the presence of the security cameras.

The Community Sport Co-ordinator believes that pupils have gained a sense of pride in competing against other schools in basketball for the first time. Unfortunately the spectators have been banned from attending matches because they were abusive to the fans of other schools. Disruptive behaviour by some pupils has an impact across the school. The school has recently introduced a behavioural programme for pupils who are disruptive in class which is making an impact in school. Because the school are undertaking a number of new initiatives simultaneously it is very difficult to attribute change to any one initiative. The new facility is considered to be a significant part of attempts to improve all aspects of pupils’ experience at Fullhurst.

One area where the facility is perceived to have had an effect is on anti-social behaviour after school. Pupils who would previously have been wandering about after school 'causing problems or getting into trouble' are now attending after school clubs in the new facility. There are plans to work with Fullhurst’s Youth Wing to ensure that links are developed to move this work forward.

The PE staff were also able to identify particular individuals who have benefited from involvement in new sports. One pupil who had previously had problems with discipline is now involved in trampolining and has given displays to other pupils and is now involved in mentoring.

As noted earlier the facility has had an impact on the motivation of the PE staff with a staff member stating that the new facility has 'given me a new lease of life'. The facility has impacted on staff beyond the PE department. Some staff have offered to run new extra-curricular clubs for the first time. In addition there is now a staff sports night on a Friday night which has been seen as having a 'knock on effect in what they offer to children'.

A number of policies designed to address such issues were being developed. Leicester City’s existing ‘Crown Project’ will be adopted to allow children from the school to get free access to the facilities as a reward for regular attendance, good behaviour and achievement in PE at school. Similarly, a strong emphasis was placed on providing coach education and training both within the school and local community as a means to address a variety of social issues. Plans to monitor the impact of these programmes are under-defined.
5.3.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

A member of the PE staff confirmed that the facility is fit for purpose noting:

‘People just come in and marvel at the facility’

The Community Sport Co-ordinator also believes it is fit-for-purpose calling it ‘fantastic’ and noting the sprung floor is particularly impressive.

For the local community the venue offers real value for money since the activities are subsidised. All activities incur a small charge (£1) as it is felt that the activity is devalued if no charges are levied.

Revenue funding remains a pressing issue at Fullhurst. Set up costs were not anticipated accurately in the original bid document. Costs such as security cameras, telephone line installation etc were not anticipated accurately. The inaccuracy was attributed to lack of experience of developing such proposals. As a result there is increased pressure on the school budget which is already pressured.

In an attempt to reduce the cost of activities for community users the Community Sport Co-ordinator has bid for and received monies to subsidise the activities provided at the new facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards for All</th>
<th>Funds basketball drop-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active sports</td>
<td>Funds participation in the Central Venue League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards for all</td>
<td>This bid was submitted by the Co-ordinator on behalf of the Badminton club who regularly use the facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school has also accepted short term bookings in order to secure much needed revenue.

5.3.6 Examples of effective practice and lessons learnt

A clear example of effective practice in the Fullhurst Community College Sports Hall project is the employment of the Community Sports Co-ordinator. The post has already been vital to the establishment of an operational facility and in the future will contribute significantly to the project’s ability to achieve positive change in participation and wider social behaviours. The support given to the post holder by senior staff within the school, particularly the Head Teacher and the Business Manager has been, and will continue to be, crucial to the success of the post.

Due to competition from a new facility being developed locally which will include a swimming pool the Community Sport Co-ordinator has taken the decision for Fullhurst to specialise in Badminton and Basketball. She organised a drop-in day for Basketball and was surprised when 58 young
people turned up. This is a regular event on a Saturday afternoon and is maintaining its popularity. With the involvement of clubs such as the Leicester Riders using the facility she believes the young people involved can see a pathway ahead of them in the sport and have positive role models to look up to.

Other examples of effective practice centre on the wide variety of innovative practices designed to encourage particular local target groups to participate:

- the extension of the ‘Crown Project’ is an excellent example both of a programme designed to address both participation and wider social behaviour and of the benefits of drawing upon and contributing to established local initiatives.
- the scheduling of selected activities to coincide with public transport availability
- the emphasis on involving staff at Fullhurst School both as a target group in itself and as a means of promoting the centre to pupils and other potential community users.

5.3.7 Overall assessment of progress to date

The project has made excellent progress both in preparing the facility for opening and in development of partnerships and programmes for the future. This progress would not have been possible without the post of Community Sport Co-ordinator and the expertise of the post holder.

The new facility has had a dramatic impact on both the quantity and quality of PE provision at Fullhurst. There has also been a significant impact on the provision of extra-curricular activities in terms of range, quantity and quality. There has also been an impact on the primary schools which feed Fullhurst. Fullhurst have also been very successful at encouraging local clubs to become involved in the new facility and also in ensuring that there is provision for Fullhurst pupils to access these clubs.

Involvement of the local community in the new facility has been disappointing according to the Community Sports Manager but she remains optimistic that this will be developed in partnership with initiatives such as Positive Futures.
5.4 Case study 2 – Langdon Community School

5.4.1 Introduction

Langdon Community School is located in the London Borough of Newham, one of the most ethnically and culturally diverse areas in London. The population of Newham suffers from high levels of economic, health and social deprivation. The project based at Langdon Community School consists of a six-badminton court sports hall. The project is one of 5 within Newham’s portfolio. The total cost of the project is £1.7 million. The school have contributed £200,000 and the LEA approx £283,000 to the project, although the final account for the project is not complete at the time of writing this report. The new facility opened in September 2003.

The project was developed in order to address the imbalance between the school’s outdoor sports provision which is considered to be of a high quality and the indoor sports provision which was described as poor in two OFSTED reports.

The initial evaluation to Langdon took place on 17 June 2003 with a follow-up visit talking place on 1 March 2004.

5.4.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Langdon Community School is a Specialist Sports College. Alongside one other school in the borough Langdon is responsible for delivering the School Sports Co-ordinator programme. The school is also involved in initiatives such as Girls in Sport and Active Sports. The project contributes to Newham Borough Council’s cultural strategy for the borough and plans for leisure provision.

The school works closely with local primary and secondary schools and has regular cross-curricular meetings. In addition the school works with local community groups such as Asian women. Community table tennis and netball clubs make use of the school's facilities.

At the time of the initial visit an advisory board was planned for this project. The school’s existing Sports College Advisory Board was expected to form the basis of this new group and will include representatives from primary schools, secondary schools, community groups, Langdon’s governing body and Borough Council officers. Additional members will be sought although processes were not yet in place to enable recruitment. The role of the group was seen as an advisory one aimed at maximising school and community use of the facility and ensuring the greatest impact on the community, primarily in terms of usage and health. At the time of the follow-up visit the way in which the facility will be managed was still undecided.

Deciding on the best way to ensure the maximum impact of the new sports hall at Langdon has been a complex process which was still unresolved at the time of the follow-up visit. Originally, it was anticipated that a health and
fitness development manager would be employed to manage the community use of the facility. An alternative strategy was also considered involving private contractors, Greenwich Leisure, being contracted to run the facility. Greenwich Leisure are already employed by Newham Borough Council to operate existing facilities within the borough. Both of these alternatives have now been discounted although the possibility of contracting out the management of the fitness suite in particular is still a possibility.

At the time of our follow-up visit a Community Sports Development Manager from Newham Borough Council’s Culture and Community department had been seconded to the school for 6-12 months. His remit is to develop a timetable for the facility in negotiation with the school and the Community Education and Culture and Community departments of the council in order to secure maximum usage of the facility by both the school and the community. Three principal aims have been identified which will inform the development of the timetable:

1. To facilitate quality progressive sporting opportunities for the school community and on a wider basis, Newham residents and or communities
2. To target young people facilitating sporting excellence and/or personal development objectives
3. To promote achievement through participation and or sports competition

It is anticipated that the way in which the facility will be managed in the long term will also become clearer as a result of the secondment.

5.4.3 Impact on Participation

Quality and quantity of PE

At the time of the initial visit the new facility was expected to impact on both the quantity and quality of PE offered at the school. Pupils in key stage 3 already receive at least 2 hours PE per week, although this is not true of pupils in key stage 4. It is anticipated that the increase in the quantity of PE for key stage 4 will be attained through pupils working to obtain sports leader awards.

During the focus group held at Langdon the pupils described PE lessons before the new facility as:

- Very boring
- Cold in the winter
- Dull
- Not enough to do
- The equipment wasn’t all there
- Limited activities
Ways in which the quantity and quality of PE have been improved for pupils include:

- There are more activities on offer than previously. An example of this is indoor athletics which had never been offered to pupils before as it meant going to other sites.
- Pupils can now learn the rules of games they play because there are markings on the floor which were not available previously.
- Taster days have been offered in new sports requested by the pupils such as karate.
- The new facilities allow students to ‘show off and shine more’ when they are being moderated for exam purposes because they have the room to do so and because they have purpose built facilities.
- The pupils also have better opportunities to analyse their classmates’ performances in PE.

The pupils offered their views about the ways in which PE had changed since the new facility opened. Responses included:

- More people get involved
- In the gym you don’t have enough space now we can play basketball properly.
- There’s lots of space
- More people are involved in PE because they get the chance to join in whereas before they would’ve watched.
- A lot of girls didn’t use to bring their kit and now they do because of the new sports hall.
- It’s modern, it’s lovely.

The pupils also confirmed that they are now more active within PE lessons because of the additional space.

The school already monitors curricular usage of the PE and sports facilities at the school. At this early stage, further monitoring and evaluation of the new facility is one issue that has not been extensively addressed. The school operates a SMART card system which records aspects of usage but is not fully operational.

**Extra-curricular activity**

One key development noted by the PE staff is the development of regular inter-form competitions in a number of sports. These competitions were requested by the pupils of Langdon through the sports council. The competitions are run by the pupils for the pupils. The new facility has allowed the competitions to take place.

The emphasis on increased opportunity at Langdon is on providing developmental opportunities for all participants. The netball club for example
has teams ranging from Year 5 up to adult. This reflects the belief that young people are more likely to progress in sport of they see where they can progress to and then have the opportunity to do this.

During the follow-up visit to Langdon the evaluation team had the opportunity to meet with the individual who had been instrumental in developing netball at Langdon. The new facility has contributed to the significant expansion of the club which is a borough wide club. It was noted for example that:

‘For our juniors we have gone from one coach to three coaches now. That’s how much it has changed since the new sports hall.’

A number of different reasons were outlined for the expansion in the club which result directly from the provision of the new sports hall:

- On the day of the evaluation visit the school was hosting an important competition between Essex and Middlesex. This was considered a huge accomplishment for the school in terms of promoting both netball and the school. The Partnership Development Manager at the school stated:

  ‘I suppose without the hall you wouldn’t have done it.’

- The Essex Netball club is moving to Langdon from other premises from September which is again as a direct result of the new facility.

- The new facility has enabled the club to develop skills amongst the players that were not possible previously:

  ‘For us I think it is probably going to sound crazy but when we were outdoor obviously it was cold but just to introduce walls into training. Its amazing the different things you can do. We didn’t have walls before. We didn’t have floors you could sit on. So many new ideas and new things we can do now because we have the sports hall.’

- Because netball practice now takes place indoors it was noted that the practices do not get cancelled for bad weather as would have happened very regularly previously. It is felt that this has resulted in increased skills by those participating in netball.

Cricket is another sport which is being developed at Langdon. Cricket has been chosen as a sport which will appeal to the local community and yet there is no local cricket club in existence. Again the club has seen a great deal of expansion over the last few months. This expansion can again be directly linked to the new facilities. Particular factors which are considered to have added to this expansion are:

- County players regularly attend the training sessions on a Saturday morning which is attended by 65+ individuals.
• Previously cricket took place at another local school due to the lack of facilities at Langdon. The school were allocated a slot late at night which was not appropriate for younger players. The new facility has ensured suitable time slots are now allocated to cricket.
• Cricket that was played at Langdon prior to the new facility was done so in facilities that were considered of a poor quality. The new facility is equipped with new nets and bowling machine which has again enhanced the young people’s prospects of acquiring cricket skills

Impact on community

The pupils of the primary schools using Langdon’s facilities currently have as little as 30 minutes PE per week. It was anticipated at the time of the initial visit that the new facility would lead to an increase in curriculum and out of hours time for primary school PE and that it would have a positive impact on the quality of PE offered to pupils. This was considered to be happening by the time of the follow-up visit. Examples of the ways in which this was happening are:

• Regular inter-school tournaments are held on Thursdays with the finals taking place over a week at Langdon. These events would not have taken place before due to the reliance on the weather.
• INSET days for primary staff. It was noted that some of the primary staff who attended netball INSET training now attend the netball club on a regular basis
• Gifted and talented taster days for primary pupils

Target groups

One of the target groups identified at the initial visit is girls. Langdon continues to have single-sex PE lessons which were implemented before the new facility was in place. The new facility has allowed girls-only activities to be offered one day a week. These activities include a range of sports because it was noted that previously if the sport on offer did not appeal to individuals they did not attend. The PE staff feel that being able to offer a wider range of activities has meant they attract more girls to participate.

Another target group the school are working with is local Asian women. The school was already working with some Asian women before the sports hall was completed but the staff feel that the new fitness suite will be a vital asset in trying to get this group active. The group are very inactive and overweight and would not use public fitness suites. The privacy of the fitness suite at Langdon and the very small group size allows the women an opportunity which is not available anywhere else locally.

When asked what the main benefits of the new facility were the pupils noted the following:

• Range of sports increased including extra-curricular activities
• Improved facilities
• Opportunity for a wider range of competitions
• Opportunity to invite good quality coaches in
• Better equipment
• A new community facility
• Children from primary schools attend festivals
• People now take a pride in their surroundings
• The pupils felt there was more of impact on the girls because the boys were already active (‘We have friends who now go to activities who wouldn’t before because it is a better experience.’)

5.4.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

When the initial visit was made to Langdon it was anticipated that the new facility would have an impact on a number of aspects of school life including GCSE results, Attendance, Behaviour, Exclusions and Value Added. At the time of the follow-up visit those interviewed felt it was too early to say in what way the new facility would impact on wider social behaviour within the school.

The Partnership Development Manager at the school noted the impact of the fitness suite on the staff at Langdon, many of whom now use the fitness suite:

‘For the staff it is great for relieving stress rather than going home and getting changed and going back out or whatever’

It was also noted that parents who drop their children off at netball training now use the fitness suite whilst their children train.

Those involved in the netball club are confident that the young people involved have increased their self-esteem. The case of one individual player was cited as an example of this. The pupil concerned was on the verge of dropping out of school and has poor academic performance. Her involvement in the netball club has not only kept her in school but has also encouraged her to complete her Junior Sports Leader Award and coach younger pupils. She now hopes to pursue a career in sports development.

The pupils of Langdon were very aware of the impact the new facility had made on their view of the school:

• We are much more proud of the school.
• Its makes you think about the privileges you have here
• Now we can tell other schools to come to us
• Now get coached by international players which is great
• You should feel proud you can come to the sports centre that other schools can’t
5.4.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

The staff and pupils are very impressed by the new facility and believe it is ‘fit for purpose’. With hindsight the PE staff note that a viewing gallery would have been very beneficial because so many pupils and parents come to watch the events that take place now such as inter-form tournaments and inter-school competitions.

Additional revenue has been secured as a result of the new facility through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund. The borough council have stated that they will make a donation to ensure the facility serves the community well. This commitment by the council has meant that Langdon has not been forced to accept lettings purely in order to generate much needed revenue. It was noted that it would be possible to fill the facility with bookings from football clubs in order to generate income but that this did not fit with the overall vision for the development of the facility. As noted by the Community Sports Development Manager:

‘We could advertise the space and existing groups would flock to use it. Its brand new and we could fill it very easily but what has that got to do with development?’

5.4.6 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned

Langdon have a pupil school sports council. There are two representatives from each form, so it is a large body of over 100 pupils. It meets half-termly at lunch-times. It has a standard agenda but the content, under fixed headings, is determined by pupils. The representatives report back to their forms and gather opinion/issues. The sports council discussed the use of the new facility at its first meeting of the new session in September 2003. The impression is that the sport council is lively and enthusiastic and also listened to by staff.

The involvement of the Community Sports Development Manager will be crucial for the future success of the sports hall at Langdon. This is recognised by those at Langdon and it is hoped that when a plan is developed for Langdon’s future that this will provide a model which can be adapted across the borough. In this way Langdon is considered a pilot for sports development in the borough of Newham as a whole.

The borough of Newham has very few local sports clubs. Rather than trying to entice existing clubs into the facility it is hoped that Langdon will create new groups which will become central to the local community and thus it is hoped that Langdon will be a catalyst for new clubs. The council has not only made a financial commitment but has also pledged to provide other resources such as coaches in order to ensure that this happens.
5.4.7 Overall assessment of progress to date

The new facility has had a significant impact on the quantity and quality of PE provision at Langdon. It has also had a similar impact on extra-curricular provision for the pupils of Langdon and for other pupils within the borough. As noted by the Partnership Development Manager the new facility has resulted in:

‘More activities. More sports. More opportunity.’

The school is working very closely with the borough council to develop and implement a strategic vision for the Langdon sports hall which is based on the notion of sporting development. The facility is part of a wider vision for the borough and this is backed by a financial commitment on the part of the borough council which has allowed the decisions about lettings to be strategic rather than purely for income generation.
5.5 Case Study 3 – Abraham Guest High School

5.5.1 Introduction

Abraham Guest High School Changing Rooms are based at the school of the same name which serves two of the most deprived wards in Wigan. The project consists of a new changing room block to serve the school’s outdoor pitches. The block comprises two changing rooms and referee’s room with showers, disabled access and toilet facilities and is located on the school site. The Fund have granted the project a total of £288,000 from a total cost of £293,000. The new facilities were opened for use by the school and community in January 2004.

The project was designed to facilitate increased participation within the school, feeder primary schools and the local community. Furthermore, the improved changing facilities were seen as having a potential effect on pupil and teacher motivation throughout the school.

The initial visit to the school was undertaken by two members of the evaluation team on 7th July 2003. A subsequent visit took place on 15th July 2004 when school staff, community users and a group of young people were interviewed.

5.5.2 Partnership effectiveness

The management structure in place for the project was very strong both at local authority and school level. Steering and action groups were in place within Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council to drive the management of the NOPES initiative. The membership of these groups, drawn from the education, leisure, health and the voluntary sectors, demonstrated the multidisciplinary approach taken by the council. At Abraham Guest the Head of Community is responsible for the overall management of the facility. He is in turn responsible to the Sports College Management Committee.

The school has an ethos of involving stakeholders in management decisions. Prior to the new facility being built, community consultation with existing users had identified that the lack and poor quality of existing changing facilities was an important issue. Furthermore, a questionnaire was conducted with pupils which identified vandalism as a potential problem with the intended location of the changing rooms which led to the re-location of the facility.

Both the school and the community users interviewed were very committed to developing a partnership based approach to developing the community usage of the school’s facilities. The school takes some care in the choice of partner community organisations in order to ensure that they share similar aims and meet certain standards, for example access for the local community. As part of the development of partnership arrangements the school has plans to develop a Community User Group. The school’s commitment to allocate all income from community usage for future developments decided upon by the
User Group shows the commitment of the school to community management and the level of power that the User Group may have.

Wigan’s entire NOPES portfolio and the individual project were effectively interwoven into a variety of different strategic plans. A specific strategic plan had been developed for the NOPES initiative which significantly influenced the choice of projects within the overall portfolio. This plan linked into Wigan’s Community Plan, Wigan’s Grass Playing Pitch Strategy, the LEA PE development plans and the Sport and Recreation Strategy. The vision and aims of each of these plans and strategies were closely aligned with those of the NOPES initiative and influenced the implementation of the initiative at the local level. Within the school setting the mutual importance of Specialist Sports College, School Sport Co-ordinator and NOPES initiatives was also recognised with strong links being drawn between the outcomes of all three.

Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council has taken a very proactive approach to monitoring the effectiveness of the Fund projects. An outside consultant is employed for two days a week by Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council to oversee the whole NOPES portfolio. The post has allowed Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council to provide a structure for the monitoring and evaluation of all projects in the portfolio. Within this structure each project will undertake a process of auditing existing practice, developing action plans and reviewing progress against these plans. At a project level, the Project Partnership Management Group, under the direction of the Head of Community, would report to the Sports College Management Committee three times a year. An annual report on the project would also be submitted to the Steering Group from which a summary would be submitted to full council.

On-going revenue funding for the project is secure. Funding for the Head of Community post is allocated through the school budget. Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council also stipulated that every secondary school that formed part of the NOPES portfolio must allocate, from the school budget, the equivalent of 5% of capital costs to a fund for developing primary school sport. Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council viewed this contribution as demonstrating commitment to involving primary schools in the NOPES project.

5.5.3 Impact on participation

Quantity and quality of PE

Although the school, as a sports college, has already reached the 2 hours of quality PE and sport target, the new facilities have improved the quality of this provision. In general, pupils felt that motivation to take part in PE had increased due to the quality of changing facilities available. Furthermore, pupils also reported that they were able to participate more fully in PE lessons as quality showers were now available before they went on to subsequent lessons. The benefits of showering to subsequent lessons, in terms of concentration and application, was also recognised by pupils.
Extra-curricular activity

Other curricular and extra-curricular benefits of the new changing facilities were:-

- providing better arrangements in general for changing across the school. It was now possible to separate different year groups and activities which reduced the need for supervision of changing and reduced any issues of intimidation
- allowing separate changing rooms for opponents in school sport fixtures. Pupils felt this was positive as it allowed team talks to take place in the changing rooms and a more professional image was exuded.
- primary schools now had greater access to the school’s sport facilities. As a Sports College, the school ran numerous tournaments for other schools and the changing rooms supported this development. Previously, many primary schools arrived already changed and as awareness grows of the new facilities more schools were taking advantage of the new changing facilities.

Impact on Community

As mentioned previously, the school are very committed to developing community usage of the school’s sports facilities. The new changing rooms, therefore, enhanced and ‘facilitated’ this continued development. For example, the existence of the new changing facilities had played a role in encouraging usage by new community groups, including the local tennis club. School pupils also intimated that the development of quality facilities would mean that they would be more likely to participate in community activities at the school.

However community usage of the school’s sports facilities is close to capacity and interviewees expressed a concern that facilities were not over-used as this would affect the quality of the service offered. Community users identified that the new changing facilities enhanced the quality of provision at the school. Current users were increasingly likely to change and shower at the facility rather than arrive already changed. Such small changes may help to develop the local community’s feelings of ownership and the overall image of Abraham Guest’s facilities.

Driven by external influences, including the Sports College targets and Sportsmark Gold scheme, the evaluation data collected by the school on participation was mostly quantitative. Participation numbers and examination results would be the primary school based-data source. Similarly, a register of community users was also collected which included the number of teams and different age groups participating. As school staff and the evaluators recognised, it would be difficult to evaluate the precise difference that the changing facilities had made on these figures.
Target groups

Before the opening of the new changing facilities, the school had identified females as one major target group for the new project. Consultation with the community had shown that the unappealing changing rooms had previously been a disincentive for female participation. One particular group that had benefited from the new changing facilities were Wigan Latics Women’s Football Club who are based at Abraham Guest. The club are expanding rapidly and viewed the new changing facilities as one ‘piece in the jigsaw’ of their continuing development.

As well as providing disabled changing facilities, the project may also have an indirect effect on the participation of disabled users. Using the new changing rooms for outdoor activities will make space available in the games hall which could be allocated to disabled users. The school were trying to develop sports services for people with a disability but had encountered problems attracting one disabled group and, in general, felt that it was a difficult group to target.

5.5.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

The new changing facilities added to the pride that pupils had in their school. A comment made in the focus group, supported by other pupils, was that ‘it makes us look like a better school if we have better facilities like that’. More generally, the impact of the new changing facilities on wider social outcomes would be through facilitating the delivery of other activities and initiatives. For example, the changing facilities supported the school’s operation of the Junior Sports Leader Award which developed citizenship skills in the 130 children that had participated in the scheme in the current school year.

As well as numbers participating in awards such as JSLA and attainment of educational qualifications, evaluation of wider social behaviours includes measurement of pupil’s attitudes towards school in Years 7, 9 and 11 as part of the school’s participation in the Lancashire Value Added project. As with evaluating participation, it would be difficult, if not possible, to distinguish the impact of the new changing facilities on these measures.

5.5.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

The cost of the changing rooms had increased considerably due to delays in the building of the facility and due to the requirement of meeting Sport England specifications. These specifications, it was felt, were more relevant to ‘elite’ facilities rather than facilities designed to enhance participation in sport. Despite a number of changes to the design of the building, a recent inspection had highlighted problems with disabled use of the facility and the school believed that disabled access to the sports hall could have been improved by creating a direct link from the changing rooms.

Despite these problems the new changing rooms are ‘fit for purpose’ and meet the needs of the school and community. In particular, it was recognised
that the inclusion of individualised showers appropriate for adult and child usage met the requirements of a modern facility and was an improvement upon previous provision.

5.5.6 Examples of effective practice and lessons learnt

The project showed many examples of effective practice both at a local authority and school level. Both Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council and the school had put in place effective management structures for the NOPES portfolio as a whole and the individual project. These structures ensured that all projects addressed key issues, shared effective practice and had suitable monitoring and evaluation procedures in place. Senior management within the local authority were also praised for their positive approach to NOPES including their commitment to cross-departmental partnership working. Furthermore, Wigan’s insistence that schools benefiting from NOPES contribute to a fund for the development of sport within primary schools is a particularly innovative and encouraging initiative.

The employment of an consultant to concentrate on monitoring and evaluating the NOPES portfolio is an example of effective practice. The impact of this post is recognised by the school. The post ensures that strong structures for monitoring and evaluation are developed across the local authority whilst the consultant is available to support individual schools in monitoring and evaluating their own projects.

Within the school the ethos of partnership and commitment to community development was particularly strong. As such consultation had had an impact on the original proposals for the changing rooms. Furthermore, on-going partnership is built on effective foundations of trust, communication and shared aims. The ongoing development of Wigan Latics Women’s Football Club is testament to this effective partnership building. The instigation of a Community Users Group, with effective powers, can only strengthen community ownership and involvement.

5.5.7 Overall assessment of progress to date

From the project’s conception the excellent management structures within the local authority and school meant that the project has always been in a good position to deliver the desired outcomes. The changing rooms help facilitate the achievement of the Abraham Guest’s, and community user’s, aims by supporting the school’s continual development of activities and services. Abraham Guest’s status as a Specialist Sports College and its hosting of a School Sport Co-ordinator partnership will also contribute to the impact on the school and community. The evaluation team are confident that NOPES outcomes will be achieved through this whole-school approach to sports development.
5.6 Case Study 4 – The St Christopher School

5.6.1 Introduction

The St Christopher School caters for 138 children with moderate learning difficulties and autism from the area of Southend-on-Sea. The project consists of a fully equipped three-court sports hall including a physiotherapy room. The changing facilities are zoned and incorporate individual disabled shower and WC facilities. The sports hall is complemented by residential respite care accommodation which has been developed along with the sports hall. Direct access is available from the sports hall into the residential facilities. The total cost of the sports hall was £755,000 of which the Fund’s contribution was £380,000.

The project is intended to address the school’s inadequate sports facilities (OFSTED 1996 and 2000) and to provide specialist sports facilities for both adults and children in Southend-on-Sea. The facility is also available to able bodied users and for the development of teaching staff.

The initial visit to the facility was made on 11 July 2003 and the return visit was made on 6 April 2004. The facility opened on 5 September 2003.

5.6.2 Partnership Effectiveness

The St Christopher school has very close links with the mental health charity MENCAP who have been instrumental in this project. The school also has close links with a number of local organisations and is very pro-active in its fund raising, already having a significant proportion of the funding in place prior to the bid being submitted to the Fund. This reflects the enthusiasm and determination of the head teacher and his staff team.

The capital programme was managed by a project manager at Southend-on-Sea Borough Council who was involved in developing the bid in partnership with the school. The NOPES portfolio has been designed to complement the Community Plan developed by the Local Strategic Partnership, Southend Together. The NOPES initiative has raised the profile of sport within Southend-on-Sea with the result that sport has now become a major issue for the Council who are looking to develop this area significantly. A new appointment has been made at senior officer level which will provide a link between education and health for children.

The St Christopher School is a foundation school and thus the school now own the facilities which were handed over by the Borough Council on completion.

A Christopher’s Cottage Management Committee is already in existence. The committee includes members of the school governing body, MENCAP, the head teacher, the sports hall manager and the project manager based at the school. Community representatives are being sought and the respite manager will join the committee when appointed. The day-to-day management of the
facility is managed by the Sports Centre Manager who was appointed specifically to fulfil this role. The role of the management committee is not clear but appears to be an advisory role.

5.6.3 Impact on Participation

Quantity and quality of PE

At the time of the initial visit the new facility was expected to impact on both the quality and quantity of PE for the pupils at the school and for pupils at other local special and primary schools. The facility was described as ‘full before its’ open’ by the project officer at Southend on Sea.

The new facility has had a dramatic impact on PE for the pupils of St Christopher’s. Previously indoor PE took place in a very small hall. The hall was also the dining room and the link between the primary and secondary school. This was particularly problematic for many of the pupils at St Christopher’s with learning difficulties such as autism meaning that they find being too close to other pupils very stressful. PE lessons were subject to constant interruptions because the hall was a thoroughfare between the two sections of the school. The PE staff at the school confirmed that the quantity and quality of PE have improved significantly since the opening of the new facility for a number of reasons:

- The new facility has allowed the school to undertake new activities in ways that would not have been possible previously.
- The new equipment has allowed new activities to be undertaken
- The Sports Centre Manager has brought new skills to the school which he is using to support the staff in PE lessons where appropriate. He has also provided training for staff

Extra-curricular activity

One of the main developments in terms of extra-curricular activity is the development of the Chris Cross Kids Club by the Sports Centre manager. The club runs after school three nights a week and involves football coaching, fitness and multi-sports. The club also runs in the school holidays. Children of all abilities are involved. The club offers the opportunity for pupils of the school to attend with their siblings and friends in order to develop their sporting ability and skills. At the time of the follow-up evaluation visit the Chris Cross Club was underway and there was an opportunity to watch the young people enjoying the facilities. Some of those involved were pupils at the school while others were siblings or friends of pupils. The young people who expressed their views were very positive about the facility and about the club itself.

There is also a youth club for older pupils where ‘past and present pupils, meet and play different sports without the confines or stresses related to school PE lessons.’
Impact on Community

There are two schools (one special school and one college for pupils who have been excluded from other schools) who use the facility each week. A number of other schools has been approached about using the facilities but were unable to commit themselves during the school year. It was hoped that other schools would be using the facility from September.

The facility is being used by a number of clubs beyond the school. Other users currently benefiting from the facility include:

- Mencap Sports Disability Group
- Leigh-on-sea Cricket Club
- Hadleigh and Thundersley Cricket (mens)
- Local Life cricket (mens)
- Scorpions Mens and Ladies Basketball Teams
- Westcliffe Cricket Club – Ladies
- Bill and Bens Badminton Club

The way in which the pupils of St Christopher’s can access these clubs is currently being explored.

Target groups

The target groups identified by St Christopher’s necessarily include people with a disability. The new facility has clearly already impacted on this target group.

Other groups which have been identified as target groups are young people at risk, young people who are gifted and talented and girls and women.

5.6.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

The pupils of St Christopher’s have special needs which mean that the facility has benefits to the pupils which may not be applicable in other schools. It was noted by the PE staff that the provision of the showers within the changing rooms has been very welcome. This has allowed the children to develop in terms of being responsible for their own personal hygiene. This has been a very important development for some of the pupils.

Another advantage of the facility for some pupils is the impact it has had on behaviour management. Some of the pupils at the school can be aggressive and disruptive. The new facility offers the opportunity for staff to deal with this behaviour in new ways by channelling aggression into physical activity.

The school is currently exploring the opportunity for pupils in mainstream schools to compete with the pupils of St Christopher’s.
As noted above the facility is being used each week by a college with pupils who are currently excluded from other schools and thus the facility is instrumental in re-engaging young people who are currently disaffected.

The project officer at the Council noted that the link between sport and educational achievement is something that the Council is keen to develop. The potential for this link to be developed has been demonstrated by one of the top schools in the area.

5.6.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

The overall impression of the facility by those at St Christopher’s is that the facility is certainly ‘fit for purpose’ and that it has met the expectations of those involved in developing the project.

At the time of the initial visit to St Christopher’s it was noted that the sports hall was bigger than the school has originally intended it to be. This was considered problematic because the school is responsible for its up-keep and maintenance. It was noted by the PE staff that the new facility was built on the school site which is limited in area and thus the school has lost a significant part of the outdoor play area. This view contrasts with a view offered by two of the external users of the facility who commented on a feedback questionnaire that:

‘There are only three badminton courts. Most halls in the area have at least four.’

‘It is shorter than I expected i.e. for a full length cricket run up when bowling.’

These comments are interesting because they demonstrate that notions of ‘fit for purpose’ will be affected by the nature of the intended purpose.

5.6.6 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned.

The enthusiasm of the head teacher and staff was instrumental in the development of this project.

In addition three new posts have been created to run and manage this facility. The Project Officer and Sports Centre Manager are already in post and a Respite Care Manager is in the process of being appointed. A Management Committee has already been established to oversee the running of the facility.

5.6.7 Overall assessment of progress to date

Those involved with developing the project are very pleased with the progress made. The acquisition of a sports hall has been a long standing ambition and the efforts of those at the school have now been rewarded with the development of an impressive facility.
The facility has made a significant impact on both the quantity and quality of PE at the school and has resulted in a wider range of extra-curricular opportunities for the pupils of St Christopher’s and for pupils at other schools in the area.

St Christopher’s school are responsible for the new facility and for the salaries of the new members of staff. The revenue required to sustain the facility is therefore dependant on outside lettings. The school has been very successful in attracting external users to the club and is confident that this will be maintained in the future. As with the other fast track projects the need to generate revenue to sustain the facility impacts on the way in which the facility is timetabled out of hours.
5.7 Case Study 5 – Paignton Community & Sports College

5.7.1 Introduction

This report describes the key findings from the first two site visits to Paignton Community & Sports College (PCSC) as part of the NOPES Fast Track evaluation. Paignton is part of the Torbay Council area, which comprises Paignton, Torquay and Brixham. During the initial consultation process, the Local Education Authority invited all local schools, primary care trusts, local voluntary groups, local sports clubs and other organisations to submit expressions of interest outlining potential projects for development with NOPES funding. Torbay Council then selected the PCSC project from a list of potential areas, using a points system to assess need and suitability. A project officer from Torbay Council, who also had responsibility for five or six other development projects unrelated to NOPES funding, supervised the project build.

The College occupies two sites, one on Waterleat Road and the other on Borough Road. The project concerned is the sports hall development at the Borough Road site. Originally the sports hall had been part of a larger bid (including additional teaching blocks) for targeted capital funding from the Department for Education and Skills, which was unsuccessful. The NOPES bid was the third attempt to obtain funding to improve poor sports facilities at the College and was deemed particularly suitable for Fast Track status, as much of the preparatory work needed had been done for the previous bids. The project was allocated £610,000 of NOPES funding.

At the time of the initial site visit, in June 2003, it became apparent that the project was considered to be key to the College’s fulfilment of its newly obtained role as a specialist Sports College. At the same time as submitting the NOPES bid, the College, led by a new Principal, applied for specialist sports college status and put in a bid under the School Sports Coordinator programme. All three bids were submitted within months of each other and were successful. From the interviews conducted in 2003, the success of the three bids appeared to be very closely linked. However, it was apparent that obtaining specialist Sports College status was a priority to the College and its head teacher.2 As part of the School Sports Coordinator programme, the Partnership Development Manager was also expected to play an important role in encouraging the use, and exploiting the availability, of the new facility.

When the research team first visited the new sports hall building had just been completed. It officially opened on 17 July 2003, although at this point it was used as an examination hall, becoming fully operational as a school sports facility at the start of the next academic term (September 2003). The new sports facilities at Paignton Community & Sports College were incorporated into Torbay Council’s education and sport development plans, which were due

2 At one point, the College had discussed seeking specialist status as an arts college, but decided to pursue sports specialist status instead.
to be published in the autumn of 2003. It was anticipated that the project would be fully integrated into the College’s financial plans, and income and expenditure derived from the project would be incorporated in the College’s overall budget (giving scope for cross-subsidisation, if necessary).

The sports hall project aimed to improve sporting facilities at the college, extending the range of sports that could be offered, and increasing out-of-hours community access to sport and fitness facilities. The development was intended to meet most, if not all, of the NOPES programme objectives, including increasing pupils’ sporting opportunities and participation, targeting vulnerable pupils and members of the community, and making facilities available to local clubs, thus contributing to the overall promotion of sport in Torbay.

The second visit took place in March 2004, by which time the new sports building had been in use for six months, and PCSC was in its second year of the five-year Specialist Sports College designation period. Face-to-face interviews and two focus groups were held at the College itself, in a new block that had been constructed since the first visit, as part of the school's ongoing development.

Since the first visit, PCSC had undergone a number of significant changes. These included the provision of additional classroom and accommodation, staff appointments and operational adjustments:

- the appointment of a Sports Hall Supervisor, Fitness Suite Manager and Fitness Manager, who were jointly responsible for the day-to-day running of the new sports facilities, reporting to the Director of Sport;
- a £4.8m expansion programme funded chiefly by the LEA to increase pupil numbers (including new ICT suite, office and classroom accommodation);
- the refurbishment of the original sports hall (which had been seen to be in poor condition at the first visit) – now a dance studio which also accommodated other activities, e.g., martial arts and yoga sessions;
- pupils in Years 7, 8 and 9 had transferred to the College’s second site at Waterleat Road in September 2003, while the Years 10, 11 and Sixth Form pupils were now based at the Borough Road site;
- the school day changed, starting at 8.30 a.m., with a slightly longer morning break, a reduced lunch hour, and a 3 p.m. finish, and
- a range of opportunities was introduced for students to take part in some form of activity at lunchtimes and between 3 and 5 p.m. each day.
5.7.2 Partnership effectiveness

Although initial interviews suggested that no formal partnership structure had been put into place, the interviewees provided evidence that relevant stakeholders within the Council and the College, as well as outside, communicated effectively with each other, thereby obviating the need for more formal structures. However, at the second visit all of those interviewed mentioned the Steering Group Committee. Membership of this committee included:

- representatives from Torbay Sports Council;
- members of the College’s Board of Governors;
- the Community Sports Co-ordinator;
- Head Teachers from partner primary and secondary schools, and
- members of Torbay Council.

The Steering Group Committee (SGC) had a steering control of external funding of sport in the college (from the Fund, sports college funding and the School Sports Co-ordinator programme). This was generally considered to be an effective body; one respondent remarked that it was ‘not just a talking shop’. It had been useful in helping the College with strategic decisions, for example, in assisting with the development of price structures and concessions for membership of the fitness suite and hiring of the sports hall.

Relationships between PCSC and the members of the SGC appeared to be very positive, both at an individual and organisational level. The Sports Council were appreciative of the high level of involvement PCSC had encouraged from the outset, and the Chair of the Sports Council was mentioned by several participants as being a useful addition to the Committee’s membership. It was suggested that the Sports Council Executive Committee might hold future meetings at PCSC as they considered it to be at the hub of sporting activity in the bay area.

In particular, the College’s senior sports faculty staff had an excellent working relationship with the Council’s Sport Development Officer, collaborating in order to pool resources and to implement events and programmes of activities for the College and other schools and community groups in the bay area.

Local sports clubs appeared to have effective communication channels with PCSC via both the Sports Council and the Sports Development Officer, although it was widely agreed that more could be done to increase awareness of the facility. It was not clear from what respondents said whether the SGC included representation from either the student body or the PTA, and there were no members from local non-sports related community groups, such as a local residents’ association. This may be something that will change over time – everyone interviewed was aware that the facility had only come on-stream relatively recently and, as such, those involved were still experiencing a fairly steep learning curve. It was suggested that leaflets could be created and displayed in the reception area in order to obtain customer feedback on the facility, but these did not yet exist.
The Partnership Development Manager (PDM), who co-ordinated the School Sports Co-ordinator programme, was based at PCSC and worked closely with staff at the College as well as with other schools. Several of the key posts were funded by money from this initiative, and these staff were considered to be instrumental in the day-to-day management of the facilities and the delivery of activities both internally within the Borough Road site and externally at the Waterleat Road site, as well as in conjunction with other sports clubs and organisations.

During the first visit the team discovered that the Sports College status, NOPES and School Sports Co-ordinator bids had all been written within a short period, and that each one seemed to have contributed to the other’s success. When this was discussed at the second visit, those involved with the financial aspects of the development felt strongly that PCSC would not have been able to provide the same high quality of facilities without additional funding. In particular, LEA capital funding had paid for the incorporation of the purpose-built office accommodation within the sports building, which facilitated efficient administration and management and provided a useful base for the PE faculty staff. Similarly, the funding accessed through the specialist Sports College status had enabled the new fitness suite to be integrated within the design of the main building and equipped to professional standards. However, while senior PCSC staff did attend Sports College conferences and meetings regularly, their experiences had been that other Sports Colleges tended to be rather competitive and somewhat reluctant to share good ideas and effective practice.

The College was keen to develop its outdoor facilities further, and at the time of the second visit staff were involved in applying to the Football Foundation for funding. The Principal said that having acquired the new indoor facilities, PCSC were now trying to find additional sources of finance to provide an all-weather surface, two new tennis courts and the creation of a well-drained and level playing pitch outside the sports hall, as well as buildings to replace the mobile classrooms on both sites.

As part of the conditions for the Sports College status and the School Sports Co-ordinator programme the Director of Sport and PDM were responsible for reporting on progress towards a range of targets. With this in mind, the anticipation of those interviewed in the first visit was that these responsibilities would expand to encompass any data collection and reporting required by the NOPES evaluation.

At the time of the second visit, the Director of Sport had recently reported to the Steering Group Committee on expenditure over the previous six months in terms of school and community based activities. Community provision monitoring was the remit of the Out of School Hours Co-ordinator. There were no specific data being collected for the NOPES evaluation, but it is hoped that the Loughborough Partnership will be able to access information on curriculum and out of school hours provision and participation in order to
inform the evaluation, either through the annual survey or in the form of copies of reports for other initiatives.

5.7.3 Impact on participation

Quantity and quality of PE

In June 2003, despite having specialist Sports College status, there had been no discernible impact on quantity or quality of PE as the new facilities were not yet in use. However, by March 2004 the new sports hall and fitness suite, and the refurbishment of the old sports hall had given the Sports College status more relevance and the combined effect was reported as having had a significant impact on both the quantity and quality of PE available to students. Participation rates among pupils were reported to have improved and Year 10 pupils now had a range of options to choose from, which both staff and students said had encouraged further participation. The findings of the focus groups confirmed this. The students who took part were aware of the marked improvement in quality and quantity of choices, and the delivery of PE tuition, especially in Out of School Hours clubs and in GCSE PE lessons.

Nonetheless, as the Borough Road site capacity had expanded to approximately 1,000 pupils, it remained extremely difficult to find sufficient space for PE, both physically and in terms of the timetable. Even with the new facilities, a maximum of two groups only could use the sports hall at any one time, and while the fitness suite was well equipped and reasonably spacious, it could only accommodate a limited number of students simultaneously. With the conversion of the former sports hall into a dance studio, complete with full-length mirrors, this space was no longer suitable for ball games or particularly vigorous sporting activities.

At both first and second visits the College was not providing two hours of curriculum PE for its students. However, there were plans to introduce this for the whole of Key Stage 4 from September 2004. Participants said that it had not been possible to implement this any earlier as the necessary facilities and staff had not been in place previously but that these difficulties had now been addressed. With the shortening of the school day, students were being encouraged to stay on the premises between 3 and 5 p.m. in order to take part in a range of physical activities that included team sports, such as football, cricket or netball, and the ‘Body Wise’ sessions, which offered opportunities to try a range of activities, such as aerobics, salsa dancing and yoga. The latter initiative targeted girls to encourage them to remain active through the provision of more ‘lifestyle’ orientated activities. Originating at PCSC, it had been disseminated to other schools across the area and had generated interest in the local press, articles from which were on display in the sports building. The girls participating in the focus group (conducted on the second visit) were very enthusiastic about these sessions, and the parent representative interviewed felt that it had made a positive impact on her daughter’s activity levels.
Extra-curricular activity

The Out of School Hours Co-ordinator had been instrumental in setting up and running a variety of activities after school and at lunch times. Opinions varied on the success of the latter. Whereas in the past, external visitors had delivered presentations or run workshops on a variety of different sports during lunch breaks, they were no longer able to do so because of the short time available. Similarly, although the level of student interest in the options offered was generally high, the reduced lunch time meant that there was insufficient time for changing in and out of sports gear, which limited what could be delivered. Evidence from some interviewees suggested that students were choosing to bring a packed lunch and eat it at morning break, leaving them more time for lunchtime activities. Those eligible for free school meals could request packed lunches, which would be available in time for morning break. However, those members of staff who opted for a cooked lunch commented that it could take 20 minutes just to queue for this, which would preclude participation in activities.

As well as increasing participation, respondents indicated that the curtailing of the lunch hour, in combination with the midday activity sessions, had been intended to reduce discipline problems encountered at lunchtime. These problems were thought to have been exacerbated by the increased numbers of students at the site and the difficulty in finding good quality lunchtime supervision. However, concerns were raised that those students opting to spend their lunch hours in organised activity were not necessarily the ones responsible for the trouble. It also seemed somewhat unfair to prevent better-behaved pupils from attending lunchtime clubs, in order to make places available for those who did not behave as well.

After-school clubs were well attended, and evidence gathered from registers indicated that different groups of children were attending different activities, rather than it just being a core body of pupils attending everything, although there were some ‘all rounders’ who came to more than one session. The Out of School Hours Co-ordinator made every effort to provide similar opportunities to students at both sites, and tried to respond to students’ requests for additional or alternative provision. Among the activities on offer at the time of the second visit were fencing, table tennis, football (boys’ and girls’ teams) and hockey. Plans were being made to introduce ‘Body Combat’, Aerobics and a regular yoga/pilates session. Sixth formers were also able to attend a subsidised British Horse Society riding course to train for NVQ Level One. In addition to term-time provision, programmes of sports and activities days for Easter and summer holidays were also proposed.

One of the difficulties encountered in maintaining this level of provision was finding qualified coaches who would be available between 3 and 5 p.m. on weekdays. PE faculty staff were supportive but some frustration with the lack of staff from other departments who were prepared to stay on site after 3 p.m. and contribute to the programme was voiced by several respondents.
Impact on Community

At the first visit plans to fulfil the obligation to provide community access were discussed but were still at a formative stage, as the facilities had not yet been officially opened. A number of target groups for the project had been identified in documents (e.g. the funding application) and during the interviews, which included disabled people and teenage mothers. The opening of the facility was to be widely advertised, which suggested that a dispersed, rather than targeted approach, would be adopted.

From interviews at both first and second visits it became apparent that individual respondents' understood one of three different ideas or definitions of 'community'. Some perceived the ‘community’ as comprising other primary and secondary schools in the area; a view that echoed that of the School Sports Co-ordinator programme’s remit, which is designed to optimise the sporting links and provision between schools in a particular locality. Others indicated that for them ‘community’ meant local sports clubs, while the remainder envisaged it including the ‘wider community’, of local people, whether related to schools, or sports clubs, or not. At the second visit, depending on which definition was in use at the time, the level of success in increasing ‘community’ participation varied.

Through the efforts of those involved in the School Sports Co-ordinator programme, and in particular the Partnership Development Manager, it was suggested that the new sports hall had had a ‘massive impact’ on local primary schools who could now use the sports hall and whose teachers could attend INSET training. However, because of difficulties in co-ordinating primary school use during school hours, much of this tended to be between 3 and 5 p.m., which would presumably limit the number of pupils able to attend. It was hoped that access might be improved towards the end of the summer term when PCSC curricular obligations decreased, as exams would have finished and many students would no longer be attending College.

The Director of Sport was also commended for his role in improving the quality and organisation of team and competitive sports provision. Parents were given more notice of forthcoming events, and students had adequate opportunities for training prior to competing, so that the experience was more rewarding for them. Respondents stated that feedback from students, teachers and parents from PCSC and other schools had been very positive.

Some organisations had voiced frustration with the postponed opening of the facilities, which was caused by a combination of delays in the building work and staffing issues. Their dissatisfaction was compounded by the fact that when the sports hall did open it remained unavailable to other users because it was used as an examination centre. This issue remained unresolved at the time of the second visit, although it was suggested that it might be addressed via the Steering Group Committee.

However, the Chair of Torbay Sports Council and the Community Development Officer were seen to be instrumental in ensuring that the sports
hall was made as accessible as possible to local sports clubs. Opinions varied among respondents as to the level of impact the facility had had on this group. It was suggested that this had been somewhat limited because, as with curricular use, constraints of time and space meant that only a few organisations could use it on a regular basis. A maximum of one or two club activities could take place each evening, and it tended to be unused on Friday nights as this was often the night before matches and therefore an unsuitable time for training sessions.

Interestingly, while one respondent reported that clubs had started to approach PCSC about hiring the facilities almost as soon as building commenced, others felt that local organisations had been quite slow to take up these opportunities. It was suggested that as clubs often book a year in advance they had probably already found accommodation by the time the sports hall opened, and would be unlikely to move their reservation if satisfied with their existing facilities.

Efforts were being made to increase local sports clubs’ awareness of the facilities on offer at PCSC. It was suggested that the Sports Council could facilitate liaison between clubs and schools to increase the sharing of both club and school facilities. Attempts to address this issue had included inviting representatives to an open evening at the sports hall, which had been positively received by the visiting clubs, and another open day was being planned for September. Participants said that there had so far been a small amount of feedback from local clubs, but that it was mostly positive. An example of a positive development was the establishment of an additional base for ‘United Football in the Community’ at PCSC, which had involved pupils of all ages. In addition, the College had been running refereeing and coaching courses, which aimed not only to involve people in sports, but also to enable them to support and promote sporting activity more widely within the community.

Interviewees said that attempts were being made to develop close links with more sports clubs, to improve timetabling and to identify and liaise with voluntary community groups who might want to access the facility at times when it is currently not used, for example, on Friday evenings. It was suggested that the appointment of additional staff with responsibility for the day-to-day running of the facility had fostered good relationships with community users and meant that appropriate equipment was made available at the beginning and properly stored at the end of sessions.

Despite publicity in the local press and through leaflets and flyers distributed at community venues, for example, doctors’ surgeries, health centres and primary schools, the consensus of opinion was that there was a lack of awareness within the wider community of the facilities available at PCSC. Other barriers to the involvement of local people were thought to be due to a perception of the facility as being primarily or exclusively for the College’s use, rather than for the community, and, for some members of the community, reluctance to attend anything taking place within an educational setting.
Word of mouth was seen as one of the most effective means of communication with the local community, and everyone interviewed felt that once people saw the sports hall and fitness suite for themselves they would be suitably impressed. In order to encourage more people to visit the new building there were plans for open days for students’ families (and possibly for other community members) at which they could try a range of sports and physical activities for free. The Easter 2004 edition of the College’s newsletter included an invitation to all parents to a free induction at the Fitness Suite and details of subsidised membership rates.

Although it was agreed that the impact on the wider community had been somewhat limited to date, everyone interviewed was enthusiastic about the quality of the new facilities and their potential and appeared extremely committed to working together to build upon the progress made so far.

Target groups

At the first visit several respondents mentioned proposed targeting of ‘Dads and Lads’, teenage mothers, single parents and disabled groups, which corresponded to what had been stated in the bid document. At the second visit, there had been some progress made in making links with the latter – Boccia refereeing and coaching courses had taken place and discussions were ongoing with Torbay Council about providing a base for a local disabled sporting association.

However, when questioned about provision for the teenage mothers and single parents, it appeared that these plans would probably be shelved until baby changing and crèche facilities were incorporated into another new building, although it was not clear when or where this might be. A ‘Dads and Lads’ session was also mentioned but again, no specific date had been planned.

Although work with these target groups did not seem to have moved on significantly since it was first mentioned in June 2003, it had clearly not been forgotten. In establishing a new facility all activities and initiatives had had to be prioritised, so it was felt to be understandable that not everything could be developed simultaneously. The research team will be able to assess progress in this area at subsequent visits.

5.7.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

Most respondents were able to cite evidence of the positive impact of the new facilities, either anecdotally in terms of PCSC’s reputation as an establishment, or in specific individual or group successes. Some mentioned being approached, when in town, by parents of students who said how delighted their children were with the new facilities. Others felt that the amount of positive coverage in local press, particularly that relating to various sporting achievements and activities, was helping to raise PCSC’s profile and change preconceptions about the College, which had previously been somewhat negative.
The majority of respondents felt that the new facilities in combination with the Sports College status had had a significant impact. When explaining the background of the area, informants stressed that five out of the eight secondary schools in Torbay had a selective admission policy and primary schools often placed great emphasis on passing the entrance examination. It was suggested that as a result of this, those children who did not obtain a place at a selective school might feel that they had failed in some way, which could have a detrimental effect on their self-esteem. However, with the improvements to facilities and commitment and drive of the staff, it was felt that both students and parents viewed the College more positively and that the obvious investment in the school was contributing to the children’s sense of worth.

As stated at the first visit, informants stressed the fact that many Torbay residents experience serious social problems, such as long-term unemployment and low income, and several wards include areas of high deprivation. Students come from across the region, from a variety of backgrounds and some from particularly difficult circumstances. In addition to this there is a high transient population, which means that relatively large numbers of students transfer in and out of the area within each academic year. The school has a policy promoting inclusion as far as is possible, and works hard to support pupils at risk of exclusion and who have been excluded from other establishments, offering an extensive ‘alternative’ curriculum for those who struggle within mainstream education. It is hoped that further work can be done with the pupil referral unit at the College in order to offer these students opportunities for involvement with sport, whether as spectators or participants. There are also plans to increase the self-esteem of pupils with special educational needs by engaging them in a specific sporting activity.

The students who took part in the focus groups agreed that they had an increased sense of pride in belonging to the College and were keen to display this by wearing the uniform sweatshirt with the new PCSC logo on it. At the time of the second visit, the student council was reported to be investigating the cost implications of having this logo emblazoned on polo shirts as well. Students also liked wearing the College fleeces when they went to external matches, but said that they would like to be able to own them, rather than borrowing them. Team members wanted to have matching kits in school livery in order to look ‘more professional’, although staff mentioned that unfortunately they had so far been unable to find funding for this. Students participating in teams had shown increased commitment, working hard in team practices, being eager to participate in competitions and asking staff to produce photos and match reports to show how well they had done.

Although at the first visit there had been mention of the College’s facilities being made available to patients on a GP’s referral scheme, this had been established with the local leisure centre, which had previous experience of a similar system. However, it was possible that this arrangement might be widened to include other facilities at a later date. The College’s on-site health facility (the TicTac Centre) continued to make an important contribution to
PCSC’s holistic approach to its students’ needs, and some of the participants in the focus groups said that their awareness of health issues had been raised through involvement in the Body Wise programme and/or GCSE PE lessons.

It was felt to be too early to assess the impact of the programme on academic achievement, as the facility had only been open for six months at the time of the second visit, and several of the staff had not been in place from the outset, however, subsequent visits and data collection will enable this to be examined in further detail.

5.7.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

Everyone interviewed and all the students participating in the focus groups were extremely enthusiastic about the quality of the new sports hall and fitness suite. Pupils reported having sports facilities that were the envy of their friends at other schools, including those in the private sector. Staff appreciated the vast improvement in accommodation, which facilitated and improved organisation and administration, and enjoyed teaching in the new facilities. Both staff and students emphasised the benefits of the integration of sophisticated ICT within the building, which enabled athletes to watch and learn from their own and others’ performances.

As with any new building, there had been some ‘snagging’ problems at the outset, including problems with plumbing, fittings and the need for the sports hall walls to be blue (they are currently white, which causes visibility problems for badminton). Initially there were no cleaning staff designated for the new facility so the PE faculty had had to take on janitorial duties. However, most of these issues had been, or were being, tackled and it was thought that none of these problems had prevented the facility from opening and being available to both the College and the public.

There was widespread awareness from those participants who were members of the SGC that the sports facilities, and in particular the fitness suite, were not making sufficient income to cover expenditure. These financial losses were being absorbed by the school for the time being, as all respondents were aware that the facility had not been open for long and that establishing full membership of the fitness suite and capacity booking of the sports hall would take time. However, various strategies for increasing revenue, in terms of wider publicity of the facilities available and the staging of more events to encourage school and community users to visit, were mentioned by several participants.

5.7.6 Examples of Effective Practice and Lessons Learnt

At the first visit, which took place just as the building work had been completed, it was considered to be too early to identify effective practice or lessons learned. During the second visit, several components were seen as being crucial to the success of the venture.
Effective communication and close working relationships between various members of the partnership were seen to be vitally important and to contribute significantly to progress made in several areas. In particular, the College’s links, via the Principal and the PE staff, with the Sports Development Officer and Torbay Sports Council seemed to have facilitated problem solving and contributed to ongoing attempts to engage the community in physical activity. The commitment of all those interviewed was immediately apparent, and the College’s staff seemed to work as a dynamic and well-motivated team.

Several respondents commented on the strong leadership of both the College as a whole and the PE faculty in particular, and this combination seemed to have been particularly effective in implementing changes and innovative provision of activities. In addition, the formation of the Steering Group Committee was widely welcomed and this was thought to be a useful aid to the management and strategic direction of the facility. In particular, the Sports Council representative was perceived to have made a significant contribution through improving links with local sports clubs and by advising on practical issues such as pricing structures.

Many respondents commented on the steep gradient of the learning curve they had encountered and were still experiencing. With hindsight it was agreed that the College would have benefited from more detailed planning of the facility’s supporting infrastructure, for example, by having staff responsible for the day-to-day management and upkeep of the sports hall and fitness suite in place from the start. As an educational establishment, those leading the development had not had previous experience of creating and running a leisure facility. This meant that some details had been overlooked, for example the wall colour in the sports hall and the need for an additional CCTV monitor to be installed in the fitness suite so that staff could observe the reception area from there. These were considered to be lessons learned during the first six months, which appeared to be relatively minor and easy to resolve.

Respondents were also aware of a continuing need to change the community’s perceptions of both the facility and the College. Apparently there had been criticism from some people who felt that PCSC had obtained funding by promising community use, which had not been made available. However, steps were being taken to address this. Various suggestions had been made relating to improving take up of the activities and facilities on offer, although there was no evidence of a clear promotional campaign at either the first or second visit. It is possible that some external advice on the timing and focus of publicity might have helped to raise the facility’s profile in a more targeted and effective way.

5.7.7 Overall Assessment of Progress to Date

Despite delays in completion and opening, mainly caused by recruitment and retention issues for both the construction company and the College, the project appears to have made substantial progress. As at the first visit, it was difficult to discern the influence of individual programmes, however, during the
second visit, the combined impact of the specialist Sports College Status, the School Sports Co-ordinator programme and the new facilities appeared to be substantial.

A strategy to implement two hours of PE provision within the curriculum from September 2004 was in place, and there was evidence of improved participation rates among PCSC students. Links with other schools and local sports clubs were being forged and strengthened, and it was hoped that increasing local awareness would contribute to an increase in the wider community’s participation in physical activity.

Six months after the opening of the new sports hall it was still too early to detect significant improvements in academic achievement, although other ‘softer’ outcomes, such as raised self-esteem, were referred to. Subsequent visits and data collection will be better able to assess progress in these areas.
5.8  Case Study 6 – South Lanarkshire Lifestyle (formerly Annan Drive Integrated Leisure Facility) ¹

5.8.1  Introduction

South Lanarkshire Lifestyle is based on land adjacent to Trinity High School in Cambuslang, South Lanarkshire. The surrounding area is one of significant deprivation with a large proportion of the school’s population residing in the nearby Social Inclusion Partnership area.

South Lanarkshire Lifestyle is a new build integrated facility consisting of a 25m pool, health & fitness facility, 6 outdoor Astroturf courts, an adult day care centre and an ICT suite. Funding for the £7m facility has come from six funding partners including South Lanarkshire Council, Better Neighbourhood Services Fund, Social Inclusion Partnership, Greater Glasgow Health Board, sportsscotland and the New Opportunities for PE and Sport initiative (which contributed approximately £760,000). The NOPES contribution has specifically funded the six floodlit, multi-purpose, astroturf courts and a hydraulically operated floating floor in the swimming pool.

The new facility is designed to meet an identified gap in school and community facilities in the area. It will replace existing dilapidated facilities at Rutherglen Pool and two other day-care and community facilities. The facility opened in May 2004 although this report is based on the first visit conducted in January 2004.

5.8.2  Partnership Effectiveness

The overall management of the project from conception through to opening was the responsibility of South Lanarkshire Council’s Project Manager. However, upon opening the management of the facility will be undertaken by South Lanarkshire Leisure, a charitable company limited by guarantee. The operation of all South Lanarkshire Council’s leisure services had passed to South Lanarkshire Leisure upon its inception in April 2002. There remain close links between South Lanarkshire Leisure and South Lanarkshire Council with the council represented on South Lanarkshire Leisure’s board. South Lanarkshire Leisure currently manage a number of leisure facilities, similar to South Lanarkshire Lifestyle, which are owned by the council. Although much of the planning for a similar arrangement at South Lanarkshire Lifestyle was in place, a formal offer to manage the facility had only recently been made and was to go to South Lanarkshire Leisure’s board on 21st January 2004.

A Service Level Agreement between South Lanarkshire Leisure and South Lanarkshire Council’s Education Resources and Social Work Resources departments will formally govern the relationship between the management of the facility and its use by schools and social work groups. So, for example, the

¹ This report is the same as one submitted in the January 2004 Annual Report. It is included in this report for completeness. Subsequent to the previous report the projects name has been changed to South Lanarkshire Lifestyle.
Service Level Agreement will include provisions which set out the times when Trinity High School and other schools had exclusive use of parts of the facility. It was positive that South Lanarkshire Leisure had experience of operating with these types of ‘dual use’ arrangements before. All parties were currently refining the agreement although staff from Trinity High School, in particular, highlighted the need for flexibility to negotiate usage within the constraints of the Service Level Agreement once the facility was opened.

The management of the facility will be overseen by a group comprising representatives from South Lanarkshire Leisure and South Lanarkshire’s Education Resources, Community Resources and Social Work Resources departments. Education Resources’ representatives include Trinity High School’s Head of PE and the PE Advisor for all schools in the council’s area. The group were currently considering ‘commissioning’ issues concerned with readying the facility for its opening. However, all interviewees felt the group’s role will change to address programming and access issues once the facility has opened and will thereafter be known as the programming group. It is positive that the local Social Inclusion Partnership that has provided funding for the facility and has numerous, strong links with the local community will, it is anticipated, be represented on the programming group.

One of the undoubted strengths of the project was the amount of consultation and awareness raising that had been conducted by South Lanarkshire Council with regard to the project. There was what was described as a ‘long lead in’ to the project in terms of stakeholder involvement with those involved ranging from council members to local community groups. The Project Manager, alone, had conducted over 30 public presentations regarding the project to a wide variety of groups including local sports councils, community councils and youth groups. Newsletters and a CD-ROM presentation of the project were also distributed and made available to the general public. The purpose of this exercise was to raise awareness of the project, allow for feedback from the community and other groups and build anticipation which will hopefully lead to community use of the facility. The consultation component of the exercise undoubtedly had an impact on aspects of the facility design. For example, the surface chosen for the astroturf courts was changed to allow a greater range of sports after comments received from a local sports council.

The responsibility for continuation of links with a variety of stakeholders is likely to transfer from South Lanarkshire Council to South Lanarkshire Leisure once the facility is open. It is hoped that South Lanarkshire Leisure will build on the good links already developed which will in turn encourage participation at South Lanarkshire Lifestyle. South Lanarkshire Leisure already had systems in place for stakeholder involvement at Rtherglenn Pool which will be transferred to the new facility at South Lanarkshire Lifestyle. These included regular customer focus meetings, exit interviews and a customer comment mechanism. Another positive development was South Lanarkshire Leisure’s plans for opening of a portacabin on site prior to opening in order to deal with any queries or applications for advance bookings from the public.
Trinity High School had also been actively involved in the development of the new facility. The school board, who were seen as representatives of the local community, had been actively campaigning for such facilities for a number of years. Of particular interest, however, was the interest generated amongst Trinity’s pupils. Informally much of this interest had been built by the proximity of the school to the development of the facility. It was felt by members of the school staff that this proximity had contributed to a sense of ownership of the facility amongst the school children. Furthermore, formal methods of consultation with children had been employed with a survey being conducted that will impact on the programming in the new facility. Access to the fitness suite for the older pupils in the school was now being negotiated and was an example of the consultation process having an impact on programming at the facility.

The development of the South Lanarkshire Lifestyle project fitted in with a number of strategies within South Lanarkshire Council, from the Council’s overall ‘Fourcast’ plan down to local capital development plans. The links with a hierarchical structure of strategies was viewed as a positive as it ‘allowed the project to be discussed and progressed within those structures’. Therefore, it was also positive that the objectives in the council plans were reflected in South Lanarkshire Leisure’s overall business plans and thereon in the business and marketing plans for South Lanarkshire Lifestyle.

From South Lanarkshire Leisure’s planning process it was apparent that the new South Lanarkshire Lifestyle facility will be very much integrated into the general management of their other facilities. During the interview with South Lanarkshire Leisure’s representatives comments such as the programmes will be ‘no different to any other facility’ were common. Whilst the integration of the management of the facility into what are obviously strong and successful existing systems is undoubtedly positive, it is hoped that once opened facility management and programming will take account of the specific local context of a very deprived area.

Within Trinity High School, the development of the new facility was effectively integrated into plans and programmes within the school. The national focus on the health agenda had been adopted by the school in their development plan which had also resulted in setting up a group with a specific remit to address health issues. The new facility was viewed as contributing to this agenda not only through participation but also by enhancing the ‘health message’ throughout the school. The new facility will also link and add value to initiatives already running in the school including the School Sport Co-ordinator scheme and programmes funded through the NOPES Active Steps strand.

How the aims and objectives of the wide variety of organisations, including the Fund, funding the project were addressed was an issue that, prior to the visit, the evaluation team were keen investigate. In fact, all interviewees viewed the aims and objectives as fitting into the agendas that their organisations were already addressing. One interviewee described the aims and objectives of the different funding organisations as ‘so similarly aligned’ while another believed
that the aims and objectives would be ‘wrapped up’ in existing health and participation agendas. The programming group was seen as key to coordinating the achievement of the different aims and objectives with each of the partnership organisations taking a role in achieving the desired outcomes. Given the integrated nature of the project as a whole, this would appear to be the most effective way of addressing the Fund outcomes and more generally the aims and objectives of the whole project.

Beyond gathering evidence for grant compliance which will be co-ordinated by South Lanarkshire Council, all monitoring of project effectiveness will be undertaken within South Lanarkshire Leisure structures. The monitoring data collected at South Lanarkshire Lifestyle, as identified in the business plan, will be integrated with similar information from South Lanarkshire Leisure’s other facilities and presented to South Lanarkshire Leisure’s board on a monthly basis. Additionally the programming group will receive similar information and act on it appropriately. This specific monitoring of the South Lanarkshire Lifestyle project by the programming group is viewed by the evaluation team as a key aspect of the overall management process at the facility.

As part of the arrangement with South Lanarkshire Leisure, South Lanarkshire Council agree a substantial annual management fee for the facility. This system ensures that revenue funding for the project is secure although savings will have to be made on an annual basis. In addition after two years Greater Glasgow Heath Board’s contribution will switch from a capital fund to an annual revenue grant. This money will be ring fenced and is planned to support a GP referral scheme, outreach work and research into the health benefits of participation.

5.8.3 Impact on participation

The current PE facilities within Trinity High School are the poorest in South Lanarkshire and extremely limiting on PE and sport within the school. Although, mainly due to staffing, there will be no significant increase in time allocated to curriculum PE, the school believes that there will be significant improvement in quality once the new facility is opened. The difference between playing football on a single grass pitch as opposed to on six quality all weather pitches was given as an example of this improved quality. Furthermore, the new facility will enable an expanded range of activities to be offered to children within the school. The interviewees from Trinity High School also thought that the teaching of certificated PE courses will be enhanced when the South Lanarkshire Lifestyle facility had been opened.

Both Trinity High School and South Lanarkshire Leisure saw the importance of the school’s extra-curricular activities in the new facility. The service level agreement included provisions for exclusive access to two of the astroturf courts for 1½ hours after school during the week and on Saturday mornings. It was thought that the better environment of the new facility will motivate children to take up extra-curricular opportunities. Good links between the school and sports clubs were already developed through the School Sport Co-ordinator programme so that children had a pathway from school to
community participation. South Lanarkshire Leisure also saw the importance of such a pathway and hoped to provide further club opportunities so that pupils could continue their participation outside of school.

Other schools from the surrounding area will benefit from the newly developed facility. It is hoped that schools that currently utilise Rutherglen Pool will transfer their use to South Lanarkshire Lifestyle. For some schools it had been identified that there were potential transport difficulties associated with this change. South Lanarkshire Leisure had taken a proactive approach to this issue and were currently investigating possible sources of funding to support transport costs.

With regard to participation amongst the wider community, South Lanarkshire Leisure hoped that the new facility will generate higher levels of participation than at the old Rutherglen Pool. Not only will the improved facilities have a positive effect on participation, it was commented that community usage was likely to increase due to the location of the facility in the centre of the local community. The representative of South Lanarkshire Council also thought the market brand of South Lanarkshire Leisure, which was different from a council-run facility, will also have a positive effect on participation.

The approach to developing participation was fairly generic. Although they were aware of groups that nationally have low rates of participation, South Lanarkshire Leisure stated that they will target ‘anybody and everybody’. Moreover, the representatives of South Lanarkshire Leisure believed that a ‘balanced programme targets all groups’. The existing concessionary scheme, agreed between South Lanarkshire Leisure and the Council, giving 50% discounted rates to young and old people and those who could provide ‘means testing’ evidence will be adopted at South Lanarkshire Lifestyle. The two groups which were most likely to show increased participation were the disabled and ‘disaffected’ youth. The integrated nature of the facility, by including the day-care centre catering for people with a learning disability, together South Lanarkshire Leisure’s existing good links with disability groups meant that participation amongst people with a disability was likely to increase. The design of the facility, including the Fund supported ‘floating floor’, will also support disabled usage. Furthermore, Trinity High School’s access to NOPES Active Steps funding allowed ‘disaffected’ youth to be offered specific opportunities which will hopefully develop into integrated participation in mainstream activities.

The use of South Lanarkshire Leisure’s existing systems for monitoring participation, and proposed new developments, will allow for excellent tracking of quantity and quality of participation. The current manual booking system will be used to record the number of users. However, South Lanarkshire Leisure are moving towards adopting a swipe card system which will allow further analysis of users by categories such as residence and age group. This will be a very useful tool for monitoring participation amongst the local community. With regard to quality, South Lanarkshire Leisure were very proud of the number of their facilities that had been given QUEST status. This
award, as a UK wide scheme for quality in sport and leisure, involved measurement against 24 different criteria. QUEST status, it was hoped, will be achieved by the new South Lanarkshire Lifestyle facility. Furthermore, South Lanarkshire Leisure planned to conduct 50 exit interviews monthly with different groups. From these interviews information on, for example, customer satisfaction, will be published.

Similarly, within Trinity High School, monitoring of participation will be integrated into existing methods. Staff were described as ‘very comfortable’ with methods such as conducting surveys at the end of specific programmes. Participation will also be informally monitored through conversations with pupils and regular meetings amongst PE staff.

5.8.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

As was pointed out by one interviewee, it is only possible to predict the impact on wider social behaviours at this point. The potential outcomes were, apart from one example, most obvious within Trinity High School. Interviewees from the school felt the new facility will have a beneficial impact on the ethos of the whole school and the pupils’ sense of belonging. It was hoped that motivation amongst staff and pupils will be increased. Furthermore, with staff potentially participating alongside pupils in the new facility relationships between the two may be improved. Other potential benefits mentioned included increased self-esteem (particularly amongst talented children who will now be able to progress) and improved health. Teachers also saw the potential for work experience and employment for older pupils within the new facility which was also mentioned in the South Lanarkshire Leisure business plan for the facility.

In fact, in terms of educational benefits the building of the new facility had already had some positive spin-offs. South Lanarkshire Council’s Project Manager had assisted in a design class at Trinity High School which studied the development of the facility. Similarly, within social education classes the CD-ROM about the new facility had been utilised. These unusual, yet extremely positive, benefits were only possible due to the excellent communication between all parties connected with the project.

Beyond the school, the integrated nature of the facility with social work, leisure and education provision all based on one site was predicted to have a significant wider benefit. Being the first such facility, certainly in South Lanarkshire if not in Scotland, the precise benefits of this arrangement are hard to predict. One possible benefit that the teachers from Trinity High School did foresee was that the integration between pupils and disabled users will boost awareness of disability issues amongst the children.

Given that the exact nature of wider social benefits is hard to predict and somewhat imprecise it would be unrealistic to expect plans for measurement of these benefits to be clearly defined at this stage. Trinity High School believed that the tools provided by the HMI inspectorate which, for example, contained indicators for measuring school ethos would be useful in evaluating wider social outcomes. South Lanarkshire Leisure commented that links with
Greater Glasgow Health Board may support some evaluation and that new separate systems may have to be set up to support this aspect of self-evaluation.

5.8.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

All interviews commented that it was hard to judge the facility’s value for money before the facility’s opening. The project manager from South Lanarkshire Council who had obviously had the most ongoing involvement in the project did comment that it had ‘exceeded expectations’, in particular the quality of the finishings which were better than would normally be found in a council-owned facility.

5.8.6 Examples of effective practice and lessons learnt

A number of examples of effective practice were evident in the South Lanarkshire Lifestyle project. South Lanarkshire Council were particularly proud of the integrated nature of the facility with education, social work day-care and leisure provision based at the new facility. The contribution from the Fund, as well as the other funders, had ensured that this integration was possible. The development procedure had allowed the council to learn more about this type of integrated facility to the extent that they were now convinced of its value. Other such projects were now being developed.

The undertaking of a large and varied advance consultation for the new facility was undoubtedly one of the strengths of the project. This will have a number of effects, including ensuring the facility met the needs of a wide variety of users, developing ownership of the project and building expectation in advance of opening. Aspects of this consultation and communication were truly innovative, for example, the advance incorporation of the building of the facility into pupil’s school lessons developed not only ownership but an educational aspect as well.

The integration of the facility into South Lanarkshire Leisure’s existing, strong management structures is again an example of effective practice. This aspect will allow the new facility to ‘hit the ground running’ as soon as it is opened. Being one of the first council-linked organisations in Scotland to adopt the QUEST system of quality assessment will ensure that South Lanarkshire Leisure develop high quality services at South Lanarkshire Lifestyle.

5.8.7 Overall Assessment of Progress to Date

Excellent progress has been made on a number of aspects of the project. The design and the construction of the facility are impressive and on schedule. One individual who had had the considerable ongoing involvement in the project commented that it had ‘exceeded expectations’, in particular the quality of the finishings which were better than would normally be found in a council-owned facility.
The background consultation connected to the project has been, as was stated earlier, particularly impressive. Furthermore, the development of plans for management of the facility are at an advanced stage. Overall, this is a project that should have a significant impact on PE and sport within a number of South Lanarkshire Schools, particularly Trinity High School, and the wider community.
5.9 Case Study 7 – Haghill Primary School Community Sports Facility

5.9.1 Introduction

Haghill Primary School Community Sports Facility combines a new build primary school with integrated indoor and outdoor sports facilities. The sports facilities replace the Alexandra Sports Centre which was demolished to provide the site for the new building.

The new sports facilities comprise a four-court sports hall, fitness suite, dance studio, 7-a-side synthetic pitch and changing rooms. The Fund contribution to the facility is approximately £1.1 million with the remainder of funding for the building (including the school) coming directly from Glasgow City Council.

The facilities are situated in Alexandra Park next to a main thoroughfare in the East End of Glasgow. Much of the local community suffers from significant levels of deprivation. Kennyhill SEN Secondary School is also adjacent to the new facility which is due to open after the 2004 school summer holidays.

5.9.2 Partnership Effectiveness

The responsibility for the management of the new facility will be shared between the Glasgow City Council’s Education and Cultural & Leisure Services Departments. The relationship between the two departments will be governed by a Service Level Agreement the development of which, at the time of the evaluation visit, was nearing completion. These management arrangements were based on those used successfully at a similar facility located at Holyrood Secondary School.

The Service Level Agreement provides guidelines as to the usage of the facility by the school and community. Haghill and other schools will have exclusive use of the facility on weekdays between 9am and 3pm. Priority will also be given to extra-curricular usage outside these times. Within the Education Department, the Primary School PE Co-ordinator will have responsibility for programming the usage of the facility by Haghill Primary School, Kennyhill School and other schools in the area. Cultural and Leisure Services Operations Team will have responsibility for the day-to-day running of the facility with the local Area Service Development Team linking with them to develop and programme community usage.

Interviewees recognised that the Service Level Agreement (SLA) could only form a basis for the management for the facility and that within the SLA framework ongoing discussion will be required between those involved in the management of the facility. Both formalised and informal mechanisms were being developed that will allowed this interaction to take place. A facility management group had recently been instigated. Members of the group will include :-
• Headteachers of Haghill and Kennyhill Schools
• Chairs of the two school boards
• Cultural and Leisure Services Personnel
• Members of the local housing association.

With Cultural and Leisure Services providing operational staff for the centre at all times, opportunities for informal contact with the Haghill headteacher will also exist to address any day-to-day problems as they arise.

All those involved in the facility, in particular the Area Service Development Team, stressed the importance of consultation with the local community to the success of the facility. Consultation with the local community had been ongoing for a period 18 months beginning during the application process. It was recognised that the impact of the initial consultation on the operation of the facility may be negligible due to the period of time between conducting the consultation and the opening of the facility.

Recently Cultural and Leisure Services staff had organised a consultation meeting for the local community in the old Haghill Primary School building. The attendance at this meeting had been better than expected. As a result of this meeting a steering group for the centre consisting of members of the local community had been instigated. Both the Operations Team and the Area Service Development Team stressed the importance of this group to the success of the facility, emphasising that it was important that those involved were seen to make an impact on the management of the facility. As such a draft programme for community usage of the facility had already been given to the group for comment and consultation.

A number of Glasgow City Council strategies were related to the development of the Haghill facility. Within the Education Department various strategies, beginning with the Best Value review of Primary School provision, suggested the rationalisation and replacement of primary schools across the city. Within these strategies, the Haghill Primary School project is to be one of five new build primary schools forming part of the ‘Primary Pilot Action Plan’.

Within Cultural and Leisure Services, the results of the Best Value Review for Sport and Recreation (completed at the end of 2002) have had major implications for the provision of sport and recreation in general and Haghill in particular. Facility operation and service development responsibilities have been reorganised and devolved to eight geographical areas of the city. This has lead to greater community based ‘bottom up’ planning, the benefits of which are seen in the commitment to consultation and community involvement at Haghill.

The Best Value Review was also described as giving ‘clear direction’ for partnership working between the Operations and Service Development Teams and externally with Education Department programmes such as School Sport Co-ordinators. It was recognised that the relative infancy of the Cultural & Leisure Services reorganisation, School Sport Co-ordinator, Active
Primary School Co-ordinator, NOPES Activity and Health Development Officer programmes meant that considerable work was required to build shared objectives and partnership working. The structure of Glasgow’s Learning Communities, based around clusters of schools, was seen as having potential to support this integration and partnership working. The Active Primary School Co-ordinators programme may be of particular relevance to Haghill since there were initial plans to house a number of these officers at the facility.

The Haghill project will also contribute to a number of other city-wide strategies. Local level implementation, inclusive of the Haghill facility, of strategies concerning health, equality, community learning and other social issues was viewed by interviewees as a natural part of their operation of partnership working arrangements. A draft Physical Activity Strategy for the city was also being developed and once complete officers will consider how it could be implemented at a local level.

Overall responsibility for monitoring the effectiveness of the facility will be divided between the Operations and Service Development Teams. Evaluation of the impact of the new facility will be the responsibility of the Service Development Team. The Operations Team will have responsibility for monitoring the day to day running of the facility. This responsibility will include producing four weekly reports on income, usage, maintenance and customer comments. The Operations Team were also seeking QUEST status for all the council’s sports facilities and will integrate quality measures, such as customer comment schemes and user forums, that are presently used at other facilities into the monitoring programme at Haghill.

The Operations Team also had responsibility for the on-going financial implications of the operation of the new facility. The business plan encompassing Haghill and other facilities in the area that had been submitted at the application stage was currently being revised and will include financial targets for the facility. The decision to allocate the budget from the demolished Alexandra Sports Centre to the new facility had allowed the Operations team some flexibility in the running of the centre. Although usage charges were standardised across the city and were described as a ‘very sensitive’ issue, this flexibility allowed some scope for some preferential rates. Considering the deprivation of the local area, this flexibility may be particularly important to the development of local community activities.

5.9.3 Impact on participation

As a result of the new building, Haghill Primary School will have ‘facilities that would be the envy of any other school in the public sector’. The new facilities will compare very favourably with the facilities available at the old school building which were constrained through their proximity to nursery classrooms and by their dual-use as a dining room. The range of facilities available and the potential for sectioning the main games hall means that there is huge potential for increasing the quantity of PE that pupils at the school undertake. Furthermore, the school will be able to offer a far greater range and quality of
activities. For example, the new hall and provision of equipment will allow the school to fulfil the gymnastic component of the 5-14 Expressive Arts curriculum whereas previously provision of gymnastics was a ‘token gesture’. The council’s contribution of £7,500 towards new equipment for school use in the new facility will also add to the impact of the facility because sports equipment was ‘expensive in a normal school budget’.

The responsibility for organisation of extra-curricular activities was one area of the service level agreement still to be finalised. It was believed that the Operations team will possibly have a role in providing after school activities for pupils from Haghill and other schools. This type of arrangement was already in place at other dual use facilities. This arrangement will support links between school activities and young people’s participation in sporting opportunities outwith the school context. If this arrangement were to be put into place, it will be important that it compliments extra-curricular activities already organised by school staff. For example, Haghill Primary School already has an extra-curricular badminton club which will benefit greatly from inclusion in the programme of activities at the new facility.

It was recognised by Haghill’s headteacher that the full utilisation of the new sports facilities will be a challenge for the school’s teachers. Staff will require some retraining to address both operational issues, for example the use of nets to divide the hall, as well as PE teaching skills so as to adapt their lessons to the new hall. It was hoped that the new Active Primary School Co-ordinators could provide advice and expertise to support this process. Furthermore, the Operations Team could possibly provide support for curriculum PE if requested.

As stated earlier Kennyhill SEN School and other local schools will have programmed use of the facility. Many of these schools have what was described as ‘dated’ facilities and the new building will provide PE facilities in a ‘different league’. Existing transport services for special schools may be utilised to transport children from other schools to the facility.

As with school use, the provision of the new building will improve the sports facilities available for the local community ‘immeasurably’. Beyond a local swimming pool, there were few opportunities for participation in physical activity in the local community. More than one interviewee commented on the potential of the new facility to ‘break the culture of inactivity’ in the local area. The dual use of the facility will, it was hoped, encourage young people to be the basis for changes in lifestyle within the wider, local community. Furthermore, it was believed that the location and design of the facility, whereby passers-by could see the opportunities available within the centre, will provide ‘self advertising’ to encourage participation. The consultation exercise recently undertaken had suggested to officers that there was enthusiasm amongst the local community for participation and some applications for hiring the facilities had already been received.

As stated previously, at the time of the evaluation visit the programming for the centre had not been finalised. However, it was anticipated that usage will
be such that it will be difficult to accommodate everyone who wanted to use the centre. From interviewees themselves and the local community there were a number of suggestions for possible participation opportunities that indicated that the facility had potential for a big impact on participation. These suggestions included:-

- the provision of activities such as street dance and majorettes which younger girls had been keen to become involved in
- the possibility of opening the gym before 9am to allow participation of adults before work
- the builders on site suggesting that they would like to use the facilities for 5-a-side football
- teachers at Haghill Primary School suggesting that they would use the facilities rather than existing gym memberships elsewhere.

Beyond involving the local community, the identification of particular local groups to be targeted was not especially clear at this point. It was, however, recognised that it will be important to target youths who currently congregated in Alexandra Park and whose anti-social behaviour constituted a potential problem for the new facility. Utilising the new area-based Service Development structure to address the problem will have an impact on all forms of community participation as it will ‘allow other groups to enjoy activity’ at the facility. Examples were provided where the provision of similar sports facilities had made a positive impact on anti-social behaviour.

There were also strategic targets included in the Best Value Review for Sport and Recreation for participation amongst particular groups. It will be the responsibility of the Area Service Development team to attract and include these groups in the activities available at Haghill.

Throughout the interviews a commitment to evaluating the impact of the project on participation was demonstrated. Within Haghill it was suggested that it may be possible to measure changes in pupil’s fitness. This may be linked to suggested evaluation on a wider basis by Active Primary School Co-ordinators who may be able to utilise control groups from other schools. It is hoped that these plans will be developed once the facility opens and the evaluation team may be able to utilise this data as part of the evaluation on subsequent visits.

Within the wider community, user statistics for the old Alexandra Sports Centre were available as a baseline for future comparison. New systems to be introduced at Haghill will also allow more detailed analysis of participation trends, for example usage by people from particular geographical areas. Further evaluation by the Area Service Development Team will involve more qualitative indicators and involve both user and non-users of the new facility. The team’s wider community role will provide the potential for them to link with a variety of groups and agencies to investigate reasons for non-participation.
5.9.4 Impact of participation on wider social behaviour

All interviewees believed that the facility had the potential to make a large impact on the local community. The new facility was one of a number of new developments in the area and it was hoped that the facility could become the focal, 'social hub' that the area had been missing for some time. These sentiments were echoed by another interviewee who suggested that there was 'a real opportunity for development with the people in that area and I think the facility is the catalyst for that'. The fact that the community had shown enthusiasm for the project through consultation was an encouraging foundation for this aspiration.

Interviewees mentioned a number of factors and strategies that may contribute to the impact on the local community. Examples of these were:

- a diverse coach education programme supporting local individuals to deliver sports activities in the centre
- membership of the steering group contributing to the community ownership and participation in the centre’s operation
- diversionary activities and targeting of particular youths impacting crime, anti-social behaviour and vandalism
- mixed opportunities in the centre contributing to breaking down denominational barriers
- awareness of the facility amongst the local community supporting efforts to change attitudes towards healthy lifestyles
- development of young people’s self-esteem through achievement in sport and physical activity.

It was recognised that in the past Cultural & Leisure Services had not been ‘particularly strong’ in evaluating the impact on wider social outcomes. A central research group had recently been set up which will support such evaluation. It was recognised that crime and vandalism figures as well as more qualitative indicators could also be used to investigate the impact of the facility on wider social outcomes. An interviewee also stressed the importance of feeding these results back to the community in order to demonstrate change in the area.

5.9.5 Fitness for purpose and value for money

All interviewees expressed their satisfaction with the quality of the facility. In fact, the Haghill headteacher commented that the new facilities were ‘beyond my wildest dreams’. From an initial site visit, the evaluation team were also extremely impressed with the facility and the attention to detail that was apparent. It was commented by one interviewee that the quality of the design had been key to the successful development of the facility.
5.9.6 Examples of effective practice and lessons learnt

The dual-use management arrangements were an example of effective practice. The introduction of these arrangements will allow the facility to be utilised for 14 hours per day. As one interviewee suggested this represents a ‘fantastic use of public money’. It was also positive that the council were learning from their own practice of such arrangements at Holyrood Secondary School.

The commitment to involvement of the local community was apparent throughout the interviews conducted. The re-organisation of the council’s Sport & Recreation provision into area based services will play a key role in supporting community involvement. The new structure will support ‘bottom-up’ planning that will hopefully ensure that the community remains actively involved in the development of the project.

5.9.7 Overall assessment of progress to date

Although the evaluation visit was conducted a week prior to completion of the building and six weeks prior to opening, the evaluation team consider that the project has the potential to make a large impact on PE and sport in the school sector and the wider community. Although it was apparent that a number of minor management and development issues still needed to be resolved, the commitment of all interviewees to the project will hopefully ensure that effective partnership working will enable this impact to be achieved.
5.10 Application of Partnership Theory to the Fast Track projects

Having almost completed the initial phase of fast track project evaluation, it is worthwhile to consider the application of theory to the findings from the fast track projects. In particular, the partnership theory identified in Section 3.1 can be readily applied to the fast track projects. Of the three theoretical concepts identified in that section as being useful to the evaluation of partnerships, the concept of governance may have most applicability at a project, rather than portfolio, level. As such it is worthwhile to analyse the management arrangements at the fast track projects from the perspective given by the governance concept. The aim of doing this analysis will be to begin to answer the following questions:-

- To what extent does the management of the fast track projects embody the changing modes of modern governance described in the literature?
- To what extent has the introduction of the NOPES initiative contributed to the development of new modes of governance in the fast track projects?
- From the application of governance to the fast track projects, what use may the concept be to the rest of the NOPES evaluation?
- What further questions and issues does this analysis raise for the rest of the evaluation?

As a starting point for the analysis, the table overleaf summarises the management arrangements at each of the fast track projects. From the table it is apparent that the project management arrangements are significantly different in the Scottish fast track projects. Overall responsibility for management of the two projects does not lie solely with the school, as with English fast track projects, and Service Level Agreements are in place to govern the relationship with the different partners involved. Of the English fast track projects, management arrangements at Langdon Community School are still emerging. However, the significant involvement of Newham Borough Council at Langdon suggests that the final management arrangements may be closest in nature to those in Scotland.

All projects have some form of management or advisory group to support the development of the project. The membership of this group typically includes the school, other public bodies and, in some cases, representatives of the voluntary sector. Although the private sector is not represented in these groups, the range of agencies involved does correspond with the arrangements described in the governance literature.

However, it is also important to examine the role and power of the group if we are to conclude that new modes of governance are apparent. In the case of three fast track projects, those at Fullhurst Community College, Langdon Community School and The St Christopher School, the group’s role appears to be an advisory one at this stage. This suggests that the variety of partners do not have a governing role in the management and development of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Management Arrangements</th>
<th>Group &amp; Membership</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Revenue Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fullhurst Community College</td>
<td>Managed by Community Sports Officer employed by school</td>
<td>Sports Centre Committee – school, public and voluntary sectors represented</td>
<td>Mainly advisory</td>
<td>Through school together with some external funding bids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon Community School</td>
<td>Uncertain – officer seconded from LEA to develop business plan</td>
<td>Sports College Advisory Board – not facility specific</td>
<td>Unclear with regard to facility</td>
<td>Through school together with some external funding bids plus support from local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Guest High School</td>
<td>Director of Community employed by school</td>
<td>Community Users Group is planned – school and voluntary sector represented</td>
<td>Unclear as yet – may have financial income and expenditure powers</td>
<td>Through school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The St Christopher School</td>
<td>Sports Centre Manager employed by school</td>
<td>Management group</td>
<td>Unclear but mainly advisory</td>
<td>Through school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paignton Community &amp; Sports College</td>
<td>Sports Hall Supervisor and Fitness Suite Manager employed by school</td>
<td>Steering Group Committee - school, public and voluntary sectors represented</td>
<td>Control of external funding. Supports school in making strategic decisions.</td>
<td>Through school at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire Lifestyle</td>
<td>By South Lanarkshire Leisure. Service Level Agreement between SLL, Education &amp; Social Work Depts.</td>
<td>Management Group comprising school, public sector and leisure trust.</td>
<td>Will address programming and access issues</td>
<td>Through South Lanarkshire Leisure allocation from South Lanarkshire Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
facilities. Groups at Abraham Guest High School and Paignton Community & Sports College may have a greater decision making role but at this stage it is not possible to fully assess the extent of the governing powers. Given the partnership arrangements at the two Scottish fast track projects, it is the groups at these projects that are likely to have the greatest role in the management of the project.

The literature on modern governance emphasises the need of partner organisations to share resources. Considering financial resources only, the majority of revenue funding at each project comes from one main source, typically the school in English projects and the local authority in Scottish projects. Where funding is received from other external sources, these sources are typically not represented on the partnership group. Although the table does not consider other types of resources this analysis again suggests that, in the main, new modes of governance are not apparent at the fast track projects.

At the projects where the partnership arrangements most resemble modern modes of governance, the NOPES initiative has provided only a small impetus for developing these arrangements. In the two Scottish fast tracks, which most resemble modern modes of governance, similar governance structures have been developed by many of the same partners to manage facilities elsewhere in the local authority. At Abraham Guest the development of a Community User Group is something that, although not unrelated to the advent of the NOPES initiative, the school would have adopted as effective practice in any case. The Steering Group Committee at Paignton Community & Sports College is the only non-advisory group to be set up as a direct consequence of the NOPES initiative.

Although, in general, the development of new modes of governance as a consequence of the NOPES initiative are not apparent at the fast track projects, the concept still has efficacy in the wider evaluation. As shown in the preceding discussion, the concept of governance offers a number of facets that can be used to both analyse individual projects and compare different projects. The application of governance to the fast track projects also supports the identification of issues which may be examined further in the fast track projects and the wider evaluation.

These issues concern both methodology and findings and can be summarised as follows:-

- **Scotland / England comparison** – as mentioned previously the fast track projects in Scotland have very different management arrangements to those in England. In the wider evaluation, it will be interesting to consider if the fast track project projects are representative of a wider trend. Furthermore, are different management arrangements apparent in Northern Ireland and Wales?

- **Timescales** – at the second visit to the English fast track projects approximately six months after opening the long term management arrangements were not fully developed in the majority of projects. To fully
utilise governance as a concept to analyse partnerships it may be that a longer period of evaluation is required.

- **Extent of partners’ role and power** – in order to fully analyse the extent to which partnership arrangements represent modern modes of governance an interview schedule which includes all partners (possibly separately) is required in order to examine different partners’ roles and powers.

- **Resources** – as with the previous issue a fuller analysis of the resources that agencies bring to partnerships and the extent to which they are shared is required if the governance concept is to be fully utilised. Resources beyond the merely financial should be considered.
SECTION SIX : ENGLAND

6.1 Introduction

Section Six presents the findings from the evaluation thus far in England. Since the previous annual report in January 2004, the evaluation has progressed considerably in England.

As described in Section 4.2, the Baseline Survey has been finalised and is presently being distributed. A brief overview of the process of distribution and return of Baseline Surveys is given in Section 6.2.2. This is followed by a comprehensive analysis of the surveys received thus far in Sections 6.2.4, 6.2.5 and 6.2.6.

In England, initial visits have been made to four of the five core case studies. Reports on each of the case studies are given in Sections 6.3 to 6.7. As an initial visit has not yet been made to Case Study C, the report in Section 6.3 is necessarily brief. Furthermore, the report on Case Study D only portrays the findings from one interview and a fuller report will be provided once the full round of initial interviews are completed.

6.2 Baseline Survey Data

6.2.1 Introduction to the Baseline Surveys

A Baseline Survey is sent to all projects approximately 3 months before the NOPES facility is due to open. Projects based at a single school site with a Fund contribution of over £125,000 receive the larger Baseline (Extended) Survey. All other projects receive the shorter Baseline Survey. Both surveys are designed to collect quantitative data, mainly on participation but also on the other key dimensions of partnership and wider social outcomes. The Baseline Surveys are designed to be completed before the new NOPES facility opens. Therefore the results presented in this section reflect the data prior to the impact of NOPES.

The following sections represent the first analysis of the 38 Baseline (Extended) Surveys and 164 Baseline Surveys received from projects in England by the 5 January 2005.

6.2.2 Distribution and Return of the Baseline Survey

Table 3 shows the surveys distributed and returned in England as of 31 January 2005. The overall return rate of surveys is 44%. Baseline Surveys will continue to be distributed throughout the coming year as projects near completion. The first Annual Survey is due to be distributed in March 2005.
Table 3: Distribution and Return of Baseline Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>Percentage Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey (Umbrella)</td>
<td>370 (11 projects)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey (Extended)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Analysis Methods

Data from the returned surveys was entered into SPSS. A number of tests were conducted to ensure that data had been entered correctly. Following that the data was subsequently analysed in SPSS to gain frequencies and averages. T-tests and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test were used to analyse significant differences for parametric and non-parametric data respectively.

6.2.4 Results from Baseline Survey and Baseline (Extended) Survey

This section will provide information from questions common to both versions of the survey. Sections 6.2.5 and 6.2.6 will subsequently provide results from questions particular to the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys respectively.

6.2.4.1 Types of Project

Of the Baseline Survey returns included in the analysis, 15 projects are not based at a single school site (e.g. Outdoor Education Centres). The 120 surveys included in the analysis have been returned from schools who are part of the 11 NOPES umbrella projects that have been completed thus far.

The facilities at the schools who have returned the Baseline (Extended) Survey are as follows:

- 6 new build Multi-Use Games Areas
- 2 refurbished and 18 new build sports halls
- 9 new build Artificial Turf Pitches
- 9 new build and 1 refurbishment of playgrounds
- 9 new build and 1 refurbishment of changing rooms
- other facilities include two projects which include reception areas, two projects with fitness areas, curriculum facilities at two projects, two dance studios and a swimming pool
6.2.4.2 Aim of Projects

The Baseline Survey and Baseline Survey (Extended) asked what outcomes particular projects were designed to deliver. The results of this question are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Percentage of projects designed to achieve particular outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For pupils</th>
<th>For community users</th>
<th>For pupils</th>
<th>For community users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide new facilities that did not exist before</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of existing facilities</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the range of activities</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to activities offered</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve links with the wider community</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the capacity of existing facilities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for competitive sport</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities to directly support the delivery of the PE curriculum</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most commonly cited aims were the same for projects that returned the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Survey, i.e. to provide new facilities and to improve the range of activities.

- Considerably more of the projects that returned the Baseline (Extended) Survey will have NOPES facilities designed to support the delivery of the curriculum than those that returned the Baseline Survey (92% compared to 69%).

- For those projects that returned the Baseline Survey, improving the range of activities for pupils was more often important than any other outcome in
the design of NOPES facilities (88%). This difference, as well as that mentioned above, probably reflects the different types of facility funded at larger and smaller projects. A similar reason could be given for the difference in the percentage of projects that are designed to improve the quality of facilities for pupils (71% in Baseline Survey, 53% in Baseline (Extended) Survey).

- Providing new facilities and improving the range of activities for pupils were priorities in the design of facilities for most of those projects returning the Baseline (Extended) Survey (90% of projects each).

- In the Baseline Survey, across all categories, except ‘links with the community’, projects are more likely to be designed to achieve outcomes for pupils than community users (p < 0.05 ). This indicates that community usage is not a high priority for smaller projects.

- On the contrary, for projects completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey the only significant difference between the percentages of projects designed for pupils and the community was in the category of improved quality of existing facilities. 53% of these projects are designed to improve quality for pupils with 42% designed to achieve the same for community users. The lack of difference in other categories suggests that, perhaps unsurprisingly, community usage is more important for larger projects.

Projects were also asked which of the particular NOPES outcomes their facilities were designed to achieve. The results of this question are given in Table 5.

- For all projects, Outcome 1 (improvement of PE and sport in schools) is the most commonly targeted of the six NOPES outcomes. All projects completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey and 89% of projects completing the Baseline Survey indicated that their NOPES facilities are designed to achieve this outcome.

- The second most common outcome in both samples is Outcome 3, which is concerned with better opportunities to increase levels of physical activity. 86% and 95% of projects returning the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys respectively indicated their NOPES facilities are designed to achieve this outcome. Together with the priority given to Outcome 1, this suggests that improving participation is the key aspiration for most projects.

- Almost all projects (95%) who responded to the Baseline (Extended) Survey are designed to address Outcome 4, improved collaboration between schools and communities. The percentage of projects completing the Baseline Survey which addressed this outcome was lower at 53%. This reflects the previous finding that larger projects are more concerned with developing community links and usage.

- Similarly, less projects completing the Baseline Survey, compared to the Baseline (Extended) Survey, are designed to achieve Outcome 5: the promotion of social inclusion (39% compared to 53% of projects). Again,
this is, perhaps, related to the lesser community focus within smaller projects.

Table 5: Percentage of Projects Designed to Achieve NOPES Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Baseline (Extended) Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1 Improved physical education and sport in schools</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and, more generally local communities</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4 Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5 Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities by all groups in society</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6 Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.4.3 Quality of Existing Facilities

Table 6 shows respondents views on the quality of existing facilities before the new NOPES funded projects have been completed.

- In general the individuals completing the questionnaires rated their existing facilities, prior to NOPES, as below average. For example, 45% of Baseline (Extended) Survey respondents rated the quality of existing PE and sport facilities as either 1 or 2 on a scale between 1 poor and 5 excellent.
- Those individuals completing the Baseline Survey, as opposed to the Extended version, rated the quality of existing facilities and their suitability for the needs of the school slightly higher. In particular, 30% of Baseline Survey projects compared to 39% of Baseline (Extended) survey projects rated their existing facility as 1 or 2 for suitability for the needs of the
school on a scale between 1 highly unsuitable and 5 highly suitable. There was a similar 9% difference on the same scale for ‘quality of existing facilities’.

Table 6 : Quality and Suitability of Existing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the current PE and sport facilities at your school (excluding those under construction)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the current facilities for the needs of the school (‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the current facilities for the needs of the community (‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ratings for suitability of facilities for the community was lower than for suitability for the school. Approximately half of all projects (50% of Baseline Survey and 47% of Baseline (Extended) Survey) rated the suitability of the facilities for the community as either 1 or 2 on the same scale as described above.

6.2.5 Baseline Survey Results

6.2.5.1 Usage of Existing Facilities by Pupils and the Community

The number of pupils using the current facilities (before the NOPES facilities open) in curriculum and extra-curricular time in a typical week, as well as community users, is shown in Table 7.

- The main usage of the existing facilities is for pupils in curriculum time. On average far more young people used the existing facility in curriculum time (224) than in extra-curricular time (82). This shows that there is potential for the number of extra-curricular users to increase, hopefully as a result of the NOPES initiative.
- The number of community users was on average low at only 29 users in a typical week. In fact, 52% of projects had no community users at present.
Table 7: Number of users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Number of Users</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during curricular time</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during extra-curricular time</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Users</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.5.2 Curriculum PE Time

Table 8 shows the responses to one of the key questions in the survey, the minimum amount of curriculum time that any pupil in each year group receives in a typical week.

- The average number of curriculum minutes of PE each year group received was fairly constant across primary schools, with an average 90 minutes in Years 1 and 2 ranging to an average of 98 minutes on average in Year 5.
- The allocation of curriculum PE time for all pupils was greater, on average, in secondary schools. The average amount of timetabled PE was highest in Year 9 at 123 minutes, above the recommended 2 hours per week.
- In all other secondary years the amount of timetabled PE was below the recommended two hours with an average of between 111 minutes in Years 10 and 11 and 119 minutes in Year 7. However, these averages are not significantly below the two hour recommendation and do not take into account other school sport that pupils make take part in.
- The 15 projects not based at a single school site were used for curriculum PE and sport for an average of 16 hours 40 minutes in a typical week. This curriculum PE and sport usage ranged from a minimum of 1 hour to a maximum of 66 hours at particular projects.
Table 8: Curriculum PE Time that All Children in Each Year Group Receive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of projects with pupils in year</th>
<th>Average minutes of PE (min)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum minutes of PE (min)</td>
<td>Maximum minutes of PE (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.6 Baseline Survey (Extended) Results

6.2.6.1 Background Information from the School

Table 9 gives information on the average number of PE and Sport training days attended by teachers and adults from the school, as well as the number of participants averaged across both the whole sample and only those schools which provided training.

- Other training provided included Junior & Community Sports Leader Training (six schools), PE Exam Training (two schools), First Aid, Primary School Inclusion, Sports Funding, Strength Agility Quickness (SAQ), Information Technology, FA coaching award and junior football organisers courses (one school each).
- 61% of projects created new staff posts as a result of the NOPES initiative. Of these posts 62% were full-time posts. Findings from the fast track and case studies suggest that these posts may be crucial to supporting the impact of projects.
Table 9: PE and Sport Training for Teachers and Other Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity based training (e.g. Netball, Cricket, Tag rugby etc)</th>
<th>Average Number of days training</th>
<th>Average Number of participants</th>
<th>Average Number of Participants in schools that provide training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity based training</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion training (e.g. Disability, Disaffected Youth)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Training</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background data from schools on attainment and exclusions was sought in the Baseline Survey (Extended) and is shown in Table 10. This will be complemented in future by data from the Pupil Level Annual School Census.

Table 10: Attainment and Exclusion in Project Schools During the Last School Year

| Average number of pupil exclusions of a day or more (includes temporary and permanent) | 75 |
| Average number of pupils attaining A*-C in GCSE (Full Course) Physical Education | 24 |
| Average number of pupils attaining A*-G in GCSE (Full Course) Physical Education | 46 |
| Average number of pupils gaining the Junior Sports Leader Award | 14 |
| Average number of pupils gaining the Community Sports Leader Award | 2 |

- 42% and 13% of projects had pupils that gained the Junior Sport Leader and Community Sports Leader Awards respectively.
6.2.6.2 Partnership and Links with Other Initiatives

Table 11 shows the other initiatives that schools with NOPES projects are currently part of and the importance of those initiatives to the future success of the NOPES project.

**Table 11 : Involvement in and Importance of Other Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Percentage of schools which are involved with initiative (%)</th>
<th>Importance of initiative to future success of NOPES funded project (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Communities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43 29 0 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Sports</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28 50 11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Schools</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27 36 9 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Action Zones</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56 22 0 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements Zoneparc / Sporting Playgrounds</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33 0 0 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Cities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44 19 19 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls in sport</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80 13 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Schools Standard</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48 30 4 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOF Out of School Hours Learning</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39 44 6 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing for Success</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33 33 17 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Futures</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33 17 0 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Sport Co-ordinators</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79 15 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Sports College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69 23 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Action Zones</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25 0 0 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step into Sport</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54 31 0 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Sportsability</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42 42 8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local sports initiatives</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58 21 5 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other national initiatives</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71 14 0 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Of all initiatives included, it is School Sport Co-ordinators (now School Sports Partnerships programme) that is perceived to be important to the success of the NOPES initiative. 87% of schools are at present involved in the initiative and of these schools 79% rated School Sports Co-ordinators as very important in the future success of the NOPES project.

• Healthy Schools Standard is another national initiative that is perceived as important to NOPES projects. 60% of schools are involved in this initiative and 78% of projects rated it as very or moderately important to the success of the NOPES project. This finding reflects the importance of the health agenda nationally and, in particular, within the NOPES initiative.

• Although fewer schools are involved with the Specialist Sports College programme (34%), the majority of those involved (74%) rated it as very important to the success of the NOPES project. This replicates the finding in some of the fast track projects where both programmes were key to the achievement of common outcomes.

• Of the area based initiatives, schools are more likely to be involved in and rate as very important Education Action Zones and Excellence in Cities compared to Sports Action Zones. Only 10% of projects are involved in Sports Action Zones and it may be of concern that of these schools 75% are unsure of its impact on the NOPES project.

• A high percentage (80%) of those projects who were involved in the Girls in Sport initiative rated it as very important to the success of the NOPES project.

• Finally, it is worth noting that half of the projects are also involved in local initiatives with 79% of these projects describing these initiatives as very or moderately important. The impact of local initiatives will be considered in more detail in the case study areas.

Table 12 shows the results of the survey question asking the number of organisations that use the schools’ existing facilities and work in partnership with the school. For both usage and partnership, the percentage of schools that have links with such organisations as well as the average number of organisations in each category is given.

• Both primary and secondary schools were common organisations to use the projects’ existing facilities (68% and 46% projects have some usage by primary and secondary schools respectively). It is also encouraging for the future that most projects had partnership links with these types of organisation (partnership with primary schools at 73% of projects and with secondary schools at 43% of projects).

• The most common users of the project’s existing facilities are sports clubs with an average of 5 clubs using the facilities at existing projects sites and usage at 76% of projects. However, fewer projects work in partnership with these sports clubs (40%), which suggests that the NOPES projects may have to work to develop stronger partnership arrangements.
Table 12: Partnership with Other Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Percentage of projects who have usage</th>
<th>Average number of orgs. who use the sports facility</th>
<th>Percentage of projects who have partnership</th>
<th>Average number of orgs. who currently work in partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth form and further education colleges</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports clubs</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governing bodies of sport</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor education centres</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioners (e.g. referral schemes)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community associations and voluntary groups</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA sports development unit</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups (e.g. Cubs, Brownies, Youth Club)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The only other type of organisation to show strong usage of existing project facilities is the local sports development unit (usage at 32% of projects). Again, there is less partnership working with these organisations.
6.2.6.3 Participation in PE & School Sport

Figure 2 shows the average number of minutes of curriculum PE that every pupil in each year group receives in the schools at which NOPES projects are based. Note that only one school that returned the Baseline (Extended) Survey, a special school, had any pupils in Years 1 to 6.

Figure 2: Curriculum PE Time

- Even prior to the opening of NOPES facilities, schools at which projects are to be based have on average achieved, or are close to achieving, the two hour target for PE and school sport in Years 7,8 and 9 (119, 120 and 114 minutes respectively for both boys and girls). These figures are very similar to those found in all School Sport Partnerships schools in the 2003/04 PE, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) Survey (DfES, 2004).
- Allocated curriculum time for PE is lower in Years 10 and 11 at 93 and 88 minutes respectively for boys and 91 and 88 minutes respectively for girls, leaving on average approximately 30 minutes of added PE and school sport required in order to reach the two hour target.
- There is no, or very little, difference between boys and girls allocated PE time.

The question on PE curriculum time is complemented in the survey by a question asking how many pupils receive the 2 hour entitlement to PE and school sport. The results of this question are shown in Table 13.

- Overall an average across schools of 73% of boys and 70% of girls receive the 2 hours PE and school sport entitlement. Although the survey uses a slightly different measure, these results are again broadly similar to the 2003/2004 PESSCL survey.
Table 13: Pupils Participating in 2 hours PE and school sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average number of pupils</th>
<th>Average percentage of pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Numerically more boys than girls in the schools at which NOPES projects are to be based receive 2 hours PE and school sport in a typical week. However, there are, on average, more boys than girls at the schools which returned the survey.
- A more reliable measure is the average across schools of the percentage of pupils that receive two hours of school sport and PE. Only at Years 10 and 11 is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$ level) between boys’ and girls’ participation. The average percentage of pupils receiving 2 hours of PE and school sport drops off from Year 9 to Year 10. Boys participation drops from 84% to 57% ($p < 0.05$) while girls participation drops from 83% to 52% ($p < 0.05$). One factor contributing to this drop-off is the lower core curriculum time PE that e year groups receive (see Figure 2). However, the drop-off is a feature that is not specific to schools involved in the NOPES initiative.

Table 14 shows the average number of sick notes and other excuses offered by pupils which resulted in non-participation in PE in a typical week.

- Although there is a small difference between boys and girls in non-participation in PE, this result is not statistically significant.
Table 14: Non Participation in PE in a typical week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average number of boys</th>
<th>Average number of girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects were also asked in the survey about the availability of and attendance at extra-curricular activities. Table 15 shows the percentage of schools offering a particular type of activity, the average time that activities are available and the average number of boys and girls attending.

Table 15: Availability of and Attendance at Extra-Curricular Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Available time in a typical week</th>
<th>Percentage of schools providing activities</th>
<th>Average number of boys attending</th>
<th>Average number of girls attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before school/breakfast PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>51 min</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaktime PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>46 min</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunchtime PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>4h 19 min</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>8h 6 min</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend activities PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>22 min</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe walking routes to school</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe cycling routes to school</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Almost all schools run lunchtime and after school PE and sport opportunities, 84% and 80% respectively. The time available for these activities is higher than at other times with an average of approximately 8 hours after school and over 4 hours lunchtime activity available in a typical week.
• Although participation by boys is on average higher than girls, the only activity at which this difference is statistically significant is ‘after-school PE & sport opportunities’ (average 97 boys as opposed to 64 girls). However, this result is qualified by the fact that the schools within the sample have statistically more boys than girls on the school roll in every year except Year 11.

Table 16 shows the results of the question that asked about the availability of sports programmes at the school’s site in holiday periods.

Table 16: Availability of School Holiday Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Schools who have Opportunities Available</th>
<th>Average Number of Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(those school who have opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Term</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31h 33 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Holidays</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23 h 47 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Holidays</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>59 h 41 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Holidays</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9 h 30 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Activities were most commonly organised, perhaps unsurprisingly, in the Easter and Summer holidays.

• Given the added length of the Summer holidays it is unsurprising that, for those schools with sports programmes, the average number of hours that the programme operated for was highest at almost 60 hours.

6.2.6.4 Participation by Pupils From Other Schools and the Community

Table 17 shows the percentage of projects whose existing facilities are used by pupils from other schools and the average number of boys and girls from other schools that use those facilities in a typical week.

• Usage of the project’s existing facilities by other schools is highest in Key Stages 3 & 4 with 37% of projects having some usage. Average numbers in a typical week are highest in Key Stage 3 with 10 boys and 8 girls participating.

• The average number of users across all age groups is fairly low and this is a facet that the NOPES facilities may have a large impact on. Usage of facilities by Key Stage 1 pupils in other schools is particularly low with this occurring at only 13% of projects.

• There are differences in usage between boys and girls. However, without knowing the rolls of the schools using the facilities it is impossible to speculate whether these differences are significant.
Table 17: Usage of Existing Facilities by Other Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of schools</th>
<th>Average number of boys</th>
<th>Average number of girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows the average community usage of the project’s existing facilities in a typical week.

Figure 3: Community Usage of Existing Facilities

- Usage of existing facilities is highest in both males and females in the under 16 age group (88 and 14 average users respectively). Usage by people in the 26 to 64 years old age group is next highest.
- Usage is higher by males than females overall, 153 as opposed to 34 average users (p < 0.05), and at every age group (all p < 0.05) apart from over 65.
One question in the survey asked for the ethnicity of pupils who take part in extra-curricular activities and community users who currently use the facility. Many respondents did not complete this question, with 11 projects specifying the ethnicity of pupils from other schools and 18 projects giving the ethnicity of community users. The results are shown in Table 18.

### Table 18: Ethnicity of Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Pupils from other schools</th>
<th>Community Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- As the evaluation team do not yet have the data from the Pupil Level Annual School Census, there is no data against which these results can be compared.

#### 6.2.6.5 Range of Activities Available

- The five most commonly available activities in curriculum time in the last 12 months are football (100% of responding schools), cricket (100%), athletics (97%), basketball (97%) and gymnastics (95%).

- Of these football (100%), cricket (95%) and basketball (90%) are also in the five most commonly available sports in extra-curricular time. Netball (90%) and cross country (87%) make up the top five extra-curricular activities.

- The percentage of schools making facilities available to the community is much lower than school use. The top five activities available to the community are all available in less than 50% of projects. The top five are badminton (42% of responding schools), netball (37%), dance (32%), fitness (32%) and basketball (26%).

Table 19 shows the minimum, maximum and average number of activities available in curriculum and extra-curricular time and also available to the community in the last 12 months at project sites.
Table 19: Range of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum number of activities at any project site</th>
<th>Maximum number of activities at any project site</th>
<th>Average number of activities at project sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.6.6 Target Groups

76% of responding projects indicated that they have identified groups to be targeted because of their current low participation in sport and physical activity. Table 20 shows the percentage of these projects targeting specific groups and, if so, the number of current extra-curricular and community users in a typical week within the group targeted.

Table 20: Target Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Percentage of targeting projects</th>
<th>Number of current extra-curricular users in target group</th>
<th>Number of current community users in target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls/Women</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with a disability</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in an area of high deprivation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people at risk</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Groups</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Almost all projects (93%) that target any group target girls and women in particular. The next most commonly targeted groups are people with a disability (43%), young people at risk (43%) and people living in areas of high deprivation (39%).
- Other target groups mentioned were boys dance and single parents.
6.3 Case Study C

Geographically, Case Study C is a large metropolitan area in the north of England. It has a population of over 700,000. Although deprivation city wide is below the national average there are areas of deprivation, with 12 of the 33 wards being in the 20% most deprived wards in the country. The proportion of the population from an ethnic minority background is also high.

The NOPES portfolio in Case Study C comprises of a good variety of projects based at a range of locations. This variety will allow the evaluation team to examine differences in the impact of projects and identify contributing factors to such differences. The portfolio also includes the largest single outdoor adventure project in the case studies with a sailing centre costing over £800,000. Also of note is the high level of revenue funding requested by projects within the portfolio.

The initial visit to Case Study C by the evaluation team is planned for the 21\textsuperscript{st} February 2005. The evaluation team have identified a number of people from the local council and the not-for-profit company responsible for providing education support services within the case study.
6.4 Case Study D

Case Study D is an inner city council with a population of approaching 245,000. It has high rates of deprivation with 20 of its 21 wards in the 20% most deprived wards in the country. The case study area also has one of the highest proportions of ethnic minority residents in the country. A Sports Action Zone covers five of the wards in the case study and six of the NOPES projects are based in this area.

The NOPES portfolio of Case Study D is managed, on behalf of the Council, by a private management company. An initial visit was made to this company in July 2004 to meet the NOPES portfolio manager. Partly due to the current management arrangements negotiating the agreement to undertake the evaluation of the Council’s portfolio has been a protracted process. However, by the end of 2004 agreement had been obtained from the authority and the initial round of interviews with local authority officers who are members of the portfolio steering group has been scheduled for late February 2005. Interviewees include the senior school advisor with responsibility for PE and sport, two officers responsible for community sports development, and two officers from the LEA who fulfil a more technical support role for the portfolio of projects. Given that these interviews have not yet been conducted this report is intended as an interim report which identifies issues for further investigation. A full report will be included in the following six monthly report once the full round of first visit interviews have been completed.

The planning meeting with the portfolio manager was effective in providing the local management and policy context for the NOPES projects, in identifying key personnel and stakeholders, and in identifying a series of aspects of the portfolio and its component projects for further consideration. Regarding the effectiveness of the partnership the following issues have been identified for investigation:

- the nature of the strategic vision for the portfolio. The strategic vision for the portfolio appears to be vague exemplified by the apparent absence of a rationale for the prioritisation of projects selected by the authority.
- the role of the steering group. The precise role and impact of the steering group is unclear. Of particular interest will be the role of the steering group after the completion of Stage 2. It is currently unclear whether the steering group will have a role in monitoring and evaluation, and in broad strategic management.
- the role of the local authority in relation to the private management company. The NOPES portfolio manager’s role, at the time of initial visit, was very much concerned with supporting Stage 2 applications and getting facilities constructed. The role of local authority personnel in the NOPES initiative will be examined in the further interviews.
- partnership groups for individual projects. It is intended to establish partnership groups for each project and the role and operation of these groups will be of interest in future stages of the evaluation.
• links with Healthy Schools Partnership, the local authority sports development strategy and with the Sports Action Zone are, at present, unclear.

There are also a smaller number of issues focused on participation that need to be explored. At the planning meeting it was difficult to identify any specific authority-wide target groups although those on low incomes were mentioned. Generally, it was difficult to identify an authority-wide participation strategy to which NOPES was an integral or contributory element. Future interviewees from the local authority are likely to be able to provide more information on these aspects. Similarly, it was not possible, at this stage, to identify the intended impact of the portfolio of projects on wider social issues, such as educational achievement, citizenship and health.

Finally, it should be emphasised that it is not uncommon to have a long list of queries following the initial planning meeting. It is very likely that following the completion of the first round of interviews the strategic logic underpinning the portfolio will be much clearer.
6.5 Case Study E

6.5.1 Introduction

Case Study E is located in the north west of England. The size of the allocation is large at almost £12m reflecting the population size and levels of deprivation within the area. The population is in the region of 1.1m of which almost 95% are described as White. The largest minority ethnic group is Asian or Asian British which represents just over 4% of the population. Eight districts within the county fall within the top 20% most deprived wards in England whilst the county’s least deprived district ranks very highly amongst the least deprived in England thus reflecting a great deal of diversity within the county.

There are 22 projects within this portfolio which includes eight sports halls of various sizes, nine MUGAs, a playground refurbishment based on the Zoneparc model and four outdoor education projects.

6.5.2 Methodology

The desk study and case manager interview for this case study were conducted on 22nd November 2004. An initial visit was made to the authority on 25 January 2005. An interview was conducted with the Buildings and Development Officer responsible for managing the capital side of the portfolio, three members of the Community Use Development team and a finance officer.

6.5.3 Partnership Effectiveness

6.5.3.1 Role and operation of portfolio level partnership

The initial development of this portfolio was overseen by the New Opportunities Fund PE and Sport Management Group which was located within the county council’s Education and Cultural Services Directorate. There was also an Outdoor Education Sub Group. The role of this management group was to ensure that the portfolio that was developed reflected the strategic objectives of the Authority and, within that context, the needs and priorities of individual schools and centres. The main focus of the group was to select the projects to be included in the portfolio through a fair and transparent process.

The group have not met over the last twelve months. During this time the development of the capital build has been overseen by one of the Buildings and Development officers who is one of the members of the management group. The school and community aspect of the portfolio has been overseen by the Community Use Development team whose senior officer was also one of the original members of the New Opportunities Fund PE and Sport Management Group.
Each of the larger projects will have their own local management groups although some of these will be more formal than others. There is likely to be a great deal of diversity between the groups reflecting the local environment of the location of the facility. This approach has been taken due to the size and the complexity of the county. Within the county there are 600 schools, eight Primary Care Trusts and twelve Local Leisure Authorities. The establishment of local management groups was considered the most effective way of ensuring that the facilities are integrated both within schools and the local community. The Community Use Development Team have been instrumental in ensuring that the local groups have been established with representatives from a wide range of local organisations included. This has been achieved by working closely with the head teachers and other school staff and also the Local Leisure Authorities.

6.5.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

The NOPES initiative is viewed very much as one of many initiatives which the Authority has welcomed in order to achieve its overall strategic aims. The following important initiatives were noted as being complemented by NOPES, Every Child Matters, Raising Standards and Achievement and Healthy Schools. In addition, the NOPES portfolio was believed to complement the Authority’s strategies on Community Cohesion and Social Inclusion, Equality and Diversity, SEN and Inclusion and the Adult Learning Plan. The way in which NOPES is overseen and managed by the Authority reflects the belief that it is one of many initiatives being embraced by the county and therefore the NOPES initiative is managed in the same way as all the other initiatives developed through the Authority. One of the main recent developments which overarches all schools within the county is Extended Schools. It is envisaged that many of the initiatives the county is currently engaged in will be very important in delivering Extended Schools in the county.

6.5.3.3 Choice of projects

The way in which the projects were selected for this portfolio was very ambitious. Each of the 600 schools in the county were asked to submit an ‘Initial Interest Pro-forma’. On this form schools were asked to outline a variety of information about their existing facilities, levels of deprivation, existing community and sporting links and usage, and details of the proposed development they would wish to have developed through NOPES. Schools were also asked to outline the ways in which any new development would impact on the NOPES key outcomes and also to comment on any existing feasibility studies for the project and any matched funding available. Four hundred of the six hundred schools submitted the pro-forma.

An elaborate marking scheme was then adopted to summarise the data contained within the pro-forma in order to rank the various projects. One of the most important considerations was the impact any new facilities would have on the ability of the school to provide two hours PE and school sport. Other factors included in the rankings were the potential to raise standards, improved collaboration and co-operation, social inclusion, deprivation,
potential community links, OFSTED criticism, potential to raise attendances and reduce exclusions.

As a result of the process 22 projects were selected by the New Opportunities Fund PE and Sport Management Group. It was noted by one of the interviewees that at the end of the process only two schools were unhappy about the decisions that were made. This was felt to be a reflection of the success of the process which has ensured that the schools with the greatest need, and with the greatest potential to make a difference, have been prioritised through a clear decision-making process.

6.5.3.4 Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities

This outcome was one of the main focuses of the decision-making process adopted by the Authority in selecting projects. This will be a major focus as individual projects develop and this will continue to be supported through the Community Use Development Team.

6.5.3.5 Sustainability

One of the key elements of ensuring the sustainability of the projects funded through this portfolio is the development of realistic budgets based on the previous experience of the Authority. A considerable amount of effort has been expended in developing the budgets in consultation with the schools who will be responsible for ensuring that the budgets are used as effective planning tools. Managers will be appointed to oversee all the large projects and managing the budget will be part of their role. In addition, project managers will be expected to seek additional sources of funding. The financial side of projects will also be overseen by the Authority’s finance officers to ensure that any problems with meeting the budgets are highlighted at an early stage. Should any concerns be raised by project managers or the finance officers there will be support offered through the Community Use Development Team based on their previous experiences. Examples of assistance that will be offered includes reviews of pricing structures, the hours of opening and marketing and targeting participants. It was, however, noted that there is an inherent contradiction between the need to raise revenue in order to be able to run a facility whilst at the same time ensuring that the facilities are accessible to the community in a targeted way.

6.5.3.6 Monitoring and evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation of the NOPES portfolio is currently at an early stage of development which is due in part to a lack of clarity about the expectations of the Fund around monitoring and evaluation. It is envisaged that within this case study the monitoring and evaluation procedures will form part of a wider monitoring and evaluation process to ensure that schools are not overburdened. This is likely to be driven through the Extended Schools development. Currently there is uncertainty over where the results of
monitoring and evaluation will be best reported although this issue is one that is being considered by the Authority.

6.5.4 Impact on participation

6.5.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools

Quantity and quality of PE

It was noted by the interviewees that this was a primary focus for this portfolio. The schools which have received funding through NOPES are schools with very poor facilities for whom providing two-hours PE and school sport was very challenging indeed. The interviewees also noted that they felt that during the early stages of the programme the impact on PE and school sport was a major emphasis of the fund. The interviewees felt that as time has moved on the emphasis of the Fund has moved away from PE and school sport and towards community use. This was a concern for the Authority who feel that there is a danger that the impact on PE and school sport will be overlooked. It was also noted that whilst all the projects have been designed to impact on community use this will be a much slower development than the impact on PE and school sport. This issue will be explored in greater detail during the individual project visits.

Extra-curricular activity

The main focus in terms of extra-curricular activity will be on increasing the range of activities on offer to young people. It is hoped that by being able to offer a wider range of activities to supplement the more traditional sports already being offered more young people will participate.

6.5.4.2 Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and more generally local communities

Target groups

There are no target groups identified for the portfolio as a whole. The target groups for individual projects have been identified to reflect local needs. One example of this is an issue that is particular relevant to this portfolio which is rurality. Many of the young people live in very rural areas and projects based within these areas will address this issue.

Impact on community

The way in which these projects will impact on the local community will reflect the needs of the local community. It was noted that any initiative such as NOPES is always used as an opportunity by the Authority to encourage schools to become more ‘outward facing.’ Some schools have a very good track record of working with the local community whilst other schools are more
insular. The Authority has been working for more than ten years to ensure that schools work with their local communities. The existence of the Community Use Development team is a reflection of this commitment to community use by the Authority. The involvement of the team in supporting the delivery of the NOPES initiative is likely to ensure that this aspect of the NOPES programme will be successful.

6.5.4.3 Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities

Fit for purpose and value for money

The design of the facilities making up the portfolio was very much informed by the designs of Sport England. It was noted by the interviewees that the specifications for the sports hall were of a higher specification than the ones that are usually used for school sports halls. This higher specification reflects the requirements needed for community use of the facilities. It was noted that this inevitably meant that the costs were much greater and also that the running costs of the facilities were also much higher due to their large size. It was noted that up to one third of the costs of running the facility arise from the changing areas which do not in themselves generate income. Whilst the community use is welcomed by the Authority it was noted that there is an additional burden on schools to generate income to cover the increased running costs. The development plans for other facilities built by this Authority are based on occupancy levels of 50% to break-even. For the projects funded through NOPES the break-even levels rely on between 60 and 70% occupancy. It was noted that for smaller projects consideration had been given to ensuring that the benefits of community use outweighed the associated costs of community use.

6.5.5 Impact on wider social outcomes

6.5.5.1 Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity

It was noted that whilst schools have committed to ensuring that this outcome is achieved the interviewees were not familiar enough with each individual project’s development plan to be able comment on this.

6.5.5.2 Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities

It was recognised by the interviewees that this was an outcome schools have said they will meet, this will be achieved in different ways by individual projects. The Authority has a number of projects being undertaken throughout the county which have proven successful in achieving these aims. It is anticipated that this will be achieved through the learning gained from these projects and through the support of the Community Use Development Team.
6.5.5.3 Other social outcomes

Again, it was recognised by the interviewees that this was an outcome schools have said they will meet. The ways in which this will be achieved will vary across individual projects.

6.5.6 Overall assessment of progress

6.5.6.1 Strengths

One of the key strengths of this portfolio is the personnel responsible for the portfolio. The portfolio is being developed on both the capital and the developmental side simultaneously. The key personnel responsible for developing this large portfolio have been able to ensure that the portfolio is effectively managed by using the combination of their extensive knowledge in two key areas, capital build and schools and their communities.

A second strength of this portfolio is the way in which schools have been involved in the development process of the NOPES portfolio from the outset. Firstly, all schools were invited to express an interest in benefiting from funding through the initiative. Secondly, schools that were successful in being selected as a project have been involved in developing the bids and development plans with the support of the Community Use Development Team. This combination of approach has ensured that the schools have been involved at an early stage and, therefore, have ownership of those plans from an early stage.

Another key strength of this portfolio is the clear commitment of the Authority to support the schools in delivering their projects. This support will be based on their extensive previous experience and is likely to be a key factor in ensuring the projects within the portfolio deliver on all the NOPES outcomes. Problems with delivering the development plans will be identified at an early stage and support will be offered in order to respond to the identified problems.

6.5.6.2 Weaknesses/Barriers to progress

One potential barrier to progress is the size of the county in which the portfolio is being developed. The response to this issue, based around local management groups, has been well implemented by the Authority but causes some logistical problems in being able to keep up to date with all the initiatives that are happening in the county.

One area which is under developed at this stage are the plans for monitoring and evaluation, particularly in terms of how any data that is collated will be utilised effectively. This is partly due to lack of clarity about what is expected of the local authority by the Fund and clarification of this process has been sought by the Authority. It is recognised by the Authority that the need to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of the initiative needs to be balanced with the desire not to overburden schools. It was anticipated at the time of the
The Building Schools for the Future programme has affected the development of two of the projects within this portfolio. The two sports halls were planned to be located at two schools which will be involved in a major overhaul of school provision within the county. This will involve a number of schools being merged or closed altogether to be replaced by new schools at new locations with different staffing structures. Planning for such a major development without head teachers in place is a very complex challenge to meet.

A final challenge for the Authority will be to ensure that the new facilities do not compete for users with the existing leisure providers in the county. The Authority values the working relationship with the various Local Leisure Authorities very highly and believe that this relationship will be instrumental in delivering the NOPES portfolio. For these reasons the Authority do not wish to have a detrimental impact on the usage of the services offered by the Local Leisure Authorities.

### 6.5.6.3 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned

The clarity of the process for selecting projects to be funded through NOPES has ensured that a portfolio reflecting both the Authority’s and the funds aims has been developed.

The decision not to seek any revenue funding for this portfolio has been possible due to the excellent existing, experientially based, structures in place within the Authority. These structures have ensured that realistic development plans have been constructed with the involvement of those responsible for delivering the plans.

Unlike some other Authorities this case study will also be supporting the schools involved in the portfolio to deliver the NOPES projects and, in particular, supporting projects to develop the community use of their facilities in a targeted way.

### 6.5.6.4 Recommendations for the local authority

A number of anecdotal examples of effective practice were offered during the initial visit interviews. It is recommended that a mechanism for sharing effective practice from both the NOPES initiative, and the many other initiatives the Authority is involved in, is developed.
6.5.6.5 Wider issues of significance to the Fund

Interviewees believed that the Fund’s emphasis for the NOPES initiative has shifted away from PE and school sport towards community use of projects. Given the focus in the portfolio on improving PE and school sport, interviewees within this Authority hoped that impact in this area is not overlooked by the Fund.

The Authority would have benefited from a clearer communication process about the expectations of the Fund in terms of monitoring and evaluation.
6.6 Case Study F

6.6.1 Introduction

Case study F is a large local authority in England with a resident population of over 1.33 million. Within the area there is a mix of urban and rural areas and the local authority encompasses areas of deprivation and wards with a high ethnic minority population. Whilst the case study locality is demographically diverse and consists of a range of affluent and deprived areas, some of the county’s highest levels of deprivation feature strongly within the bid. The county has the third highest funding allocation \(^1\) through NOPES in England and includes 65 projects. Within the portfolio there are three Outdoor Education Centres for the benefit of the whole county. The portfolio is managed by key personnel who are based at the Sports Development Unit, within the Education Directorate at Case Study F County Council. The NOPES programme is part of the overall vision to maintain a strategic county-wide approach to improve the sporting facilities and sports activities for both schools and the wider local communities in the case study area.

6.6.2 Methodology

An initial desk study was completed in November 2004 to examine the application documents and to gather information on the key outcomes and defined need for each of the projects. Following the desk study, two initial visits to the case study area were undertaken in December 2004 and January 2005 to meet with the PE and Sport Portfolio Manager and key personnel working at the strategic level; and to begin to identify specific projects to be included in the case study. A total of eight interviews were conducted with five representatives from the Sports Development Unit, one representative from Youth and Community Services, one representative for Case Study F Borough and District council’s and one representative from the County Cricket Board. In addition, seven project sites were visited to initiate the project level evaluation.

6.6.3 Partnership Effectiveness

6.6.3.1 Role and operation of portfolio level partnership

There is a strong partnership with good county wide representation at the portfolio level. Approximately 60 representatives from different organisations were brought together to consult on the first stage of the bid. These included representatives from Borough’s and Districts, Health Authority, police, youth and community services and schools. The partnership selected projects for inclusion in the bid and played a crucial role in the early stages of the application and will continue to offer advice throughout the development of the portfolio. The partnership was particularly effective at ensuring that both the

\(^1\) Behind Lancashire and Birmingham.
key outcomes and the wider social outcomes were addressed in setting up the individual projects.

6.6.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

Case Study F County Council representatives all stated that the NOPES programme is aligned with the wider strategic aims of the county. Key personnel from the Sports Development Unit have worked closely with governing bodies to implement the strategic framework for sport, including local disability frameworks. The NOPES programme targets a number of strategic documents countywide and also at a national level, for example Building Schools for the Future.

6.6.3.3 Choice of projects

The partnership was formed to identify and advise on key priority areas. At this time the Sports Development Unit had drawn up a Single and Multi Sports Facility Deficiency document and were therefore able to identify where the sports deficiencies were throughout the county. The partnership worked to cross-reference individual facility needs with wider sporting needs against levels of deprivation. Each individual bid was scored on behalf of the schools to ensure that they met with the Fund’s key outcomes for the programme. Throughout the application process community use was a key factor, particularly in areas where leisure provision is low.

6.6.3.4 Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities

The extent of collaboration and co-operation between schools and communities is unclear at present, as the projects are still in the developmental stages. However, there is a clear awareness of the need for a partnership approach and both individual project and Local Authority personnel have a sound understanding of the wider community needs. Partnership between schools is being encouraged by the partnership at portfolio level, through, for example, the sharing of facilities through programmes such as the School Sports Coordinator Partnership programme. The Sports Facilities Development Manager is particularly keen that every school in the county has access to high quality sports facilities. In order to achieve this, collaboration and co-operation between schools and communities is essential. The NOPES programme should be a significant step toward achieving this goal.

6.6.3.5 Sustainability

The projects included in the NOPES portfolio contribute to one of Case Study F County Council’s long-term aims, which is to increase participation in sports across the county for both schools and the wider community. In order to ensure sustainability, plans are in place to evaluate the projects to ensure value for money and fitness for purpose once construction is completed.
Research conducted by the Sports Development Unit and by the projects themselves has enabled the key stakeholders to identify need and also to assess enthusiasm within the community. Marketing is also to play a strategic role in increasing awareness of the forthcoming facilities which will be crucial in terms of sustaining facility use. The Sports Facilities Development Manager felt that to ensure sustainability it will be necessary to understand and address the issues that are relevant to the various target groups. For example, it was suggested that to sustain facility use by Asian women, it is necessary to understand their different cultural and religious needs.

6.6.3.6 Monitoring and evaluation

At the application stage, each project had to develop its own monitoring and evaluation procedures and identify key performance indicators against which progress will be monitored. These indicators were selected through local consultations to identify the key target groups and to establish a baseline against which to monitor increased participation. The project design was closely monitored by the PE and Sports Portfolio Manager, who worked with the project managers to ensure budgets were adhered to. During the construction stage, the project development has been monitored by the County Council Property Group and the Finance Department who have the necessary expertise in this area. Revenue funding has been secured to enable The PE and Sport Portfolio Manager to continue to support and guide the projects in their monitoring and evaluation needs.

6.6.4 Impact on participation

6.6.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools

It is hoped that the projects based on school sites will improve the quality of PE as many of the facilities are currently inadequate. More information on this aspect of the evaluation will be provided in the next report.

6.6.4.2 Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and more generally local communities

Widening participation, particularly within the wider community is a key objective for the County Council, and the NOPES programme is a significant part of the overall strategy to achieve this. When developing the portfolio, personnel from the Sports Development Unit, in particular the Sports Facilities Development Manager and the PE and Sport Portfolio Manager, were careful not to create additional competition for existing public leisure provision. The result of this careful planning is that the facilities are situated in the community areas with the highest need, thus encouraging wider community use whilst simultaneously promoting social inclusion. A particular strength in Case Study F is the work that has been done to increase participation amongst disabled people and to support this there is a designated Disability Development Manager based at the Sports Development Unit. Partnership representatives
also expressed their intention to increase participation amongst ethnic minority groups and people on low-incomes. In addition to improving physical activity among local communities, the school age population should benefit from improved sporting facilities, particularly those that are based on school sites.

### 6.6.4.3 Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities

The majority of the facilities are still in the construction phase and consequently this outcome cannot be fully evaluated in this report. However, the second largest allocation in the portfolio can be cited as an example of innovation and best practice. The project is a new sports hall, fitness suite (including gymnasium and studio) and changing facility, which has been designed to a high standard with a particular emphasis on disabled access.

### 6.6.5 Impact on wider social outcomes

#### 6.6.5.1 Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity

Individuals with experience of working directly with schools reported that improved sports facilities have a positive impact on behaviour, concentration and motivation, although the impact of the NOPES projects can only be evaluated once construction is complete. A number of respondents expressed the hope that pupils will feel a sense of pride in relation to the new facilities, which in turn should improve standards across the whole school.

#### 6.6.5.2 Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities

All the respondents at the portfolio level recognised the contribution sporting facilities and activities can make to social inclusion, but argued that the impact will be greater if delivered in conjunction with other community initiatives. There is a strong relationship between several of the projects, particularly those under the remit of outdoor education and Youth and Community Services, which are striving to prevent disaffection and aim to work with young people to promote social inclusion.

### 6.6.6 Overall assessment of progress

#### 6.6.6.1 Strengths

The Sports Development Unit showed foresight in securing the necessary internal funding to establish the post of PE and Sport Portfolio Manager, which all key personnel identified as a particularly effective driving force behind the development of the bid and establishment of the programme. Overall, there is a strong partnership which was responsible for selecting the projects for inclusion within the portfolio. The partnership comprises representatives from the district councils, participating schools, the police,
health authorities and other stakeholder groups. There is a clear understanding of the key outcomes and a shared vision of how these outcomes will be achieved as the projects develop.

6.6.6.2 Weaknesses/Barriers to progress

Several of the key stakeholders expressed concern over delays caused by the Big Lottery Fund, in particular delays to construction as a result of the Stage 2 application process. Respondents working within the sports department expressed concern about lack of clarity from the Big Lottery Fund on a number of issues, including for example the parameters of evaluation.

6.6.6.3 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned

Overall, it is evident that the case study portfolio has benefited throughout the NOPES process from having a large Sports Development Unit within the county. There is a good working relationship between portfolio personnel, in particular the PE and Sport Portfolio Manager and the individual projects. The application process represents an example of good practice based on good partnership working and clearly defined criteria for project selection. The application process and early stages of development have been carefully documented. The County Council is working with Local Authorities and other County Authorities, particularly those which have a similar structure, to compare experiences of the NOPES programme and to disseminate examples of effective practice.

6.6.6.4 Recommendations for the Local Authority

- To maintain the strong working relationship between portfolio personnel, in particular the PE and Sports Portfolio Manager and individual projects
- To continue to encourage collaboration and partnership between schools and communities

6.6.6.5 Wider issues of significance to the fund

Respondents working within the Sports Development Unit expressed concern over the workload, in particular the paperwork generated by their involvement with the Big Lottery Fund. It was also felt that, throughout the process, Big Lottery Fund procedures have been unclear. Associated with this interviewees perceived that, due to the length of the phase two application process, construction had not progressed as quickly as they had hoped. This has had an adverse effect on strategic planning within the authority.
6.7 Case Study G

6.7.1 Introduction

Case Study G is a city with a population of approximately 280,000 based in the East Midlands. The city has areas of significant deprivation with 19 wards in the 20% most deprived wards in the country. There is also a high ethnic minority population within the city. A Sports Action Zone covers part of the city and is connected to two of the projects in NOPES portfolio.

Case Study G has only seven projects within its NOPES portfolio, one of which is a Fast Track project. All of the projects are classified as large with the smallest project costing £440,000. All the projects bar one have some partnership funding and in three cases this partnership funding is a significant proportion of the total costs.

The NOPES initiative in Case Study G is described by interviewees as ‘a doing scheme’ in that after making strategic decisions about choice of project, the main concern is getting projects built.

6.7.2 Methodology

A desk study of the Stage 1 application documents for Case Study G was undertaken on 27th July 2004. Previously evaluation visits had been undertaken to the Fast Track project within the portfolio.

One group interview was conducted by two members of the evaluation team on 1st December 2004. Present at the interview were the PE and Sport Strategic Manager from within the Education Department, the Head of Sport (Regeneration & Culture Department) and the NOPES Portfolio Manager.

The interview was recorded and extensive notes were taken throughout. These notes have subsequently been checked and added to by listening to the tape recording. The notes have formed the basis of this report.

6.7.3 Partnership Effectiveness

6.7.3.1 Role and operation of portfolio level partnership

Within Case Study G, the Education Department was designated as the lead department for the NOPES initiative. A Strategic Steering Group was created for the NOPES initiative involving all the partners requested by the Fund. The group, chaired by the Director of Education, included representatives from Finance, Education, Property Services, Community Sports, Police & Housing. All three interviewees were members of the Strategic Steering Group.

The Steering Group meets three times per year and its main role is to ‘make sure representatives at the highest level knew’ how the portfolio is being developed. However, the ‘core vision’ for the NOPES portfolio has come from the PE & Sport Strategic Manager and the Head of Sport working together.
These two individuals have a large amount of prior experience in working together and have developed a strong personal relationship. It is this effective working partnership that has provided the impetus for the NOPES initiative in Case Study G. Furthermore, their different roles within the local authority ensure that different aspects have been addressed within the NOPES portfolio. For example, the Head of Sport provides a community and wider sport strategy perspective to what might otherwise be a school-dominated focus.

The strong relationship between the PE & Sport Strategic Manager and Head of Sport has developed despite there being historically ‘very poor’ relationships between the Education and Regeneration & Culture Departments. In trying to build relationships with the Education Department, that has a bigger budget and greater funding opportunities, the Head of Sport found that he ‘shared the same vision’ as the PE & Sport Strategic Manager. The two individuals have found a way of working together despite there being ‘a long way to go in terms of directors working together’.

However, despite this good working relationship, wider departmental issues still affect the two individuals. For example, recognition of input in the building of new facilities has become an issue. It was suggested that when facilities are built/opened in or near schools, there is a tendency to credit the Education Department rather than also seeing the role of sport personnel. The proper recognition for the work of different departments is, therefore, a key micro-political concern given the wider difficulties between the departments.

Other members of the Strategic Steering Group have added particular input and expertise into the NOPES portfolio. For example, the Racial Equality Steering Group has been advising on specific groups’ needs in order that the NOPES portfolio may address them. This is a new collaboration for all concerned.

The core partnership of the PE & Sport Strategic Manager and the Head of Sport is complemented by the role of the NOPES portfolio manager. The Portfolio Manager has had an important role in brokering the link between the Education and Regeneration & Culture Departments. This individual also adds invaluable expertise on the Stage 2 application process, offers support to projects and handles the broader administrative requirements of the programme. It is also noted that support of a Project Manager within the Commercial Services Department has been important in providing the technical expertise required by projects. Furthermore, officers managed by the Head of Sport also provide advice and support to projects as they seek to devise Sports Development and Business Plans as part of their NOPES applications. Working as a team, it is the PE and Sport Strategic Manager, Head of Sport and the NOPES Portfolio Manager who together provide vision, strategy and support to the whole NOPES portfolio.
6.7.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

Interviewees stressed the importance of developing high quality sports facilities to meet curriculum needs and to raise the profile of PE within schools. OFSTED reports consistently highlight poor facilities as a problem in Case Study G, and interviewees feel that this has a negative effect on participation. However, it is felt that it is important that community requirements are ‘on an equal footing’ with those of schools. It is an aim within the authority that schools become the hub for their local communities, and that schools are about ‘more than education’. NOPES is important in helping to achieve this aim by supporting attempts to make existing ‘pockets of good practice … the norm rather than the exception’.

Another programme that the NOPES portfolio links to in Case Study G is the Space for Sports and Arts (SSA) programme. It is recognised that the local authority has already had successes in developing joint school and community use of facilities through SSA. Therefore, the experience of SSA has been of considerable benefit to the local authority in developing its NOPES portfolio.

An Interviewee also mentioned the links between NOPES and the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme. It is foreseen that these two programmes will become more intertwined in the future. However, the local authority has had difficulty in linking the application processes for the two programmes together.

6.7.3.3 Choice of projects

A ‘matrix of need’ to underpin decision-making on funding specific projects was developed jointly by the Head of Sport and the PE/Sport Manager. Selection criteria included Sportsmark status, free school meals, levels of deprivation, partnership funding and SSCO involvement. In developing the matrix, the SSA criteria were used as a baseline and were adapted and then dovetailed with the requirements of the NOPES initiative. Beyond the matrix, other factors such as sustainability, geographical spread and diversity of types of facility were key considerations. The identification of areas in most need of new facilities through the Sports Development Strategy (2001) was also very important in the decision making process.

The selection process involved requesting bids for funding from the seven development groups within the authority. 19 bids in total were submitted. Decisions as to which projects were included in the NOPES portfolio were then taken jointly by the PE & Sport Manager and the Head of Sport. Beyond the assessment of projects provided by the matrix, it was often decisions made by these officers that were most important in the composition of the NOPES portfolio. For example, irrespective of the matrix assessment some projects were rejected because they did not fit strategically into the ‘bigger picture’ within the case study area.
The decisions made on the composition of the NOPES portfolio were then passed to the Director of Education for confirmation. A consultation process with Head Teachers was undertaken, and although it didn’t alter the original selections, it did give Heads the opportunity to voice their key issues and concerns. The Head of Sport and the PE/Sport Manager felt confident they could justify their selection because of the robust selection criteria they had used and also pointed out that they were able to see the ‘bigger picture’ more readily than individual head teachers. Despite this, interviewees felt that the selection process was conducted ‘in a rush’ in order to secure funding and that with more time for planning and strategy, the NOPES portfolio could have been much better.

One of the projects within Case Study G progressed through the Fast Track process. The decision to apply for Fast Track status was made because the project was already ‘ready to go’ with the application materials being able to be taken ‘off the shelf’ for presentation to the Fund. The selected project reflected an established need, had been seeking funding for some time and could be adapted to NOPES requirements.

The key point made about the experience of being involved in the Fast Track phase is that it provided evidence for the authority that the three key personnel, working together, could deliver. NOPES was the first capital development of sports facilities for some time, and the successful delivery of the Fast Track project has given the authority confidence and ‘raised the profile of us and the project’. Added to this is a key point made emphatically by all three personnel: involvement in the Fast Track project has been like a pilot for the main project delivery. It was described as a ‘steep learning curve’ that will, however, result in better delivery of the whole NOPES portfolio. It was suggested that involvement in Fast Track projects should be a requirement for all partnerships.

Through NOPES, two projects have revenue funding and, in total, three revenue posts will be created, one of which will be strategic. The original plans for revenue funding were changed once the sustainability requirement became apparent to the interviewees. It is felt that these posts will now contribute to the sustainability of projects and support links between Education and Sport provision.

**6.7.3.4 Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities**

See Section 6.7.3.2 above.

**6.7.3.5 Sustainability**

Interviewees are acutely aware that sustainability is a key issue within the NOPES portfolio, and that working with schools to ensure they take ownership of facilities is one way forward. It will be the sustainability of community activity, and in particular posts created to develop community use, that will be most problematic. Financial commitment from the schools involved will be
required to ensure the posts created are continued. The team attempts to draw upon expertise located in different parts of the authority to help schools to become more skilful in their management of the facilities.

6.7.3.6 Monitoring & Evaluation

Interviewees saw monitoring and evaluation as the responsibility of individual project managers. This had been built into development plans and projects had been made aware of their responsibility to contribute to evaluation. The NOPES portfolio manager could provide support to individual projects for self-evaluation as well as collating results across projects to provide information for the steering group as required.

6.7.4 Impact on participation

6.7.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools

It was agreed by all three interviewees that as a result of the NOPES portfolio quantity of provision will increase, but there was less certainty that the portfolio will lead to increased quality of provision. Evidence previously gained by the evaluation team from the fast track project did, however, suggest a big impact on quality of physical education and sport in the school concerned. Furthermore, one interviewee commented that improvements in PE facilities would result in young people’s experiences of PE becoming better. As such good facilities are central to long term sustainability of participation in sport and physical activity. In order to sustain this impact, therefore, long term maintenance of facilities will be important.

Other particular projects were designed to have a larger impact on physical education and sport in schools. For example, one project was located between three schools and as such had the potential to benefit a large number of pupils. At this project it is recognised by interviewees that the challenge is to ensure that the schools collaborate to ensure maximum usage. Collaboration is encouraged by allowing schools free access and a share of any profits made.

6.7.4.2 Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and more generally local communities

Impact on the Community

Interviewees recognised that there will be increased participation in physical activity at the NOPES project sites. However, it was suggested that some of this increase may simply be individuals who switch participation from other venues. Some projects are located in areas where there is no existing provision and so, at these sites, it is thought that participation is bound to increase.
It is also anticipated that at particular NOPES projects, the provision of ATPs in particular ‘will make a massive difference to provision [to overcome] huge gaps’. Hockey in particular suffered from a lack of ATP provision and, therefore, the advent of NOPES projects will allow clubs to increase participation.

**Target Groups**

At portfolio level, target groups were mainly addressed by the location of projects in areas of high deprivation. Furthermore, NOPES projects were based in areas where there was a high ethnic minority population. Further information on this aspect of social inclusion is given in Section 6.7.6.1 below. Specific target groups were addressed at particular projects. For example, disabled users have been targeted at one NOPES project and have been consulted at each stage of the project’s development.

### 6.7.4.3 Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities

In terms of the management of facilities, interviewees recognised that, at present, schools do not have expertise in managing commercial facilities. Given the context of the local authority, an interviewee suggested that schools’ priorities are ‘raising standards’ rather than acquiring the skills required for commercial management of an additional facility. In developing the NOPES portfolio, the core partnership tries to ensure that schools ‘take ownership’ of projects by realising that there is a financial risk. However, it is also important to share knowledge and skills across LEA departments as the expertise does exist and should be drawn upon where required.

Interviewees also recognised the importance of linking NOPES with other funding streams. For example, opportunities are anticipated in the government’s recent announcements about schools and ‘wrap-around childcare’ whereby additional funding may be sought for extended opening of facilities.

### 6.7.5 Impact on wider social outcomes

One interviewee noted that it is important to ensure that wider social aims stated by projects at the application stage are still in evidence throughout the operation processes. The NOPES portfolio manager is in a key position to ensure this. The threat of ‘clawback’ of funds was suggested as one way to ensure wider social outcomes are met. Furthermore, it was noted that although schools have previously struggled to meet wider social outcomes agendas, due to lack of capacity rather than lack of will, they have attempted to comply in order to not miss out on future funding opportunities.
6.7.5.1 Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity

It is anticipated by interviewees that better and more attractive PE and sport facilities at school will encourage participation and involvement in sport and, in some cases, in wider school life. Similarly, OFSTED reports in Case Study G have identified poor facilities as a barrier to learning and it is hoped that with better facilities in place such barriers will be overcome. Moreover, interviewees stressed the link between attendance at school, pupils’ self-esteem and raised standards across the whole school and believed that the NOPES initiative could act as a catalyst in this process. As one interviewee stated ‘you put one thing in place [NOPES facility] that allows other things to happen’.

It is important to note that the PE & Sport Manager is located in the ‘Standards and Effectiveness Division’ of the Education Department. This is an important indication that the local authority expects his work, including his NOPES role, to have an impact on standards.

6.7.5.2 Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities

Because of the demographics of Case Study G, interviewees stated that ‘everything in [the authority] is targeted at social inclusion because we have no alternative’. In the case of the NOPES portfolio, promotion of social inclusion ‘will happen’ because, for example, some projects are sited in areas where 98% of the population are from an ethnic minority. Revenue posts funded through NOPES will also have social inclusion built in to the job descriptions. Furthermore, as was noted earlier, there is also a strategy in place to work closely with the Racial Equality Team to support targeting of underrepresented groups.

An example given of an individual NOPES project promoting social inclusion was a tennis centre where project managers believe that ‘there is a real need to promote tennis to ethnic minorities’. This fits well with both the regional and national agenda for tennis development.

6.7.5.3 Other social outcomes

It is clear to interviewees that health is one of the key agendas underpinning the NOPES initiative. Given the widely assumed link between increased physical activity and health, it is suggested that the NOPES portfolio will impact on this wider social outcome. However, it is recognised that because of the impossibility of measuring the direct impact of NOPES on health and the long term nature of any benefits that might accrue, it may be unclear as to whether NOPES has made a tangible difference to health within Case Study G.

An interesting development in the area of health is the establishment within Primary Care Trusts in Case Study G of physical activity posts. There is
already a realisation amongst health professionals (for the first time, interviewees suggested) that PCTs will need to work with education and sport sectors in order to meet their physical activity targets. This is a development that might prove to be interesting over the medium term.

6.7.6 Overall assessment of progress

6.7.6.1 Strengths

A number of strengths are apparent in the NOPES portfolio as a whole and at particular projects :-

- The way in which three key personnel have worked together to develop and deliver a shared vision for education, sport and the NOPES portfolio
- The NOPES portfolio has been built on existing experience. For example, selection criteria were developed from those used in Space for Sports and the Arts. Experience gained through having a Fast Track NOPES project has also aided the whole portfolio.
- There is clear targeting within the portfolio of existing gaps and groups with specific needs. Examples of this are: locating facilities in areas where high ethnic minority populations are underrepresented in particular activities, making a strategic choice of projects in localities with few or no other sports facilities and, in the case of one particular project, targeting use at disabled people
- Consultation with targeted user groups at particular projects to maximise chances of success

6.7.6.2 Weaknesses/Barriers to progress

Potential barriers to progress within Case Study G identified by the evaluators are :-

- Despite the excellent relationships between key personnel involved in the NOPES initiative, wider departmental tensions in the local authority remain problematic and have the potential to disrupt effective partnership working.
- Considering the portfolio as a whole, there is some lack of clarity as to how core outcomes will be delivered by all NOPES projects. Responsibility for delivering key outcomes rests almost entirely with the projects themselves and their commitment to doing so will be crucial.
- The amount of detailed information required during the bidding process has impeded both NOPES portfolio and project development. At a portfolio level, it is recognised that a more strategic approach might have been possible if the timescales had allowed. Individual projects are currently asked to supply a level of detail in, for example, programming that will not help the projects deliver key outcomes when facilities open.
6.7.6.3 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned

The following are examples of existing practice and lessons learned in Case Study G: -

- A strong working relationship between three key personnel (in this case linking PE/Education, Sport & NOPES) can overcome barriers and deliver successful projects.
- Involvement in Fast Track has been an invaluable learning process and is recommended for all partnerships. The core partnership in Case Study G feels that Fast Track involvement will help to ensure the success of the whole portfolio.
- It is difficult to envisage clear evidence being collected that links NOPES projects directly to improved health or higher educational standards. However, it is assumed that increased participation in physical activity can and does lead to these outcomes.
- The NOPES application process may require too much information at an early stage.

6.7.6.4 Recommendations for the local authority

Recommendations to the local authority in the continuing development of the NOPES portfolio are: -

- To continue to work towards building relationships across departments and around projects, rather than allowing departmental barriers to become barriers to provision and achieving NOPES outcomes.
- To encourage sharing expertise across departments to help projects become sustainable. Furthermore, longer term systems to support individuals and share experience across the different projects may be considered.

6.7.6.5 Wider issues of significance to the fund

The core partnership in Case Study G suggested that there was too much detail required at an early stage in the NOPES application process, and that this is not commercially sound. Instead, it was suggested that there was an initial need to identify general demand, providing more detail after the Stage 2 application process. The short timescales mean that there is sometimes poor decision-making and a level of tokenism in bid preparation. Detailed Business and Development Plans reflect a time 18 months before the opening of the facility, and much will have changed in the interim.

As recognised by the evaluators, Case Study G identified the difficulty in projects measuring wider social outcomes and attributing change directly to NOPES facilities. In requesting evidence to support the monitoring process, the Fund should recognise the difficulty in clearly demonstrating projects’ contributions to wider social outcomes.
The Fast Track process was invaluable to this local authority in developing the rest of its NOPES portfolio. Beyond reports by evaluators, the Fund may wish to consider how the experiences of Fast Track projects are shared with other local authorities. Furthermore, it may be that expansion of the number of fast track projects may be useful in future programmes.
SECTION SEVEN : SCOTLAND

7.1 Introduction

Within Scotland the NOPES initiative contains two strands, the Activities and Facilities programme. The evaluation and this section of the report encompasses both strands. Due to the one stage application process and the shorter lead in time before projects begin implementation, the Scottish Activities programme is further advanced than any aspect of the NOPES initiative elsewhere in the UK. The evaluation of the programme is therefore at a more advanced stage.

The NOPES Facilities programme in Scotland is exactly the same as in the rest of the UK. The Activities programme has an allocation of £35m out of the £87m funding for the NOPES initiative in Scotland. The funding is purely for revenue programmes which can last for up to three years.

The activities programme has two different strands; one for Out of School Hours Activity (OSHA) projects and the other for Active Steps projects. OSHA will offer children and young people, aged 5 to 16, a wide range of sporting and cultural activities, including dance, outdoor education, adventure and other challenging activities. Active Steps will fund activities designed to promote the role of sport in diverting children and young people aged 5 to 16 from crime or behaviours likely to lead to crime. Each local authority was required to allocate at least 40% of their NOPES activities funding to each strand with the remaining 20% allocated at the authorities’ discretion.

The two strands have the following desired outcomes :

For OSHA and Active Steps :
- Provide more opportunities for children and young people to develop their personality, talents, and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential by promoting effective links between learning and sporting and cultural activities
- Promote social inclusion through the provision of sporting and cultural activities
- Improve opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among young people
- Establish new links between schools and their communities that encourage young people to enjoy lifelong involvement in sport and cultural activities

For Active Steps only:
- Use sport to divert young people from criminal activity or behaviour likely to lead to such activity
- Promote positive behaviour to aid in the reduction of truancy and exclusion from schools

The evaluation in Scotland has thus far included the development, distribution and return of the Activities Baseline Survey. A small number of Facilities
Baseline Surveys have also been distributed and returned. Reports on both these surveys are given in Sections 7.2 and 7.3.

Evaluation within the two case study areas concerns both the Facilities and Activities programmes. Two visits have been made to each case study. However, due to the amount of data collected, the case study reports in Sections 7.4 and 7.5 reflect only the initial visit in each case. As a template for formatting case study reports in Scotland has not been finalised as yet, these reports remain structured around the three key dimensions of partnership, participation and wider social outcomes.

7.2 Activities Baseline Survey Data

7.2.1 Introduction

The Activities Baseline survey was sent out to local authorities in January 2004. The survey comprised two sections:-

- Section 1 – related to the whole local authority grant scheme portfolio
- Section 2 – was to be completed by each project within the local authority’s grant scheme portfolio (as designated by inclusion of an Appendix A for the project in the application documents).

The results from the Section 2 surveys can be used to provide indicators of how local authorities have attempted to achieve the desired NOPES outcomes. As such these results can be used to complete, in a Scotland-wide generalised way, the activities and influential factors in the NOPES Initiative Basic Logic Model described in Section 3.2.

7.2.2 Return Rates

Returns were received from 23 of the 32 local authorities involved in the programme. In total, 20 completed Section 1 surveys were received. 170 completed Section 2 surveys were received. Although some of the projects in local authority areas have changed, this can be compared against the 328 project Appendix A documents received by the Fund at application. This represents a good response rate of 51.8%.

7.2.3 Section 2 Results

The following results are those from the completed Section 2 surveys. Section 2 surveys requested data that will be of greater use when annual surveys are returned.

7.2.3.1 Types of Projects

Table 21 shows the number and percentage of baseline survey returns from different types of project. It also shows the number and percentage of project
types as would be expected from the Appendix As submitted at application (the ‘whole population’ of projects).

- Given that more projects described themselves as falling into both Out of School Hours Activity (OSHA) and Active Steps strands than there were projects who applied for funding from both strands, it is assumed that a number of projects wrongly identified their funding strand. This assumption is supported by results from a number of other questions which suggests that these projects were ‘tick happy’ when required to give tick box answers. Given that the percentage of Active Steps projects almost exactly matched their proportion in the whole population, it can also be assumed that the majority of the projects that identified themselves as both OSHA and Active Steps were, in fact, Out of School Hours Activity projects.

- Respondents were asked how long their project was to last. Projects on average were expected to last just under 2 years 8 months. The vast majority of projects (81.6%) were expected to last for the entire three years of the available funding period.

- The majority of projects (83.9%) were managed by the local authority. Of the other projects 10.7% were managed by the voluntary sector, 2.4% by the private sector and 3.0% were managed by a different type of organisation. These results indicate a significant level of local authority control over the management of funding allocated through the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21 : Types of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Survey Returns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aims, Objectives and Desired Outcomes

Table 22 (overleaf) shows the percentage of projects that were designed to achieve each of the six NOPES activity programme outcomes. As with all the following tables, the results are shown for all projects and split by those that identified themselves as being funded through the OSHA, Active Steps and both funding strands.

- The results for those projects self-identified as receiving both OSHA and Active Steps funding are in all cases above the average for all projects. As suggested previously, it is difficult to place much importance on the results for these projects.
A qualitative question in the survey also asked projects to identify their specific aims, objectives and outcomes. The results of this analysis will be used throughout the following discussion.

Projects, and in particular OSHA projects, were most commonly designed to achieve Outcomes 1 and 3 which involved the creation or improvement of opportunities for physical activity. Given the nature of the programme this is not surprising. In qualitative answers more projects suggested aims relating to developing opportunities for physical activity (53) than actually increasing participation itself (38). This suggests that projects own (implicit) theories of change may have a gap between activities and participation outcomes.

Active Steps projects were more likely to be designed to impact on criminal activity, exclusion and truancy (Outcomes 5 & 6). Again given that these two outcomes were specific to Active Steps programmes this result is not surprising.

Over a third of OSHA projects did however address the two Active Steps outcomes (5 & 6). This could be interpreted in two ways, as either projects again being 'tick happy' or anticipating that their delivery of sport and physical activity will contribute to these outcomes. Given that qualitative aims and objectives provided stressed in almost equal measure participatory and wider social outcomes, it may be that the second interpretation is more relevant.

Table 22 : Percentage of projects designed to achieve Fund outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>OSHA Projects</th>
<th>Active Steps Projects</th>
<th>Both (OSHA &amp; AS Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong> : Provide more opportunities for children and young people to develop their personality, talents, and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential by promoting effective links between learning and sporting and cultural activities</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong> : Promote social inclusion through the provision of sporting and cultural activities</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong> : Improve opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among young people</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 4</strong> : Establish new links between schools and their communities that encourage young people to enjoy lifelong involvement in sport and cultural activities</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 5</strong> : Use sport to divert young people from criminal activity or behaviour likely to lead to such activity</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 6</strong> : Promote positive behaviour to aid in the reduction of truancy and exclusion from schools</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the four outcomes that both OSHA and Active Steps strands are designed to address, Outcome 4, which relates to building partnerships to sustain participation, was addressed by the least amount of projects. This may suggest that at this point in time sustainability of structures and participation is less important to projects.

7.2.3.3 Services Provided

Concern for the sustainability of projects is also raised by the results of the question asking project’s about the types of services delivered (see table 3). Less than half of the projects deliver training (45.3%) or leadership courses (37.9%) which may support the sustainability of the activities that are developed.

Similarly of concern is the sustainability of young people’s participation. The lowest percentage of projects (35.3%) provide activities that are designed to sustain participation between primary and secondary school. This transition point is recognised to be one where drop-out from sport and physical activity is highest.

### Table 23: Percentage of projects delivering specific types of activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>OSHA Projects</th>
<th>Active Steps Projects</th>
<th>Both (OSHA &amp; AS Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New and/or expanded sporting and cultural activities in areas of low provision</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and taster sessions in a wide range of sports and activities to enable young people to find an activity that is right for them.</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that bridge the gap between primary and secondary schools and involve primary and secondary pupils working together.</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to enable workers and/or volunteers to expand the range of sporting activities offered.</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that help deliver the LA Youth Crime strategy</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of physical activities as part of a wider citizenship programme to promote active citizenship and social responsibility</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports leadership courses which incorporate personal development</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure activities</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, projects are designed to address gaps in provision. 76.5% of all projects and 91.7% of OSHA projects are designed to provide ‘new and/or expanded sporting and cultural activities in areas of low provision’.

This finding is supported by a qualitative question which asked about the need for the activities that were to be delivered by projects and the extent of current provision. 72 projects suggest there was no or limited previous provision of similar activities in their area. This result was augmented by a substantial number of projects who either identified particular barriers to participation or who identified a lack of provision for particular target groups.

The question regarding services provided also gives some indication of the nature of Active Steps projects. 50.9% of Active Steps projects aim to provide new and/or expanded opportunities while 58.5% of projects build these opportunities for physical activity into a wider citizenship programme. This suggests that, in the main, projects use physical activity rather than other types of sporting opportunity to achieve the desired outcomes. The fact that 56.6% of Active Steps projects provide outdoor adventure activities suggests that this is viewed as an effective medium for addressing criminal activity, truancy and exclusion.

### 7.2.3.4 Targeting

Table 24 shows the percentage of respondents who had identified any particular target groups for their project. It is perhaps unexpected that Active Steps projects, given their intended outcomes, should show higher rates of targeting. However, the fact that all Active Steps projects have identified particular target groups is testament to the strength of the targeting approach in achieving the Active Steps outcomes.

Furthermore, of those projects that indicated that they did target particular groups Active Steps projects identified on average 3.85 different target groups as opposed to 2.78 target groups for OSHA projects. This difference was identified as statistically significant at the p<0.05 level. This suggests that as well as having a greater commitment to targeting in general, Active Steps projects also target services more widely than OSHA projects. Alternatively it could be hypothesised that the groups identified by Active Steps projects overlap considerably. This second hypothesis is supported by the fact that 79.2% of Active Steps projects target all of the following three groups:- young people at risk of offending, young people at risk of being excluded from school and young people who truant.

Of those projects that stated that they had identified target groups, the percentages targeting particular groups is given in Table 23.

A particularly high percentage of projects target young people at risk of offending (65.9%) and exclusion from school (62.9%) and young people who truant (58.3%). While these results are not unexpected for Active Steps projects, the percentages of OSHA projects targeting these groups are still relatively high. As with OSHA projects addressing Active Steps outcomes, this can either be attributed to respondents being ‘tick happy’ or it represents genuine commitment to achieving such aims.
The other target group that was identified by a majority of projects was people living in areas of economic and social disadvantage (59.8% overall). This result again suggests that all projects are committed to addressing prominent social issues. Given the links between economic disadvantage and crime, it is perhaps surprising that the percentage of Active Steps projects targeting these areas (51.0%) falls below the average for all projects.

Table 25: Target groups of those projects who actively target services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Groups</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>OSHA Projects</th>
<th>Active Steps Projects</th>
<th>Both (OSHA &amp; AS Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people at risk of offending</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people at risk of being excluded from school</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people who truant</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with a disability</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in areas of economic and social disadvantage</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in areas of rural deprivation</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Groups</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 (overleaf) shows the percentage of projects that provide services for different age groups.
The majority of projects provide services for age groups from P6 to S4. Given that the two most common age groups for OSHA projects are P6-7 (69.0%) and S1-2 (60.7%), it is perhaps disappointing that fewer projects actively aim to address the transition between the two age groups as mentioned previously.

Active Steps projects most commonly work with pupils in S1-4 (90.6%). This is the time period when pupils are at most risk of criminal behaviour, exclusion and truancy.

Very few projects (23.5%) work with children in the P1-3 age group. Although physical activity in this age group is relatively high (Scottish Health Survey, 1998), information from the case study areas suggests that this may be an age group that suffers from lack of provision. Despite the advent of the NOPES initiative this may remain so. Furthermore, possibly due to the difficulties working with this age group, there is a lack of research and information on participation in this age group.

Table 26: Percentage of projects delivering services for particular age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>OSHA Projects</th>
<th>Active Steps Projects</th>
<th>Both (OSHA &amp; AS Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 – 3</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 – 5</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 – 7</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 – 2</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 – 4</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.3.5 Delivery of Services

Projects were asked how they organised the delivery of individual activities. The results from this question are given in Table 27.

- Linking with the results given for targeting of particular age groups, the majority of projects (53.0%) organise activities in and for individual secondary schools. More generally the results for OSHA and Active Steps projects reflect the proportions across the range of age groups identified in Table 6, this suggests that the results have some validity.

- A slightly higher percentage of OSHA projects deliver activities within individual primary schools (43.2%) rather than in clusters of primary schools (39.5%). Given that cluster development is a model suggested by sportscotland, it is surprising that more projects are not adopting this approach. How projects link with the Active Primary Schools Coordinators, who adopt this cluster approach, will therefore be of interest.
- 62.3% of Active Steps projects organise their activities for individually referred or selected children. As with previously described results, this suggests that these projects have a very targeted approach.

**Table 27: Method of delivering projects services by percentage of projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Method</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>OSHA Projects</th>
<th>Active Steps Projects</th>
<th>Both (OSHA &amp; AS Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised in and for individual primary schools</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised for clusters of primary schools</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised in and for individual secondary schools</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised for other groupings of schools</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised for particular geographical areas</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised for individually referred / selected children</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities open to young people from any school in any area</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Although the results come from a small sample (53 projects), it is also interesting that Active Steps projects that do not deliver outdoor adventure activities are far more likely to target individually referred or selected children (80.0%) than those Active Steps projects that do deliver outdoor adventure activities (39.1%). This suggests that Active Steps projects that do not deliver outdoor adventure activities have a far more selective targeting policy.
Table 28: Percentage of projects organising activities in particular time periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>OSHA Projects</th>
<th>Active Steps Projects</th>
<th>Both (OSHA &amp; AS Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Term</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Term</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Holiday</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October Holiday</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Holiday</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Holiday</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No activities organised in school holidays</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No activities organised in school term</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities organised in all school holidays</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities organised in all school terms</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 shows the results of questions asking in which periods the projects organise their activities.

- Projects mainly organise their activities in term times. The percentage of projects organising their activities in each of the four terms is reasonably similar (ranging from 78.9% to 86.1%). Only 3.6% of projects do not organise any activities during term time.

- Fewer projects organise activities in holiday periods. 45.2% of projects do not organise any holiday activities. It would be interesting to investigate how many of these projects employ full time officers and what work such officers undertake during holiday periods. As would be expected fewest projects organise activities in the Christmas holidays (14.1%).

- Provision during holiday periods is higher in Active Steps projects than OSHA projects. This reflects the year-round problem of criminal activity and the particular need for diversionary activities during holiday periods.
7.2.3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

- A qualitative question was included in the survey asking projects how they intended to assess the impact of their project. In the main, projects favoured the collection of quantitative data. The use of questionnaires was particularly popular with 36 projects suggesting they would use that method.

- Given that stated aims and objectives were primarily based around creation of opportunities for physical activity, there is some inconsistency with the fact that participation numbers will be the main data collected by projects (mentioned by 62 projects). However, such data can be used effectively to show the impact of the initiative and also supports the collection of data by the evaluation team.

- 15 projects also suggested that they would collect quantitative data on wider social outcomes, for example, truancy rates and crime data. Although this is not discouraged, it may be difficult for projects to show the direct impact of their programmes on these figures.

- Other categories of quantitative data to be collected by projects will be membership of clubs and other progression opportunities (16 projects mentioned), number of qualifications attained and coaches involved (13), number of opportunities developed (12), number of schools, clubs and teams involved (7) and fitness assessments (3).

- Methods for collecting qualitative data were less precise. Feedback from participants and others was the most popular method of qualitative data collection (30 projects). How this data is to be recorded and analysed is not clear.

- Other categories of qualitative data to be collected by projects will be individual diaries and plans (6), focus groups (5), interviews (4) and photos, videos and other methods (4).

- The responses of 41 projects were unclear in their methodology. Hopefully the distribution of the Self-Evaluation Website and the new evaluation website will support improvement of these self-evaluation methods.
7.3 Facilities Baseline Survey Data

7.3.1 Introduction

A Baseline Survey is sent to all projects approximately 3 months before the NOPES facility is due to open. Projects based at a single school site with a Fund contribution of over £125,000 receive the larger Baseline (Extended) Survey. All other projects receive the shorter Baseline Survey. Both surveys are designed to collect quantitative data, mainly on participation but also on the other key dimensions of partnership and wider social outcomes. The Baseline Surveys are designed to be completed before the new NOPES facility opens. Therefore the results presented in this section reflect the data prior to the impact of NOPES.

The following represents the first analysis of the 6 Baseline (Extended) Surveys and 21 Baseline Surveys received from projects in Scotland by the 5 January 2005. Of the Baseline Survey returns, 11 projects are not based at a schools site (e.g. Outdoor Education Centres). The small number of Baseline (Extended) Surveys included in this analysis means that the results below cannot be considered generalisable.

7.3.2 Distribution and Return of the Baseline Surveys

Table 29 shows the surveys distributed and returned in Scotland as of 31 January 2005. The overall return rate of surveys is 52%. Baseline Surveys will continue to be distributed throughout the coming year as projects near completion. The first Annual Survey is due to be distributed in June 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>Percentage Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey (Extended)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.4 Analysis Methods

Data from the returned surveys was entered into SPSS. A number of tests were conducted to ensure that data had been entered correctly. Following that the data was subsequently analysed in SPSS to gain frequencies and averages. T-tests and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test were used to analyse significant differences for parametric and non-parametric data respectively.
7.3.5 Results from Baseline Survey and Baseline (Extended) Survey

This section will provide information from questions common to both versions of the survey. Sections 7.3.6 and 7.3.7 will subsequently provide results from questions particular to the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys respectively.

7.3.5.1 Aim of Projects

The Baseline Survey and Baseline Survey (Extended) asked what outcomes particular projects were designed to deliver. The results of this question are shown in Table 30.

Table 30: Percentage of projects designed to achieve particular outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For pupils Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>For community users Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>For pupils Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
<th>For community users Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide new facilities that did not exist before</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of existing facilities</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the range of activities</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to activities offered</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve links with the wider community</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the capacity of existing facilities</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for competitive sport</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities to directly support the delivery of the PE curriculum</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More of the projects that returned the Baseline (Extended) Survey will have NOPES facilities designed to support the delivery of the curriculum than those that returned the Baseline Survey (100% compared to 81%).

For those projects that returned the Baseline Survey, improving the range of activities for pupils was more often important than any other outcome in the design of NOPES facilities (91%). This result, as well as that mentioned above, probably reflects the different types of facility funded at larger and smaller projects.

All of the projects returning the Baseline (Extended) Survey reported that their new NOPES facilities will improve the range of activities and improve links with the wider community for pupils in their school. Furthermore, 93% projects declared that the NOPES initiative would improve the capacity of existing facilities for pupils.

In the Baseline Survey, for the categories of improving the quality of existing facilities, improving the range of activities and improving the capacity of existing facilities, fewer projects are designed to achieve outcomes for community users than pupils ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that community usage is not a high priority for smaller projects.

Projects were also asked which of the particular NOPES outcomes their facilities were designed to achieve. The results of this question are given in Table 31.

All projects completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey indicated that their NOPES facilities are designed to achieve NOPES Outcomes 1 to 4.

95% of those projects that returned the Baseline Survey had NOPES facilities designed to deliver Outcomes 1 & 3 which are concerned with improved PE and sport in schools and better opportunities to increase levels of physical activity. These results suggest that improving participation is the key aspiration for these projects.

The percentage of projects that are designed to deliver Outcome 4, the promotion of social inclusion, is almost equal, at 86% and 83% respectively, in projects that completed the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys.
Table 31: Percentage of Projects Designed to AchieveNOPES Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Baseline (Extended) Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong></td>
<td>Improved physical education and sport in schools</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong></td>
<td>Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong></td>
<td>Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and, more generally local communities</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 4</strong></td>
<td>Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 5</strong></td>
<td>Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities by all groups in society</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 6</strong></td>
<td>Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.5.2 Quality of Existing Facilities

Table 32 shows respondents views on the quality of existing facilities before the new NOPES funded projects have been completed.

- In general the individuals completing the questionnaires rated their existing facilities, prior to NOPES, as below average. For example, 83% of Baseline (Extended) Survey respondents rated the quality of existing PE and sport facilities as between 1 and 3 on a scale between 1 poor and 5 excellent.
- Those individuals completing the Baseline Survey, as opposed to the Extended version, rated the quality of existing facilities and their suitability for the needs of the school slightly higher. In particular, 64% of Baseline Survey projects compared to 83% of Baseline (Extended) Survey projects rated their existing facility as 1 or 3 for suitability for the needs of the school on a scale between 1 highly unsuitable and 5 highly suitable. There was a smaller 6% difference on the same scale for 'quality of existing facilities'.
Table 32: Quality and Suitability of Existing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the current PE and sport facilities at your school (excluding those under construction)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1–Poor to 5–Excellent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the current facilities for the needs of the school (‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1–Highly Unsuitable to 5–Highly Suitable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the current facilities for the needs of the community (‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Alternatively those individuals completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey thought their facilities were more suitable for the needs of the community than those completing the Baseline Survey. 67% of those completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey ranked their facilities between 1 and 3 on a scale of suitability for community between 1, Highly Unsuitable, and 5, Highly Suitable. This compared to a figure of 94% for the same measure for projects completing the Baseline Survey.

- 33% of projects returning the Baseline (Extended) Survey receive additional funding through the NOPES Activities strand compared to 48% of projects returning the Baseline Survey. 10% and 17% of projects returning the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys respectively are unsure as to whether they received any funding from this source.

7.3.6 Baseline Survey Results

7.3.6.1 Usage of Existing Facilities by Pupils and the Community

The number of pupils using the current facilities (before the NOPES facilities open) in curriculum and extra-curricular time in a typical week as well as community users is shown in Table 33.
Table 33: Number of users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Number of Users</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum Number of Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during curricular time</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during extra-curricular time</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Users</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The main usage of the existing facilities is for pupils in curriculum time. On average far more young people used the existing facility in curriculum time (311) than in extra-curricular time (103). This shows that there is potential for the number of extra-curricular users to increase, hopefully as a result of the NOPES initiative.

- The number of community users was on average lower at 53 users in a typical week. In fact, 28% of projects had no community users at present.

7.3.6.2 Curriculum PE Time

Table 34 shows the responses to one of the key questions in the survey, the minimum amount of curriculum time that any pupil in each year group receives in a typical week.

- The average number of curriculum minutes of PE each year group received was fairly constant across primary schools, ranging from an average of 76 minutes in Primaries 1 to 3 to an average of 79 minutes on average in Primary 6 and 7.

- The allocation of curriculum PE time for all pupils was slightly greater, on average, in secondary schools. The average amount of timetabled PE was highest in Secondary 1 at 93 minutes. The lowest average in secondary schools was 82 minutes in Secondary 4. The figures in all year groups are considerably lower than the 2 hours target for PE and school sport.

- The 11 projects not based at a single school site were used for curriculum PE and sport for an average of 11 hours 3 minutes in a typical week. This curriculum PE and sport usage ranged from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 26 hours at particular projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of projects with pupils in year</th>
<th>Average minutes of PE (min)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum minutes of PE (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.7 Baseline Survey (Extended) Results

7.3.7.1 Background Information from the School

Table 35 gives information on the average number of PE and Sport training days attended by teachers and adults from the school, as well as the number of participants averaged across both the whole sample and only those schools which provided training.
Table 35: PE and Sport Training for Teachers and Other Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity based training (e.g. Netball, Cricket, Tag rugby etc)</th>
<th>Average Number of days training</th>
<th>Average Number of participants</th>
<th>Average Number of Participants in schools that provide training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity based training (e.g. Netball, Cricket, Tag rugby etc)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion training (e.g. Disability, Disaffected Youth)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No projects who returned the survey have created new staff posts as a result of the NOPES initiative.
Background data from schools was on attainment and exclusions was asked in the Baseline Survey (Extended). The results from the surveys received is in Table 36.

**Table 36 : Attainment and Exclusion in Project Schools During the Last School Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of half days missed as a result of authorised absence</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of half days missed as a result of unauthorised absence</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils eligible for free school meals</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupil exclusions of a day or more (includes temporary and permanent)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary Schools Only**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils attaining <strong>Standard Grade 1-2 in Physical Education</strong></td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils attaining <strong>Standard Grade 1-5 in Physical Education</strong></td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils who gained <strong>5 or more Standard Grades</strong> at grades 1-2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils who gained <strong>5 or more Standard Grades</strong> passes at 1-5</td>
<td>188.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of pupils gaining the Junior Sports Leader Award</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of pupils gaining the Community Sports Leader Award</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3.7.2 Partnership and Links with Other Initiatives

Table 37 shows the other initiatives that schools with NOPES are currently part of and the importance of those initiatives for those schools that are part of them.

- Although all six projects identified that they were involved in local sports initiatives, there is various opinions regarding the importance of these to the success of the NOPES initiative. A third of projects were unsure of the importance of these projects, while a third each thought they were moderately and very important.
Table 37: Involvement in and Importance of Other Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Percentage of schools which are involved with initiative</th>
<th>Importance of initiative to future success of NOPES funded project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Sport Co-ordinators</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Primary School Co-ordinators</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion Partnerships</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Neighbourhood Services Fund</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Lottery Fund Out of School Hours Learning</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Community Schools</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Sportsability</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local sports initiatives</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other national initiatives</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The School Sport Co-ordinators and Active Primary School Co-ordinators projects were both thought, by each of the projects who were involved in the initiatives, to be very important to the success of the NOPES project. The lower percentage of projects involved in Active Primary School Co-ordinators reflects both the role out of the programme and the fact that the facilities were, in the main, based at secondary schools.

- 83% of projects were involved with the Fund’s Out of School Hours Learning (OSHL) programme. While 40% of those projects saw OSHL as very important to the success of the NOPES project, 20% believed it to be not at all important. This signals some concern as to the linkages between the two programmes.

Table 38 shows the results of the survey question asking the number of organisations that use the schools facilities and work in partnership with the school. For both usage and partnership, the percentage of schools that have links with such organisations is given as well as the average number of organisations in each category.
Table 38 : Partnership with Other Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Percentage of projects who have usage</th>
<th>Average number of orgs. who use the sports facility</th>
<th>Percentage of projects who have partnership</th>
<th>Average number of orgs. who currently work in partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further and Higher education institutions</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports clubs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governing bodies of sport</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor education centres</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioners (e.g. referral schemes)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community associations and voluntary groups</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA sports development unit</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups (e.g. Cubs, Brownies, Youth Club)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All projects had usage of their existing facilities by other primary schools. Of these 60% were classed as working in partnership with primary schools.
- Sports clubs are also a common user of the project’s existing facilities with an average of 5 clubs doing so. However, partnership with these clubs is less (an average of 2 clubs at each site), which suggests that the NOPES
projects may have to work to develop more widespread partnership arrangements.

- The only other type of organisation to show strong usage of existing project facilities is the local sports development unit (usage at 60% of projects). Linking with the involvement in local sports initiatives it may be that such organisations play a key role in the development of NOPES facilities.

7.3.7.3 Participation in PE & School Sport

Figure 4 shows the average number of minutes of curriculum PE that every pupil in each year group receives in the schools at which NOPES projects are based.

Figure 4: Curriculum PE Time

- There is no difference between boys and girls in average curriculum PE time in a typical week.
- Minutes of curriculum PE in primary schools is lower than in any of the years between Secondary 1 and 4. However, only two schools have primary school classes and so this is a small sample from which to draw wider lessons.
- Average curriculum PE time peaks in Secondary 1 at 116 minutes, close to the two hours target for PE and school sport. From there, allocated time slips to 79 minutes in Secondary 4. In Secondary 5 and 6, there is very little curriculum PE time for all pupils (21 minutes in Secondary 5 and 0 minutes in Secondary 6).
The question on PE curriculum time is complemented in the survey by a question asking how many pupils receive the 2 hour entitlement to PE and school sport. The results of this question are shown in Table 39.

**Table 39 : Pupils Participating in 2 hours PE and school sport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average number of pupils</th>
<th>Average percentage of pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall an average across schools of 48% of boys and 39% of girls receive the 2 hours PE and school sport entitlement. This difference between boys’ and girls’ participation is statistically significant at the p < 0.05 level.

- This difference between girls' and boys' participation was mirrored by statistically significant differences (p < 0.05) between the genders in both numbers and percentages receiving two hours PE and school sport in Secondary 3, 5 and 6.

- Also of concern is the drop-off in the percentages receiving 2 hours PE and school sport as young people progress through secondary school. In Secondary 1, the average percentage of pupils receiving the 2 hour entitlement is 94% for both boys and girls. The average percentage of boys participating in two hours PE and school sport then drops to a low of only 34% in Secondary 5, while the girls’ drop off is even more significant reaching a low of only 14% in Secondary 6.
Table 40 shows the average number of sick notes and other excuses offered by pupils which resulted in non-participation in PE in a typical week.

- At each age group there is a small difference between the numbers of boys and girls not participating in PE. However, this difference only becomes statistically significant (p < 0.05) when considering the overall totals where on average 54 girls do not participate in a typical as compared to 41 boys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average number of boys</th>
<th>Average number of girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 to P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 to P7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 to S2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 to S4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 to S6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects were also asked in the survey about the availability of and attendance at extra-curricular activities. Table 41 shows the percentage of schools offering the particular type of activity, the average time that activities are available and the average number of boys and girls attending.

- Five out of six schools run both lunchtime and after school PE and sport opportunities. The time available for these activities is highest with an average of over 8 hours after school and almost 4 hours lunchtime activity available in a typical week.
- Although participation by boys is on average higher than girls, with the small sample of projects to return the survey, none of these differences are statistically significant at this stage.
### Table 41: Availability of and Attendance at Extra-Curricular Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available time in a typical week</th>
<th>Percentage of schools providing activities</th>
<th>Average number of boys attending</th>
<th>Average number of girls attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before school/breakfast PE/sports opportunities</strong></td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breaktime PE/sports opportunities</strong></td>
<td>0 min</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunchtime PE/sports opportunities</strong></td>
<td>3h 47 min</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After-school PE/sports opportunities</strong></td>
<td>8 h 40 min</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekend activities PE/sports opportunities</strong></td>
<td>3 h 30 min</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe walking routes to school</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe cycling routes to school</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 shows the results of the question that asked about the availability of sports programmes at the school’s site in holiday periods.

### Table 42: Availability of School Holiday Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Schools who have Opportunities Available</th>
<th>Average Number of Hours (those school who have opportunities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easter Holidays</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Holidays</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October Holidays</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christmas Holidays</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Activities were most commonly organised in the October and Summer holidays (three out of five schools responding).
- Little emphasis can be placed on the time available in each of the holidays as this represents the average from a very small sample of between one to three schools.
7.3.7.4 Participation by Pupils from Other Schools and the Community

Table 43 shows the percentage of projects whose existing facilities are used by pupils from other schools and the average number of boys and girls from other schools that use those facilities in a typical week.

Table 43: Usage of Existing Facilities by Other Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of schools</th>
<th>Average number of boys</th>
<th>Average number of girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 to P4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 to P7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 to S2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 to S4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 to S6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Usage of the project’s existing facilities by other schools is highest in Primary 5 to 7 with 50% of projects having some usage. Average numbers in a typical week are also highest in this age group with 32 boys and 35 girls participating.

- Outside the Primary 5 to 7 age group, the average number of users from other schools is fairly low and this is a facet that the NOPES facilities may have a large impact on. Usage of facilities by Primary 1 to 4 pupils in other schools is particularly low with this occurring at only 17% of projects.

Figure 5 shows the average community usage of the project’s existing facilities in a typical week.

- Usage of existing facilities is highest in both males and females in the under 16 age group (112 and 130 average users respectively). Usage by people in the 26 to 64 years old age group is next highest.

- There is no statistically significant difference between participation by males and females.
7.3.7.5 Range of Activities Available

- The most commonly available activities in curriculum time in the last 12 months are dance (100% of responding schools), athletics, badminton, basketball, fitness, football, gymnastics and hockey (all 80%).

- Badminton and football extra-curricular activities are available in all of the schools that returned the survey. Other commonly available extra-curricular activities were basketball and dance (80% of responding schools each).

- The percentage of schools making facilities available to the community is commonly lower than school use. The top five activities available to the community are badminton, football (both 83% of responding schools), basketball, (67%), fitness (67%) and gymnastics (50%).

Table 44 shows the minimum, maximum and average number of activities available in curriculum and extra-curricular time and also the activities available to the community in the last 12 months at project sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Average Number of Users in Typical Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44: Range of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum number of activities at any project site</th>
<th>Maximum number of activities at any project site</th>
<th>Average number of activities at project sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.7.6 Target Groups

All of the responding projects indicated that they have identified groups to be targeted because of their current low participation in sport and physical activity. Table 45 shows the percentage of these projects targeting specific groups and, if so, the number of current extra-curricular and community users in a typical week within the group targeted.

Table 45: Target Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Percentage of targeting projects</th>
<th>Number of current extra-curricular users in target group</th>
<th>Number of current community users in target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls/Women</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with a disability</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in an area of high deprivation</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people at risk</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Groups</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* - insufficient data to calculate average)

- Five out of six projects that target any group, target girls and women in particular. The next most commonly targeted groups are young people at risk and people living in areas of high deprivation (33% each).
7.4 Case Study A

7.4.1 Introduction

Case study A is a city council with a total NOPES allocation of £2.6million. The case study authority has six proposed facilities projects and three activities projects. Of these three activities projects, two are funded through the Active Steps strand and the other project receives all the Out of School Hours Activity funding and a small contribution from the Active Steps strand.

Following the summary of the methods used in the case study evaluation, the report will provide an analysis of the strategic focus of the whole portfolio. This will encompass portfolio level management and partnership structures as well as a comparative analysis of the activities projects where appropriate. Individual reports of particular projects will then follow. This will cover the three activities projects:

- Activities Project 1 – a mainstream sports development style project
- Activities Project 2 – a sports outreach project targeting looked after children
- Activities Project 3 – an outdoor education project.

At the time of the evaluation visit, Activities Projects 1 & 2 had been operating for between 2 and 3 months. It was anticipated that Activities Project 3 would begin full operation in April 2004 once the facilities renovations were complete.

Also reports on the two most advanced facilities projects will be included. These are:

- Facilities Project 1 – enhancements to an outdoor education centre
- Facilities Project 2 – an umbrella project providing playground marking and equipment in primary schools.

Because of the integrated nature of outdoor education facilities and activities projects these reports will be combined.

7.4.2 Methodology

Interviews were conducted by two members of the evaluation team between 12th and 14th January 2004. One further interview took part on 11th February 2004. The interviews were designed to investigate the strategic focus of the whole portfolio as well as individual activities and facilities projects. The schedule of interviews included various members of the Leisure and Arts, Education and Communities Departments including permanent staff and staff employed directly through the NOPES initiative.

Over eight hours worth of mini-disc recordings were generated as a result of the decision to record all interviews. Due to this being the first visit to any case
study and the quality of data gained, it was viewed imperative to transcribe all interviews in full.

A second visit to Case Study A was conducted between 1st and 3rd November 2004. This visit comprised of follow up interviews with key stakeholders at portfolio and project level. The findings from this visit will be included in the next six-monthly report.

7.4.3 Portfolio Level Partnership Effectiveness

The overall strategic direction for the NOPES initiative in Case Study A was undertaken by the portfolio steering group. Initial discussions with the Council’s Chief Executive led to the Director of Leisure and Arts chairing this group. The other members of this group were :-

- the Leisure and Arts Development Manager (who was also nominated as the Lead Officer for the NOPES programme)
- the Director of Education
- Education Services Manager and an Education Officer
- a Strategic Manager from the Social Work Department
- Youth Justice / Fast Track Co-ordinator
- Communities Department Manager
- Principal Sports Development Officer.

A Community Health Development Officer from the Corporate Planning Department had also recently been co-opted onto the group. The Leisure and Arts Development Manager stated that the group had considered the Fund’s suggestion of voluntary sector representation on the steering group but decided that there was not an appropriate role for them. The voluntary sector would, however, be represented on groups at the level beneath the steering group. This was considered by the evaluation team to be appropriate.

7.4.3.1 Role of Steering Group

The initial remit of the steering group was to ‘create the vision’ for the NOPES initiative in the case study area. One interviewee described the members of the group as being ‘all clear … [that the NOPES portfolio’s] targets [were] about increasing physical activity’. Within this broad vision there was to be focus on early intervention to change lifestyles, increasing the skills of young people and a targeting of girls for particular attention. Two particular issues were also initially identified as key to the overall programme. First, addressing identified gaps in existing after school physical activity provision was considered as vitally important. The second key issue was the sustainability of all funded projects. This second issue was considered particularly relevant to the activities programmes and will be returned to later in this section.

Based on this vision the steering group refined an original shortlist of projects down to those in the final application. Interestingly, the proposed activities projects were developed first in order to achieve the aims of the group’s vision for the NOPES initiative. The proposed facilities projects were then designed to allow these activities projects to realise their aims. Different interviewees all
stressed the relative importance of the activities projects. Due to the relative size of the activities programme, it was seen as the key to making a ‘step change’ in provision. Furthermore, the activities projects together with two of the facilities projects were seen to ‘cohere very well’. In contrast, the level of funding for the facilities programme was seen as significant but not irreplaceable. As such the majority of the facilities projects were more ‘disparate’ and were the projects that had been identified for development for some time.

Subsequently as the initiative has developed, the role of the steering group has gradually changed. Although some members of the group are still responsible for developing Stage 2 facility applications, over time the monitoring and review remit has, and will continue, to expand. Individual members of the steering group represent each of the activity and facility projects in the portfolio. These projects are responsible for conducting their own monitoring and evaluation which is then reported to the steering group along with any other relevant developments. The steering group then has the opportunity to suggest possible courses of action which are communicated to the project through the responsible group member. This seems to be an effective structure for the overall review of the portfolio and one which will link well with the next tier of project management.

Within this next tier of management, there was at least one sub-group responsible for the operation of each project. These groups had a more operational and wider membership, including the voluntary sector, which allowed connections to be made with a variety of other programmes and plans. More information on each of these sub-groups is given in the individual project reports.

7.4.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

It was clear that at a strategic level the NOPES portfolio was already well integrated into other strategic plans and more generally with other initiatives in the local area. This was seen as one of the key roles of the steering group whose collective knowledge would ensure appropriate links with the NOPES portfolio were made. At a national level, the roles of the Director of Leisure and Arts and the Leisure and Arts Development Manager in sportscotland planning structures allowed integration of all council programmes with the national agenda and resultant national plans.

At a local level, although one interviewee was concerned by the possible existence of too many plans, the NOPES portfolio was integrated into plans in a number of sectors. Of particular importance was building the NOPES initiative into the upcoming rewriting of the city’s Sport and Recreation Strategy Action Plan. Furthermore, links had also been drawn with the Sports Development Section’s Vision and Action Plan and the Education Department’s Health Promoting Schools and Sports Development Plans. The development process for these plans had, it was believed, brought the Education and Leisure & Arts departments closer together and it was believed
that the NOPES initiative had been a positive influence on this wider cooperation.

In addition to integrating the NOPES initiative with other plans, interviewees felt it was important that co-ordination take place between the individual activity projects within the portfolio. Meetings were to be organised on a project to project basis, some of which had already taken place. The impact and development of these links will be of interest to the evaluation team in future visits.

Differences in partnership arrangements were apparent between the three projects. In Activities Project 1, a sports development project, partnerships and links to other organisations were developed mainly through formal structures such as local planning groups. Conversely, the sports outreach project linked with projects in a far more informal way. Finally, many of the relationships with other organisations developed by the outdoor education project were managed by contract-style service level agreements. Each of the projects were situated in different council departments and structures where the existing culture, it could be speculated, have influenced the type of partnerships formed.

7.4.3.3 Sustainability

As mentioned earlier sustainability had been a main consideration of the steering group. This issue was particular relevant to activities projects, as one interviewee described the danger in removal of programmes at the end of a three year period of significant funding. The strategies for sustainability were, however, different for each of the projects. The sports development project, which had received the bulk of the Out of School Hours Activities funding allocation, intended to build programme structures which were sustainable beyond the lifetime of the project. Thus emphasis was placed on training teachers to deliver activities and developing a strong club structure within the city to support the project’s programmes. Alternatively, the two Active Steps projects were, in the main, pilot schemes that, if successful, would be able to seek further funding from other sources in the future.

7.4.4 Activities Project 1

7.4.4.1 Introduction

Project 1 has three separate components a P1-4 programme, a P5-S2 programme and a sports passport scheme. Overall the project receives NOPES funding of £827,269 the majority of which is through the Out of School Hours Activities (OSHA) strand. The remainder of the funding represents 9% of the local authority’s Active Steps allocation.

The P1-4 and P5-S2 programmes are very much integrated into a distinct management structure. The funding for these programmes employs a team manager, five development officers, a sports administrator and a clerical
assistant. These programmes aim to provide a comprehensive physical activity and sports programme which will contribute to the general well being, health and overall self-esteem of all children in the city and impact directly to reduce social exclusion. The majority of this report relates to the P1-4 and P5-S2 programmes which will hereafter be referred to as ‘the project’.

The sports passport programme is an expansion of a scheme that has been running for six years. The additional funding will provide cheap transport to participating facilities as well as extension of the programme into Easter and October holidays and new activities for 14 to 16 year olds. A fuller evaluation of this aspect of the programme will be given in future reports.

7.4.4.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

The project is integrated into the Sports Development Section within the Leisure and Arts Department. As such the overall responsibility for the project resides with the Principal Sports Development Officer who represents the project on the council’s NOPES steering group. The project was integrated into existing planning structures in the Sports Development Section.

Beneath the steering group, the ‘strategic vision for the project’ is provided by the council’s Health Promoting Schools strategic group. The group, which has a wide remit across a variety of health-related issues, comprises the Principal Sports Development Officer, representatives from the Education and Communities Departments and individuals representing health organisations.

Within the Health Promoting Schools structure, the project is also represented on the Sport and Physical Education Group which is chaired by the Principal Sports Development Officer. The Sport and Physical Education Group brings together members of the Leisure and Arts and Education departments to support joint planning of programmes within both departments. The group provides links between the project and other programmes such as Active Primary Schools Co-ordinators and School Sports Co-ordinators. The group was described as being in the ‘bedding in’ stage with further consideration of remit and membership thought to be advantageous by one officer. However, some benefits of the group were already apparent as it allowed better relationships and access arrangements to be developed with schools.

Project Structure and Planning

Each of the project’s development officers had three aspects to their role. Each had responsibility for development in a specific sport, one particular programme within the project and a cluster group of primary and secondary schools. The five programmes delegated to particular officers were:

- Primary 1 to 4 programme
- club and sports specific development from Primary 5 to Secondary 2 children
- a programme of ‘Alternative’ activities for the same age group
• coach and people development
• playground activities.

The officers recognised the importance, and gave examples of, the links both within the different aspects of their own role and between the roles of their colleagues.

Within their cluster, consisting of a secondary school and its associated primary schools, each officer was responsible for setting up a cluster planning group. Members of these groups typically included staff from the schools together with representatives from the Communities and Social Work Departments and the voluntary sector. At present the project’s officers lead these groups although it was hoped that in order to aid sustainability a different officer with a permanent contract, for example the School Sport Coordinator, may take the lead in the future.

As relatively new structures, these groups were in the early stages of defining their priorities and producing plans for development in their cluster. However, officers believed that the groups were already beginning to show benefits in communication and co-ordination. Officers observed that each cluster group had a different character with different issues to address and would therefore develop in a different way. It was commented that the cluster group structure provided bottom up planning to complement the top down planning coming from the strategy groups described earlier. As groups at different levels had representatives from similar organisations these arrangements have the potential for good integration between plans in what was a very formalised planning structure for the project.

Links with other plans, programmes and structures

Due to these structures the project was, as one interviewee described, ‘very heavily integrated’ into both the Leisure and Arts and the Education Departments. Particularly close links were seen between the project and the NOPES facilities funded school playground marking scheme. Training supporting the playground markings had involved officers from the project which had allowed further informal links to be developed with school staff. Links between the project and other NOPES funded projects would be developed through the overall steering group.

Other collaborative links were being developed according to the needs of the particular programmes and the existing structures within the city. As an example, one interviewee described how the club development programme linked to the local Hockey Development Group to provide a channel for communication with local clubs. In the early stages of the project, links and support from other agencies was seen as an important part of the consultation process in identifying issues to address.

Consultation with Stakeholders
Consultation, in general, was given high importance by all interviewees. Achieving the project’s targets, for example, increased participation amongst girls, was viewed as dependent on consultation so that the right activities could be delivered. Consistent with the planning structure, consultation was to be carried out on a cluster specific basis. Consultation training for the project’s officers had been undertaken and a pack was being developed to support this. Already an audit of existing provision had been conducted which was viewed as the basis for consultation and teachers had provided some informal and formal feedback. Officers, however, believed that it was important that different people, including young people, were included in the consultation process. The cluster planning groups would then provide a forum into which the results of consultation could be fed back.

Project Sustainability

Given the three year NOPES funding for the project and the ‘scary’ prospect of the officers’ posts no longer existing after that point, sustainability was already a major issue. Sustainability was to be delivered both through the cluster approach and through the individual programmes which officers developed. The two development officers interviewed had responsibility for the club development and coach / people development programmes. Providing support to clubs to link them into existing sports development structures and particular schools through service level agreements was viewed as one method of providing sustainability. Similarly, the coach / people development programme would seek to train and support coaches, volunteers and senior pupils to allow continuation of the sporting provision after the lifetime of the project.

At a cluster level, the proximity of the project and its activities to the local area was seen as a key to attaining sustainability. By involving local schools, clubs, groups and community members it was hoped that ownership of programmes could be developed. The potential for these local organisations to raise further funding to continue provision was one example given of sustainability potentially being achieved through development of ownership. Furthermore, in each cluster the mainstream, permanent funding of Active Primary School Coordinators was seen as a huge step to ensuring structures endured in the longer term given continued localised support from the Sports Development Section.

7.4.4.3 Impact on Participation

Aims and Objectives

With regard to participation the ‘most important thing’ for the project was ‘increasing opportunities for physical activity’. Furthermore, interviewees mentioned the need to create a pathway for participation from 5 to 18 years which had inbuilt choices to reflect the needs and ability of individuals. These two aims linked to the Sports Development Sections two aims which were adopted by the project in its synopsis document :-
- Ensure opportunities exist for regular, life-long participation in physical activity and sport, for every person in [Case Study A]
- Ensure opportunities exist for every individual to enter sport and reach their highest potential limited only by their ability, drive and ambition’

It is positive that the project’s synopsis document includes a number of formal targets for the project relating to participation and opportunities to participate.

Within the synopsis document the aims of each of the project’s programmes is also briefly described. Interviewees also mentioned aims such as addressing the transition from primary to secondary school and disability integration but understood work had still to be done to ‘tease out’ how these fitted into the more general aims. Similarly interviewees were confident that the Fund’s outcomes would be addressed but again had not fully thought through how they fitted with the project’s particular aims and targets.

**Target Groups**

One interviewee believed it was ‘easy to name target groups’ such as girls, people living in Social Inclusion Partnership areas and people with disabilities, but emphasised the importance of understanding exactly the nature and population of target groups. As such consultation and information sharing was viewed as essential to identify specific target groups in their local (cluster) context. For example, one previously unidentified group that the project had become aware of through consultation was that of sedentary boys.

Girls were also a major target group for the project as a whole as this had been identified through a range of national and local plans and research. Again, positively, interviewees realised that girls were not a single homogeneous group and consultation on an individual basis was necessary. Suggested strategies to target girls including altering the types of activities offered, which was the aim of the ‘alternative’ programme, running girls-only sessions and introducing different activity leaders, for example female senior pupils.

**Identifying needs and barriers**

This consultation was important in identifying ‘as many barriers as possible which is going to allow [the project’s] opportunities to increase participation’. Previous experience had shown that travel and cost were barriers to participation. The audit conducted by the project had also helped identify gaps in provision and cluster groups were continuing this process at a local level.

The cluster group planning method allowed these needs and barriers to be addressed. For example, simply by providing opportunities in the local area identified issues such as travel problems would be overcome. Other more generic strategies that were designed to address the aims of the project were delivering a diverse range of activities to meet the needs of all children and
ensuring the activities were delivered on a regular basis, thereby promoting continued participation.

**Sustainability of participation**

This sustainability of participation was a key theme to be addressed by the project. The links between the projects and other programmes in the city was seen as crucial to addressing this aim. Links into pre-school programmes continuing into the P1-4 programme were seen as essential in equipping children with the skills needed to participate in sport as they grew older. At a later stage the links with city wide programmes and club structures were seen as necessary to allow continued participation on a ‘non-prescriptive’ pathway which gave individuals choice as to the activities they pursued. Getting clubs involved in school provision was a first step towards this as it allowed young people to become familiar with club personnel and structures.

One other aspect that the project was addressing to promote continued participation was the promotion of parental support. This was viewed a difficult task as it involved a changing of culture and attitudes towards physical activity. However, parental involvement was something that the project had begun to tackle. Given recent research suggesting links between parental involvement and participation this was viewed very positively and future progress in this area will be followed closely.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Interviewees were very keen to use monitoring and evaluation to demonstrate the impact of the project on participation. It was stated that the project would be ‘fully monitoring and evaluating impact’ in each of the project’s programmes using a variety of methods. It was hoped that by adopting a variety of methods a more complete ‘picture’ of the project would develop. An example of an evaluation already conducted on a pilot P1-4 programme was provided. This evaluation had used a variety of techniques including observation and had provided very positive feedback.

However in general, at the time of the interviews, interviewees realised that a more specific plan for data collection and reporting was required. Monitoring would be conducted against outputs set in the cluster action plans which were being developed. These measures would be linked to data collected on participation opportunities through the audit. Although interviewees realised the difficulty of collecting data on ‘actual activity levels’, the project was working on developing a tool to do so with the Education Department which examined the number of participants and the frequency of participation. If the project is to show its impact on participation, rather than just the opportunities created, the development of such a tool is vitally important.

**7.4.4.4 Impact on wider social outcomes**

Interviewees commented that it was at present too early to envisage all the wider social outcomes of the project which would become clearer in time as
delivery progressed. However, potential changes in wider social behaviours and outcomes were, in the main, viewed by interviewees as resulting from the intrinsic nature of sport. This approach was exemplified by the comment that the ‘very essence of sport [as a rule based activity] … has a role to play’ in addressing wider social behaviours. Similarly, with regard to specific benefits, one interviewee commented that sport was ‘proven [to have] a knock on effect on increased self-esteem and self-respect, more confidence and becoming more independent’. Specific active steps outcomes, relating to crime, truancy and exclusion reduction, would also be addressed by the ‘whole essence of the project’. Besides these benefits, the other main identified intrinsic impact of the project’s sport and physical activity provision was on young people’s health.

Some other potential impacts were identified as arising from the way in which programmes were developed. So, for example, it was thought citizenship may be developed through a playground buddying programme involving P6 and P7 pupils. Furthermore, the localised planning model was thought to have the potential to develop ownership and belonging amongst young people.

Evaluation of wider social outcomes was to be developed as part of the overall monitoring and evaluation plan for the project discussed in the previous section.

7.4.4.5 Overall Assessment of Progress

The project as a whole had made an excellent start. The planning structures into which the project was integrated provided guidance for the project and ensured effective links were made with other organisations. Furthermore, the cluster planning model developed by the project was seen by all concerned as an excellent forum for localised development and delivery. The project also had a good emphasis on sustainability, both structural and with regard to participation, consultation and evaluation. Officers from the project had also identified potential weaknesses and were resolved to address them.

The only aspect of the project that was unclear was the place of the sport-specific programmes which formed one third of each development officer’s role. From interviews it was apparent that the other two aspects to development officers’ work, the cluster and programme development roles, linked together well. How city-wide sports-specific work integrated into this was not evident. This aspect will be followed up in subsequent visits.

7.4.5 Activities Project 2

7.4.5.1 Introduction

Project 2 has two distinct components. Firstly, there is an extension to an existing football programme which has, for two years, been running courses for young people at risk of substance abuse and offending. The NOPES funding allows the project to extend the programme from term time into the
school holiday period. The second part of the project seeks to develop sporting provision for young people who are looked after by the local authority in Young Peoples Units, foster care and at home under the supervision of a social worker.

The project has received funding of £215,270 through the Active Steps strand which enabled the employment of two new officers. The officers’ posts encompass both components of the project. The posts are managed by a project manager who had previously been running the football project alone.

7.4.5.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

Although based at a local professional football club the project was line managed through the Education Department. The Council’s Youth Justice / Fast Track Co-ordinator was also a close advisor to the project to ensure linkages were made into the local youth justice system.

The project also had a steering group which had an advisory role for the project. The group consisted of:-

- the project manager
- the Education Officer who line managed the project
- the Youth Justice / Fast Track Co-ordinator
- a representative from Social Work’s Looked After group
- Social Work’s Strategy / Performance Manager
- a Youth Sport Development Officer who worked in disadvantaged areas of the city
- a development officer from a nationwide, independent advocacy group for young people in care.

This last member gave voluntary sector representation on the group and as their work involved speaking to looked-after children it was felt that they were in an excellent position to provide feedback directly from young people. There had been consideration as to inviting other representatives onto the group but a decision was taken to keep the group to what was described as a manageable size which offered a ‘well rounded package’.

Project Structure and Planning

The project as a whole built on the existing structures previously developed for the football programme. The addition of the looked after element to the project was described as a ‘natural progression’ into similar areas of work. For the two new officers the integration into existing structures with an experienced manager was seen as very important in what was a ‘great learning curve’.

Planning for the football programme consisted of expanding the original 10 to 12 week programme into the school holiday periods. This extension enabled the programme to involve more young people. The original blueprint for the
programme had been built upon practice elsewhere in the UK. Although young people could contribute to the planning process there was an emphasis on having a set programme that the children could fulfil. Planning for the looked after programme was more ad-hoc partially due to continued changes in the young people resident in the Young Peoples Units. Over time the officers hoped to be able to integrate children from the seven Young Peoples Units from across the city in activities. Currently staff from the Young Peoples Units were apprehensive about this plan although the officers believed that the young people themselves were keen for this to happen.

**Links with other plans, programmes and structures**

The project as a whole was linked into a variety of structures and plans, mainly through the involvement of officers in various council groups. Overall the project ‘fitted in well’ with the local Youth Justice Strategy due to its early intervention approach. The Youth Justice / Fast Track Co-ordinator provided a link to the Youth Justice Strategy Group while the project manager had recently become a member of the newly set up Youth Justice Services team which sat beneath the strategy group. Membership of this and other similar groups was a new task for the project manager but served as method by which practice could be developed and information on particular young people could be shared.

The Education Officer line managing the project also provided links with different council groups including the Looked After Development and Implementation Group. The project had close links with the local football club as well as being based at their stadium. In particular, the development of a new learning centre at the stadium was seen as being highly important to the project and again the Education Officer sat on the management group for the centre.

Links with other organisations were on a more informal basis at present. Officers had contacted and built links with a local project that dealt with young offenders and a sports development project that worked within the city’s Social Inclusion Partnership areas. These links were viewed as potential sources of referrals of young people to the project’s activities. Links were also made with staff at the council’s Outdoor Education Centre, which also received NOPES funding, with the aim of extending opportunities for young people and providing access to equipment. Networking with the other NOPES funded sports development project (project 1) and the Sports Development Section was viewed as being important to developing young people’s participation in mainstream opportunities in the longer term. The project also could act as a conduit between the Sports Development Section and the Young Peoples Units by passing information on sporting opportunities between the two.
Consultation with Stakeholders

Informal consultation with young people was viewed as the most appropriate method by which to involve them in developing the project’s services. Although the project was looking to develop a ‘client friendly questionnaire’ to be administered through the Young People’s Units or foster carers, one interviewee summed up the feelings of those involved in the project by stating that ‘hands on evaluation on a day to day basis is invaluable’. Given the nature of the client group and possible literacy problems, the evaluation team considered that this was the most appropriate form of consultation.

The two project officers had already gone to each of the seven Young Peoples Units to talk to staff and young people. Feedback had also been received after an early activity day. Initial findings had shown that the young people were interested in a wide variety of sports which had highlighted the need to develop individualised programmes. However, it was also recognised that young people’s preferences were highly changeable which made for further planning difficulties.

Project Sustainability

Interviewees stated there was a ‘range of ideas’ for ensuring the sustainability of the project. From a corporate viewpoint the project was viewed as a pilot project which if successful could garner further funding in the future. Positive evaluations of the project’s work were seen to be essential if further funding was to be secured. Structurally, the design of the project, being strongly linked to the learning centre at the football club, was developed to build inherent sustainability. The post of project manager had now also been mainstream funded by the Education Department after the football project had previously been on an annual funding stream. Mainstream funding was seen as one potential source of future financial support, although different funding arrangements whereby Young Peoples Units commissioned services from the project was also seen as a possible financial mechanism. Money from other external funding streams as they arose in the future was another potential source.

Beyond the prospect of further funding, other plans for structural sustainability were at an early stage. Interviewees spoke about developing volunteer mentoring schemes for the young people and linking with the local further education college to provide training for leaders within the Young People’s Units. As the project was in its very early stages these were no more than ideas which would possibly develop in the future.
7.4.5.3 Impact on participation

Aims and Objectives

Overall the project aimed to begin a process whereby young people’s interest in sport and physical activity was developed and then sustained in the longer term. Interviewees hoped that the ‘vast majority’ of children in Young Peoples Units would get the chance to take part in sporting activities either individually or as a group. Particular participation targets were not clear at this stage although one interviewee suggested a target was to get 50 to 70% of referrals into some form of sporting activity.

Target Groups

As stated earlier the football project was aimed at ‘young people who are at risk or involved in offending behaviour or drug misuse’. Young people were referred from both primary and secondary schools to the project and priority was given to young people who were looked after and offending. Participants were also chosen for their interest in football.

Since the advent of NOPES funding one all-girl group had started on the football programme. As this was the first time such a programme had been run, the young people had all been referred from one school to aid familiarity. Due to her enthusiasm, one girl from a Young People’s Unit had also participated in the course and had integrated well with the rest of the group. Officers gave positive feedback on how the course had progressed.

Identifying needs and barriers

Although many looked after children were also members of the football programme’s target group and in some cases had been part of that programme previously, there was a previously identified gap in provision for looked after children. A survey of Young People’s Units had shown a lack of staff time and skills to address this lacuna and staff had also had difficulty engaging young people in sport and physical activity. Funding for a previous, smaller pilot project providing equipment and staff training within the Young People’s Units had paved the way for a larger NOPES funded programme.

In order to meet the aims of the project and attract target groups the activities developed would be, as one interviewee described, ‘young people led’. To ensure this judgements would be made through consultation as to whether group or individual programmes for children from the Young People’s Units were most appropriate. However, difficulties with time pressures were identified as problematic if individual programmes were to be developed.

Developing relationships with the young people was seen as key to ensuring their involvement in programmes. Such relationships would ensure the young people were ‘comfortable’ in the sport and physical activity sessions. The link between the project and the local football club was also thought to be a major incentive for young people to participate. It was hoped that players from the
football club as well as activity leaders would be role models for the young people to help promote continued involvement.

Sustainability of participation

Promoting continued participation had already been a main facet of the football programme. Young people who had completed the course had a chance to act as mentors for future participants and also to work towards their Junior Sports Leaders Award. This was seen to be a natural progression for the young people and a link with the local further education college had seen some previous participants enrol on a nationally qualified Sports Coaching course. For those young people for whom this was not an appropriate route, interviewees hoped that they could be ‘brought back in at a later stage’.

Plans for promoting sustainable participation for looked after children were at a less advanced stage. At the time of interviews the main focus of the project were to build interest amongst the young people with the ‘hope [that] they would be able to continue once they had an interest’. As stated earlier links with the Sports Development Section and its NOPES funded project were being built to provide progression opportunities. However, interviewees stressed the need to assess individuals’ self-esteem and confidence before they were ready to access mainstream provision. One interviewee also suggested that officers may be able to accompany individuals to their first mainstream sessions to aid familiarity. An identified potential problem with supporting looked after young people’s continued participation was the movement of children in and out of and between Young People’s Unit. Interviewees recognised the need for a back up system which could address this problem. Once developed, a system of volunteer mentors could possibly form part of a solution to this problem.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Another method which could be used both to keep track of participants and provide monitoring and evaluation data was the database of participants that was being developed. Information on current participants had been recorded and would be entered when the database had been developed. The potential of the database to cross reference with other statistics such as offences and school attendance records had been identified.

7.4.5.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

Aims and objectives

The project had a very strong focus on addressing young people’s wider social development. As one interviewee stated ‘all work [conducted by the project] … is constantly [about] personal and social development’. Even those children who were targeted due to a diversionary need had opportunities provided for personal and social development, although the balance between the two (diversionary and development) depended on the needs of the particular young person. Across all the activities a key feature identified to
enable personal and social development was building relationships between young people and the project's officers.

Potential wider social benefits mentioned by interviewees for young people included encouragement of positive lifestyles, support in making positive choices, reintegration into structured opportunities, education on specific issues affecting young people, providing opportunities for personal achievement and building self-confidence through enjoyment of activity. Sport and physical activity was viewed as both a tool and as an incentive to help attain these aims.

Strategies to achieve aims and objectives

The incentive aspect of the existing football programme was an element of the project which was particularly highlighted. Young people taking part were accepted on the basis that they would attend school and that their behaviour in school and within the community was acceptable. As well as the programme itself, trips to football games in other parts of the country were also used as an incentive.

Educational opportunities were also built in as part of the football course. For example, workers from a drugs project were invited to give sessions as part of the ongoing programme. Interviewees believed that young people would respond better to the learning environment provided at the football stadium as opposed to the environment that they encountered as school. Software provided in the stadium's learning centre also addressed issues such as healthy living and lifestyle choices.

Aspects of the football programme were seen as appropriate for young people involved in the looked after programme. Officers did see the potential for such young people to participate in the education aspects of the football programme. However, the contract element, whereby participation was conditional on school attendance and behaviour, was viewed as slightly more problematic as it could contribute to increased exclusion of young people.

One interviewee saw the potential for attendance at the project’s activities to be included in measures decided by children’s hearings. As such the activities may have a diversionary impact on young people who may have begun offending. For other young people the project was seen as an early intervention strategy for those with identified risk factors. The integration of such children from the Young People’s Unit into activities, such as the football programme, which had participants from other environments was viewed positively.

Monitoring and Evaluation

In the football programme an evaluation system was already in place. An evaluation midway throughout the course, which involved the young people and teachers, had been used in the existing programme. Such evaluations conducted by the NOPES funded officers had proved positive. Informal
evaluation on the football courses was also used as one interviewee commented ‘you’ve seen the difference with them coming in, building up the relationship, building in confidence and building up their self-esteem’.

Beyond such informal assessments, officers were unsure what evaluation methods would be adopted in the looked after element of the project. School attendance and exclusion figures were suggested as an improvement indicator as was the offence record that would be built into the participant database. One interviewee also noted the need for evaluation to continue in the longer term once the project’s direct involvement with an individual young person had ceased.

7.4.5.5 Overall Assessment of Progress to Date

In the short period of time that officers had been in place the project had made significant progress. Fitting the project into existing structures had been of great benefit to the project both as a support to new workers and as a platform for development of services. This was particularly apparent with the football programme aspect of the project where the existing planned programme was easily expanded with the advent of NOPES funding. Planning for the looked after aspect of the programme appeared to be somewhat more ad-hoc. This was undoubtedly partially due to the nature of the client group. However, the evaluation team considered that planning for, for example, sustainability of participation and evaluation were underdeveloped at this stage. With delivery of some activities commencing there was a risk that strategies may be developed ‘on the hoof’ which may not be as effective as those which were strategically planned in advance. That said, the project was very much in its infancy and the good progress made to date and the commitment of the officers was manifest.

7.4.6 Activities Project 3 and Facilities Project 1

7.4.6.1 Introduction

Activities Project 3 and Facilities Project 1 are both based at an outdoor education centre in the city. The two projects are intimately connected and so shall be reported on together.

The facilities project consists of improvements and upgrades to the existing outdoor education centre. Improvements including a new indoor climbing wall, enhanced equipment stores, drying rooms, disabled access, artificial ski slope, teaching facilities and office space are being supported by NOPES funding of £176,000.
The activities project, which receives NOPES funding of £145,000 under the Active Steps stream, has three strands as follows:

- introductory, one week outdoor education courses for S3 and S4 pupils who ‘experience acute poverty’
- instructor training for outdoor activities
- an outdoor learning accreditation scheme, Natural Connections

Throughout the report the facilities project and different activities strands will be referred to both individually and collectively.

7.4.6.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

The centre and both the NOPES project were managed through Communities Department structures. The centre manager was responsible for the running of the centre and its programme of activities on a day to day basis. In the main the activities project was to be delivered through existing staff and structures at the centre. One new member of staff was to be employed to support delivery of the introductory outdoor education courses and some instructor training would be delivered by externally contracted providers.

Overall responsibility for the centre and the NOPES projects rested with a manager within the Communities Department. This individual provided a link between the project and the portfolio steering group although the NOPES projects were described as self-contained to a large extent. The main benefit of the steering group to the NOPES projects was the potential for sharing information on the available activities with other council departments who may wish to refer prospective participants.

The main leadership for the projects was provided by the interdepartmental Outdoor Education Stakeholders Group which was chaired by the Communities Department Manager. The group included representatives of Leisure and Arts, Education, the ranger service and legal services. The local voluntary action group had been asked to suggest a suitable voluntary sector representative for the group. As with existing outdoor education projects, the NOPES projects would report to the group on a three monthly basis. These reports would include evaluations that had been conducted by staff.

Project Structure and Planning

The overall plan for the activities projects is to integrate them with existing programmes at the centre. The existing programme, to which the facilities project would add quality, was well developed and the activities project would ‘merge into’, ‘enhance’ and ‘complement’ this programme. Planning for the training element of the activities programme centred on developing a new structure for the provision of outdoor activities within the city. The outdoor education centre at which the project was based would then become a ‘centre of excellence’ hub providing training for associated clubs and other
organisations who could then deliver activities to the same standard. Young people, and other members of the community, could begin participation at the centre before continuing their involvement in outdoor activities at the associated clubs.

Although planning for this aspect of the project was at an initial stage, the Natural Connections accreditation scheme was the element of the project where planning had progressed fastest. Natural Connections is a modular certificated scheme which involves developing a variety of skills in an outdoor environment. The scheme is to be delivered by a variety of providers including the outdoor centre who will provide overall administration and accreditation. Initial training for staff who will deliver the scheme was to be delivered shortly.

Links with other plans, programmes and structures

The main links that the outdoor education centre, and the NOPES projects, formed were with schools. These links would allow children to participate in the activities funded by the NOPES grant as well as take of advantage of the enhanced facilities ‘in their own right’. Partnerships with schools were governed by Service Level Agreements and a similar arrangement would be in place for the activities project. Interviewees also saw potential for collaboration with the other two NOPES activities projects to ensure the needs of young people were met by the different activities each project had to offer.

Consultation with Stakeholders

The relationship the outdoor centre had with organisations, such as schools, and individual community participants was more akin to a commercial customer relationships than joint collaborations. In response to questions asked about how stakeholders were consulted about services, interviewees responded that the centre operated in a commercial or semi-commercial way and therefore had to deliver the services which those customers wanted. Feedback on services was then received through the evaluation process and informal networks of staff and stakeholders.

Project Sustainability

With regard to the enhanced facilities the council had already agreed funding to maintain the building. Existing programmes were also already mainstream funded. Within the activities project, the Natural Connections accreditation scheme would continue to run using existing structures in much the same way as the Duke of Edinburgh programme is operated at present. Interviewees thought that the sustainability of the other activities programmes would to a certain extent depend on continued government funding. Alternatively, interviewees did see scope for delivering the training aspect of the project at a subsidised or cost price once NOPES funding ceased.
7.4.6.3 Impact on participation

Aims and Objectives

In terms of the improved facilities, interviewees noted that it would be the ‘quality of what we are doing that [the Fund] is going to enhance’. For example, the upgraded storage facilities will ensure that the quality of equipment available to young people and the community would be maintained. In terms of increasing participation at the outdoor education centre, even with enhanced facilities, interviewees commented that it was impossible to meet demand due to lack of staff.

The activities project would, however, make a difference in the number of young people and adults participating. The training programme would increase the number of instructors external to the centre which in turn would allow more young people to participate. An example of the change training could provide was the existing Duke of Edinburgh scheme which at present could only accommodate a finite number of young people due to a lack of qualified expedition leaders. With regard to the Natural Connections scheme interviewees hoped that ‘everybody within the age group eligible will get an opportunity to join’. As opposed to this generic approach the outdoor education courses will seek to make a difference in participation in a small target group with 300 young people to be involved per year through 30 one week courses.

Target Groups

Each of the different activities strands had different target groups and strategies to attract and include them. The outdoor education courses were to be, as stated previously, targeted at young people in ‘acute poverty’ as determined by those eligible for free school meals and clothing grants. The decision to target in this way had been taken because the barrier of cost had meant that many young people had not had the opportunity to participate in outdoor education programmes previously. Furthermore, although the target groups may overlap, previous targeting by the centre had focused on behaviour difficulties rather than poverty.

The initial plan for the outdoor education courses was to include children who were referred through school referral teams to which the centre staffed linked. However, possibly due to the strict targeting guidelines, interviewees suspected schools may not be keen to be selective in the children that they referred. A commitment to the project was therefore being sought from schools. If this commitment was not forthcoming, the project would seek referrals, based on the same criteria, from other sources such as youth workers from the local Social Inclusion Partnership, social workers and welfare officers. Courses would be adapted as necessary to accommodate the different sources of referrals.

The Natural Connections scheme, in accordance with its generic approach, was aimed at all secondary school pupils. Primary school pupils were not
included as this might have caused resources to be distributed too thinly. The strength of the scheme was its flexibility to meet the needs of a wide variety of young people. As one interviewee commented in highlighting this flexibility ‘you make the award fit the young person not the young person fit the award’. In a youth culture characterised by diversity, this flexibility was viewed as being attractive to young people.

The training component of the project was available to adults from statutory, independent and voluntary sectors. Information advertising the service would be distributed through existing networks of schools, youth organisations and the voluntary sector. However, the project was ‘very careful about selection criteria’ for the training courses to ensure they benefited young people in the local authority area. For the volunteer sector in particular, individuals accessing training had to have been a member of a local organisation for some time and be prepared to deliver programmes for two years after completion of the course. These selection criteria would be enforced by an interview procedure which also served to maintain interest in training and ensure the appropriateness of the particular course for the individual concerned.

**Sustainability of participation**

Encouragement of sustainable participation was built into the projects through the interlinking of the different strands. Young people who had attended, and enjoyed, the outdoor education courses would then be encouraged to work towards the Natural Connections award. Achieving such an award was seen as a building confidence towards entering the more rigid Duke of Edinburgh’s award scheme. Outdoor clubs were also seen as key to facilitating future participation. Encouraging clubs who had previously not been ‘young person friendly’ before was seen as a major task. However, one interviewee stressed the need to ‘convince specialist clubs to see their future in taking young members’. The training programme and the accessibility of the enhanced facilities at the outdoor education centre available at discounted rates were to be used as incentives to clubs to develop junior participation. Furthermore, in order to continue to attract the target group from outdoor education courses, it was proposed that the centre’s equipment hire system may be altered to ‘mitigate in favour’ of social inclusion.

### 7.4.6.4 Impact of participation on wider social behaviours

**Aims and objectives**

Both the facilities and activities projects’ impact on wider social behaviours would be due to the intrinsic nature of outdoor education. Interviewees believed the nature of outdoor education ensured it was a ‘more powerful medium’ to ‘bring about many of the learning outcomes that young people struggle with in terms of formal schooling’. Examples given by interviewees of the benefits that outdoor education could have for young people were providing enhancement of co-operation skills and technical progression, a diversionary outlet for aggression, a medium for development of relationships
with adults and an incentive for attendance in mainstream education. Because of these benefits delivered through outdoor education, interviewees described their vision of the centre as ‘a significant contributor to individual young people’s social and development needs’. The enhanced facilities would give staff the ‘foundation to back up’ their ability to deliver this vision.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Evaluation of both participation and wider social behaviours was to be conducted in a variety of ways. A participant tracking system, across council departments, being piloted in the following year would provide information on individual participants. More qualitative information would be sought from the ‘widest range of activities and from groupings of stakeholders’. Mechanisms through which this information would be collected were feedback from young people, contact with referring agencies, focus groups and from technical advisors and staff.

7.4.6.5 Overall Assessment of Progress to Date

Both the facilities and activities projects were in their early stages of development at the time of the evaluation visit. The Fund had agreed to deferment of the activities projects to allow the facilities enhancement to be completed before commencement of activity delivery. This was just one example of the integration between activities and facilities projects which would undoubtedly have benefits in the future.

The benefits of both projects were enhanced by their integration into the existing well developed programmes at the outdoor education centre. This was complemented by the commitment of officers to the projects and outdoor education in general. Planning for the activities programmes was well thought through, particularly in relation to the development of outdoor education structures in the city which would aid sustainability.

It was obvious that interviewees believed strongly in the inherent personal and social development properties of outdoor education. However, the only possible concern was how these benefits would contribute to the Active Steps outcomes of diverting young people from criminal activity and reducing truancy and exclusion from school. This was particularly the case in activities strands where there was no specific targeting of young people who were at risk of such behaviours.

Overall, however, the project demonstrated immense potential and the evaluators are keen to return to the project to assess the impact in the future.
7.4.7 Facilities Project 2

7.4.7.1 Introduction

Facilities Project 2 is an umbrella project which will provide playground improvements for all 42 primary schools in the city. Improvements will consist of playground markings and equipment packs at each of the schools with ten schools also gaining further fixed equipment in their playground. The project is to receive £200,000 through the NOPES initiative.

The project has been subject to many delays. An initial timeline for the project anticipated that installation of equipment would be completed by May 2003. However, at the time of the evaluation visit it was thought that pupils would not be able to use the new facilities until after the 2004 summer school holidays. This delay was due to a longer than anticipated application process for the project.

7.4.7.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

Within the council’s Health Promoting Schools structure a sub-group had been set up to manage the overall development of the project. The group consisted of a primary school head teacher, a School Sport Co-ordinator, two Active Primary School Co-ordinators, Sports Development Officers and health representatives. The group had drawn up an action plan for the project which included the development of resources and training that would support implementation in schools. The model of playground equipment and games resources used in the project was built on existing examples of effective practice. The group met regularly to assess the progress of the project and to assign tasks in the action plan as appropriate.

Within the primary schools, Active Primary School Co-ordinators had set up pupil council style groups to consult and provide feedback on the development of the project. This process had the additional benefits of building interest and ownership of the project amongst the children involved. Schools were invited to produce bids to be one of the ten schools to receive the larger fixed playground equipment. The bids were required to involve schoolchildren in the design of the equipment. Interviewees commented on the extremely high standard of work produced by schoolchildren and expressed disappointment that many of the children involved would not see the results of their efforts due to delays in the application process and the children’s progression to secondary school.
Links with other plans, programmes and structures

The project was integrated into the council’s Healthy Schools Strategy which aimed to have all schools gaining Health Promoting Schools status within the next three years. Within the Healthy Schools Strategy the project combined with the NOPES Activities Project 1, the School Sport Co-ordinator and Active Primary Schools Co-ordinators programmes to address a previously identified need for increased physical activity beyond the existing curriculum.

Interviewees believed that combining these programmes and projects under the banner of the Health Schools Strategy was viewed positively by schools who preferred this integrated approach. The strategy also fitted with wider education department planning which moved away from curriculum development to focusing on school ethos and practice development. Within the strategy each school was required to produce a development plan for health promotion to which the playground markings will contribute.

Project Sustainability

Decisions had been made to ensure the project’s sustainability. Hard wearing playground markings had been chosen especially and maintenance of these and fixed equipment had been included in a ‘normal’ installation contract. Although non-fixed equipment was subject to normal wear and tear, schools were expected to fund replacement of such equipment through their budgets.

7.4.7.3 Impact on participation

Aims and Objectives

The project will allow primary school children to experience a greater range of activities both in curricular and extra-curricular time. The project was hoped to also develop enjoyment of physical activity amongst young people. As part of the application process timetables had been developed to ensure that all primary school children got access to the new facilities and it was hoped that primary PE specialists would be encouraged to use it as part of their curricular sessions. Particular target groups for inclusion were identified as girls and children in early years with the hope that lifestyles could be changed to sustain participation in the future.

Strategies employed to meet aims and objectives

To ensure the quality of provision, training had been delivered for playground supervisors and classroom assistants. Interviewees reported that the training had been very positively received. Unfortunately, again due to delays in the application process, the training had been delivered long before the new facilities were actually available. Interviewees acknowledged that knowledge and skills gained through training would be lost in the interim and were committed to following up the original training in the future.
Additionally resources had also been produced to support the schools in developing provision. A playground guide had been produced which included suggestions for games that could utilise the new facilities. Furthermore, a pack for schools which addressed more formal issues included information on playground policies, monitoring and evaluation, award schemes, management of equipment and zoning of playgrounds had been distributed to schools.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The Health Promoting Schools Steering Group had been considering how to monitor participation in physical activity in general and in specific projects such as this one and activities project 1. At the time of the evaluation visit a pilot project was being developed based on a diary style system completed by the children themselves. Besides identifying playground activity the system would include other health promoting schools issues such as diet. It was hoped that the diary system could be integrated into the curriculum and have cross-curricular benefits such as raising awareness of physical activity issues. Alongside this interviewees also highlighted the use of informal evaluation by staff who could assess the usage of the new facilities.

7.4.7.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

Given the project’s strategic position it is unsurprising that the emphasis of the project was on improving health and educational development. The project fitted into broader agendas of building a healthier lifestyle by creating enjoyable physical activity experiences. Educationally, potential benefits of the project were the development of citizenship, enterprise and learning skills, the building of relationships with teachers and the use of physical activity as a preparation for learning. As with all projects yet to open, it is hard to anticipate fully the wider social benefits of the project. Such benefits are likely to become more apparent as the project develops and shall be investigated further in future evaluation visits.

7.4.7.5 Overall Assessment of Progress to Date

The project has potential to make a large impact on a small investment on each school site. Progress on the project has been considerably delayed due to the length of the assessment process. Besides the obvious disappointment felt by officers, these delays have had more tangible, negative impacts for example on the young people who will never experience the facilities which they helped design and the staff whose training will need to be refreshed before use.
7.4.8 Case Study Summary and Conclusions

This section provides a summary of key issues and themes emerging from the case study. It will be followed by sections addressing emerging issues for the Fund and for the evaluation team. This section will primarily focus on the activities programmes in the case study for two reasons. Firstly, in comparison to the facilities programme, all activities projects were underway and at a similar stage of development. This allows for some cross comparison of projects. Secondly, the local authority also viewed the activities, rather than the facilities, programme as the key element of the NOPES initiative. As such there was a far more strategic approach to the activities programme overall.

In fact, interviewees questioned about the strategic focus of the whole portfolio tended to emphasise, consciously or not, the importance of activities project 1. A number of reasons could be given to explain this. Methodologically, the two interviewees questioned about the strategic focus of the portfolio were from the Leisure & Arts and Education Departments to which the project was most strongly connected. From an operational perspective the management of the whole portfolio was driven by the Leisure & Arts Department who also line managed activities project 1. Furthermore, and perhaps most obviously, this project was by far the largest activities project and was furthermore the only entirely new project.

Overall the structures developed for the portfolio were strong. The steering group provided a vision for the whole portfolio and monitored the continued operation of the individual projects. Each project then had individual management groups which provided direction and support for the project. This structure of groups provided effective management for the whole portfolio while not reaching the fine line across which such structures could become overburdening to the individuals and organisations involved.

From the top down there was a strong ethos of partnership working within the portfolio. Similarly, the whole portfolio was fitted into a number of strategic plans. With the individual projects in their early stages of development, bottom-up collaborative links were now being developed by all projects to complement those at a higher level.

The vision developed for the portfolio at a corporate level was to address existing gaps in provision. This vision was adopted by all the projects whose officers were continuing work to investigate further the precise nature of gaps at a local level. In addressing these gaps, all projects had fairly generic aims in terms of increasing participation amongst young people.

Contrastingly, there were differing ways in which projects addressed wider social outcomes. Activities project 2 mainly used sport as an incentive tool in a broader programme to address personal and social development. The other two activities projects saw broader social outcomes as intrinsic, natural consequences of the types of activities that they delivered.
The other two main issues which were a focus at a strategic level were sustainability and monitoring and evaluation. In turn, each of the projects had a strong commitment to both of these issues. Although addressed differently by each of the projects, there was strong evidence of sustainability being considered even at the early stages of project development. Projects also had a positive approach to monitoring and evaluation even if plans were not fully developed as yet.
7.5 Case Study B

7.5.1 Introduction

Case study B is a local authority situated in the west of Scotland which encompasses both urban and rural areas. The council has a total NOPES allocation of £6.3 million. Within the council’s NOPES portfolio there are four activities projects and facilities projects based at three school sites and one outdoor education centre outwith the local authority area.

The structure of the report will be as follows:-
1. A brief summary of the methods used in the case study evaluation will be given.
2. An evaluation of the strategic focus of the whole portfolio including the partnership structures developed to support the initiative.
3. A brief report on the Sports Comprehensives pilot at the three schools where the facilities projects are sited.
4. Individual project reports will then cover:-
   - Activities Project 1 – the only project funded through the Active Steps strand
   - Activities Project 2 and Facilities Project 1 – both based at an outdoor education centre
   - Activities Project 3 – an outdoor education project designed as a follow-up to existing services
   - Activities Project 4 - a mainstream sports development style project
5. A summary of the case study and some initial conclusions.

7.5.2 Methodology

Interviews were conducted by two members of the evaluation team between 8th and 10th March 2004. Due to the unavailability of one interviewee a further interview was conducted by telephone on 12th May 2004. The interviews were designed to investigate the strategic focus of the whole portfolio as well as individual activities and facilities projects. The schedule of interviews included various members of the Education, Community Services and Social Work departments and a representative of an outdoor education charity.

Over nine hours worth of mini-disc recordings were generated as a result of the decision to record all interviews. As with the other initial case study visit in Scotland all interviews were transcribed in full.

Over 11th & 12th January 2005, a second evaluation visit was paid to Case Study B. Many of the same interviewees were asked to give updates on their projects and the operation of the whole portfolio. An updated report on the case study will be in the next six monthly report due July 2005.
7.5.3 Portfolio Level Partnership Effectiveness

7.5.3.1 Introduction

The NOPES portfolio (both activities and facilities) was developed by the council’s NOPES steering group. The steering group included representatives from the Education, Community Services and Social Work Departments. A consultant from a leisure company, who had a large role in developing the NOPES application and the individual projects, was also a member of the steering group. Subsequent to their appointment the NOPES portfolio manager and the co-ordinator of the Active Steps project also joined the steering group. The Director of Education chaired the group.

7.5.3.2 Role of Steering Group

The NOPES steering group was originally set up to co-ordinate the development of the application to the Fund. Different members of the steering group took responsibility for developing different parts of the portfolio. For example, although the steering group was lead by the Education Department, the Community Services and Social Work Departments were asked to lead the development of the Active Steps component of the activities programme.

During the application process, the external consultant employed by the council has taken a key role. Most obviously, the consultant has taken a significant proportion of the workload involved in the NOPES application from already busy council officers. It would not be overstating this particular role to say that without the involvement of the consultant it would be difficult to imagine the council completing the NOPES application process without considerable disruption to existing services.

Furthermore, the consultant’s expertise in a number of different areas has also been hugely beneficial to the local authority. For example, with regard to the facilities projects the consultant had expertise in both facility design and management. Although similar expertise was available within the local authority, it existed within different individuals and departments. Therefore, the availability of one person with a range of expertise reduced the need for difficult and time-consuming co-ordination between different individuals and departments. However, these benefits for the local authority came with the obvious financial cost of employing the external consultant.

Subsequent to completion of the main part of the application process, the steering group did not meet for an extended period of time. This was attributed to fatigue with the NOPES initiative after what was viewed as an arduous application process. However, with the appointment of officers and the commencement of the activities programme, the steering group meetings have been re-established.

Three interlinked roles for the re-established steering group were evident. The steering group will have responsibility for the overall monitoring and evaluation of the NOPES portfolio. The results of this process will, it was
foreseen, have a large effect on decisions to provide mainline funding for aspects of the portfolio in the future. Linked to monitoring and evaluation, the steering group was also a key link in the communication process for the initiative. One aspect of this communication was providing the Director of Education and relevant council committees with updates regarding the progress of the portfolio. Conversely, the steering group also had a role in disseminating information about the NOPES initiative within the local authority structures and throughout the local community.

During the period when the steering group did not meet the absence of this communication channel did affect some of the activities projects operationally. For example, officers had encountered problems working across different departments within the council. The re-instatement of the steering group was viewed as extremely positive in allowing these problems to be addressed at a corporate level. Problems were now shared ‘openly’ and ‘honestly’ within the steering group which could then provide a lead in developing cross-departmental solutions.

The remit of the NOPES Portfolio Manager had also developed to one that linked well with the revised role of the steering group. Originally the NOPES portfolio manager’s role had been envisaged as one which was primarily concerned with the activities projects. Subsequently, this role has developed into one that encompasses both the facilities and activities strands. It involves both co-ordination across the individual projects and reporting back to the steering group on progress. The evaluation team saw the role of portfolio manager as a vital one at the time of the initial visit. Projects were still developing operational plans and the portfolio manager played an important role in supporting this, as well as providing a co-ordinating link between projects and with the steering group.

7.5.3.3 Vision for programme

The local authority aimed to use the NOPES funding in a ‘strategic way to reach [the council’s] aims’ which it was believed ‘mirrored’ the aims of the Fund. One interviewee commented that the Fund’s aims for the initiative had sufficient flexibility to allow this integration to occur. This, the interviewee believed, was a feature which had not been apparent in the Out of School Hours initiative.

Two strands of the local authority’s vision for the portfolio were apparent and both linked with the Fund’s desired NOPES outcomes. One part of the vision was the development of opportunities for participation in sport and physical activity. It was hoped that the NOPES initiative would contribute to the development of pathways whereby young people could continue their own involvement in sport and physical activity at whatever level they chose and their ability allowed.

The second strand of the vision emphasised the educational and wider social outcomes of the initiative. The contribution of sporting opportunities towards realising the educational vision set out in the council’s ‘Raising Achievement’
policy was viewed as a key outcome of the initiative. Furthermore, the initiative was seen as contributing towards other wider agendas such as health, inclusion and combating deprivation.

Dependent on their particular role, different interviewees emphasised different aspects of the local authority’s vision for the NOPES initiative. One interviewee actually highlighted this point and commented that while a more integrated vision was emerging there was still a ‘need to get [the vision] clearer and maybe more focused’. The evaluation team, while recognising the importance of this point with regard to the development of programmes, do view the local authority’s broad vision as well-matched to the Fund’s own vision for the NOPES initiative.

7.5.3.4 Choice of projects

The council had decided that NOPES would be a ‘corporate initiative led by Education [Department]’. As such, the choice of projects, particularly in the facilities strand, was mainly determined within the Education Department. This decision was then presented to other departments who were described, by an Education representative, as ‘very happy with it’.

However, the choice of facilities projects was by no means an easy one for the Education Department. A strategic decision was taken to concentrate funding at a small number of sites, mainly based at three Sports Comprehensive schools. This alternative was preferred to spreading funding more widely, and thinly, as it was thought it would ‘benefit [the local authority area] in a much greater way’. However, interviewees suggested that there had been difficulties overcoming the objections of schools and others who, when they became aware of the money available, wanted facilities based at their own site.

It is apparent that the choice of activities projects was taken for more pragmatic reasons. For example, the activities funding allocated to outdoor education was required to service the new facilities that were being built through the facilities strand. Similarly, the mainstream sports development style project was a continuation of a Fund Out of School Hours project. The requirement that at least 40% of funding had to be allocated to Active Steps also ensured that a new project had to be created since the local authority had not undertaken activities of this type previously.

7.5.3.5 Links with other strategic plans

As noted earlier the NOPES initiative was intrinsically linked to the Education Department’s ‘Raising Achievement’ policy. This policy promoted personal development through education and recognised the importance of attitude, self-belief and motivation to young people’s educational achievement. The policy emphasised the role that sport and physical activity could play in realising these objectives. Therefore, the NOPES initiative and its aims provided an excellent match with the ethos of the Raising Achievement policy.
It was also recognised that the NOPES initiative contributed to and linked with a number of different agendas and plans including:-

- the PE and sports strategy which has a renewed focus on links between extra-curricular and community activities
- the contribution of sport and physical activity to the national and local health agenda
- the planning of NOPES activities taking into consideration local transport policy
- the Active Steps project contributing not only to the national youth crime agenda but also to a draft local authority inclusion strategy.

7.5.3.6 Partnership

Interviewees described how in the past there had not been a strong ethos of partnership working at a corporate level between council departments, particularly with respect to Education and Community Services. However, it was acknowledged that improvements in these relationships had been apparent recently and the advent of the NOPES initiative had played a role in this improvement.

Furthermore, it was believed, that the benefits of these corporate partnerships would filter down through departments to allow better operational collaborative working. Some local examples of this were already apparent with one interviewee citing, for example, a ‘major shift’ in understanding between schools and leisure centre managers. This is an extremely encouraging development and it is pleasing to see the NOPES initiative contributing to wider positive change within the local authority.

There was also a commitment to develop links between the individual NOPES projects. At the time of the evaluation visit it was recognised that this aspect had not been developed to its full potential as yet. It was hoped that by building communication between projects, awareness of the aims of individual projects would be developed providing a basis for cooperation. However, there were some early examples of collaboration, for example projects working together on holiday programmes and Sports Comprehensives sharing examples of effective practice.

7.5.3.7 Sustainability

The council was described as having a ‘good track record’ in making projects sustainable. In general and with regard to NOPES, the council saw ‘no point of an initiative that is good for a couple of years and goes away’. It was hoped that structures would be developed which would allow as much of the initiative as possible to be mainline funded after the completion of NOPES funding. However, it was recognised that this would be difficult considering the scale of the activities programme.

Therefore, other methods of sustainability would be important. Funding could be sought from other sources and through income generation. Furthermore, it was viewed as important that projects developed a ‘culture’ and ‘ethos’ of
activity which would benefit the local authority area in the longer term and encourage others to continue the delivery of activities.

7.5.4 Facilities Programme

7.5.4.1 Introduction

Four of the five facilities projects are based at three schools that had been given the status of ‘Sports Comprehensives’ by the local authority. Although no specific evaluation of these projects was undertaken on the first visit, these facilities projects and the Sports Comprehensives in general were given such prominence in interviews that it is worthwhile to provide some detail about the schools and the facilities. This descriptive section will report on the Sports Comprehensives projects collectively rather than individually. No conclusions or assessment of progress will be offered on these facilities projects at this stage.

Three Sports Comprehensives were set up in August 2003 as a pilot project supported by funding from the council and the Scottish Executive. The model for the Sports Comprehensives was based on the concept of Sports Colleges in England and the council had worked with a number of English Sports Colleges over a period of a year to develop the concept for implementation in Scotland.

Facilities to be built at each of the three schools were:

- a new build 4-court sports hall with 3 sets of changing rooms and a fitness room / club room
- conversion of 3-court to 4-court sports hall with disabled access with a total refurbishment of changing rooms and gyms. Second project at the school provides a new community entrance, dance studio and fitness suite.
- an extension to existing 3-court sports barn including 3 sets of changing rooms, new fitness room, storage room, club room and access.

7.5.4.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Planning

The Sports Comprehensive schools had previously been regular comprehensive schools in the local authority area. One interview believed that the comprehensive system, while still being appropriate, had become jaded and, possibly, was affected by working to the ‘lowest common denominator’. The objective of the Sports Comprehensives pilot was therefore to infuse these schools with a new ethos which focused on participation for all and created a sense of belonging.
In particular, the Sports Comprehensives aimed to impact on three areas:–

- Curricular delivery in the secondary and associated primary schools
- Out of School Hours activities
- Development of community based activities (taken from Sports Comprehensives pamphlet)

By developing these areas the council hoped to address a broad range of ‘key’ outcomes such as increasing pupils’ self-esteem.

When first developing the concept of Sports Comprehensives, the local authority asked schools to volunteer to become part of the pilot. From the schools that volunteered, three were strategically chosen to become Sports Comprehensives. One particular factor in the final choice was to place the Sports Comprehensives in different geographical areas of the local authority. This has lead to one Sports Comprehensive being based in one of the most deprived areas in Scotland while another is in a more affluent area.

As described in Section 7.4.3, a strategic decision was made to place the NOPES facilities projects, apart from the fast track project, at the Sports Comprehensives. By doing so the new facilities would not only provide a ‘boost’ for schools and communities that the council would have been unable to do, but also support the Sports Comprehensives pilot. This was particularly important for one of the schools involved as facilities at that site had been ‘diabolical’ and, it was believed, the Sports Comprehensive may have ‘struggled a bit’ without new investment in the facilities.

The choice of the particular facilities to be built at each school was dependent on the particular needs of the schools. However, in order to allow the delivery of alternative activities the local authority had stated that each Sports Comprehensive had to have a fitness suite and dance studio which affected the choice of facilities projects. The construction of the NOPES projects would mean that, as one interviewee stated, the facilities at the schools would ‘match the ability and the quality of staff’ at the school.

Project Management

There was a particular strong management structure in place for the management of the Sports Comprehensives pilot. Overall there was a steering group overseeing the pilot. This steering group consisted of:–

- the Director of Education
- the Headteacher and Head of PE from each of the three schools
- the council’s Physical Education Advisor
- a representative of sportscotland.

The group had a role monitoring and evaluating the development of the Sports Comprehensive pilot. Furthermore, an external evaluation of the pilot will be undertaken under the auspices of the Scottish Executive.

Hierarchically beneath this steering group, local community management groups were being developed at each Sports Comprehensive. The advent of
the NOPES facilities had been a catalyst for the instigation of these groups which, at the Fund’s request, were now governed by formal partnership agreements. The council’s Physical Education Advisor and the NOPES Portfolio Manager were members on all three local management groups as were different representatives of the Community Services department. Further members of these groups were members of the local community and users of the school’s community facilities.

These local community management groups were responsible for the community operation of the school’s sport facilities, including the NOPES facilities, after the end of the school day. These groups’ responsibilities included the financial implications of opening the facilities for wider community use in the evenings. This was a significant change from the previous arrangement whereby Community Services managed the buildings in the evenings. Interviewees viewed the advent of local community management as leading to increased ownership of the facilities and more strategic development of services (as opposed to the previous system whereby there was ad-hoc booking of facilities by recreational groups). The evaluation team see this change in management structures as a courageous decision by the local authority which if successful will have benefits for the long term development of the facilities and their local communities.

Links with local authority plans

The Sports Comprehensive concept was intrinsically linked to the local authority’s ‘Raising Achievement’ strategy. The idea behind Sports Comprehensives matched that of the local authority’s strategy which ‘emphasised using sport or art or music … as a medium for general personal development and raising achievement’. Furthermore Sports Comprehensives were seen as fitting in well with the council’s corporate health agenda.

Project Sustainability

There are two facets to the sustainability of the facilities projects: building and programme sustainability. Of the two, building sustainability is easiest to ensure as this has been integrated into the on-going maintenance costs of the schools at which the facility are based. The sustainability of community programmes will primarily be the responsibility of the local community management groups although they will have the support of the Education department and professional staff to ensure this. Business plans have been developed for each of the facilities, in consultation with the local community, which address the financial implications of community use of the facility. It was also acknowledged that the local community management groups would be able to apply for funding for community programmes from sources which the local authority itself could not access.
7.5.5 Activities Project 1

7.5.5.1 Introduction

Activities project 1 is the only project in the case study authority funded through the Active Steps activities strand. As such the project receives NOPES funding of approximately £1.4 million representing 53% of the authority’s activities programme allocation.

The project has three distinct strands:
- an outdoor education element offering, for example, kayaking, climbing and snowboarding
- general sports activities offered within local community facilities
- the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme.

Development officers for each of these strands were appointed in November 2003 alongside a co-ordinator for the project.

7.5.5.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

The project was line managed through the Community Services department. It was hoped that this management structure would enable the project to link strategically into both the Community Services and Social Work Departments. The creation of a new Children and Young People Team within Community Services aided this process of integration and partnership.

Both the project co-ordinator and the line manager from Community Services were members of the overall NOPES steering group. It was recognised that the steering group would play a role in monitoring the progress of the project. However, interviewees were unsure at this early stage as to what other roles the steering group may play in relation to the project.

Links with other programmes, plans and structures

Linking with other organisations was key to the success of the project as this was the conduit through which many young people would be referred to the project. Also with the project’s co-ordinator being new to the council, such links provided a source of knowledge and experience which could be tapped into. As such much of the early work of the project had been focused on building relationships with other workers and organisations.

In line with good partnership practice, the project was keen to ensure that the basis for links with other organisations was clear at the outset. Following a presentation to introduce the project, other organisations were supplied with a pack that explained in a simple terms possible partnership arrangements including, for example, criteria for young people’s involvement. This was followed up by further meetings to discuss ‘individual groups’ backgrounds, needs, external support, roles and responsibilities of staff [and] aims and
objectives.’ This was supported by a partnership agreement which covered each of these areas.

Such links were firstly developed with the organisations within the Education and Social Work Departments likely to be ‘big players’ in the project. One example of this was the link with Home School Partnership Officers project which had been recently established in each of the Secondary Schools in the authority. This partnership was potentially very positive for the project since it offered a direct link into secondary schools. Furthermore, the close alignment between aims and target groups of both projects would add to the strength of the partnership.

The project had also identified and were approaching other potential partnership organisations. These organisations included Apex (who work with offenders, ex-offenders and young people at risk), Barnardos and voluntary organisations addressing health, drug and alcohol issues.

Project Planning and Consultation with Stakeholders

Planning for the whole project had changed somewhat since the original application process. For example, rather than pilot the project in four schools initially the project was now working with a broader range of schools. This was due to the employment of the Home School Partnership Officers which had not been anticipated at the time of the application process. These officers allowed easier and more direct links to be made with all schools.

Planning for the implementation of activities was intimately connected to the consultation with the partners involved. Initial partnership agreements covered the timescales for the programme and the type of activities to be delivered. The advice of key workers from the partnership was very important to developing the programme because it was recognised that they had more detailed knowledge of the needs of the young people to be involved. So, for example, key workers would comment as to whether integration of young people into mainstream activities was appropriate.

Key workers from partnership organisations would also be involved in a review of programmes halfway through implementation. This would ensure that the programme was meeting the aims and objectives that were identified at the outset and reaching the expectations of both organisations. As with the development of partnership agreements governing the programmes, this review process was viewed by the evaluation team as important in ensuring that partnerships successfully delivered the desired outcomes.

Young people were also involved in the development of programmes. The young people involved were described as ‘fairly vocal’ in expressing what activities they wished to participate in. Although the activities would be kept ‘as close possible to what [young people] would like to do’, interviewees recognised that often these views would have to be moderated by officers to ensure that ‘a bit of realism [was] involved’. In the future this process of consultation with young people would be formalised and individualised by the
introduction across the council of Individual Learning Plans as suggested by an HMI inspection. This development would also support collection of evidence against set targets and objectives for young people.

Project Sustainability

There were a number of opinions as to how the programmes that the project delivers may be sustained. It was suggested by one interviewee that in the future the project may be mainline funded through Social Work and the Youth Justice Strategy. It was realised that this was obviously dependent on provision of evidence demonstrating the success of the project.

Other officers more directly involved in the project stressed a more community based approach to ensuring sustainability. Emphasising this approach one interviewee stated that the approach across community development was ‘changing from [direct] provision … to community capacity building’. As such the project was recruiting young volunteers who would be supported to provide activities in their own communities. Similarly, interviewees outlined plans for Duke of Edinburgh participants to be involved with community work. Such plans would involve a considerable commitment of support over an extended time period to ensure a high level of sustainability.

Finally, changing the culture within council departments was seen as another route to sustainability. Given the impetus provided by the project, it was hoped that in future Children’s Units, Youth Justice Teams and others would include sport and physical activity within their own care and action plans. This option would still require some support to actually provide the activities identified.

7.5.5.3 Impact on Participation

Aims and Objectives

The main aim of the project was to develop services for and effect change within a particular target group. With regard to participation in particular, it was acknowledged that the ‘young people who are involved [with the project] haven’t particularly done anything in the past’. This idea was supported by evidence that the project had collected from the young people who in the main had not been involved in structured physical activity opportunities outside of the school environment. The project, therefore, aimed to address this gap and also, more generally, change the culture of non-participation within this group.

Target Groups

The target beneficiaries for the project were ‘5 –16 year olds at risk of offending [or] truanting’. Within this broad classification the project was able to include other groups of young people, for example those who were accommodated by the local authority. It was acknowledged by more than one interviewee, however, that it was important for the project not to label or stigmatise young people targeted to be involved in the project.
Young people from the target group were referred to the project, both individually and as groups, by the project's partner organisations. Workers from these organisations would refer young people for whom the project's services were deemed appropriate. In some cases young people referred individually would be integrated into existing groups for logistical purposes. This only occurred where the young person's key worker deemed it appropriate.

Other sources of referrals were through the project's services being built into action plans developed for individual young people. For example, the authority's pilot Youth Court could include participation in the project's activities as part of a care package for a particular young person. Such participation could also be built into individual action plans developed by the recently formed Youth Justice Teams.

A very small part of the project was funded to provide services which were not based on referrals. Where particular behavioural problems had been identified by, for example, the police or local councillors the project could develop services to address the problem. As an example of such work, an interviewee described a pilot in a particular geographical area which had been affected by vandalism and graffiti. In this case the project consulted with young people on the street and as a result activities were developed for these young people.

Sustainability of participation

The importance of sustaining participation, after the project had generated an initial interest, was recognised by the interviewees. Identification of pathways for individuals to continue their participation was viewed as essential. This was to be supported by initial work in developing young people’s skills to enable them to take up such opportunities. Positively, young people were involved in identifying possible opportunities for their own continued participation through questionnaires developed by the project.

Interviewees did feel that the project could play a role in developing appropriate opportunities and pathways where they did not already exist. So for example, where a club did not have room to include new members the project could provide financial support to provide extra instructors.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of participation utilised a variety of methods for a variety of purposes. These purposes fell into three broad categories :-

- quantitative measurement of participation
- assessment of individuals’ attitudes towards sport and physical activity
- a tool for further improvement of the project’s services.

Where quantitative measurement of participation rates was undertaken this consisted of collecting a baseline before the project’s involvement against which future participation could be measured. As described earlier, the
baseline measurements undertaken by the project thus far had shown little participation amongst the target group.

Assessment of individuals’ attitudes towards physical activity, and in particular the project’s activities, was undertaken by questionnaire. These questionnaires were designed to be completed by young people and identified, for example, aspects of the programme that they had particularly enjoyed.

As such these questionnaires could be used to further develop the project’s services. Similarly, interviewees described the role of evaluation in identifying and building on effective practice. With this purpose, evaluation had been built into a healthy lifestyle pilot project undertaken in partnership with a particular school.

7.5.5.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

Aims and Objectives

Interviewees believed that within the project’s services there was a balance between diversionary and personal development objectives. One of the initial reasons for individuals or groups being referred to the project may be to provide diversionary activities. It was hoped that delivering initial diversionary activities could build interest in activities that might be provide a longer term diversionary outcome. However, especially with regard to persistent offenders, purely diversionary activities in isolation were not seen as successful in meeting the project’s aims. Therefore all activities would also include elements of personal and social development.

With regard to personal and social development, interviewees regarded ‘sport as part of a wider change process’. Therefore, the project could also link into other avenues to support individuals development. However, sport and physical activity provided ‘a learning opportunity’ that young people might not get elsewhere. Some of the new skills that interviewees thought that participants may gain were team building, integration with other people, health and life skills, responsibility and citizenship. The link with Individual Learning Plans was viewed as an important in delivering these outcomes.

Strategies to achieve aims and objectives

The means by which the project would achieve its aims of wider social change were a mixture of obligation and reward. On one hand, interviewees ‘saw logic’ in a ‘carrot and stick’ approach whereby, for example, young people were allowed to take part in activities only if they were attending school. These arrangements could, possibly, be formalised by ‘virtually tying [young people] into certain contractual arrangements’ outlining individuals responsibilities and the services they will receive in return.
Alternatively, interviewees also saw recognition of young people’s achievements as very important. The local authority already had a number of avenues to do this and the project also had a number of smaller scale methods to do so. So for, example, it was suggested that taking young people to a football game could be a reward for involvement and achievement.

One further example was given which suggests that in addressing particular social problems the project, due to its status, could play a very particular role. In the case of a particular young person referred to the project due to truanting, the project was viewed as ‘kind of neutral’ whereas previous involvement by Social Work carried a certain stigma with the young person’s parent. This is potentially a very important facet of the project which may enable it to make a greater impact in the wider youth work environment.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Within the council, discussions were currently underway to enable collation of quantitative data on issues such as truancy and youth crime. This data collection may also include ‘softer’, more qualitative indicators and could be linked to Individual Learning Plans. The development of such a system may help the project provide evidence of its impact on wider social outcomes.

Interviewees also recognised the need for the project to provide its own evidence of impact although as yet how the project may record this information was unclear. This was apparent through an example given where a young person had particularly benefited from horse riding activities. Informal feedback from the horse riding centre manager on the young person’s progress had been positive. However, the interviewee was equivocal as to whether feedback at the end of the programme would demonstrate the outcomes for the young person involved.

**7.5.5.5 Overall Assessment of Progress**

The project was very much in its early stages of development where networking and partnership building were of prime importance. It was, therefore, hugely positive that the project had realised the value of developing partnerships on sound foundations and had developed materials to formalise relationships. Furthermore, there was evidence that the council’s approach to the issues that the project addressed was progressing. It is not unreasonable to believe that the initiatives and mechanisms developed will provide support to the work that the project undertakes.

Despite the fact that the project had only been operating for a short period of time, the evaluation team considered that the amount of support and resources needed to develop sustainability was somewhat underestimated. Substantial support for young people volunteering and also for the target group continuing their participation outside the project will be required if these aspects of the project are to be successful.
Examples of the project’s early successes were given by interviewees. The evaluation team are keen to return to the project to learn more about the particular activities delivered by the project and the outcomes of these services.

7.5.6 Activities Project 2 and Facilities Project 1

7.5.6.1 Introduction

Activities Project 2 and Facilities Project 1 are both based at an outdoor education centre on the west coast of Scotland outside the local authority’s geographical boundaries. The two projects are intimately connected and so shall be reported on together.

The facilities project consists of an extension to the existing facility supported by NOPES funding of £537,300 from a total cost of £848,621. The extension will provide new accommodation blocks allowing for the residential capacity of the building to be increased from 72 to 88.

The activities project, which has NOPES funding of approximately £400,000, allows the employment of five additional instructors at the facility. These new members of staff are required to deliver the additional activities programmes required due to the increased residential capacity. Full operation of the activities project will commence once the facilities project is completed.

7.5.6.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

The facility is managed through the council’s Education Department. The centre manager, whose time is spent both at the centre and in the local authority, is responsible for all aspects of the facility’s operation. This includes the operation of the building, staff management and organisation of the groups attending the centre. The centre manager’s role has been extended to encompass the two NOPES projects and there was a concern that this would impinge on the manager’s time allocated to undertake core management tasks. Some support for the development of new partnerships through the NOPES projects was given by the NOPES Portfolio Manager.
Project Structure and Planning

The facilities and activities projects were ‘absolutely tied together’ as the new facilities could not operate effectively without the increased revenue funding.

One of the main functions of the centre was to run residential courses for Primary 6 and 7 pupils. These courses contributed to the Education Department’s ‘Raising Achievement’ policy that included a specific aim to provide a residential experience for every primary school pupil. Before the extension of the building, primary schools attended the centre on a three year rotational basis. It was hoped that the new projects would enable primary schools to access the facility every two years. It was also suggested that subsequent planning for the rotation of primary schools could allow schools from the same cluster to attend at the same time. This would allow children to mix with those from other schools and, therefore, support the transition to secondary school.

The advent of the new facilities had prompted developments in planning for community usage. New partnerships, described in the next section, were being built with local organisations. Additional weekend access for groups from the local authority area was also planned. It was recognised by the local authority that these changes in working practices were understandably difficult for existing staff at the centre. For example, increases in community activities at weekends may require new sessional staff to be employed whose commitment and reliability was likely to be less than existing, full time staff. At present, due to delays in the building of the facility’s extension, existing staff had been allocated to delivering extra community activities.

Links with other plans, programmes and structures

The advent of NOPES projects were a catalyst for developing collaborative links with the local leisure centre which was run by a leisure trust. Joint programming had allowed the outdoor education centre to run activities using the leisure centre’s climbing wall. Furthermore, the leisure centre would provide advertisement and take bookings for programmes that were run at the outdoor education centre. These collaborations were formalised in the business plan and other contractual documents.

Further links were also made with the local secondary school. This enabled pupils from the school, in particular those in S3 & S4, to take part in activities at the outdoor education centre.

Consultation with Stakeholders

Due to the nature of the activities delivered by the outdoor education centre it would be difficult to provide stakeholders and participants with a significant role in deciding the activities that were delivered. However, the centre had existing systems to consult with young people and parents about the programmes to be delivered. The centre manager or his deputy already give a presentation to parents of children attending the centre on residential visits.
These presentations would encompass issues such as medical cover and health & safety and would enable parents to raise any issues of concern. While resident at the centre young people would have a briefing every morning regarding the activities programme for the day. There was some flexibility in this programming if the young people expressed strong views.

**Project Sustainability**

As the funding provided through the NOPES activities strand was essential in servicing the additional facilities, the need for continued, additional funding in the future was recognised. However, at present the precise source of this funding was unclear. Development of a ‘much more vibrant community and commercial use, paying reasonable rates’, as envisioned in the newly written business plan for the centre, was an important source of future funding. The business plan provided predicted income and expenditure for the following two years which showed increased income due to the new usage of the facility. However, no predictions were given for after the NOPES activities funding ceases.

In addition increases in mainline funding for the centre were mentioned as another possible funding mechanism. The fact that the Education Department were viewed as being ‘100% behind outdoor education’ would be important in securing extra funding from the council.

7.5.6.3 **Impact on participation**

**Aims and Objectives**

The primary aim of both the activities and facilities projects, as stated previously, was to expand participation in outdoor activities by increasing the regularity with which primary schools visited the centre. The precise target, of accommodating each primary school every two years, was viewed as difficult to achieve due to enhanced community group access to the centre.

**Target Groups**

In accordance with the principal aim of the projects, the main target group was Primary 6 and Primary 7 pupils. However, rather than have to implement specific policies to attract this group the centre had a ‘captive audience’ of 150 primary schools who wished to attend the centre. Because of this, places at the centre had to be rationed on the basis of bids made by schools and when each school last attended to ensure a fair system of allocation.

Although not a specific target group, it was recognised that the new facilities would provide greater access for people with a disability. This would allow disabled young people to be integrated with able bodied people who attended the centre with their schools. It was also hoped that ‘word will go about’ amongst community groups that people with a disability could now be accommodated at the centre. With this developed capacity to accommodate people with a disability, it was recognised that the next step for the centre
would be garnering further capital funding to widen the range of activities that disabled people could participate in.

**Sustainability of participation**

Sustaining young people’s participation in outdoor adventure activities, after one residential trip, was viewed as difficult by interviewees. This difficulty was primarily due to the distance (over 100 miles) between the centre and where the young people who attended residentially normally lived. An interviewee recognised that there were facilities available in the local authority area where young people could continue their participation but believed that there was a need for someone to have a role to encourage this. It was hoped that the overall NOPES Portfolio Manager could play a part in developing this aspect by building awareness of the problem and developing links with School Sport Co-ordinators and others to address it.

7.5.6.4 **Impact of participation on wider social behaviours**

**Aims and objectives**

Personal and social development was the ‘most important part’ of what the programme of activities at the centre delivered. Some identified aspects of this personal and social development were :-

- socialising and integrating with children from other schools
- developing responsibility through young people being required to look after equipment and conduct other maintenance chores
- building teamwork through a number of outdoor activity challenges
- ‘encouraging outdoor healthy living’ in general.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

At the time of the evaluation visit, interviewees stated that they were looking to develop the evaluation mechanisms currently in place. Currently evaluations were undertaken using simple questionnaires with the young people attending the centre. Mechanisms for gaining informal feedback from teachers and the children were already in place. Interviewees did see the need to formalise and develop these mechanisms so that the data collected could be recorded and used for evaluation purposes.

Previous feedback had suggested a number of relevant points :-

- that teachers gained different perspectives on their pupils through their involvement in a different environment
- young people who did not excel in the classroom environment gained a different opportunity for achievement
- the residential visit was one school experience that young people valued and remembered.
Given these extremely positive benefits, it would be very beneficial for the centre to find some way of recording them in the future so that the impact of the centre can be demonstrated.

7.5.6.5 Overall Assessment of Progress

Both the facilities and activities projects will enhance the capacity of the outdoor education centre to fulfil one of its core functions, that of providing residential experiences for primary school children. The NOPES funding has also provided a catalyst for development of secondary functions of the centre which will provide benefits for the local community and an income stream for the centre.

One key concern, that has been identified by the centre itself, is the sustainability of young people’s participation after they have visited the centre. Development of this aspect will require support from the local authority itself.

It is positive that the centre has plans to develop its evaluation systems. It is key that that the project’s contribution to raising the achievement of young people is proved, particularly if long-term funding to service the increased capacity of the facility is to be secured.

7.5.7 Activities Project 3

7.5.7.1 Introduction

Activities Project 3 is an outdoor education project funded through the Out of School Hours strand. The project receives NOPES funding of approximately £60,000. The programme of activities takes place at the local authority’s largest country park which is managed by the Community Services Department.

At the time of the evaluation visit one block of pilot activities had been delivered.

7.5.7.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

The overall management of the project is overseen by the local project manager of a national outdoor education charity (hereafter referred to as ‘the charity’). Staff delivering the project’s activities come from the charity’s existing and associated staff. Instructors from the country park are also involved with delivery of activities.

The NOPES portfolio manager is the main link and point of contact between the project and the council. He provides a communication channel between the project and the overall NOPES steering group. As will be explained in
more detail below, the steering group has already taken a role in resolving issues within the council that have affected the project.

Project Structure and Planning

The model for the project was developed jointly by the charity's project manager, an Education Department Policy Advisor and staff from the country park where the activities are delivered. The project is designed as a follow on from residential outdoor education courses in the highlands of Scotland, organised by the charity, that 1000 S4 pupils from the local authority participate in each year.

The project is designed to offer a number of these young people a transitional step between the residential trip and continuing their participation in their local area. The programme of activities consists of a course of five half-day sessions each with a group of 10 to 12 young people. The group of young people attending each course will come from a number of different schools. During the course, young people will participate in kayaking, mountain biking and sailing, a number of team challenges and have the opportunity to learn about other outdoor learning opportunities in the local authority area.

Ten of these courses will be organised in each year of the project. In the first year of the project there will be one weekend course, two after-school courses in the summer term with the remainder taking place during the school holidays.

Links with other plans, programmes and structures

Overall the charity running the project had a ‘very good working relationship’ with the council and, in particular, the Education Department. This relationship was based upon eight years of partnership working on the residential courses in the highlands. The charity also already had direct links with a number of schools in the local authority area.

One of the main partnerships within the project was between the charity and the country park. This partnership was not based on any formal contract or service level agreement. The potential for a ‘very positive working relationship’ between the two organisations was identified. It was suggested that this partnership could enhance the programme by allowing young people to gain from the expertise of both organisations.

At an operational level the relationship between the charity and the country park was strong. The instructor from the country park assigned to the project was described as enthusiastic, flexible and had a good rapport with the young people.

In further developing the project, it was believed that other links would be built with a number of local organisations and clubs who were involved in outdoor activities. Linking with these organisations would provide pathways for the young people to continue their participation. The charity was looking to use
these links, as they develop, to provide a resource pack for the young people which would include details of further participation opportunities.

Consultation with Stakeholders

Once the original model for the project had been developed, a pilot of the course to be delivered was organised. The pilot course allowed the young people attending to provide feedback as to 'how they perceived the programme and what they thought of it'. The views of the young people were described as very positive. As a result few changes were made to the programming of the course.

Project Sustainability

After the completion of the three years of NOPES funding, it was hoped that the council may find further funding for the project. The charity involved in the project also had a fundraising department who could also, it was believed, play a part in raising some partnership funding for the project in the future.

Besides this aspect of future funding, it was hoped that over the three years of the project the links with local clubs and organisations providing outdoor activities could be developed. This would enable them to work more directly with schools and the original residential course to present a pathway to future participation to the young people involved.

7.5.7.3 Impact on participation

Aims and Objectives

Increasing participation in outdoor activities was 'very much the aim of the programme'. The residential course in the highlands had a greater focus on providing a personal development experience for the young people. Both the council and the charity were aware that few of the young people continued their participation on returning from this trip. The rationale for the project was to address this gap.

The project, therefore, aimed to show young people that opportunities for outdoor activities were 'not restricted to the highlands [and young people] can do them on their own doorstep'. This involved demonstrating what was available at the country park and also identifying to the young people what was available elsewhere in the local authority.

Target Groups

One quarter of the local authority’s S4 year group attended the original residential course every year. Those picked to attend were described as young people ‘in between’ the academic ‘high fliers’ and those whose behavioural difficulties may cause problems. The group, therefore, consisted of those young people who had ‘potential to achieve and attain more’.
From the overall group of 1000 pupils who had attended the residential course, the target group for the project was those for whom the intervention was most likely to be effective. Schools in the local authority were asked to pick young people who had ‘expressed interest, enthusiasm and excitement’ for the activities they had participated in on the residential course. Another condition was that the young people showed signs of the skills required to access further opportunities within their local community. In terms of reaching its aim of continued participation, the selection of young people on this basis gave this project the highest chance of success.

**Sustainability of participation**

As described earlier, ensuring the continued participation of young people in outdoor activities was the main aim of the project. Regarding the residential course it was felt ‘there was little connection between the experiences they [young people] have there and the opportunities available 100 miles away back at their own home’. The project was seen as the key link between the two elements. The success of the project in achieving its aim lay not only with ‘opening [young people’s] eyes to opportunities which exist’ but also on the commitment of young people to follow up on opportunities. Both the resource pack and the project’s links with clubs and other organisations will be very important to achieving the aim of continued participation.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

The structure of project evaluation had not yet been discussed between the project’s partners. It was believed that the council would lead on the evaluation with support from the charity managing the project. Evaluation of the project’s activities may be similar to that used with the pilot programme and could also involve feedback from schools as well as young people.

The potential for monitoring the continued participation of the young people involved in the project over an extended period was identified. Considering the main aim of the project, the evaluation team believes that this would be vital to demonstrating the success of the project. However, undertaking such monitoring would not be simple, particularly because some of the young people participating are likely to leave school shortly after their involvement with the project. Therefore, monitoring participation with partner clubs and organisations may be the best way to evaluate the project’s success.

**7.5.7.4 Impact of participation on wider social behaviours**

**Aims and objectives**

Impacting on wider social outcomes was described as the reason for the project promoting further involvement in outdoor activities. Wider social outcomes identified as resulting from participation in outdoor activities were :-
- promoting health lifestyles
- building self-esteem
- developing citizenship skills and commitment
- providing young people’s interests as a diversion from negative activities

Some developmental benefits of the project's own activities were also recognised. In particular, integration between children from different schools in the project’s activities was viewed positively. It was also thought that this interaction and integration would also develop the confidence needed for young people to access further opportunities in their local area.

7.5.7.5 Overall Assessment of Progress

The project, if successful in achieving its aims, represents excellent value for money on a relatively small investment. The project was based on a strong, clear rationale that addressed an identified gap in existing services. This allowed the project to have a specific aim around which the project could be planned. Piloting of planned activities has given the project a greater chance to realise this aim. The range of expertise brought by different partners should also add to the project’s strength. As stated above, the project’s main difficulty may be in demonstrating the achievement of its principal aim.

7.5.8 Activities Project 4

7.5.8.1 Introduction

Activities Project 4 is a mainstream sports development project supported by almost £800,000 of funding through the Out of School Hours Activity strand. The project is a continuation of a programme that has previously been funded through the Fund’s Out of School Hours Learning initiative.

7.5.8.2 Partnership Effectiveness

Project Management

The original Out of School Hours Learning (OHSLS) project had been managed by an officer, based within the Education Department, whose responsibilities were split between the OSHL project and volleyball development. Reflecting this split, funding for the post came from both the Fund and the Scottish Volleyball Association. The OSHL funding for this post runs out in June 2004.

In the original application for NOPES funding it was envisaged that the NOPES Portfolio Manager would organise the programme of activities planned for the project. However, since this officer has been appointed the role of the Portfolio Manager has, as stated earlier, changed considerably. Furthermore, the Portfolio Manager and current OSHL funded officer have, working together, suggested a number of changes to the project. These
changes will be described in more detail in subsequent sections. Due to these changes it has been recognised that a dedicated officer is required to manage the project. Therefore, at the time of the evaluation visit, the council had asked the Fund to change the allocation of funding to allow the continued employment of the present OSHL manager. Given that the proposed changes will greatly enhance the project, the evaluation team fully supports the proposal.

**Project Structure and Planning**

The project was able to build on the programme developed by the ‘very, very successful’ Out of School Hours Learning project. However, the employment of new staff (the NOPES Portfolio Manager and a new OSHL manager) had lead to an informal review of the project. As a result planning for the project was now ‘radically different’ from both the previous project and that detailed in the NOPES application.

The new planning for the project sought to build on the positives of the OSHL project by developing greater links with club structures and the community. This sought to address a number of problems identified with the OSHL such as :-

- difficulties in central co-ordination of a very disparate project
- officer's time being spent on maintenance of programme rather than development
- little continuity in the programme with children’s attendance not being linked into developmental programmes
- resulting high drop out rates of children
- large, unsustainable spending on transporting children
- unsuccessful holiday programmes attributed to various aspects of promotion and design.

The revised planning for the project sought a more flexible approach through which the programme could be adapted to local needs. It was anticipated that the programme manager, if the application to extend the post was accepted, would have a more developmental, rather than operational, role within the general strategic framework for the project.

This framework placed a greater emphasis on community development and bottom-up planning . Key people were to be identified in local school clusters and communities who would be supported to develop the project as they saw fit within a general ethos for the programme. The strategic framework also sought to concentrate on primary school age children initially which would then develop as the children grew older over the lifetime of the project.

Within the strategic framework, four to five pilot programmes were now being set up to evaluate the ways in which the project could develop. These pilots would involve a number of sessions being delivered within individual primary schools. These sessions would be delivered either by a member of staff from the primary school, with support from externally provided lesson plans or a
coach who would work throughout the programme in the school. Delivery in this manner would enable the children involved to build a relationship with the coach or member of staff. Furthermore, as opposed to the OSHL project where each primary school had a quota of children who would be transported to a central venue, this method of delivery would allow a greater number of children from each primary school to participate. Following on from these programmes, a number of primary schools would be invited to attend sessions at a central venue. These central venue sessions would then be the basis of development of a community club.

The pilot programmes would also try to build in a number of other features beyond those mentioned above. These features would include:-

- aiming to build continuity through longer term, community club structures
- removing the provision of transport, except in rural areas
- trying to increase parental involvement in and commitment to the programmes
- attempting to develop community involvement in coaching through delivery of training
- involving young people, who are undertaking Community Sports Leader Awards, in coaching supported by mentoring provided by existing, experienced coaches
- integration of holiday and term time programmes and involving School Sport Co-ordinators and Active Primary School Co-ordinators in promotion.

At present schools and children were described as keen to be involved in the new pilot programmes.

Links with other plans, programmes and structures

The OSHL project, which the NOPES project will build on, has already contributed to improved partnership working with schools. Although it was recognised that some schools integrated better with the project, in general both projects had developed a change of attitude in schools whereby they were no longer ‘threatened’ by outside organisations and coaches delivering sports activities in their schools. The links with schools will no doubt be strengthened by the work the portfolio manager plans to undertake in consulting with primary and secondary head teachers and PE staff over the development of the project.

With this continued development of the project, and the extension of its community focus, it is hoped that further local partnership structures will be built. Following the proposed instigation of local community clubs, the next step would be to develop local area forums to provide a focus for community development. It is envisioned that these forums will include organisations such as the health board, police and local voluntary groups. As such they will provide a forum for local consultation and, it was thought, help address other wider social issues. Interviewees hoped to have three of these area forums
set up in the next year. The evaluation team views these forums as a very positive step in community development and will be interested to investigate progress on future visits.

Partnership working was also proposed to support development of holiday programmes. Previously, interviewees recognised, different council department’s holiday sports programmes had overlapped to the detriment of all involved. The project’s staff had been working to break down the barriers within the council so that holiday programmes could be developed collaboratively to make the best use of each department’s strengths.

Consultation with Stakeholders

Interviewees stated that a lot of consultation had already taken place with individuals such as School Sport Co-ordinators, Active Primary School Co-ordinators and coaches to analyse the OSHL programme and how it could be developed under the NOPES project. As stated earlier, further consultation with schools is planned.

After Easter 2004, a Youth Conference is planned which will give young people a voice on the development of the project. The conference will look to evaluate what the project had delivered so far and gather opinions about what services are needed in the future. Interviewees recognised the need to temper the preferences expressed by young people in order to create a balanced programme.

Project Sustainability

The sustainability of the project was a major factor in the process of renewed planning for the project. Community ownership was seen as very important to ensuring the project’s future. Interviewees thought that through the development of community clubs, the provision of sports opportunities would become sustainable. As stated earlier, unsustainable aspects of the OSHL project, in particular the provision of transport, were being discontinued as far as possible.

It was suggested by one interviewee that commercial sponsorship may be one source of future funding for the project’s activities. Rather than getting activities for free, it was also suggested that the young people participating also paid a contribution to the cost of activities in order to support future sustainability.
### 7.5.8.3 Impact on participation

#### Aims and Objectives

The project aimed to bring about a ‘culture change’ in respect of young people’s involvement in physical activity. It was hoped that by getting young people ‘hooked early on’ participation in sport and physical activity would become an ongoing lifestyle choice. This, it was seen, would build ‘committed participation’ where young people did not pick and choose when and where to take part, as was seen to be the case at the present.

The involvement of parents was one aspect that was viewed as important if this ‘culture change’ was to be achieved. Parental support was seen as important if commitment to participation, in particular amongst younger age groups, was to be developed. Parents were also recognised as potential helpers in the delivery of opportunities. The programmes delivered by the project had already been changed, in some cases, to promote parental involvement. For example, activity sessions had been lengthened partially with the aim of making them fit in with the working hours of parents.

#### Target Groups

Targeting of particular groups of young people was another area of the project that had undergone change through the transition from OSHL to NOPES funding. It was suggested by one interviewee that OSHL criteria for targeting lacked flexibility. This had lead to problems both in targeting the young people who may benefit most from intervention and in integrating young people from different schools.

With the revision of the programmes under NOPES, the project would not target specific groups in the same way as before. Instead where programmes were open to young people the project aimed to collect more information from schools on the particular needs of specific young people. This would allow services to be delivered and adapted specifically to accommodate these needs.

A number of potential groups were also identified by interviewees as possibly requiring specific intervention to encourage them to participate. Interviewees recognised that there was a specific problem with a high drop out rate amongst girls. However, there had been some resistance from schools to implementing policies, for example quotas and girls only sessions, to encourage girls to participate. Interviewees hoped that these schools would be persuaded to change their views although the project was prepared to make decisions to achieve its aims in spite of resistance encountered.

Another area where officers had encountered resistance was in developing specific services for ethnic groups. It was suspected that participation in the project’s activities amongst minority ethnic populations was low although interviewees were aware of the need for research to ascertain if this was the case and the reasons for low participation. However, the options available to
the project to combat low participation were limited since officers had been
told it would be ‘politically incorrect’ to develop specific activities which were
only available to ethnic groups.

In contrast, there did not appear, to the evaluation team, to be any barriers to
providing specific activities for people with a disability who were another group
that officers were looking to target. Positively, interviewees recognised their
own lack of knowledge in working with this target group and were addressing
this by communication with a teacher who had specific expertise in the field.
As a result of this the project was looking to provide specific activities for
people with a disability or else provide the required support to enable
integration into mainstream activities.

Sustainability of participation

Developing the community aspect of the project was viewed as the best way
to promote the sustained participation of young people. Previous programmes
were described as good at building demand amongst young people but
having a weakness in providing opportunities for continued participation. The
approach now taken to developing sustained participation was a balance
between providing suitable opportunities and building commitment amongst
the young people involved.

As such developing longer term programmes which offered a pathway for
young people was viewed as important. Competitive opportunities, if
developed in the correct way, were also seen as building young people’s
interest in sport and physical activity. Similarly, the building of local community
organisations and structures would, hopefully, ensure young people’s
commitment to and ownership of activities developed, further contributing to
sustained participation.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Interviewees were proactive in looking for methods to use in evaluating the
project. For example, a questionnaire developed by the Scottish Health
Education Unit had been used on one programme to measure physical
activity levels. Although this would be likely to produce quantitative data, the
value of qualitative information was also seen as important in ascertaining the
impact of the project.

7.5.8.4 Impact on wider social outcomes

Aims and objectives

Interviewees thought that the project would now address wider social
objectives in ways which were absent from the OSHL programme. Although
the project aimed to address wider social outcomes using methods that were
not immediately apparent to the young people involved, specific measures
had been taken to promote particular issues. For example, the development
of activities beyond the normal 4-6pm schedule was seen as a way to divert
young people from anti-social activity. Furthermore, the project’s community development focus could potentially address citizenship issues, in particular denominational barriers between young people.

7.5.8.5 Overall Assessment of Progress

Revising the project’s strategic planning, building on the previous OSHL programme, has been a major stride forward by the project. The new strategy has a greater focus on a community based approach which will deliver longer-term change and a greater focus on sustainability of structures and participation.

The process for developing the new strategy has been excellent. This has involved identifying weaknesses in the OSHL programme, consulting with relevant organisations and piloting new methods of working. By undertaking this process the chances of the strategy’s, and the project’s, success have been increased.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the new strategy supersedes, in some ways, the substantial work that was put into the NOPES application process by council officers and others. However, this is not a criticism of those officers as it has only been since the NOPES Portfolio Manager has been employed that the resources have been available to conduct the review undertaken.

7.5.9 Case Study Summary and Conclusions

The evaluation team were impressed by the staff and NOPES projects in the case study. Given that the portfolio was lead by the Education Department it was not surprising that overall the portfolio had a strong focus on education-related outcomes. This focus was seen to filter down to all the projects in the portfolio. Activities projects also had a strong focus on encouraging participation and either had considered or were actively working on plans to sustain this participation in the longer term.

The large allocation that the local authority received for the facilities strand allowed a very strategic approach to this aspect of the initiative. It is envisaged that this, ultimately, will increase the impact of the portfolio. As highlighted in Section 7.4.3, the activities strand did not have the same strategic focus. However, the activities funding was allocated according to priorities of the local authority and addressed existing funding gaps.

Activities projects were, in the main, in the early stages of planning and development. It was unfortunate, although unavoidable for the local authority, that plans outlined in the application process had to be revised when NOPES officers were employed. However, a greater level of guidance for projects in strategic planning may have come from the steering group if its meetings had not been adjourned for some time after the completion of the application process.
Individual activities projects were very clear about their own methods of involving young people in the activities. Although these methods differed somewhat between projects, their general clarity and quality will, hopefully, ensure that opportunities for sport and physical activity are fully utilised by young people.

Although the projects are, at present, at the beginning of the NOPES funding period there is some early concern about the long term sustainability of these projects. Three of the four activities projects highlighted the possibility of mainline funding as key to sustainability. Although the council’s commitment to these projects cannot be doubted, the level of funding required to mainline fund projects would, as one key interviewee highlighted, be substantial. It is suggested that projects investigate other sources of funding and give higher priority to building sustainable structures to address this potential problem.
SECTION EIGHT : WALES

8.1 Introduction

Two case studies are being undertaken in Wales. An initial visit took place to Case Study H during October 2004. The progress with Case Study I has been problematic. A consultant based at University of Wales, Bangor, Dr Della Fazey, was originally appointed to assist with Case study I. Two members of the Loughborough Partnership and the consultant visited the Welsh offices of the Big Lottery Fund in March 2004 to discuss the evaluation in Wales. Unfortunately, the Welsh speaking member of the team at Bangor was unable to continue to be involved in the evaluation. Despite extensive efforts to replace the Welsh speaker this has not proven possible. The Loughborough Partnership are urgently seeking an alternative partner to undertake this Case Study.

Reports on the data received from the Baseline Surveys and on the two case studies are included in this Section Eight.

8.2 Baseline Survey data

8.2.1 Introduction

A Baseline Survey is sent to all projects approximately 3 months before the NOPES facility is due to open. Projects based at a single school site with a Fund contribution of over £125,000 receive the larger Baseline (Extended) Survey. All other projects receive the shorter Baseline Survey. Both surveys are designed to collect quantitative data, mainly on participation but also on the other key dimensions of partnership and wider social outcomes. The Baseline Surveys are designed to be completed before the new NOPES facility opens. Therefore the results presented in this section reflect the data prior to the impact of NOPES.

The following sections represent the first analysis of the 9 Baseline (Extended) Surveys and 14 Baseline Surveys received from projects in Wales by the 5 January 2005.

8.2.2 Distribution and Return of the Baseline Survey

Table 46 shows the surveys distributed and returned in Wales as of 31 January 2005. The overall return rate of surveys is 32%. Baseline Surveys will continue to be distributed throughout the coming year as projects near completion. The first Annual Survey is due to be distributed in June 2005.

8.2.3 Analysis Methods

Data from the returned surveys was entered into SPSS. A number of tests were conducted to ensure that data had been entered correctly. Following that the data was subsequently analysed in SPSS to gain frequencies and
averages. T-tests and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test were used to analyse significant differences for parametric and non-parametric data respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>Percentage Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey (Extended)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.4 Results from Baseline Survey and Baseline (Extended) Survey

This section will provide information from questions common to both versions of the survey. Sections 8.2.5 and 8.2.6 will subsequently provide results from questions particular to the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys respectively.

8.2.4.1 Types of Project

The facilities at the schools who have returned the Baseline (Extended) Survey are as follows:

- 1 new build and 1 refurbished Multi-Use Games Area
- 3 new build sports halls
- 1 refurbished and 6 new build Artificial Turf Pitches
- 1 refurbishment of changing rooms
- 1 new build dance teaching area

Of the Baseline Survey returns, 5 projects are not based at a schools site (e.g. Outdoor Education Centres).

8.2.4.2 Aim of Projects

The Baseline Survey and Baseline Survey (Extended) asked what outcomes particular projects were designed to deliver. The results of this question are shown in Table 47.

- More of the projects that returned the Baseline (Extended) Survey will have NOPES facilities designed to support the delivery of the curriculum than those that returned the Baseline Survey (100% compared to 71%).
- For those projects that returned the Baseline Survey, improving the range of activities for pupils was more often important than any other outcome in the design of NOPES facilities (86%). This result, as well as that
mentioned above, probably reflect the different types of facility funded at larger and smaller projects.

**Table 47 : Percentage of projects designed to achieve particular outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided new facilities that did not exist before</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve the quality of existing facilities</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve the range of activities</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve access to activities offered</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve links with the wider community</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve the capacity of existing facilities</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide more opportunities for competitive sport</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide facilities to directly support the delivery of the PE curriculum</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (%)</th>
<th>Baseline Survey (Extended) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For pupils</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For community users</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All of the projects returning the Baseline (Extended) Survey reported that their new NOPES facilities will improve the range of activities and provide more competitive opportunities for pupils in their school. Other common aims were to improve the quality of existing facilities for pupils and the community, to improve access to activities offered for pupils and the community and to improve the capacity of existing facilities (all 89% of projects).

Projects were also asked which of the particular NOPES outcomes their facilities were designed to achieve. The results of this question are given in Table 48.
Table 48: Percentage of Projects Designed to Achieve NOPES Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Baseline Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Baseline (Extended) Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1 Improved physical education and sport in schools</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and, more generally local communities</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4 Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5 Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities by all groups in society</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6 Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All projects completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey indicated that their NOPES facilities are designed to achieve NOPES Outcomes 1 to 4.
- 100% and 93% of those projects that returned the Baseline Survey had NOPES facilities designed to deliver Outcomes 1 & 3 respectively. These outcomes are concerned with improved PE and sport in schools and better opportunities to increase levels of physical activity. These results suggest that improving participation is the key aspiration for these projects.
- High percentages of projects were designed to achieve the remaining outcomes with at least 71% of projects addressing each outcome.

8.2.4.2 Quality of Existing Facilities

Table 49 shows respondents views on the quality of existing facilities before the new NOPES funded projects have been completed.
### Table 49: Quality and Suitability of Existing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the <em>current</em> PE and sport facilities at your school</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding those under construction)</td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the <em>current</em> facilities for the needs of the school</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the <em>current</em> facilities for the needs of the community</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>Baseline (Extended)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In general, the individuals completing the questionnaires rated their existing facilities, prior to NOPES, as below average. For example, 55% of Baseline (Extended) Survey respondents rated the quality of existing PE and sport facilities as either 1 or 2 on a scale between 1 poor and 5 excellent.

- Those individuals completing the Baseline Survey, as opposed to the Extended version, rated their existing facilities more positively on each of the three scales. For example, 50% of Baseline Survey projects compared to 66% of Baseline (Extended) Survey projects rated their existing facility as 1 or 2 for suitability for the needs of the school on a scale between 1 highly unsuitable and 5 highly suitable.

- For those projects returning the Baseline (Extended) Survey, existing facilities were less suitable for the needs of the community compared to the needs of the school. 77% of those completing the Baseline (Extended) Survey ranked their facilities between 1 and 2 on a scale of suitability for community between 1, Highly Unsuitable, and 5, Highly Suitable. This compared to a figure of 66% for suitability for the needs of the school on the same scale.
8.2.5 Baseline Survey Results

8.2.5.1 Usage of Existing Facilities by Pupils and the Community

The number of pupils using the current facilities (before the NOPES facilities open) in curriculum and extra-curricular time in a typical week, as well as community users, is shown in Table 50. It is worthwhile noting that these figures may appear high due to a third of the projects completing the Baseline Survey being not based at a school site (e.g. outdoor education centres).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Number of Users</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Users</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during curricular time</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during extra-curricular time</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Users</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The main usage of the existing facilities is for pupils in curriculum time. On average far more young people used the existing facility in curriculum time (785) than in extra-curricular time (156). This shows that there is potential for the number of extra-curricular users to increase, hopefully as a result of the NOPES initiative.
- 82% of projects had some existing community usage which suggests there is a positive tradition of such usage for projects to build on when NOPES facilities open.

Table 51 shows the responses to one of the key questions in the survey, the minimum amount of curriculum time that any pupil in each year group receives in a typical week.

- The average number of curriculum minutes of PE each year group received was fairly constant across primary schools, with an average of 63 minutes in Year 1 and 73 minutes in Years 2 to 6.
- The allocation of curriculum PE time for all pupils was slightly greater, on average, in secondary schools. The average amount of timetabled PE was highest in Years 7 and 8 at 114 minutes. The lowest average in secondary schools was 78 minutes in Year 11. The figures in all year groups are somewhat lower than the 2 hours target for PE and school sport.
- The 11 projects not based at a single school site were used for curriculum PE and sport for an average of 25 hours 12 minutes in a typical week. This curriculum PE and sport usage ranged from a minimum of 6 to a maximum of 48 hours at particular projects.
Table 51: Curriculum PE Time that All Children in Each Year Group Receive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of projects with pupils in year</th>
<th>Average minutes of PE (min)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum minutes of PE (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.6 Baseline Survey (Extended) Results

8.2.6.1 Background Information from the School

Table 52 gives information on the average number of PE and Sport training days attended by teachers and adults from the school, as well as the number of participants averaged across both the whole sample and only those schools which provided training.
Table 52: PE and Sport Training for Teachers and Other Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity based training</th>
<th>Average Number of days training</th>
<th>Average Number of participants</th>
<th>Average Number of Participants in schools that provide training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Netball, Cricket, Tag rugby etc)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion training</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Disability, Disaffected Youth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Training</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 44% of projects created new staff posts as a result of the NOPES initiative. Of these posts 25% were full time posts. From the fast track and case studies, these posts may be crucial to supporting the impact of projects.

Background data from schools on attainment and exclusions was asked in the Baseline Survey (Extended). The results from the surveys received are presented in Table 53.

Table 53: Attainment and Exclusion in Project Schools During the Last School Year

| Average |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Number of pupil exclusions of a day or more (includes temporary and permanent) | 60 |

Secondary Schools Only

| Average |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Average number of pupils attaining A*-C in GCSE (Full Course) Physical Education | 27 |
| Average number of pupils attaining A*-G in GCSE (Full Course) Physical Education | 41 |
| Average number of pupils gaining the Junior Sports Leader Award | 1 |
| Average number of pupils gaining the Community Sports Leader Award | 2 |
### 8.2.6.2 Partnership and Links with Other Initiatives

#### Table 54: Involvement in and Importance of Other Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Percentage of schools which are involved with initiative</th>
<th>Importance of initiative to future success of NOPES funded project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE and School Sport Development Centres</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragon Sport</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls First</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike Girls in Sport</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTLOT Community Chest</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTLOT Capital</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Council for Wales Minor Grants</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Sport Cymru</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmarc Cymru</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Sports Development Programmes</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing bodies sports specific programme</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Lottery Fund Out of School Hours Learning Programme</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Network of Healthy Schools Schemes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Class Moves</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities First</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Futures</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other national initiatives</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 54 shows the other initiatives that schools with NOPES are currently part of and the importance of those initiatives for those schools that are part of them.

- Projects were most commonly involved with the Dragon Sport, SPORTLOT Community Chest and Welsh Network of Healthy School Schemes programmes (67%, 56% and 56% of projects respectively).
- Of these three programmes, respondents perceived the Welsh Network of Healthy Schools Schemes as most important to the success of the NOPES projects with 60% believing the initiative was ‘very important’.
- All projects involved with the SPORTSLOT capital, Sportsmarc Cmryu and Out of School Hours Learning programmes viewed them as very important to the success of the NOPES project. However, the small number of projects involved with these programmes means that these results cannot be generalised.

Table 55 shows the results of the survey question asking the number of organisations that use the schools facilities and work in partnership with the school. For each both usage and partnership, the percentage of schools that have links with such organisations is given as well as the average number of organisations in each category.

- 89% of all projects had some usage by and worked in partnership with primary schools at their existing facilities.
- The majority of schools (86%) also had some usage by sports clubs. However, the percentage of schools working in partnership with these clubs is far lower at 29%, which suggests that the NOPES projects may have to work to develop more widespread partnership arrangements.
- The only other type of organisation to show strong usage of existing project facilities are youth groups (usage at 43% of projects).
### Table 55: Partnership with Other Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Percentage of projects who have usage</th>
<th>Average number of orgs. who use the sports facility</th>
<th>Percentage of projects who have partnership</th>
<th>Average number of orgs. who currently work in partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further and Higher education institutions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports clubs</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governing bodies of sport</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor education centres</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioners (e.g. referral schemes)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community associations and voluntary groups</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA sports development unit</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups (e.g. Cubs, Brownies, Youth Club)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8.2.6.2 Participation in PE & School Sport

Figure 6 shows the average number of minutes of curriculum PE that every pupil in each year group receives in the schools at which NOPES projects are based. Note that no schools had pupils in Years 1 to 6.
Even prior to the opening of NOPES facilities, schools at which projects are to be based have on average achieved, or are close to achieving, the two hour target for PE and school sport in Years 7, 8 and 9 (123, 119 and 114 minutes respectively for both boys and girls). These figures are very similar to those found in all School Sport Partnerships schools in the 2003/04 PE, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) Survey (DfES, 2004).

Allocated curriculum time for PE is lower on average in Years 10 and 11 at 86 minutes leaving over 30 minutes of added PE and school sport required in order to reach the two hour target.

There is no difference between boys and girls in average curriculum PE time in a typical week.

The question on PE curriculum time is complemented in the survey by a question asking how many pupils receive the 2 hour entitlement to PE and school sport. The results of this question are shown in Table 56.

Overall an average across schools of 87% of boys and 85% of girls receive the 2 hours PE and school sport entitlement. Although the Baseline (Extended) Survey uses a slightly different measure than the PESSCL survey, these results suggests that schools which are to receive NOPES projects have a higher percentage of pupils receiving 2 hours PE and schools than the national average (from the 2003/2004 PESSCL survey).

There are no statistically significant differences between boys and girls in either the number or average percentage of pupils receiving 2 hours PE and school sport.
Table 56: Pupils Participating in 2 hours PE and school sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Although there is a drop off in the average percentage receiving 2 hours from Year 9 to Year 10, due to the small number of respondents this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 57 shows the average number of sick notes and other excuses offered by pupils which resulted in non-participation in PE in a typical week.

Table 57: Non Participation in PE in a typical week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average number of boys</th>
<th>Average number of girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worthwhile noting that there is very little difference between boys’ and girls’ non-participation in PE.

Projects were also asked in the survey about the availability of and attendance at extra-curricular activities. Table 58 shows the percentage of schools offering the particular type of activity, the average time that activities are available and the average number of boys and girls attending.

### Table 58: Availability of and Attendance at Extra-Curricular Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Available time in a typical week</th>
<th>Percentage of schools providing activities</th>
<th>Average number of boys attending</th>
<th>Average number of girls attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before school/breakfast PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaktime PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>17 min</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunchtime PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>5h 02 min</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>9h 54min</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend activities PE/sports opportunities</td>
<td>0h 26min</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe walking routes to school</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe cycling routes to school</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All schools run after school activities and 89% of schools have lunchtime PE and sport opportunities. The time available for these activities is highest with an average of almost 10 hours after school and over 5 hours lunchtime activity available in a typical week.
- Although participation by boys is on average higher than girls, the only activity at which this difference is statistically significant is ‘after-school PE & sport opportunities’ (average 89 boys as opposed to 65 girls). However, this result is qualified by the fact that the schools within the sample have, on average, more boys than girls on the school roll.

Table 59 shows the results of the question that asked about the availability of sports programmes at the school’s site in holiday periods.

- Activities were most commonly organised in the half term holidays. (three out of nine schools responding).
- Little emphasis can be placed on the time available in each of the holidays as this represents the average from a very small sample of between one to three schools.
Table 59: Availability of School Holiday Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Schools who have Opportunities Available</th>
<th>Average Number of Hours (those school who have opportunities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half Term Holidays</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Holidays</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Holidays</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>180 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Holidays</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>60 h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.6.3 Participation by Pupils from Other Schools and the Community

Table 60 shows the percentage of projects whose existing facilities are used by pupils from other schools and the average number of boys and girls from other schools that use those facilities in a typical week.

Table 60: Usage of Existing Facilities by Other Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of schools</th>
<th>Average number of boys</th>
<th>Average number of girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Usage of the project’s existing facilities by other schools is highest in Key Stage 2 with 56% of projects having some usage. Average numbers in a typical week are also highest in Key Stage 2 with 12 boys and 14 girls participating.
- The average number of users across all age groups is fairly low and this is a facet that the NOPES facilities may have a large impact on. In particular, no facilities are used by pupils from other schools in Key Stage 1.
Figure 7 shows the average community usage of the project’s existing facilities in a typical week.

Figure 7: Community Usage of Existing Facilities

- Usage of existing facilities is highest in both males and females in the under 16 age group (31 and 19 average users respectively). Usage by people in the 26 to 64 years old age group is next highest.
- There is no statistically significant difference between participation by males and females.

8.2.6.3 Range of Activities Available

- All schools had the following activities available in curriculum time in the last 12 months: athletics, cricket, dance, fitness, gymnastics, rounders and rugby union.
- Athletics, and fitness extra-curricular activities are available in all of the schools that returned the survey. Other commonly available extra-curricular activities were cricket, dance, football, gymnastics, rugby union and tennis (89% of responding schools each).
- The percentage of schools making facilities available to the community is commonly lower than school use. The most common activities available to the community are fitness, football, tennis (all 56% of responding schools), badminton, basketball, cricket, and rugby union (each 33% of responding projects).

Table 61 shows the minimum, maximum and average number of activities available in curriculum and extra-curricular time and also available to the community in the last 12 months at project sites.
Table 61: Range of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Time</th>
<th>Minimum number of activities at any project site</th>
<th>Maximum number of activities at any project site</th>
<th>Average number of activities at project sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.6.3 Target Groups

89% of responding projects indicated they have identified groups to be targeted because of their current low participation in sport and physical activity. Table 62 shows the percentage of these projects targeting specific groups and, if so, the number of current extra-curricular and community users in a typical week within the group targeted.

Table 62: Target Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Percentage of targeting projects</th>
<th>Number of current extra-curricular users in target group</th>
<th>Number of current community users in target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls/Women</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with a disability</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in an area of high deprivation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people at risk</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Groups</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* - insufficient data to calculate average)

- Seven out of eight projects that target any group, target girls and women in particular. The next most commonly targeted groups are people with a disability, young people at risk and people living in areas of high deprivation (25% each).
8.3 Case Study H

8.3.1 Introduction

Case study H involves a portfolio developed by the Education, Leisure and Community Services directorate of a County Borough Council based in the South of Wales. The population of the authority is almost 130,000 of which 18% are under 15 years old. The proportion of the population of working age who speak Welsh is 20% which is slightly below the average for Wales (21%). 1.4% of the population are from minority ethnic groups which is again slightly below the average for Wales (1.5%).

The electoral divisions in this authority range from some of the most deprived to some of the least deprived in Wales. Half of the electoral wards were more deprived than the average for Wales, with just over a quarter amongst the most deprived in Wales.

The NOPES allocation for this local authority was just under £2.1 million. There are seven projects within the portfolio. These are:

Large projects

- Project 1 – refurbishment of a swimming pool to create a county development centre with 25m pool, changing rooms and fitness suite. This will not be completed until 2006. (This ambitious project is partly funded by NOPES (£500,000) with additional funding being received from Sportlot (£1.2m), the local authority (£1.2M) and the County Swimming Association. 18 schools are expected to benefit from this project).

- Project 2 – New Build four badminton court sports hall with changing facilities for schools and community use.

- Project 3 – Refurbishment of an existing sports barn. Upgrade of a three tennis court size hard court area with floodlighting for community use.

- Project 4 - Conversion of a red gra to a NOTTS sports type multi-sport area with floodlighting.

- Project 5 – ATP and refurbishment to girls changing rooms.

Small projects

- Project 6 – Installation of climbing wall at a local college supporting schools, colleges and community use with other on-site facilities.

- Project 7 - New build of changing facilities to support disability sport. Court markings to one tennis court size hard court area.
Both of the smaller projects are complete.

8.3.2 Methodology

This report is based on a desk study (conducted on 17 August 2004), an interview with the Big Lottery Fund Case Manager and an interview conducted on 4th October 2004 with the Portfolio Manager (Sport and Recreation Manager, Development) based within the local authority and the PE and School Sport Co-ordinator.

8.3.3 Partnership Effectiveness

8.3.3.1 Role and operation of portfolio level partnership

With the exception of Project 1 which has been managed separately due to the size of the project, the development of the portfolio has been managed by the Portfolio Manager. Numerous other individuals within the local authority have also been involved as it was noted by the Portfolio Manager that the diversity of skills required to manage and develop a portfolio such as this are beyond any one individual.

At the time of the initial visit an overall steering group for the NOPES portfolio, the Portfolio Management Board, was due to meet for the first time within six weeks of the evaluation visit. The role of the board was described as ‘putting a management structure on an operational project’. It was anticipated that the board will meet three times per year. During the meeting the projects will be reviewed and the progression of each built-upon.

In addition to overseeing the NOPES portfolio this group will also oversee all the initiatives the local authority is involved in which involve PE and school sport with the hope that there will be a seamless approach to PE and school sport within the county.

The main efforts of the Portfolio Manager to date have focused on establishing local boards to oversee individual projects within the portfolio. These local boards are designed to support best practice and to monitor and evaluate individual projects. It was noted by the Portfolio Manager that it would have been easy to impose artificially constructed boards upon individual projects, but for him this would have been an opportunity wasted. By contrast the NOPES funding was seen as an ideal opportunity for the local authority to develop links with the schools that would benefit from the funding. The local authority have worked closely with each school to establish development plans for the projects which are linked to the school’s own Development Plan. The promise of NOPES funding has assisted in the development of the relationships between the schools and the council. It was noted that to try and build this relationship after the facility has been constructed is too late and the financial ‘carrot’ is no longer there. It was suggested by the Portfolio Manager that too many demands for capital related
paperwork were exerted by the Fund which potentially detracted from the what he saw as the key aspect of the planning phase – the establishment of the project development plans.

Previous experience within the local authority has shown that councils have assumed too much in their working relationships with other parties such as schools in the past. The relationships between the schools involved in the NOPES portfolio and the local authority have been formalised in dual-use agreements and terms of reference which set out the responsibilities of all the involved parties. The terms of reference have been developed with input from various sources including the Health Alliance, Community Safety, National Governing Body officers and representatives from community clubs and voluntary organisations. The dual-use agreements are based on a standard template developed by the Sports Council for Wales, which has been adapted for this initiative. Whilst the Portfolio Manager noted that the templates are not perfect he was clearly heartened by the way in which head teachers have signed the agreements, not because they have to, but because they have been involved in developing the projects and are committed to achieving the intended aims of the project. The head teachers have signed the agreements, but these will not be enforced with a heavy hand. The whole purpose of the agreement is to ensure that the schools offer an efficient service and that the outcomes for the projects are met.

8.3.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

The authority was described by the Big Lottery Fund Case Manager as having an excellent relationship with the Sports Council for Wales.

The NOPES portfolio is linked with a number of other strategies:

- The Authority’s Education Development Plan, Education Strategy and Sport and Recreation Strategy
- National Assembly Culture Strategy for Wales Action
- Sports Council for Wales’ Facilities Planning model ‘Sports Halls’
- Disability Sport Cymru Development Plan
- Young People First Strategy

The programme also supports the aims of Dragon Sport, the Welsh Amateur Swimming Association National Strategy, Communities First and other local development plans. The portfolio addresses issues and concerns raised in ESTYN reports.

8.3.3.3 Choice of projects

To select the projects included in this portfolio the local authority used a process of prioritisation based upon the core values and strategic objectives of the local authority. The criteria used in the process of prioritisation are listed below. (These are taken from: Overview of Portfolio- Additional Information provided by the local authority to the Fund.)
1. Ability to link the proposals of schools to the criteria and outcomes provided by the Fund.
2. Evaluation of the compatibility of the proposals to developments outside the school avoiding conflict with existing or planned developments.
3. Projects sited within areas of deprivation or secondary schools attracting pupils from such catchment areas (use of multiple deprivation index and free school meal allowances).
4. Projects with a focus on redressing imbalances in participation particularly for girls, children with disabilities or young people from sport’s ‘poor’ catchment areas.
5. Projects where the applicant shows commitment either in partnership funding or programme development. Focus given to evaluate partnerships with the broader community.
6. Projects involving schools working together to develop best practice and sharing facilities with other schools.
7. Based on a zone approach, projects that would support quality transition from primary to secondary and community.
8. Projects that showed innovation and could be justified beyond the needs of the individual school as a regional resource.

Following prioritisation of possible projects and the recommendations of the Portfolio Development Team, the portfolio was endorsed by the Cabinet member for Education, Leisure and Community Services together the Director of Education.

Originally there were twenty projects, including a number of very small projects, planned for this portfolio. This has now been reduced to seven projects due to escalating costs. This was considered to be very disappointing for the local authority who had very high hopes for some of the smaller projects.

8.3.3.4 Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities

Outcome 4 is one of the key aims for this portfolio. The local authority is committed to collaborative partnership working and has already been shown to be working collaboratively with the schools involved in the initiative and a variety of key stakeholders. Four (5-8) of the criteria on which projects were selected for inclusion in the portfolio outlined in the sub-section above encompass this outcome.

8.3.3.5 Sustainability

The Portfolio Manager is optimistic about the sustainability of the NOPES initiative for a number of reasons. Firstly, the new facilities have the ability to generate income for the schools where they are located through community use. Perhaps more importantly though, sustainability within this portfolio is anticipated to arise through achieving cultural change within the schools. Schools are not expected to simply do what they did previously in terms of PE
and school sport in the improved facilities. The previous experience of the local authority has demonstrated that over three years the whole culture of schools they have worked closely can be changed. The Portfolio Manager believes that any new initiative should focus on the concept of the initiative rather than on the financial resources which underpin this concept. By ensuring those involved in delivering the initiative are committed to the concept, sustainable change is more likely to occur.

8.3.3.6 Monitoring and evaluation

The Stage 1 application for this local authority was based on an extensive research basis involving surveys of young people and a survey of key stakeholders (Sports Clubs and Associations, Sports Coaches, PE Heads of Department, Leisure Centre Managers, officers within key sport National Governing Bodies).

The monitoring and evaluation for this initiative will be overseen by the Portfolio Management Board who will be provided with formal reports from each of the projects. Progress will be measured against the development plans for each project.

Data will be collected within school in line with the agreements that have already been drawn up with schools. This process will be supplemented by surveys conducted by the local authority and also school inspection reports.

8.3.4 Impact on participation

8.3.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools

Quantity and quality of PE

For the two local authority interviewees the impact on the quality of PE was considered the most challenging aspect of improving PE. Whilst the schools had made a commitment to increase the quantity of PE within the curriculum, it was recognised that in order to improve the quality of PE there would need to be additional input beyond provision of improved facilities. One key way in which this was expected to be facilitated is through the close links between this initiative and the PE and School Sport programme.
Extra-curricular activity

It was noted that extra-curricular provision is also high priority for those involved in delivering the portfolio. Again it is anticipated that this will be facilitated in part through the PE and School Sport programme. The seven projects in the portfolio are located in communities where participation is currently lowest and where the barriers to participation are greatest. One such barrier is transport issues. Many of the pupils within this region travel 10 miles to school on a bus which impacts on their ability to attend after-school activities.

8.3.4.2 Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and more generally local communities

Target groups

The portfolio has very clearly defined target groups, these being:

- Young people living in areas of high deprivation
- Women and girls
- Young people with disabilities

The selection criteria for projects makes clear reference to these targeted groups. These groups have been selected for targeting as they are recognised as groups who are currently under-participating.

Impact on community

The impact of this portfolio upon the community is a key part of the development plans for the projects within this portfolio. In order to ensure the portfolio does impact on the community the decision was made not to hire out facilities on a ‘pay and play’ basis. In constructing the development plans for the projects, schools were required to think about who their target groups were at various times. They were also encouraged to think about the benefits of any hiring for their pupils, with priority being given to those clubs who have junior teams for example.

The local authority has also encouraged schools to be flexible in their approach to hiring out facilities so that any decisions they make can be revised if they feel the decision is not serving the best interests of young people.

The first year of operation of the facilities has been designated as an assisted year where the council’s dual-use team will support the schools who are unfamiliar with running facilities on a commercial basis.
8.3.4.3 Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities

Fit for purpose and value for money

The capital plans have been approved by both the Sports Council for Wales and the Fund’s technical assessor. The professional fee element for the portfolio was put out to tender and this proved cheaper than using the in-house team.

It was noted by the Portfolio Manager that there has been an emphasis on ‘value for money’ with the design of these projects and this has resulted in robust facilities for school use being developed rather than high-specification facilities on a par with commercial ventures.

8.3.5 Impact on wider social outcomes

8.3.5.1 Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity

This is believed to be an ambitious aim for this portfolio in which other outcomes are perceived to be a higher priority. Whilst there is agreement that increased levels of participation in PE and school sport can deliver higher standards it is believed that this link is very difficult to demonstrate. Ways in which this outcome may be achieved include:

- Sport being used as a socialisation process or diversionary activity
- Re-engaging young people who are truanting or who are not fully engaged in school
- In some schools there is likely to be an impact on GCSE PE grades
- Many schools struggle to retain sixth form pupils and it hoped the facilities may impact on the decision-making of potential sixth form pupils.

8.3.5.2 Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities

One of the key ways in which this portfolio will achieve Outcome 5 is through mentorship and leadership training. The new facilities will have a dramatic impact on the ability of some schools to provide leadership training for its pupils as they currently do not have the facilities in which to offer these programmes.

Another way in which it is anticipated this outcome will be achieved is through building stronger links with the local community which is a key aspiration for this portfolio.
8.3.5.3 Other Social Outcomes

Health is an important issue for the local authority who are currently developing a health strategy. Whilst it was noted that the authority will not be able to demonstrate directly the impact of this initiative on health it will demonstrate the impact on factors associated with health, including levels of participation.

8.3.6 Overall assessment of progress

8.3.6.1 Strengths

- The extensive evidence base upon which the portfolio has been developed. The local authority are very active in collating data from a variety of sources to support the strategic decisions that are made by the authority. This data set has underpinned the decisions that have been made in order to develop the authority’s NOPES portfolio.
- The management structures in place for delivering the portfolio. A Portfolio Board will oversee the progress of the projects on a regular basis as part of their role in overseeing all PE and school sport in the region. Individual projects will be managed by local boards based on procedures outlined within agreed terms of reference and dual-use agreements.
- The local knowledge base of the Portfolio Manager which is based on previous experience within both the authority and the locality.
- The ownership by schools of the development plans for projects which has arisen as a result of a negotiated process to create a ‘shared vision’

8.3.6.2 Weaknesses/Barriers to progress

At this stage of the evaluation there are no noted weaknesses, however, there are potential barriers to progress.

- The schools included in the portfolio are the ones where participation is currently lowest. As noted by the Portfolio Manager:

  ‘The school’s that we’re in are the ones that will make the most difference.’

  For this reason it is recognised that removing the barriers to participation for these young people and their communities will be a challenge.

- The local authority is seeking not only to increase levels of participation amongst young people and their communities but also to achieve cultural change within both the schools and the communities benefiting from new facilities funded through NOPES. This ambitious approach will ensure that delivering the aims of this portfolio will be challenging for the local authority.
It is anticipated that the potential barriers will be overcome by ensuring that all the resources committed to PE and school sport are managed strategically.

8.3.6.3 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned

- The ‘bottom-up’ approach taken in developing the management structure for this portfolio is particularly noteworthy. The NOPES funding has been used as an opportunity to engage head teachers and others during the planning of the projects within this portfolio. This has ensured that those responsible for delivering the projects have ‘ownership’ of the projects from the outset. It was noted by the Portfolio Manager that it is important that this process begins well before the capital build begins. He believes there is more incentive to become involved in the process before the facility is complete as the promise of the new facility is exciting and provides an incentive for involvement.

- The support offered by the local authority to projects both prior to construction and during the initial year of operation should ensure that schools within this portfolio are well-equipped to meet the challenge of impacting on the wider community. The support offered will involve all issues relevant to letting out new facilities to the community e.g. advice on health and safety issues, booking procedures and marketing the facility.

- The monitoring and evaluation procedures for this portfolio have been established by all the parties involved in the portfolio as part of a negotiated process from the outset.

8.3.6.4 Recommendations for the local authority

- It is recommended that a mechanism for sharing effective practice between projects is established.

8.3.6.5 Wider issues of significance to the fund

- The NOPES funding will be used by this authority as one ‘jigsaw piece’ in its overall strategy for PE and school sport for the Authority. All progress in this area will be overseen by a strategic board. It is expected that this will help in ensuring that the intended aims of both the NOPES programme and the local authority are achieved and also that the aims are sustainable in the future.

- The application process was considered to have been too onerous and drew finite resources away from the tasks (e.g. engaging schools in the process of establishing a shared vision) which the local authority prioritised.
8.4 Case Study I

Case study I is a County Council located in the North of Wales. The population is just under 120,000 of which 19% are under 15 years old. The proportion of Welsh speakers is one of the highest in Wales. 2.1% of the population are from minority ethnic groups which is slightly above the average for Wales (1.5%). The largest minority ethnic group is Chinese.

The deprivation scores for the electoral divisions in this area are evenly distributed over the whole range. Two fifths of the electoral divisions were more deprived than the average for Wales, with one seventh being in the 20% most deprived in Wales.

The NOPES allocation for this local authority was £1.6 million. There are 17 projects in the portfolio. There are 16 projects within the portfolio of which only 1 project is large. The large project is a four court sports hall. In order to ensure that all catchment areas in the region benefited from the initiative it was agreed that the remainder of the allocation would be divided equally between the areas to provide a new facility in each. These facilities include two outdoor education facilities, two specialist sports facilities, five MUGAs, three fitness suites, a PE classroom, two specialist sports facilities and a grass pitch.

At the time of writing this report, an initial visit to Case Study I has not yet been undertaken. This visit will take place shortly. A full case study report will be included in subsequent reports by the Loughborough Partnership.
SECTION NINE : NORTHERN IRELAND

9.1 Introduction

The evaluation in Northern Ireland is proving to be particularly interesting due to the different local government structures involved and the particular demographics of the country. This introduction provides background information on the context of the NOPES initiative in Northern Ireland as well as giving an introduction to the evaluation findings contained in Section Nine.

The education system in Northern Ireland has a complex structure. There are ten statutory bodies together with a number of voluntary organisations that are involved in the management and administration of education in the country. Overall, the Department of Education is responsible for the central administration of education and related services. Five Education and Library Boards (ELBs) which are the local education authorities for their area. The ELBs have responsibility to ensure there are enough schools of all types to meet the needs of their area as well as funding all schools under their management. Another key statutory body is the Council for Catholic Maintained Schools (CCMS) which is responsible for the employment of teachers in Catholic maintained schools and for a number of other, mainly advisory, functions.

The main types of schools in Northern Ireland are:
(i) Controlled schools are managed by the Education and Library Boards through Boards of Governors. These boards usually include representatives of the Protestant church.
(ii) Catholic Maintained schools are owned by the Catholic church through a system of trustees and managed by a board of governors.
(iii) Other Maintained schools are owned by the Protestant church through a system of trustees and managed by a board of governors.
(iv) Voluntary Grammar schools are owned by the school trustees and managed by a board of governors who employ all staff.
(v) Grant Maintained Integrated schools are usually partially owned by trustees and managed by a board of governors.

A number of other key policies and reviews in Northern Ireland form the context for the NOPES initiative. The review of post-primary education has recommended a departure from the current selective system (11 plus) for admission to post-primary schools. A new common funding formula for schools will be implemented in April 2005 replacing the seven different formulae that previously existed.

At a more general level, there is an ongoing review of public administration underway in Northern Ireland encompassing all aspects of the public sector. This process is likely to result in a significant change in the organisations that have been responsible for delivering the NOPES initiative. Review consultation documents have recommended a reduction in the number of
local councils as well as the formation of a new organisation that encompasses the administrative roles of various organisations, including the five ELBs and the CCMS.

Allocations of funding for the NOPES initiative were made to each of the five Education and Library Boards areas in Northern Ireland, who then were required to bring together a range of partners in an Area Partnership to decide priorities for funding. The CCMS has been involved in each of Area Partnerships and has staff in place to support schools in its sector involved in the NOPES initiative. The Fund also has a service level agreement with the Sports Council for Northern Ireland that allows the ELB Portfolio Managers and the CCMS Portfolio Advisor to access technical support and expertise in business and sports development planning.

The evaluation team have selected two ELBs (and a sample of the projects in their portfolios) in Northern Ireland to be case studies. This ensures that the evaluation encompasses a diversity of geographical and demographic features. Reports on the initial visits to each of the case studies are included in Section Nine.

At present only one Baseline (Extended) Surveys has been sent out in Northern Ireland. The report on survey data, therefore, only covers the findings from the Baseline Surveys received.
9.2 Baseline Survey Data

9.2.1 Introduction

The following represents the first analysis of the 26 Baseline Surveys received by the 5 January 2005. With a small sample of projects included in this analysis, it should be recognised that the results described below are only preliminary and care should be taken in generalising these results more widely. All of the surveys received were from projects connected to a particular school and had a Fund contribution of less than £75,000.

As only one Baseline Survey (Extended) had been received by this point, analysis of this survey will be presented in future reports.

9.2.2 Distribution and Receipt of Surveys

Table 63 shows the surveys distributed and returned in Northern Ireland as of 31 January 2005. The overall return rate of surveys is 52%. Baseline Surveys will continue to be distributed throughout the coming year as the programme continues to roll out. The first Annual Survey is due to be distributed in September 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>Percentage Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Survey (Extended)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2.2 Aim of Projects

The Baseline Survey asked what outcomes particular projects were designed to deliver. The results of this question are shown in Table 64.

- Most significantly, for all specified outcomes, projects are far more likely to be designed to achieve outcomes for pupils rather than community users. This is unsurprising since there is less onus on projects under £75,000 to address community use. Approximately half of projects were designed to build links with the wider community.
- All facilities were designed to improve the range of activities for pupils. This indicates that improved quality of PE and sport opportunities are important to the projects.
96% of facilities were designed to ‘provide facilities to directly support the PE curriculum’. This again highlights the focus of the facilities on activities for pupils.

Table 64: Percentage of projects designed to achieve particular outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For pupils</th>
<th>For community users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide new facilities that did not exist before</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of existing facilities</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the range of activities</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to activities offered</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve links with the wider community</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the capacity of existing facilities</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for competitive sport</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities to directly support the delivery of the PE curriculum</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects were also asked which of the six NOPES Outcomes the facilities were designed to achieve. The results of this question are shown in Table 65.

- Almost all of the projects were designed to achieve the participation outcomes 1 & 3 (100% and 89% respectively). This shows that improved participation is a key aim of the projects.
- 96% of projects targeted Outcome 2 which links participation with the wider social outcome of higher standards across the whole school. How projects intend to do this will be a key feature of early case study project visits.
- Although the projects were less likely to be designed for community users, a high percentage of projects (69%) were designed to improve collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities (Outcome 4). This suggests the approach taken in Case Study K, of schools developing projects in partnership, may be prevalent across the whole of Northern Ireland.
- Less than half the projects (46%) targeted Outcome 5, the promotion of social inclusion. This could again be related to the lower priority of community usage and the particular type of facilities at these smaller projects. It may be that larger projects show a different approach.
### Table 65: Percentage of Projects Designed to Achieve NOPES Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Perc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other forms of structured activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity among the school age population and, more generally local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools and their communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of,</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports and outdoor adventure facilities by all groups in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.2.3 Quality of Existing Facilities

Table 66 shows respondents views on the quality of existing facilities before the new NOPES funded projects have been completed.

- In general, schools rated their facilities as below average. 92% of projects rated the quality of existing facilities as 3 or lower on a scale between 1 – Poor and 5 – Excellent. Similarly, 88% rated as 3 or lower the suitability of existing facilities for the needs of the school.

- The suitability of facilities for the needs of the community was rated even lower with 44% rating the facilities as highly unsuitable for the community. This suggests that sporting community usage has previously not been an important consideration in the development of these schools’ buildings and, given other results described earlier, this may remain the case after the advent of the NOPES initiative.
Table 66: Quality and Suitability of Existing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the <em>current</em> PE and sport facilities at your school</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding those under construction)</td>
<td>(1 project)</td>
<td>(11 projects)</td>
<td>(12 projects)</td>
<td>(2 projects)</td>
<td>(0 projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1–Poor to 5–Excellent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the <em>current</em> facilities for the needs of the school</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>(2 projects)</td>
<td>(9 projects)</td>
<td>(12 projects)</td>
<td>(3 projects)</td>
<td>(0 projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1–Highly Unsuitable to 5–Highly Suitable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suitability of the <em>current</em> facilities for the needs of the community</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘fit for purpose’)</td>
<td>(11 projects)</td>
<td>(8 projects)</td>
<td>(4 projects)</td>
<td>(2 projects)</td>
<td>(0 projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1–Highly Unsuitable to 5–Highly Suitable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2.4 Usage of Existing Facilities by Pupils and the Community

The number of pupils using the current facilities (before the NOPES facilities open) in curriculum and extra-curricular time in a typical week as well as community users is shown in Table 67.

Table 67: Number of users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Number of Users</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Users</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during curricular time</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils during extra-curricular time</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Users</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The main usage of the existing facilities is for pupils in curriculum time. On average far more young people used the existing facility in curriculum time (191) than in extra-curricular time (55). This shows that there is potential for the number of extra-curricular users to increase, hopefully as a result of the NOPES initiative.
• The number of community users of the current PE and sport facilities was on average very low at only 7 users in a typical week. In fact, 19 of the 24 schools to respond to this question had no sport community users at present. This supports the findings from a number of the questions in the survey. The average number of community users in the other 5 schools was still low at 34 users in a typical week.

Table 68 shows the responses to one of the key questions in the survey, the minimum amount of curriculum time that any pupil in each year group receives in a typical week.

Table 68 : Curriculum PE Time that All Children in Each Year Group Receive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of projects with pupils in year</th>
<th>Average minutes of PE (min)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum minutes of PE (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• 22 of the completed surveys were received from primary schools, 2 were secondary schools and one was a special school with pupils from Years 1 to 11.

• The average amount of curriculum time in primary schools was fairly stable across all year groups ranging from an average of 68 minutes in Year 4 to 74 minutes in Years 1 & 2. This average is below the target in Northern Ireland of 90 minutes per week. Given the focus of the NOPES
initiative, it would be hoped that these figures will increase after the opening of new facilities at the schools.

- It is concerning that in some schools primary school aged pupils only received 30 minutes of PE in a typical week. Again it is to be hoped that the NOPES initiative will make a positive impact on this figure.

- In the small sample of 3 schools with secondary aged pupils, the amount of curriculum PE delivered was far higher than in primary schools. In each year group the average PE that pupils received in a typical week was above the Northern Ireland target of 90 minutes. Only in Year 11 in one school did the allocated PE fall below this target.

- However, the amount of curriculum PE dropped as pupils got older from an average of 117 minutes in Year 8 to 98 minutes in Year 11. It has to be realised that this result is from an extremely small sample of 3 schools and cannot be generalised in any way.
9.3  Case Study J

9.3.1  Introduction

Case study J is a mostly rural area encompassed by one Education and Library Board and five district councils. The ELB area has a population of over 280,000 of which 67% are Catholic and 31% are Protestant. 63% and 41% of schools in the primary and post-primary sectors respectively are Catholic maintained. The area includes 'significant areas of concentrated urban disadvantage together with more scarcely populated areas in the south'.

Case study J has a total of 36 projects which are geographically spread across the area. They are mainly based at school locations, including 3 special schools but there are a number of district council owned sites and community sites included in the portfolio. The aims of the portfolio are two fold, to increase and improve PE and sport in schools and also to encourage community use to improve participation in the wider community. A number of smaller projects are based in rural areas where it is anticipated they will make a large impact. Revenue funding within the portfolio is relatively low at just over £300,000. One project is based at an integrated school.

9.3.2  Methodology

Interviews were undertaken on the 28th January 2005 by two members of the Loughborough Partnership team. Interviews took place with three members of the Education and Library Board, a representative from one district council and a representative from the Council for Catholic Maintained Schools. The interviews were used to examine the development of the whole NOPES portfolio.

All interviews were recorded and transcribed. Relevant sections of the transcriptions have been used to provide the information presented in this report.

9.3.3  Partnership Effectiveness

9.3.3.1  Role and operation of portfolio level partnership

The lead organisation responsible for the development of the portfolio and the construction of the Area Partnership has been the Education and Library Board. The Head of Curriculum Advisory Services within this organisation has taken on the role of chair of the group. There are five members of the Education and Library Board on the Partnership and they provide a wealth of expertise on all schools as well as physical education and sports development experience. Alongside these representatives sit members from other school authorities including the Council for Catholic Maintained Schools, the Council for Integrated Education and the Irish medium sector. All these

---

1 Populations statistics are taken from the 2001 census. It is recognised that, given the time period since the census, these statistics may not be particularly accurate.
representatives bring knowledge of their own schools and needs within these. The final members are representatives from each District Council. The local knowledge of individual members regarding facilities in their areas as well as their expertise on specific issues, has been invaluable in devising the selection process. As well as the specific knowledge of their sector/district that partners bring, several also have previous experience of developing capital projects and were able to draw on this to the benefit of the group. The members felt this had saved a great deal of time because they could easily tap into knowledge of existing education, sports and health strategies that the portfolio would link to and also the location and type of existing facilities. The interviewed members were keen to stress although they felt they represented their organisation at the Area Partnership there was a strong ethos of being present for the ‘greater good’ and it was the success of the overall portfolio that was important not the success of projects that fitted into their specific area of work.

Although some of the members of the group have previously worked together, this set of organisations were not used to operating together at a strategic level. The NOPES initiative has therefore assisted with developing wider collaboration across the case study area. Over time there has been some drop out of members of the Area Partnership by representatives from particular geographical areas. One interviewee suggested this was due to these areas not being involved once the projects were selected. Another interviewee felt that due to the length of time spent developing the portfolio, the members who were still regularly attending were extremely enthusiastic and committed to the success of the project. They were therefore the ‘right’ people to be involved at partnership level.

All the interviewed members have a clear and consistent vision for the NOPES portfolio within their area. They hoped it would assist with supporting schools, increasing PE and sport within schools and would increase the partnerships between schools and their local communities. They also felt it presented an excellent opportunity to bring together schools, community groups, District Council and statutory bodies to form a genuine partnership where hopes would be delivered and become a reality. They felt the NOPES portfolio was a real chance to make an impact in school and communities and ensure wider physical activity opportunities for all.

Although the interviewees saw all members as being a vital part of the partnership, they felt the NOPES portfolio manager and the Education and Library Board had played an important part in developing the partnership and driving the vision to become a reality. Several members highlighted how the portfolio manager had visited individual projects to assist with problems and the breadth of expertise that the Education and Library Board representatives were able to offer to ensure suitable projects were selected.

The Partnership saw their main aim as ensuring that the portfolio became a reality. Initially their primary concern was informing all schools in the area of the initiative, inviting expressions of interest and selecting applicants to move forward to the Stage 1 phase. They received 110 potential applications and
the Area Partnership was responsible for reducing these to the chosen 36. The Partnership found the most work intensive period for them was developing the scoring matrix, to select appropriate applications. More detail is provided on this 9.3.3.3. A mapping exercise was then developed by the partnership to identify all existing facilities and their locations. Once this process had been developed and projects selected, the Area Partnership was responsible for organising and developing workshops to ensure they provided the necessary information and expertise to help projects develop extensive and thorough applications. Currently they have delivered the 19 smaller projects and are supporting the flagship projects. Beyond this the Partnership were awaiting guidance from the Fund as to their potential continued role when projects are open and running. Some interviewees debated if there would be any role. One interviewee suggested they saw the Partnership as providing a useful basis in the future for delivering other area wide initiatives and anticipated adopting a similar model and, if possible, continuing with the same membership. As their projects move into Stage 2 of the application process the members are finding there is much less work for them to undertake and they are generally meeting solely for progress reports on how projects are developing.

9.3.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

Clearly there is a close partnership between the group members but the Area Partnership has also drawn on the expertise of other key organisations. The Northern Ireland Sports Council has provided what was perceived as a vital advisory role. They have been on hand during the development of the matrix system and selecting the bids to advise as to how they felt various bids fitted within their national sports strategy and how suitable the proposals for facilities were. After project selection the Sports Council have again been on hand to discuss with individual projects their requirements in both of these areas at a more detailed level. They have brought in knowledge of other similar existing projects in Northern Ireland and possible best practice ways to approach the application, building and management process. In addition to this, they have conducted individual site visits so project management teams have felt fully supported in their bid and the Area Partnership were confident they were developing a portfolio that offered suitable sites, where the projects were fit for purpose and offered value for money as well as reflecting the needs of national sports strategies.

At a more local level the involvement of the District Council has ensured the integration of strategic council planning within the bids in their areas. Although specific information was vague, the interviewees felt that during the development of the bids they had ensured that sites in their area developed applications which linked to their District community, health, education and sports development strategies. One interviewee stated there was an increased focus in their District on community collaboration and this provided a useful strategic fit with the NOPES project. Equally within the school sector, the strategic focus is on developing community use of schools and making the school a focus of the local community. They felt the NOPES portfolio clearly linked into and assisted with developing this strategic vision.
There was evidence of wider partnership involvement through the dissemination of information to all the organisations that the Area Partnership members represented. Area Partnership members would report back the activities of the partnership to their own boards to ensure all organisations were aware of the work being undertaken. In addition to this, minutes of meetings and agendas were sent to all organisations who had been invited to take part in the partnership but had never attended meetings. This ensured all relevant organisations had the opportunity to find out the progress of the portfolio.

9.3.3.3 Choice of projects

As indicated previously the projects for the Case Study portfolio were developed from a selection of expressions of interest from prospective projects. The Area Partnership held a number of promotional seminars to give information on the programme, the types of bid they were looking for, and the criteria the projects would need to meet to be successful. The Education and Library Board performed a key role in developing these seminars. Information was also sent to all relevant organisations and departments within the District Councils as well as to all local schools. This information stressed that applications would be selected on merit and would be welcomed from all sectors.

A sub group of the Area Partnership spent a considerable amount of time developing a scoring matrix to assess the bids. This was given to the full partnership for wider discussion. Initially bids were selected on two criteria, evidence of need and step change. After bids had been reduced through this process, a further scoring system was used to examine strategic fit with other existing facilities, strength of management structure and sustainability, collaboration and partnership at local level. The aims of the matrix and rigorous scoring system were to make the bidding process as transparent and fair as possible. The interviewees were keen to stress that they had assessed projects on individual merit in these categories. They were not aiming for a geographical or sector spread but by chance have ended up with both of these. All the projects were ranked in order of importance with the three outdoor education projects ranked highest due to their probable impact across the whole portfolio area.

All of the accepted applicants received extensive support from the Area Partnership through the workshops that were organised. The Partnership saw the workshops as breaking down the application process into ‘bite size chunks’ so that it was not off putting for the project management teams. The Area Partnership felt without this support the projects would have found the application process extremely daunting. They were given advice on constructing budgets, business plans and management strategies and shown how they could link their proposed project into the six NOPES outcomes. As a follow up to this, projects could also access advice from the Sports Council for Northern Ireland as discussed. Members of the Area Partnership were
available to provide individual assistance with any issues. The Portfolio Manager played a key role in this.

Although they felt the application process had been somewhat laborious, the interviewees had not found it overly difficult to undertake. As a result of the rigour applied to the application process and the time spent developing it, the interviewees felt they had a well balanced portfolio that they were pleased with. Interviewees felt the portfolio would deliver on the six outcomes and had a strong chance of producing step change within their local communities. The portfolio was also targeting rural areas, which is a primary concern for the Partnership, together with areas of high deprivation. There had been little disagreement over the choice of projects. The only problematic issue identified was where one District Council felt their area was not accessing the funding it deserved, but due to the strength of the Partnership they have now been encouraged back into the process.

Generally there has been very little disagreement regarding the choice of projects. Any that were rejected and expressed they were unhappy were provided with written explanations as to why they had not been selected. In all cases these written explanations were accepted in that no further action was taken.

9.3.3.4 Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities

Several of the interviewees stated that their vision for the NOPES portfolio was to see increased partnership working between schools and local communities. They anticipated the school becoming the central focal point of the community and being accessed by all. As a result of this vision it was important for all projects to show evidence of community collaboration within their application. This included identifying community groups they would be working with, groups which would utilise the facilities and generally gaining local opinion of the proposed project. There have been some excellent examples within this portfolio of the latter which are highlighted in the effective practice section (9.3.6.3). The project management teams have gone into different aspects of the local community, shopping centres, local churches and asked people to fill in questionnaires. Again the local representation within the Area Partnership has been crucial in this process and has been able to advise the partnership of where this is actually happening to ensure projects are delivering real collaboration. Each project has developed their own management group and they have been encouraged to ensure this consists of members of their key groups to assist with creating community ownership of the projects. It is felt creating this feeling of ownership is essential for the bigger facilities to encourage community use and pride in their facility. All of the projects were good at developing their management teams and bought into the ethos of including different elements of the community on these.
9.3.3.5 Sustainability

At an individual project level the interviewees felt the rigorous and extensive planning already undertaken would assist greatly with their future sustainability. Through the workshops the Area Partnership has ensured each of the larger projects has a realistic business plan which extensively demonstrated anticipated cash flow, where funding will be generated from, and anticipated potential users.

In addition, a good management structure at individual project level was seen as crucial to sustainability. It was felt the management team must ensure community collaboration at all levels to engage the local community with the facility and to ensure the facility becomes a focal point and is well used. Good marketing, promotion and sliding price scales reflecting reductions for target groups were also anticipated as being key to the future success of facilities.

The support of the District Councils was viewed as crucial. The Area Partnership felt they had moved some way to ensuring this occurred by including all the District Councils on the partnership. There was also the potential for financial support from some of the District Councils which again was felt to assist with sustainability.

The interviewees also felt the uncertain situation in Northern Ireland regarding public services, with the current review of public administration, may potentially hinder sustainability. Depending on the results of the review the current structure may change dramatically which could remove existing support for individual projects from statutory groups.

9.3.3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

Given the lack of clarity on the future role of the Area Partnership there is also uncertainty regarding the role of the Partnership with respect to monitoring and evaluation at portfolio level. Individual projects have written plans for monitoring and evaluation in their application, but it is unclear who will manage this and who the results will be reported to. Several members felt the Partnership would hold no responsibility for this. Responsibility for monitoring and evaluation would instead fall to the project management teams and the Big Lottery Fund.

9.3.4 Impact on participation

9.3.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools

All of the interviewees felt each project in the portfolio would have a large impact on this objective. They felt schools would have more time to deliver physical education because facilities would be on site or nearby which would ensure the 1 ½ hour per week entitlement for PE and sport was met (or exceeded) due to the higher profile of physical education within the school. At
the moment several schools have to travel a minimum of twenty minutes to facilities which reduces their PE time. At some of the smaller projects, what appeared to be minor changes, such as the provision of a store could have a great impact on the range of activities available through the clearing of a multi-use hall for PE and sport activities.

As well as extra time and space in lessons, the interviewees felt the quality of the pupils’ experience would improve due to having better surfaces, more room and more time to focus on the tasks. The different impacts were very specific to each project, but it was felt all projects would benefit in some way from improved PE quality. However, one interviewee stressed that whilst the facilities could assist with some improvement in PE, the only way to ensure a high standard of quality was to focus on teacher training and continuous professional development for teachers so their delivery would improve. The new facilities could only have a limited impact on improving quality without this.

Several of the interviewees highlighted that schools would be able to seek support from external coaches and clubs now they had appropriate facilities to work in. Interviewees felt this would increase the quality of provision with expert delivery support being regularly available to the school. It was felt all of these were transferable benefits from the curriculum to extra-curricular activities. The increased collaboration of schools to develop the project was also seen as impacting on the quality and quantity of PE. There would be more opportunity for competitive partnerships between the schools now they had links with one another and the facilities to utilise these links to create inter-school competition.

9.3.4.2 Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and more generally local communities

Impact on Communities

Throughout the development of the portfolio there has been a strong emphasis at partnership level and local level that the community should also benefit from the projects. The interviewees felt that simply having these facilities in the local community, rather than individuals having to travel miles to access similar ones, would result in use and increased physical activity. The value of the rigorous application process is again highlighted. By including strategic fit with other facilities in the local area as a key criterion there is no duplication and facilities are in areas where they are most needed and where the community has previously expected to travel outside to access.

Due to the community collaboration that has taken place, it was felt that the community were generally enthusiastic and aware of projects and would see the facility as ‘theirs’ and therefore want to make best use of it. It was felt the facilities would be open most of the day and would be accessible to the community at times that they wanted to use it.
Target Groups

Ensuring target groups can access the facilities has been an integral part of the planning process. No project has specifically targeted one group to use their facility but rather projects have focused on the need for accessibility to everyone. The Partnership have been guided on selection of their targeted groups by the Fund's guidelines and by section 75 of the 1998 Northern Ireland Act. This states that a public authority must ensure equality of opportunity to everyone and ensure there is no discrimination on the grounds of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation; between men and women generally; and between persons with a disability. These groups have been used as part of the scoring matrix with projects gaining points for demonstrating how they are ensuring their facilities will be able to provide for all of these groups. Examples of adherence to this act have been ensuring all projects have disabled access, surface changes to make surfaces more appealing to girls, and sliding admission scales to ensure those in lower economic groups are not priced out of participation. There was also an example of one project moving sites because its original location would exclude one religious group from using it. Once this was discovered the Area Partnership negotiated with the project's management to move it to a site where all groups could access the facility and this duly occurred. Ensuring target groups are involved has been considered to be the responsibility of the Area Partnership in the application phase as well as individual projects once the facilities are open.

9.3.4.3 Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities

Fit for purpose and value for money.

The interviewees felt they had addressed this aspect extensively in their application process. As well as the expertise accessed through the ELB’s architects, several of the District Council officers were able to provide experience from existing facilities and being involved with other capital build projects. Several of the Education and Library Board members also assisted with the financial aspects and were able to help the projects develop applications that were value for money. The key partnership in this process has been with the Sports Council for Northern Ireland. They have been able to advise all projects on whether they are fit for purpose and have provided illustrative examples of how much they feel projects should cost. Where projects appeared to have been incorrectly costed the Area Partnership have been able to return to the project management team and use the Sports Council's expertise to bring the costs in line with the perceived value for money cost. In addition, all the designs of the buildings have been put out to tender to further ensure value for money. There was concern raised by one interviewee that although they felt the projects originally were definitely value for money it was now hard to evaluate in the light of the rising costs they were experiencing on some projects. They were unsure whether they would now represent value for money in the context of the original assessment.
9.3.5 Impact on wider social outcomes

9.3.5.1 Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, Sport and other forms of structured activity

It was felt the NOPES portfolio would certainly increase standards of physical education. The interviewees provided several examples where the schools had highlighted in their application that they felt the initiative would allow them to improve their delivery of G.C.S.E PE and AS PE. They would also be able to enrol a greater number of pupils wanting to participate in these subjects. They felt further impact was more hypothetical. Potentially the interviewees felt that the NOPES portfolio would increase physical activity within the school and this could have a positive effect on pupils self esteem, academic achievement and behaviour generally within the school. They felt PE and sport could be a way to re-engage disaffected youngsters back into the school or target pupils with learning difficulties. One interviewee felt school attendance would improve.

9.3.5.2 Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities.

The Area Partnership included social inclusion in their scoring matrix. They felt projects were addressing social inclusion issues by ensuring their facilities were accessible for all of the target groups encompassed in section 75. In general the interviewees felt the facilities had been placed in several areas of extreme economic deprivation as well as rural deprivation. By doing this and encouraging physical activity within the community there would be increased health benefits. This has the potential to be more pronounced in deprived areas where the health of the community is usually poorest. Some interviewees felt having a facility that would be open during the evening may encourage young people to access different activities rather than being on the streets, causing anti-social behaviour or being involved in crime. It was suggested, though, that this may only be effective for individuals who were being pulled into crime due to lack of other opportunities, rather than those who were determined to engage in anti social pursuits.

At a general level the interviewees felt the community collaboration and profile of the projects in the community would increase ownership and generate a sense of pride and unity within communities. The facilities would be a place where the community could get together. Interviewees saw this coming together of the community in itself as promoting greater social inclusion within their local areas. At this stage all of these assumptions were hypothetical and the interviewees felt it was down to the individual management teams to ensure these outcomes became a reality.
9.3.6 Overall assessment of progress

9.3.6.1 Strengths

There were several strengths to the development of the NOPES portfolio in the case study. Of greatest importance was an extremely effective Area Partnership which contained representatives from all the key partners in education, sports development and the local districts. The group worked very well together with a common focus on ‘step change’ in the provision of PE and sport facilities and opportunities for young people and their communities. Area Partnership members brought a great deal of knowledge to the Partnership from their respective geographical locations and areas of expertise. The Area Partnership is a new body, but the interviewees all felt they had the right mix of members involved to ensure the development of an appropriate and suitable portfolio for their largely rural area.

A further strength was the rigorous planning process the Area Partnership had undertaken to develop a scoring matrix for the NOPES portfolio. Again this was devised through the expertise of group members who were able to ensure not only that the portfolio met the Big Lottery Fund criteria, but, also it reflected the best strategic fit on the basis of need, taking into account the area’s existing facilities. Due to the rigorous criteria developed for bid selection, the Area Partnership experienced minimal dispute of their final selection and were able to be transparent and informative concerning their choices.

At project level a further strength was a number of workshops the Area Partnership organised to assist projects with working through their applications. These workshops allowed the Area Partnership members to pass on expertise to ensure the bids were likely to deliver on The Fund’s six key outcomes and had effective business plans which demonstrated sustainability through appropriate management structures. In addition representatives of the Northern Ireland Sports Council attended the workshops to assist projects with ensuring they were providing value for money and would be fit for purpose. Following on from the workshops, assistance at individual project level was offered by the Area Partnership.

There were also several examples of extensive community consultation on the larger projects which had helped increase the sense of ownership of the projects within the local community.

9.3.6.2 Weaknesses/Barriers to progress

Similar to other case studies (Case Study K), strategic thinking regarding the co-ordination and support for facilities once they are open was underdeveloped at this stage. The Area Partnership members feel that once projects are open, responsibility for the delivery of the NOPES key outcomes will fall to the individual project management teams. However, through the workshops, projects have liaised and made contact with similar projects to...
themselves and this collaboration may continue to act as support once facilities are open.

A further significant barrier to progress is the escalating costs on some projects. Although the Fund has met all its published timescales for the programme, the process has been longer than Area Partnership interviewees initially anticipated resulting in costs being higher than expected at the outset. It was anticipated that within their current budget the Area Partnership would not be able to deliver their full portfolio due to the continued rising costs.

Interviewees stated that schools had withdrawn from the programme due to the perceived threat of a financial claw back by the Big Lottery Fund if projects were not sustainable long term. The Area Partnership felt the smaller projects would have more chance of delivering sustainable change as they only relied on the school where the facility was based remaining open. Area Partnerships felt it was impossible to be certain that the larger projects would be sustainable for at least 20 years, because of the requirement for community use which was unpredictable and because of the political uncertainty regarding the future of the Education and Library Board in the long term.

The Area Partnership has experienced some difficulty with one District Council representative withdrawing from the Area Partnership because, as two interviewees suggested, they felt their District, which was one of the main cities in the area, was not receiving adequate allocation to reflect the high levels of deprivation and larger population within the city. However there has been continuous liaison with the District representative by the Area Partnership and the District representative has recently rejoined the group.

9.3.6.3 Examples of Effective Practice

The main example of effective practice is the formation and work of the Area Partnership. The extensive membership of the Area Partnership with representative from all the key sectors was extremely effective. The workshops for projects organised by the Area Partnership facilitated the sharing of expertise between Area Partnership staff and project staff, between the Sports Council for Northern Ireland and project staff and provided highly valued networking opportunities for staff working on projects of a similar nature. This process ensured a strong portfolio was produced which met local needs and was also viewed as being deliverable and sustainable.

The interviewees felt their portfolio, with an appropriate balance of smaller (below £30,000) and larger flagship projects was a further example of good practice. Also the delivery on the smaller projects which involved, for example, building additional storage in schools or draining a pitch has raised the profile of the portfolio within the area, encouraged community interest and developed community belief that the Partnership could and would deliver on the portfolio and has thus contributed to the likely success of the larger projects.

The community collaboration undertaken by the larger flagship projects was cited as effective practice. One project had undertaken extensive community
questionnaires and has visited their local church groups in the community to gather opinions. The Area Partnership had used this example as a model with other projects when they were unsure of how to undertake community collaboration.

9.3.6.4 Recommendations for the Area Partnership

The Area Partnership has been extremely successful and is an example of effective practice in partnership working. It is recommended that the Partnership remain operational once projects have been opened, possibly with a role relating to the dissemination of effective practice across projects or in taking responsibility for the collation and use of monitoring and evaluation findings for the whole portfolio.

9.3.6.5 Wider Issues of significance to the Fund

There is a lack of clarity as to the role of the Area Partnership once facilities are open and running. The Partnership would welcome guidance on this issue from the Fund. The Partnership are also unsure of responsibility for monitoring and evaluation and there is a lack of strategic guidance for this process. The Area Partnership require the Fund to state clearly what the Fund monitoring will involve and whether or not the Fund see any role for the Area Partnership in monitoring and evaluation.

A further issue for the Fund is the escalating costs being experienced within this portfolio that will severely hinder the Area Partnership from delivering all of their projects.
9.4  Case Study K

9.4.1  Introduction

Case Study K is an urban area encompassed by one Education and Library Board and one local council. The case study area has a population of approximately 280,000. 47% of the population are Catholic and 48% are Protestant. 34% of post-primary schools and 37% of primary schools are Catholic maintained. Based on the average of ward scores in the 2001 Indices of Deprivation, the case study area is the second most deprived local authority in Northern Ireland.

Case Study K has a total of 38 projects which are based at a variety of locations including a number sited at council or higher education sites rather than schools. The portfolio is designed to improve PE and sport in schools as well as to make a significant impact on the local communities in which projects are based.

9.4.2  Methodology

An initial desk study of Stage 1 application documents was undertaken on 4th October 2004. Interviews were undertaken on the 17th and 18th January 2005 by one member of the Loughborough Partnership team. Four interviews with representatives of the local council, the Education and Library Board, the local university and a strategic community development organisation were undertaken. Interviews examined the development of the whole NOPES portfolio.

All interviews were recorded resulting in over six hours of taped interviews. Subsequently extensive notes made from listening to the tapes provide the information presented in this report.

9.4.3  Partnership Effectiveness

9.4.3.1  Role and operation of portfolio level partnership

As the lead organisation in the NOPES initiative, the Education and Library Board had responsibility for constituting the portfolio level partnership, or Area Partnership as it was known. In doing so it was opportune that the Regional Sports Development Partnership already existed within the Case Study K area. The Regional Sports Development Partnership thus became the basis of the Area Partnership. In addition, with guidance from the Fund, other members of the Area Partnership were sought by the Portfolio Manager to ensure a ‘wide and diverse spread of personnel [which was also] representative of education sectors’ within Case Study K. The membership of the Area Partnership is diagrammatically represented in Figure 8.

---

1 Populations statistics are taken from the 2001 census. It is recognised that, given the time period since the census, these statistics may not be particularly accurate.
Figure 8: Membership of the Area Partnership

It was recognised by interviewees that the membership of the Area Partnership had many benefits for the Partnership’s operation. Within the Regional Sports Development Partnership, members had been able to build up relationships, trust and partnership working which provided an excellent base for the work of the Area Partnership. As one interviewee commented, the involvement with NOPES, and the synergy this produced, enhanced the level of partnership working within the existing group. Furthermore, the wide membership of the group ensured that all schools and other groups have had some representation on the Area Partnership which in turn has deflected any potential criticism of the decisions which the Partnership has made.

Particularly in the early stages of portfolio development, when the involvement of all interviewees was greatest, the role of the Sports Council Northern Ireland in the NOPES initiative and their membership of the Area Partnership was an issue where there was a lack of clarity for some of the interviewees. Members of the Area Partnership stated that the reason for there being little involvement of the Sports Council in the development of the case study portfolio was a potential conflict of interest in supporting the Area Partnership whilst also assessing applications to the Fund. Although there is sufficient strategic experience of Case Study K existing within the Area Partnership, it is felt that with a more consistent input the Sports Council could have played a greater role in linking the NOPES initiative with national strategies.

In the infancy of the Area Partnership there was a significant amount of debate amongst members as to its precise role in the NOPES initiative. As a non-constituted body without any statutory power, the Area Partnership’s role was described by one interviewee as one of recommendation and steering with ultimate responsibility lying with the Fund. This is a role that the interviewee described the partnership as being comfortable with.

At the outset of the NOPES initiative, the Area Partnership was clear that its main task was to select the projects that would constitute the Case Study K NOPES portfolio. Although members of the Area Partnership would have liked
to adopt a strategic approach to the selection of projects, the absence of a Sports Development Strategy for Case Study K and the lack of time to undertake an audit of existing facilities meant that a different approach had to be undertaken. This approach involved developing a process by which potential projects applied to the Area Partnership for inclusion in the Case Study K NOPES portfolio. Although more detail on the precise application and assessment process undertaken by the Area Partnership is given in Section 1.4.3, the key considerations in this process were that it was ‘open to any school that wished to apply’ and was also seen as ‘fair’ and ‘transparent’ to all stakeholders, an essential feature in the context of Northern Ireland. By doing so, the Area Partnership was in a position to justify its selection of projects to anybody who may query it.

Within the process of application to the Area Partnership, it is clear that the NOPES Portfolio Manager and a Project Manager seconded from the Regional Sports Development Partnership have played an important role. These individuals have provided, as one interviewee described, ‘strong leadership’ for the Area Partnership as well as providing neutral support for projects through the application process to the Area Partnership and subsequently to the Fund. The Portfolio Manager has also provided liaison between Fund staff, Area Partnership members and individual projects. This is a significant role, given that it is in addition to the previously existing workload of this officer.

It is through this subsequent period, where individual projects are submitting Stage 2 applications to the Fund and commencing construction of facilities, that the Area Partnership’s role has become less clear. Interviewees recounted that initially it was thought that the Area Partnership’s role would be complete once the portfolio of projects had been chosen. However, as further direction from the Fund has been forthcoming, it has become clear to its members that the Area Partnership has got a continuing role in the development of the portfolio. Although not directly involved in individual project applications to the Fund, members of the Area Partnership have been responsible for providing support to those projects as well as making strategic decisions when major changes to the portfolio have been required. Operationally, this role has not required the Area Partnership to meet with the same regularity as previously and much of the communication between members has been possible through email.

The future role of the Area Partnership, once NOPES facilities have opened, is similarly uncertain. Lack of longer term guidance from the Fund throughout the NOPES process has contributed to this uncertainty. Given that the application process for individual projects, both to the Area Partnership and the Fund, does not encourage linkage between projects, a continued role for the Area Partnership in providing overall strategic guidance and co-ordination for the portfolio would be worthwhile. This issue was recognised by several interviewees, one of whom commented that they ‘would have thought that was the most important role’ for the Area Partnership. Further consideration of the possible continuation of the Area Partnership role is given in the sections on Monitoring & Evaluation and Revenue Funding.
9.4.3.2 Partnership and links with other strategic plans

The NOPES portfolio has both linked and contributed to the emerging sports development structures and strategies in Case Study K. As was mentioned above, when the NOPES initiative was initiated there was no Sports Development Strategy in place for the Case Study area. Since that time work on a strategy has commenced and the advent of NOPES has ‘accelerated the need’ for such a strategy. Similarly, as well as benefiting NOPES through the existing relations of its members, the link between the NOPES initiative and the Regional Sports Development Partnership has supported the development of that organisation. One interviewee articulated a commonly held view that NOPES has ‘galvanised thinking and speeded up development’ within the Regional Sports Development Partnership.

The NOPES initiative also has links with other sports programmes and structures in the Case Study area. The ‘developing and emerging’ Community Sports Development Network may help some individual projects link to existing community structures and could also play a role in supporting revenue funded posts. Furthermore, NOPES will support the work of Youth Sport projects by enabling opportunities that personnel had ‘not been able to do in the past’.

At a wider organisational level, individual interviewees feel the NOPES initiative fitted well with strategies and plans within their own fields. For example, NOPES contributes to aims of the local council’s Corporate Plan which emphasises easy access to facilities, participation of young people, partnership working and heath. Similarly, the Education and Library Board’s vision emphasises the extended curriculum and schools becoming ‘hubs’ of their communities which the NOPES initiative will support.

One area where interviewees recognise links are difficult is at projects where PPP bids were being developed. Timescales, legal issues and providing access to the community has made the co-ordination of NOPES and PPP bids problematic. It is hoped that such issues may be followed up in at least one of the projects to be evaluated within the case study.

9.4.3.3 Choice of projects

As was outlined earlier, projects for the Case Study K NOPES portfolio were selected on the basis of applications to the Area Partnership from prospective projects. The Area Partnership’s role in this process was to publicise the programme and applications, ensure projects had support to develop bids, devise application forms and assessment criteria and subsequently to apply these criteria to the applications received.

In terms of publicising the application process, the Area Partnership held roadshows, wrote to schools and other prospective applicants and placed advertisements in newspapers. Although bids were not solicited in any way, as one interviewee recalled, some bids were encouraged to apply by
individuals outside the Area Partnership such as councillors. Other schools were described as needing to be convinced of the merits of the programme before applying.

The Area Partnership spent a considerable amount of time developing the application form and the criteria, or matrix, for assessing the resultant bids. In developing the matrix the Area Partnership attempted to interpret the policy direction that the Fund had provided and integrate this into the specific context of the case study area. As such, the matrix was described as prioritising projects that showed partnership working, diversity and targeting of deprivation as well as placing an emphasis on enhancing existing provision rather than building new facilities. Within the matrix the programmes to operate within the suggested facility and their anticipated impact were more important than the type of facility itself. The precise weighting of particular criteria was as shown in Table 69.

**Table 69: Weighting of Criteria in Assessment Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Constituent Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Impact</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Number of children (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of schools (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time dedicated to PE (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Use</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>number of users (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>time allocated (5%), range of activities (5%),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management structure / sustainability (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Financial (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Kind (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Area Partnership’s point of view the work put into developing the matrix is considered as time well spent. The development of the matrix tried to ‘eliminate subjective thinking’ in the assessment of projects and thus provided ‘safety’ for the Area Partnership if any decisions about funding particular
projects were challenged. Furthermore, the grading criteria helped the actual assessment process to be simple and resulted in a portfolio that was already ranked, as the Fund required, at the end of the process.

Projects were able to access a considerable amount of support in developing their applications both through the Area Partnership and other networks of contacts. Furthermore, interviewees suggested, the partnerships that schools had to build in order to develop a successful application were also supportive during the actual application process. Despite this support, it was suggested that the application process was still difficult for schools as ‘new skills were required for headteachers … [as the application process was] not something they would have done’ before.

From the application process all interviewees were very positive about the resultant portfolio of projects. As one interviewee commented the ‘portfolio [is] one of which we are proud’. Positive comments about the portfolio emphasised its diversity and range of projects, the mix of large and small projects, the balance between primary and post-primary schools and the fact that it met the Fund’s needs in terms of placing projects in areas of deprivation. It was also thought that the matrix had prioritised good bids from those organisations that would best utilise the facilities.

The process of selecting projects by application and assessment criteria did, however, have some negative consequences. It is recognised that, geographically, projects are more concentrated in particular areas of Case Study K. This had resulted in some ‘hard questions’ from local councillors. Interviewees recognise that the process favoured those schools who had the expertise, experience and ability to complete the application forms well. Furthermore, it was suggested that, possibly, some projects with particular need did not apply due to the focus of the NOPES initiative, in particular the requirements for community use, and the whole application process to the Area Partnership and the Fund. Despite these problems, it is recognised that the application process was, most probably, the only fair and open way for the Area Partnership to choose projects in the absence of an existing strategy. Furthermore, it was felt by one interviewee, that those projects that had the commitment to go through the application process would have similar commitment to delivering the desired outcomes of the NOPES initiative.

Revenue Funding

Throughout the application process to the Area Partnership, individual projects were encouraged to include revenue funding in their project bids. Experience with other capital projects within the case study area had demonstrated the benefit of having revenue funding and therefore in the NOPES initiative, revenue funding ‘would be money well spent to make projects successful’. As such 22 of the 38 projects originally selected, and almost all of the larger projects, included revenue funding into their projects.

The revenue money will fund a number of posts at different individual projects. Through a Service Level Agreement with the Regional Sports Development
Partnership, the Education and Library Board intend to use money remaining in the whole portfolio to provide support, such as training opportunities, for individuals employed in these posts. Given the different nature of these posts to those staff traditionally employed by schools, one interviewee in particular views such support as crucial in maximising the impact of the portfolio as a whole. The evaluators agree with this sentiment and suggest that the best way to support these individual revenue funded officers is given consideration as a potential part of the Area Partnership’s possible ongoing strategic role.

9.4.3.4 Outcome 4: Improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities

One interviewee’s main aspiration for the NOPES portfolio is to strengthen links between schools and their communities. This view is shared by other interviewees who suggest that the greatest benefit may be seen where the NOPES project enhances links that are already developing. Furthermore, it is thought that sport, and the NOPES initiative in particular, can support links between post-primary schools and their cluster primary schools.

The application process to the Area Partnership supported the development of collaboration between schools and their communities. Project management groups consisting of schools and different organisations were set up to develop bids. Applications where such management groups were in place were assessed positively according to the criteria developed. It is recognised that these new groups, however, faced difficulties in developing the trust required in effective partnerships and maintaining momentum through the extended application period.

The revenue funded posts will also be important in developing collaborative links. ‘Robust’ partnerships with the community and other organisations are seen by one interviewee as more important than developing programmes in ensuring the long term future of projects. It is viewed as essential that those individuals in revenue posts, therefore, receive the support and training required to develop such partnerships.

9.4.3.5 Sustainability

Similar to other ongoing issues within the portfolio (see Sections 9.4.3.4 and 9.4.3.6), there is some uncertainty as to where responsibility lies for ensuring and monitoring the sustainability of the whole portfolio. Without any long term monitoring by the Fund, it may be, as one interviewee believes, a key partnership of the local council, the Education and Library Board and the Regional Sports Development Partnership that would support the sustainability of the whole portfolio.

At an individual project level, factors were identified that would enhance and hinder project sustainability:
the application process to the Fund, it is thought, ensures projects are serious about sustainability of community access and the development of projects’ business plans will support this

- the partnerships built up by projects through application, if they are continued, will assist projects in developing the sustainability of programmes

- with the particular outcomes to be achieved through NOPES, it is thought that the projects are unlikely to become financially self-sustaining. However, as one interview positively commented, ‘if they run good programmes [that meet social outcomes] there will be money’ available through other sources of funding

- some projects based at local council or university sites will benefit from having the support of large organisations.

As with many other aspects of the Case Study, there will not be a uniform approach to sustainability across the NOPES portfolio. Rather it will likely be the responsibility of individual projects to develop their own sustainability strategies.

**9.4.3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation**

All interviewees agree that monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the whole NOPES portfolio is very important. Examples of reasons given as to why monitoring and evaluation is important were:

- to be able to learn from the NOPES process in order to benefit similar programmes in the future

- to ‘build a case for additional future investment’

- to ensure that projects deliver the outcomes that have been promised in the application process.

However, interviewees are unclear collectively as to where the responsibility to co-ordinate monitoring and evaluation across the portfolio lay. Again the evaluators believe that the Area Partnership should consider monitoring and evaluation as a potential component of an ongoing strategic role. Furthermore, the Fund may have to provide a steer to the Area Partnership, and possible funding, to promote monitoring and evaluation across the portfolio in order to ensure that the desired outcomes are achieved and maximised.

**9.4.4 Impact on participation**

**9.4.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved physical education and sport in schools**

**Quantity and quality of PE**

It is anticipated that the NOPES initiative ‘hopefully will make a massive impact’ on quantity and quality of PE. A number of the identified potential impacts are as follows:
as schools are the lead applicant for a projects, there is a commitment to increase the quantity of PE
an increased diversity and range of activities available in curriculum time
a 'huge difference in skill learning and, therefore, confidence and enjoyment'
greater status for PE within schools as a result of new facilities
more creative timetabling of PE classes
primary schools may benefit from specialist post-primary teaching where facilities are based at a post-primary school.

Given this last issue, more than one interviewee commented that despite new facilities, quantity and quality of PE would still be dependent on teachers. In primary schools, in particular, teacher training and specialist PE teachers are seen as important in order for new facilities to have the maximum impact.

**Extra-curricular activity**

In terms of extra-curricular activity one of the themes throughout the interviews was the linking of schools with clubs and therefore providing pathways for young people to continue their participation. The placing of NOPES facilities at schools was very important in this regard. The Youth Sport project will be particularly important in developing these links and providing the 'glue' between PE and continued physical activity. It is also thought, by one interviewee, that by developing partnerships with clubs general awareness of coaching skills and opportunities may be raised within schools.

9.4.4.2 **Outcome 3: Better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and more generally local communities**

**Impact on Community**

All interviewees view the community aspect of the NOPES initiative as very important. Through developing community usage it is hoped that sport is viewed as something young people want to continue to participate in, rather than dropping out in teenage years. A variety of issues were raised which are important, support and hinder potential community usage at individual projects and across the portfolio:-

- existing facilities within the case study area are 'underscoped', that is not open when usage is required. NOPES may help to change this.
- opening facilities for community usage is a 'big jump' for some schools
- as such individual project management group decisions on access and programming will be key to the impact on the community. The drive provided by revenue posts, or other individuals, will also be important in ensuring this impact.
the impact on the community will be increased by sharing the existing few school-based examples of good practice. Again the Area Partnership, or another organisation, may have a role in sharing this good practice.

- within the portfolio there is demonstrated demand for community usage with little duplication between projects
- the initial involvement of young people may encourage others, such as parents, to use the new facilities.

**Target Groups**

As interviewees recalled there was discussion amongst the Area Partnership as to how targeting of specific groups was to be addressed. This resulted in the guidance that the Fund provided in the NOPES criteria being included in the assessment criteria of bids to the Area Partnership. Girls and women, disabled people, ethnic minorities, the over 50s and areas of deprivation were prioritised in the scoring matrix. Beyond this, the impact on target groups will be the responsibility of individual projects, although it was suggested that the diversity of projects in the NOPES portfolio would support access by different groups in the community.

**9.4.4.3 Outcome 6: Innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities**

**Fit for purpose and value for money**

The Area Partnership has little control over ensuring the facilities were ‘fit for purpose’ and ‘value for money’. The assessment by the Fund and Sports Council of technical aspects of the projects is most important in ensuring facilities were fit for purpose. Furthermore, it is ‘difficult to assert’ that projects will be value for money given that they are subject to prices in the building market. It was noted that quantity surveyors had found it difficult to predict the costs of facilities until they went to tender.

In terms of innovative management of facilities, the evaluators consider the partnerships between schools and with other organisations, such as universities, in the application for and management of facilities, as particularly innovative. This aspect was encouraged by the application process that the Area Partnership devised. It is also recognised that many of these partnerships are new to those involved.

**9.4.5 Impact on wider social outcomes**

**9.4.5.1 Outcome 2: Higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity**

In one sense it is seen that the new facilities themselves will have an impact on improved standards across the whole school. Physical facilities would enhance the status of the school and the new facilities would, in particular, appeal to the pupils.
However, there is a general understanding amongst interviewees that it will be the programmes within the new facilities that will make the most difference on higher standards throughout the school. As such, one interviewee stated ‘of all the outcomes this is the one that requires most careful consideration of how we are going to achieve [it]’. As such, the design of innovative programmes and the skills with which they are delivered are, therefore, thought to be most important.

9.4.5.2 Outcome 5: Promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities

Somewhat unlike other wider social outcomes, promotion of social inclusion is something that the Area Partnership could and did address during their decision making process. The assessment criteria ensured that projects were based within areas of multiple deprivation. As such, it is hoped that by locating facilities as close to people as possible will build the value attached to physical activity in deprived areas.

However, as with other outcomes, the precise impact will be dependent on the operation and focus of the individual projects. For example, the link between one particular NOPES facility and the probation service will, hopefully, be useful in promotion of social inclusion. The evaluation of individual projects will consider different ways in which this outcome has been considered.

9.4.5.3 Other Wider Social Outcomes

Similarly interviewees recognise the potential of the portfolio to impact on other social outcomes but again believe it will be the programmes individual projects put in place that will provide the impetus for achievement of these outcomes. Potential outcomes mentioned were the chance to promote community development through developing individuals’ skills, confidence and qualifications.

However, as one interviewee outlined ‘there is potential but it will really require creative thinking and creative partnership [at project level] to maximise those kind of outcomes, but they are achievable’. The achievement of wider social outcomes, therefore, depends on the priority given to particular outcomes by particular projects. Although some consideration of this was undertaken in the application process to the Area Partnership and the Fund, at the majority of projects the opening of the facility is ‘too far away’ for project staff to be thinking of how wider social outcomes may be achieved.

9.4.6 Overall assessment of progress

9.4.6.1 Strengths

The strength of the NOPES initiative in Case Study K rests on the effective Area Partnership developed at the outset of the process. It has been extremely positive that this Partnership was based on the existing Regional
Sports Development Partnership which meant that good existing working relationships formed the basis of effective partnership working. Furthermore, the individual expertise, commitment and wide range of responsibilities that members bring to the Area Partnership have added to its strength.

In choosing its projects the Area Partnership developed a robust, fair and open process by which schools could apply to become part of the NOPES portfolio. Given the context within which the Area Partnership worked, this was most probably the only and best way in which an effective choice of projects could have been made. The assessment criteria used has helped to develop a strong, diverse portfolio of NOPES projects.

Case Study K has used the NOPES portfolio to build on and enhance existing structures and practices in order to maximise the benefits of the initiative. Developing the Area Partnership from the basis of the Regional Sports Development Partnership has helped the ongoing development of this organisation. Another strength of the portfolio is the manner in which individual NOPES projects have been selected to build on existing effective practice.

9.4.6.2 Weaknesses/Barriers to progress

The lack of a Sports Development Strategy for the case study area when the NOPES portfolio was being developed is an identified weakness within Case Study K. However, of potentially longer term detrimental impact is the lack of strategic thinking regarding the co-ordination and development of the whole portfolio once facilities are open. The application process does not encourage individual projects to collaborate and share experience and there is a danger that unless projects are given strategic support to do so the overall impact of the initiative will be lessened.

9.4.6.3 Examples of effective practice and lessons learned

Other than the strengths identified above, another example of effective practice was the development of the matrix by which applications to the Area Partnership were assessed. This matrix effectively integrated the criteria designated by the Fund with the local concerns within Case Study K. Furthermore, as the matrix allowed transparency in the assessment process it met the Area Partnership’s need for a fully accountable process. As a result of the matrix, the Area Partnership believe they have developed a strong portfolio of NOPES projects.

9.4.6.4 Recommendations for the Area Partnership

In order to address the weaknesses identified above it is recommended that the Area Partnership consider the best way in which projects, and their particular officers, can be given ongoing support and leadership once new facilities begin to open. Particular areas that may be considered in order to maximise the impact of the portfolio are:-
• how to share practice, avoid duplication and co-ordinate the operation of individual projects
• how the whole portfolio is monitored and evaluated
• how a strategic approach may be adopted to support the sustainable impact of the whole portfolio.

9.4.6.5 Wider issues of significance to the fund

Throughout the NOPES process there is a concern, both from the interviewees and the evaluators, that there has been insufficient clarity in the roll-out and long term development of the initiative. In this case study, particular examples of this are:

• in the early stages of portfolio development, interviewees’ confusion as to the role of Sports Council Northern Ireland in both supporting and assessing the development of NOPES projects and portfolios
• lack of clarity about the longer term role of the Area Partnership.

It is recommended that the Fund considers how the Area Partnership could be supported and encouraged to address its potential role in supporting projects and revenue-funded posts and conducting monitoring and evaluation. Furthermore, it may be that the Sports Council Northern Ireland could be encouraged to also take a role in this longer term development of the initiative.
SECTION TEN: EMERGING ISSUES AND FUTURE PLANS FOR THE EVALUATION

10.1 Introduction

Conducting the evaluation of this ambitious programme across four countries remains a challenging task for all those responsible. The evaluation also offers exciting opportunities to contribute to the understanding of:

- partnership working
- factors impacting on the participation of young people and their communities in sport and physical activity
- the relationship between participation and other social outcomes including health, social inclusion and educational achievement.

The evaluation has made significant progress during the last year. The fieldwork conducted within the Fast Track case studies has been invaluable in both piloting and refining the evaluation approach. The findings from both the case studies and the surveys have raised some important issues which will be addressed during the remainder of the evaluation. This section of the report outlines the issues that have emerged to date from the data collection and considers the implications for the evaluation as a whole.

10.2 Emerging Issues from the Fast Track Projects

The evaluation approach adopted for the fast track projects was focused at individual project level. Although each of the projects is an intrinsic part of a local authority portfolio, for the purpose of the fast track evaluation each project has been examined on an individual basis. The fast track projects by their very nature are perhaps atypical of projects funded through NOPES and yet offer lessons for future ‘maintrack’ projects.

The emerging issues arising from the fast track evaluation are discussed under the three headings which form the three strands of the evaluation¹.

10.2.1 Partnership

The notion of partnership working is deeply embedded both within the NOPES initiative and within the overall evaluation approach. It is apparent from the follow-up visits to the fast track projects that operational realities have taken precedence over strategic aims and objectives. The facilities are being used on a day-to-day basis within and beyond the school day. In order to be able to do this, schools have found a way of working which has allowed the facilities to be accessed by both pupils and the community. The role of partnerships in enabling the facilities to become functional is not apparent.

¹ Note: As full second visits have only been conducted at the English fast track projects, these conclusions pertain mainly to these projects alone.
However, partnerships are seen as being instrumental in achieving much longer term goals. For example, at Fullhurst Community College, the partnership with the Positive Futures project was seen as key to targeting particular types of community user. This is important for at least two reasons. Firstly it raises questions about the role of partnerships in both the short and long term. Secondly, it re-emphasises the value of the longitudinal nature of the evaluation.

10.2.2 Participation

The potential of the fast track projects to impact on both the quantity and quality of PE was apparent to the evaluation team at the time of the initial visits. The follow-up visits to the fast tracks in England have demonstrated that the impact on both the quality and quantity of PE within the these five schools has been dramatic. This impact is recognised by both staff and young people within these settings. In addition the facilities have had a very positive impact on the provision of extra-curricular activities.

This finding is welcome but it raises a number of issues for the evaluation. Firstly, whilst staff and young people were very vocal about the impact the new facilities have had on PE and extra-curricular activities, this was not well supported by documentary evidence. Despite being asked to provide the figures which supported these impact claims, schools were not able to provide this evidence readily. Documenting change is not embedded within their normal practice. This is not unexpected but is a concern. If schools cannot provide evidence, there is a real danger that much of the impact of NOPES may go unrecorded.

Another issue which the evaluation will need to address is to examine the ways in which these changes are sustainable. Is there a ‘honeymoon period’ after the facility opens or can this enthusiasm and impact be maintained over the long term and, if so, how will it evolve?

The impact on participation within the community was always going to be a far bigger challenge for projects than impacting on pupils and this has proven to be the case with the fast track projects. Projects face a number of challenges in terms of ensuring that the new facilities have an impact on the local community and even more challenges in bringing about longer-term change. The term ‘community’ has been interpreted very widely by both those involved in delivering the NOPES initiative and by the evaluators and this is an issue which will be explored in greater detail.

10.2.3 Impact on wider social outcomes

Assessing the impact of the NOPES initiative on wider social outcomes has been recognised by the evaluation team as being a challenging aspect of the evaluation. The evaluation of the fast track projects so far has supported this belief.
Individuals based within individual projects have their own views on how they feel their project may impact on wider social outcomes but this is very rarely articulated beyond a notion that an outcome may be possible in the long term. The benefits of increased participation for its own sake appear to be well understood by projects but the links between increased participation and wider social outcomes are based on individuals’ generalised assumptions about the benefits of sport and exercise. This is not unexpected as it is representative of an issue recognised as prevalent in the wider sport and leisure environment (ODPM, 2004). The schools have faced a number of challenges getting facilities operating and thus the day to day operational demands have taken precedence over long term goals in the short period that fast track projects have been operating.

The need for projects to generate income in the long term is one that was very apparent during the visits to the fast track projects. Whilst projects may have a strategic vision for the way in which they wish to progress there is a very real need to generate income. Again, this was not unexpected but it has implications for the evaluation process. Achieving wider social outcomes is a long term goal which may well be delayed by decisions aimed at generating income.

A final complication for assessing the impact of the NOPES initiative on wider social outcomes is that each of the schools where the fast track projects are based are engaged in a number of different initiatives simultaneously.

10.2.4 Resources

There is a great deal of variation between projects in the resources, both financial and non-financial, available to fast track projects in order to deliver the intended NOPES outcomes. The impact of this variation will need to be addressed in future by the evaluation team.

It is also important to note that the original allocation through NOPES has assisted fast track projects to lever other funding.

10.3 Emerging Issues from the Core Case Studies

10.3.1 Introduction

Reflecting the advanced progress of the Scottish Activities programme, two visits have been made to each of the case studies in Scotland. These visits were very important in developing the evaluation approach for the case studies across the UK. The two case studies offered an opportunity to trial the questions and analysis structure adopted to evaluate the initiative at both portfolio and project level. Based on this experience these methods have subsequently been revised for use in the rest of the UK.

Both of the case studies in Scotland are regarded as having a strong focus on monitoring and evaluation. It was recognised by the evaluation team that it was important not to duplicate work that is already being undertaken by
projects. It was therefore decided that a workplan would be developed for each case study outlining timescales and the type of data that may be collected for each project. This would then form the basis for collaborative working with the case study projects.

The crucial difference between the evaluation of the core case studies and the fast track projects is that the evaluation of the fast track projects was focused on individual projects whereas the evaluation of the core case studies is focused on both the portfolio and the projects within the portfolio. It was, therefore, anticipated that the initial evaluation of the core case studies would allow the evaluation team to explore the strategic basis and direction of portfolios, and their constituent projects, in a way that was not appropriate with the fast track projects.

As with the fast track projects, the emerging issues from the core case studies will be presented under the headings of partnership, participation and impact on wider social outcomes. Within this structure, issues that will be explored over the next three years as the evaluation progresses have been identified. As the evaluation is still at a very early stage there is no attempt to draw any conclusions about the impact of the different approaches taken by different cases.

10.3.2 Partnership

10.3.2.1 Role and Operation of partnerships

The initial visits have indicated that there is a great deal of diversity between cases in the partnerships that have been developed and the roles that have been assigned. In some case study areas, the role of the partnership has been perceived as being one of selecting and then building projects. In other cases, the partnership has a very clearly defined role in ensuring the delivery of the portfolio and of the NOPES outcomes. A number of cases have developed informal or formal partnerships at project level with one portfolio adopting a ‘bottom-up’ approach whereby the project management groups were developed prior to the strategic partnership.

There is also a great deal of variation between the ways in which the strategic partnerships evolved. In Northern Ireland, for example, one partnership was founded very much on existing partnerships whilst the other was an entirely new partnership. The membership of the partnerships was also very diverse with some being located within one or two departments of local authorities and others involving a much broader range of partners and stakeholders. For some cases, there is a very clear link between education and sports development but for others this link is less evident for a number of reasons.

10.3.2.2 Partnership and links with other strategic aims

Although there was a great deal of diversity between case studies in terms of which strategies were considered important, in all cases there was a consensus that there were important links between NOPES and other
initiatives in which they were involved. This is also confirmed by the survey results.

10.3.2.3 Choice of projects

The way in which projects were selected for inclusion within the individual case study portfolios was also very diverse. In some cases, bids or expressions of interest were sought from schools or other organisations whilst in other cases this did not happen. In many instances very complex decision-making criteria were established upon which the final decisions were based. Those interviewees who noted that the final decisions have been largely well received appeared to be located in cases where the process was open, clear, robust and well communicated.

The way projects proceed once selected to be part of the NOPES portfolio has differed across the case studies. In some cases, the local authority has been primarily responsible for developing Stage 2 applications, documents and plans. In other cases, this role has been undertaken primarily by the project, with support from the local authority. While the local authority may have more expertise in conducting these tasks, it has been suggested that by projects undertaking them, ownership and commitment to the project are built. This issue will be considered by the evaluation team as the case studies progress.

10.3.2.4 Sustainability

Sustainability for both facilities constructed through NOPES and also their outcomes is clearly a very important issue for all those responsible for delivery of the NOPES initiative. One of the most important issues relevant to this discussion is the issue of revenue funding. In the six monthly report (July 2004) it was noted that the importance of the activities funding stream to the case study authorities in Scotland was particularly evident and as this strand of the NOPES initiative only exists in Scotland, revenue funding elsewhere may become a key issue in the evaluation.

There has been a great deal of variation between the cases in terms of their view of revenue funding. The case study with the largest allocation made a deliberate decision not to apply for any revenue funding through NOPES in order to be able to build the maximum number of facilities possible. Other cases have ensured that their facility provision is supported with revenue funding although this funding is generally earmarked for recruitment of staff. The variation between the cases in terms of revenue funding will allow the impact of these differing approaches to be assessed over time.

For many projects the need to generate sufficient income to run and maintain the facility is something that is very new to the schools who have to take responsibility for the facilities. The support available to schools in order to take on this new responsibility is varied across cases. In some cases the costs are being underwritten by the local authority whilst in others, dual-use agreements are in place. Where schools are responsible for their own income generation,
there is variation in the level of support offered by the local authority in order to achieve this.

Factors which have been noted as being crucial to the sustainability of projects include partnership working, linking with other initiatives (e.g. School Sports Partnership) and clear, realistic business plans.

10.3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation requirements for local authorities and individual projects was not well understood by those interviewed. Whilst there was a clear commitment to deliver the outcomes in the longer term, there was often confusion about the way in which the impact would be demonstrated and how the monitoring and evaluation would be resourced.

10.3.3 Participation

10.3.3.1 Quantity and quality of PE

In line with the findings from the fast track projects, it was widely believed that NOPES would have a dramatic impact on both the quantity and quality of PE and it was generally agreed that this was one of the main purposes of the NOPES initiative in the case study areas. However, the precise impact of the NOPES initiative, on all outcomes including PE, will be individualised at each project. Beyond general notions, there was scant evidence of consideration as to how the NOPES initiative may impact on PE across the whole local authority.

10.3.3.2 Extra-curricular activity

Again it is expected that the new facilities will have an impact on both the quantity and the range of extra-curricular activity.

10.3.3.3 Target Groups

There are a range of groups targeted within the cases reflecting local priorities. The strategic decisions made about targeting at portfolio level were often concerned with placement of facilities, for example, in areas of deprivation or where there are large minority ethnic populations.

At individual projects, there is clear evidence in some cases that a strategic plan to target and involve identified user groups (such as disabled users) throughout the design and building stages has resulted in user-friendly, accessible projects.

10.3.3.4 Impact on community

Impact upon the community in which the new facilities are located is again a key ambition for those involved in delivering the NOPES initiative. Accessible and appropriate location is a key feature of NOPES funded facilities, and this
is perceived as overcoming one of the main barriers to participation by communities. In many cases the NOPES initiative is viewed as a catalyst for cultural change, encouraging schools to become more ‘outward looking’ in the hope that they can become the hub of their community.

In summary:

- Some schools are very used to working with the local community whilst for others this is a relatively new venture. The level of support available to schools in order to make this shift in outlook is varied.
- Schools who already work closely with the community in other areas may not have the expertise or capacity to manage and run large scale leisure facilities.
- There is an inherent contradiction between the need to raise revenue in order to be sustainable and the need to undertake community development work by targeting those members of the community who are currently under participating in physical activity.

Those responsible for delivering NOPES are looking for assistance in overcoming these barriers.

10.3.4 Wider Social Outcomes

The impact of NOPES on wider social outcomes such as health, social inclusion and educational attainment is an issue which, as in the fast track projects, is based on very general, but strongly held, notions. As the main focus of those interviewed has generally been to ensure the facility is constructed and becomes operational, this is perhaps not surprising. In general, the cases seemed to adhere to a belief that increasing participation in physical activity by the provision of more, and more attractive, facilities would lead to all the other outcomes. Strategic location was an important factor in this, as was the development of close working relationships with target groups. However, cases may need further advice and support to enable them to be more specific about impact on wider social outcomes.

10.3.5 Other issues

One of the overarching themes that has been consistent across all the communication with those responsible for delivering the NOPES initiative is the importance of learning from experience. In Case Study G, involvement in the fast track process was considered invaluable in developing the remainder of the portfolio, whilst Case Study E described how much they had learnt from developing their first project in the portfolio.

One of the key strengths for a number of cases was noted as being the prior experience of the personnel involved in delivering NOPES. Clearly this has important implications when individuals with lesser levels of experience have responsibility for delivering the NOPES portfolio. These individuals, potentially, have much to gain from sharing examples of effective practice.
10.4 Emerging Issues from the Baseline Survey

It is possible to make a few general statements, across the four home countries, from the returns of the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) Surveys. However, as few Baseline (Extended) Surveys have been received from outside England as yet, it should be noted that detailed comparisons across the four countries cannot be drawn.

NOPES projects prioritised participation outcomes in their responses to both versions of the Baseline Survey. Of the six NOPES outcomes, Outcomes 1 & 3 (improved PE and sport in schools and better opportunities to increase physical activity) were those most frequently addressed by new NOPES facilities. New NOPES facilities were also viewed, generally, as having the potential to increase the range of activities available and provide support for curriculum PE. The quality of facilities existing before the advent of NOPES were viewed, across each of the four countries, fairly negatively.

Respondents to the Baseline (Extended) Survey indicated that there are a few key initiatives that are important to the success of NOPES projects. In both England and Scotland, the School Sport Co-ordinator programme (now renamed in both countries) is very important to the success of NOPES. Schools did also report some existing usage of facilities by primary schools and sports clubs although there was less partnership working with these organisations.

Questions regarding participation in PE and school sport provided very interesting results. In England, participation in 2 hours of PE and school sport at schools that will receive NOPES facilities was similar to the national average. Although from a small sample, the percentage of pupils receiving 2 hours PE and school sport was higher in Wales but lower in Scotland. Across England, Scotland and Wales, the percentage of pupils receiving the 2 hours entitlement dropped off towards the end of secondary school. This corresponded to a drop in the average minutes of PE that pupils received in later years. There is also some evidence of fewer girls in later secondary years participating in 2 hours of school sport and PE.

In general, smaller projects completing the shorter Baseline Survey, had less focus on using NOPES facilities for the wider community. Across all projects, usage of existing facilities (prior to the opening of the NOPES project) by the community is fairly low and the range of activities available to the community is narrower than in curriculum time. There is some evidence of greater community usage amongst males than females. Almost all respondents indicated that they had identified target groups for their NOPES project and, given some of these initial findings, it is positive that girls and women were a commonly targeted group.
10.5 Future Plans

The issues raised above clearly have implications for the future of the evaluation. In particular:

- Through the combination of evaluation approaches the evaluation team will explore the issues raised above in order to identify the factors which impact most favourably on delivering the NOPES outcomes.

- The evaluation team will continue to identify and disseminate examples of effective practice as it is anticipated these will be crucial to the success of the initiative.

Significant progress has been made in developing the evaluation methods during the year. The evaluation goals for Year 3 include:

- Finalise the evaluation approach for the core case studies at the level of the project including the participant survey for use in the case study areas.

- Finalise and distribute the Participant Survey for the Activities programme in Scotland.

- Select the cases for the Football Foundation Case Studies and commence the case studies

- Pilot and conduct the Telephone Case Studies

- Further distribution and collection of baseline surveys in all four countries will continue.

- Complete the evaluation seminars and continue to update the website in order to disseminate examples of effective practice.

- Newsletters will also continue to be used to disseminate effective practice
11.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to highlight any issues that emerge through the evaluation that the team believe are particularly useful or relevant to those responsible for delivering the NOPES initiative. At this stage of the evaluation there are limited findings that could be considered to be generic, however, this section will become more extensive as the evaluation progresses.

11.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Issues and Recommendations

The experiences of the evaluation team gained from the evaluation seminars and case studies indicate that monitoring and evaluation are underdeveloped in NOPES. In part, this is due to a lack of clarity over the Fund’s expectations concerning monitoring and evaluation. In many cases, local authorities have expressed a willingness to undertake monitoring and evaluation, but are unsure how best to achieve this without burdening schools. The evaluation team have responded to this in a number of ways including the provision of evaluation seminars, development of a self-evaluation handbook and an evolving website.

Given the perceived need not to overburden schools, it is recommended that local authorities take advantage of existing data collection processes wherever as possible, including taking advantage of the offer by the Loughborough partnership to write a report for the local authority if more than 50% of projects return the baseline and annual surveys.

11.3 Effective Practice

Interviews and discussions with those responsible for delivering NOPES have highlighted the need to share effective practice. Identifying and disseminating examples of effective practice is a high priority for the evaluation team.

As in one of the case studies, local authorities may wish to be proactive in sharing expertise and experience of the NOPES initiative with others in the same position as themselves.

11.4 Fast Track Operational Issues

At some of the fast track projects, it has been noted in Section 10.2.1, that operational issues in the opening of the facility have taken precedence over delivering broader strategic objectives. It is recommended that local authorities consider how best to support projects through the opening period, especially in schools that have little prior experience of managing new sports facilities.
Sharing practice and expertise between projects may be very beneficial to maximising the overall impact of the NOPES initiative. Again, this may be particularly important for projects with little prior experience of developing sports facilities, especially for community-use. Local authorities could have a key role in bringing together project staff for networking and sharing of effective practice.
SECTION TWELVE : EMERGING ISSUES FOR THE FUND

12.1 Introduction

This Annual Report documents the progress of the evaluation of the NOPES initiative during the months February 2004 and January 2005. Initial evaluation findings have been presented from:

- Seven Fast Track projects
- Ten core case studies
- Returns from the Baseline and Baseline (Extended) in the four home countries.

In addition feedback on the initiative has been received directly from those responsible for delivering NOPES through telephone queries and through evaluation seminars.

The culmination of these early findings is that the NOPES programme is welcomed as an important initiative that mirrors many of the aims and objectives of those local authorities responsible for them. The following recommendations are made based on the initial findings from the evaluation.

12.2 Application Process

Those involved in developing the bids for this initiative have found the process ‘particularly arduous' when compared to other initiatives. There is a widely held belief that too much information is required, that the information is often duplicated and that some of this information is required too early and is therefore unrealistic. Many local authorities felt there was a lack of trust on the part of the Fund towards their officers and systems. It was also noted that the time taken to process bids is longer than for other funding bodies

It is recommended that the application process is reviewed and any possible reduction in the volume of data required identified.

12.3 Delivering NOPES outcomes

The findings presented within this report demonstrate that there is a great deal of diversity between different local authorities in their ability to support the projects to deliver the NOPES outcomes once projects are open. At least one of the core case studies is looking to the Fund to offer advice and direction to help the case in delivering the intended outcomes.

It is recommended that Fund’s role in supporting local authorities to deliver the NOPES programme once facilities are opened is clarified and communicated to local authorities.

There is a clear desire by all those involved in the NOPES programme to identify and disseminate effective practice.
It is recommended that the Fund continues to be involved in identifying effective practice and disseminating examples in a variety of methods.

12.4 Monitoring and evaluation

The monitoring requirements of the Fund have only recently been agreed and this has contributed to underdeveloped monitoring and evaluation systems being in place in a number of authorities. It was noted by some local authority representatives at the evaluation seminars that the decision only to visit projects one year after opening has two implications. Firstly, many projects will only be beginning to demonstrate impact after just one year. Secondly, there was a concern that local authorities would have very little leverage over their projects to undertake further evaluation activities beyond one year when there will be no further intervention from the Fund.

It is recommended that the Fund publicise their monitoring and review process at the earliest possible date and clarify for individual projects and local authorities their respective roles in the monitoring and evaluation process.
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