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Introduction

The challenge

Italy ranked second from last for educational well-being in a 2007 UNICEF report looking at the well-being of children and young people in 21 developed countries. Although there have been substantial improvements in educational outcomes in recent years, Italy still scores comparatively poorly on measures of school achievement, the percentage remaining in education and the transition to employment.

In contrast, Italy scored the highest for family and peer relationships in the UNICEF report. This is largely a reflection of the traditional Italian emphasis on the family, seen in family structures and the amount of time parents spend with their children. Despite this good overall result, there are children in Italy, as in all countries, with poor home lives. More than 15% of Italian children are growing up in relative income poverty, which is a high proportion compared to most OECD countries. The evidence from many countries overwhelmingly shows that children who grow up in poverty—indeed, the wider the sense of the word—are more vulnerable, now and in the future.

What can be done? Much of childhood is spent in one of two places—home or school. These places therefore play an integral role in a child’s learning and development. But there is increasing recognition that other places also have a role to play, particularly when there are problems at home or school.

A daily centre—defined as a place where children and young people go on a regular basis to participate in a range of supervised activities outside the school day—is one such place. Daily centres have the potential to be of huge benefit to the young people who attend. They may help improve the self-esteem of those who have trouble fitting in with peers, or the behaviour of those who are continually acting up in class, or the academic attainment of those whose parents have no time to help with homework.

Furthermore, the impact has the potential to be much wider than just the young person attending the daily centre. As a result, parents may have better relationships with their children; schools may have a reinvigorated focus on teaching and helping their pupils succeed; and communities may experience a reduction in anti-social behaviour. At the society level, daily centres have the potential to contribute towards improvements in well-being and education and employment outcomes.

The potential may be great, but little is known about whether daily centres are actually achieving these benefits for young people; for their families, schools and communities; and for society. Daily centres may track progress at the centre—whether young people are completing activities successfully, their behaviour is improving, and positive relationships with staff are being formed. But whether this translates into changes at home and school is only known informally, if at all. Daily centres may ask for feedback about whether young people enjoy the activities, but do not ask the young people themselves whether the activities make them feel happier.

There are ramifications to daily centres of not measuring impact. They have difficulty attracting and sustaining funding, as they are unable to prove that their way of working is achieving greater impact than another intervention, which is perhaps operating at lower cost. They have difficulty knowing, except on an anecdotal level, whether young people are being helped, now and in the future. Without evidence of what is working, they have difficulty improving activities.

The purpose of this report

This report has been commissioned by the Oliver Twist Foundation, which as well as giving grants, also directly runs projects in Italy designed to help ‘minors in difficult circumstances’—i.e., those who are at risk of being taken into care or dropping out of school. The report looks at how the Foundation could measure the impact of the daily centres it funds, based on research from both Italy and the UK.

The UK was chosen as the point of comparison for several reasons. The first was to determine to what extent daily centres exist outside of Italy—whether there is the need for such places in other countries, and if so, whether the response is the same in a different country context. Having established that there are UK charities with similarities to Italian daily centres, the second was to develop a framework to assess the aims and objectives of daily centres in both countries, and whether these are likely to be achieved.
The report recommends what indicators could be collected to measure the impact of daily centres. These recommendations and the framework are also intended to be useful for other funders, public and private, and for organisations that run daily centres, in Italy and elsewhere.

Methodology

New Philanthropy Capital (NPC) based this report on several stages of research. The first stage was to find out about daily centres in Italy, particularly their social and political context. This was accomplished through desk research, conversations with the Oliver Twist Foundation and the Comune di Milano, and visits to three daily centres in and around Milan.

We quickly realised that daily centres, as defined by features such as having a formal attendance requirement, do not exist in the UK. There are UK charities, however, that have many of the same objectives as Italian daily centres. We therefore decided to define a ‘daily centre’ not by particular structural or process features (e.g., child-to-staff ratio or sources of referral) but by a common set of desired outcomes. These outcomes are not just for young people, but also for wider society.

This outcomes-based definition has numerous advantages. Firstly, it allowed us to identify which charities in the UK would serve as interesting comparisons to Italian daily centres. This was informed by NPC’s previous research and knowledge of charities in the UK, and by visits to several charities. Secondly, it also clearly links the definition of a daily centre with our indicator recommendations.

The second stage of the research was to develop a questionnaire to understand the aims and objectives of daily centres in both countries. This questionnaire asked first how the activities of the daily centre address the needs of the young people who attend, and then how these activities result in the outcomes that the daily centre wants to achieve. The daily centre is then asked to comment on its own model—what parts it considers to be most important and how it fits into the wider social and political context. Basic information about the organisation was also collected. The questionnaire is given in Appendix 1.

Four organisations in Italy and four charities in the UK completed the questionnaire:

- Associazione Cometa;
- Centro Italiano Aiuti all’Infanzia;
- Cooperativa Martinengo;
- Diapason Cooperativa Sociale;
- Eastside Young Leaders Academy;
- Family Action in Rogerfield and Easterhouse;
- IntoUniversity; and
- The Tullochan Trust.

The Oliver Twist Foundation administered the questionnaire in Italy; NPC did the same in the UK. The Oliver Twist Foundation selected the Italian organisations to reflect a combination of those that it currently funds and those that it does not, but all were chosen as examples of best practice. All organisations have daily centres in and around Milan; although many of the findings will apply to daily centres in other regions of Italy, some may be specific to the regional context. NPC selected the UK charities as ones that have interesting models, with parallels to Italian daily centres. Two are based in London; the other two are based in or around Glasgow.

The next stage of the research was to analyse the questionnaire responses. This analysis informed our definition of a daily centre, our framework for assessing them and our set of potential indicators for daily centres. It also allowed us to draw some interesting comparisons between Italy and the UK.

The framework has three parts, and takes NPC’s framework for analysing charity effectiveness and performance as its starting point.* NPC’s framework is designed to be flexible to analyse different sizes and types of charities. Consequently, the first and third parts of this framework were adapted from this, but tailored particularly to daily centres.

---

* NPC’s analysis framework will be available on its website, www.philanthropycapital.org, in summer 2009.
Unlike NPC’s framework, this framework does not look at leadership and finances; although critical to effectiveness, assessing these was not the purpose of this research.

The decision about what to include in the assessment criteria for the second part was based on evidence of what is important to daily centres in achieving desired outcomes. The evidence behind this varies—in our hierarchy of evidence, we looked first for support from findings from the questionnaires, then the relevant literature and NPC’s previous research, and finally our own logical assessment of what is important. Whether the framework could actually be used to assess daily centres in Italy and the UK was tested by applying it to the organisations participating in the research.

The final stage of the research was to suggest what indicators daily centres could collect to measure their impact. This stage was informed by our understanding of the outcomes that daily centres want to achieve. We recommend indicators to capture best these desired outcomes, with an awareness of the practical issues involved in data collection.

**Scope and content**

Many of the findings of this report were based on the questionnaires completed by eight organisations. Although the questionnaire responses are not necessarily representative of all daily centres in Italy, and of all similar charities in the UK, bolstering them with other evidence strengthens the findings.

**Structure**

The report is structured as follows:

*Chapter 1* defines what a daily centre is, broadly enough to encompass charities in the UK that are similar to Italian daily centres, but precisely enough to highlight what is core to the makeup of a daily centre. The chapter then identifies what daily centres in both countries want to achieve, and why they may be needed. It concludes with our model of a daily centre.

*Chapter 2* presents a framework for assessing the aims and objectives of a daily centre, and whether it is likely to achieve them.

*Chapter 3* looks at what daily centres are measuring at the moment and what indicators they could be collecting to measure their impact.

*Conclusions* looks at what is known and what could be known about daily centres in Italy and the UK.
Defining daily centres

A daily centre is a place where children and young people go on a regular basis to participate in a range of supervised activities outside the typical school day. This chapter more precisely defines this intentionally broad definition of a daily centre, identifying what daily centres in Italy and similar charities in the UK want to achieve for young people; for their families, schools and communities; and for society. It then suggests why a daily centre, as a place separate from home and school, may be necessary to address problems in either of these two places. The chapter concludes with our model of a daily centre.

What is a daily centre?

We define a daily centre as a place where children and young people go on a regular basis to participate in a range of supervised activities outside the typical school day. Our research identifies the following characteristics as central to a daily centre:

- As a place, a daily centre is normally separate from school and home. Daily centres sometimes operate out of a school building if they cannot afford their own building.
- The children and young people participating are a range of ages. In Italy, the broad age range is 6 to 16 years old.
- Attendance is ‘regular’ in that it is not a one-off occurrence; children may attend every day or once a week, for example.
- Activities vary, but often include curriculum-focused activities such as homework help; arts, crafts and drama; sports and other physical activities; and day outings and longer residential trips.
- Activities are supervised by qualified staff. Qualifications vary; in Italy, daily centres require, at a minimum, staff to have a social work qualification.
- Activities take place outside the school day, which in most cases means after school. Most daily centres will offer activities at other times too—before school, at weekends and during school holidays.

This is an intentionally broad definition to test what is core to the concept of a daily centre. It also encompasses charities in the UK that are doing similar things to daily centres in Italy, but do not fit the exact definition of a daily centre, if defined by structural features such as having a particular child-staff ratio.

What are their objectives?

Analysis of the questionnaire responses indicates that daily centres in both countries want to achieve outcomes for young people that can be mainly grouped into two categories—those connected to well-being and those related to school.

Well-being outcomes

All eight daily centres want to improve the well-being of young people, and well-being is the largest category of desired outcomes. These outcomes can be summarised as:

- improved self-esteem (ie, a person’s overall evaluation or appraisal of his or her own worth);
- greater resilience (ie, the positive capacity to cope with stress and difficulties);
- better relationships with others, including peers, parents, teachers and other adults;
- decreased behavioural problems; and
- improved pro-social skills.

There appears to be a split between Italy and the UK as to which aspects of well-being are emphasised. The daily centres in Italy stress the importance of improving relationships with others, whereas the UK charities are more focused on improving self-esteem.

Both are important aspects of a healthy, happy life. It is interesting to note, however, that the Children’s Society recent inquiry report A Good Childhood argues individualism has been over-emphasised in the UK. The report calls for the balance to be redressed, with a greater focus on relationships with others. The UK could perhaps learn from Italy in striking the right balance between individualism and relationships with others.
Academic outcomes

All daily centres except one have at least one desired outcome that can be grouped in the ‘academic outcomes’ category. These can be summarised as:

- improved cognitive skills (e.g., literacy and numeracy);
- awareness of own academic ability (i.e., seen in choice of secondary school or university);
- better attitude towards and improved effort at school;
- less disciplinary action (e.g., exclusion—banning from school);
- better school attendance and less truancy (i.e., unauthorised absence);
- greater academic attainment;
- remaining at school beyond the minimum leaving age;
- aspirations to higher education; and
- participation in higher education.

These outcomes are often associated. For example, a better attitude towards school will encourage higher attendance rates and less truancy from school.4

Daily centres in Italy appear to place more emphasis on helping young people with their immediate concerns, which vary by age. For example, when young people are applying to secondary school, the daily centre may want them to have an awareness of their own academic abilities to choose the right school. In contrast, charities in the UK are likely to have the ambition for a longer-term impact; for example, wanting eight-year-olds attending the daily centre to be more likely to go on to college or university in ten years, or to find a well-paid job they enjoy. This distinction may result, however, from the selection of daily centres and how outcomes are articulated.

Other outcomes

Most daily centre outcomes can be grouped into either the well-being or academic category; although these outcomes are often associated—e.g., better relationships with peers and teachers (a well-being outcome) are linked with improved behaviour at school, resulting in less disciplinary action and fewer exclusions (academic outcomes).

However, daily centres also want to achieve outcomes in terms of preventing young people from engaging in risky behaviour. Several daily centres mention wanting to prevent young people from offending, abusing drugs or alcohol, or being involved in a gang. Although not as explicitly mentioned, other daily centres want young people to have better physical and mental health. This is evident in the activities offered—sports and other physical activities—and several daily centres directly addressing the mental health problems of young people.

More than the young person

Daily centres want to effect change for more than the young person, although these outcomes may not be articulated as well as the individual outcomes. Many daily centres do mention outcomes for families; these can be summarised as encouraging parents to have better relationships with their children and to be better parents. Some daily centres want to improve the conditions of the family as a whole. This may be practical living conditions such as getting laundry done, or the more intangible circumstances of the family that contribute to its well-being. An indicator of this would be children not being taken into care, which the daily centres in Italy give as a reason for their existence.

What was left out?

The best daily centres want to achieve wider outcomes. Not all will be applicable to every daily centre; many are also difficult to measure and attribute solely to the daily centre. However, our research suggests that the following could also be considered as desired outcomes:

- Outcomes for the school. Daily centres could want to help schools manage behaviour, to focus on teaching and to raise aspirations about the future.
• **Outcomes for the community.** Daily centres could want to reduce anti-social behaviour and cultivate more civically-minded young people.

• **Outcomes for society.** Daily centres could want to help improve education and employment outcomes, reduce crime and encourage greater social mobility.

**Why are they needed?**

As a place separate from home and school, a daily centre is uniquely placed to address problems in either of these two places. Our research suggests the following reasons why a daily centre may be required:

**Problems at school**

The proportion of children who report ‘liking school a lot’ is 13% in Italy, and is 19% in the UK. A high proportion of young people being ‘disengaged’ from school can be seen as a major reason behind the poor statistics for school achievement at age 15, the percentage ages 15 to 19 remaining in education and the transition to employment, given in Table 1. Using these measures, both the UK and Italy ranked in the bottom third for educational well-being in a 2007 UNICEF report comparing the well-being of children and young people in 21 developed countries.

One of the reasons that young people are increasingly becoming disaffected with school is the narrow focus of the school curriculum. In both Italy and the UK, the focus in schools is more on cognitive skills such as literacy and numeracy. The Cambridge Primary Review’s recent report into primary education in England argues that this risks neglecting the development of learning in other areas. Other reasons for disaffection relate to relationships with friends and peers, and to the home environment of the child.

Children may also need help with their curriculum-based school and homework. Teachers are often over-stretched, having to manage classes of over 20 students. One or two disruptive students can undermine what others are able to learn, and the full curriculum may not be covered, or is covered patchily, in class. Children whose parents do not have the time or the skills to help them with their school and homework are at a greater risk of disaffection. Research from the UK suggests that parents’ involvement in their children’s education, coupled with their attitudes towards the value of education, is very important for their children’s own involvement in and attitudes towards school.

The transitions from primary to secondary school, and from school to further education or employment, are often unsettling times for children and young people. Important decisions about the right secondary school or what to do after leaving compulsory education can be daunting without the right support. Research suggests that attempts to reverse trends in social immobility in the early years are quickly undone if children are not supported during these times of transition.

**Table 1: Educational well-being**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>OECD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of young people ‘liking school a lot’</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading achievement aged 15</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics achievement aged 15</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science achievement aged 15</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in educational institutions aged 15–19 as a percentage of the population of 15 to 19 year olds</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 15–19 year olds not in education or employment</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils aged 15 aspiring to low skilled work</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why does young people being disaffected with school matter? Much of young people’s futures depends on how well they do in school, whether they stay on at school and whether they are successful in getting a job. Educational attainment is strongly associated with achievement later in life. In both Italy and the UK, as in other countries, those who do not complete upper secondary education are less likely to be employed and earn a lower wage when employed. In Italy, those who do not hold an upper secondary qualification earn only 79% of the earnings of those who do hold these qualifications, though over time there is evidence that this earnings disadvantage has lessened. Employment rates are also much lower for those without upper secondary education (53%) compared with those who have achieved this level (74%), though again, in recent years, these disparities have been reduced. Academic attainment is therefore very important for upward social mobility.
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Problems at home

As mentioned above, many parents do not have the time or skills to help their children with their homework. More generally, parents often struggle to be ‘good’ parents—spending time with their children or setting appropriate boundaries. Social trends in both Italy and the UK have exacerbated these concerns, among them the increase in the number of families in which both parents work.11 There is a growing need for somewhere safe and supervised for children to go after school before their parents get home from work.

Italian young people have the best family relationships of the countries under review in the 2007 UNICEF report, while the UK comes out bottom of the rankings. This is largely a reflection of the traditional Italian emphasis on the family, seen in family structures and the amount of time parents spend with their children. Italy is the only country to feature at the top for both indicators attempting to measure the quality of family relationships. Compared to other OECD countries, Italian families have maintained the tradition of spending time with each other, eating together and just talking to each other, much more tenaciously.

These cross-country comparisons mask the variations in family relationships that exist within countries, however. In both Italy and the UK, as in all countries, children are growing up with poor home lives. This is ‘poor’ narrowly defined as low income—one in ten children lives in relative poverty in the UK; one in six does in Italy—but also more broadly to encompass other factors relating to disadvantage.12*

NPC’s previous research into several relevant issues—literacy, mental health, truancy and exclusion—has highlighted how potentially damaging a poor home life can be to a child.4, 13, 14 The most immediate group of risk factors for whether a child will struggle to read, develop a mental health problem, play truant or be excluded from school relate to the home.

Interconnected problems

This highlights how interconnected the problems at school and at home actually are. Problems that show up in school may actually arise from problems at home—eg, a child living in a home where drug abuse occurs is much more likely to play truant or be excluded from school. Moreover, a problem in one place may be exacerbated by a problem in another place; for example, children in care are at greater risk of being bullied at school.4

The home or school may serve a protective function, however. Home or school may be a ‘safe haven’ for a child with a problem elsewhere. These problems may also be identified, and children supported, in a place other than the one with which they are typically associated. A daily centre is an additional place for children to receive this support.

A model of a daily centre

There is therefore potential for daily centres being important, given the needs they could address and the outcomes they could achieve. Figure 1 gives our model of a daily centre. This figure is a useful way of visualising the logical model of the daily centre. On the left-hand side, the daily centre identifies what needs it wants to address. Our research suggests that these needs can be generally grouped into problems at school or at home, although there is often an overlap between the two.

On the right-hand side, the daily centre identifies what outcomes it wants to achieve. Our research suggests that daily centres are often most ambitious to improve the well-being and academic outcomes of young people, but also have other desired outcomes for young people and other groups too.

So how does the ‘daily centre’ in the middle fit into the picture? Of course, much depends on the context in which the daily centre is working—the social and political context and the particular ethos of the organisation. Our research suggests, however, that there are certain elements that are important for all daily centres to consider. The next chapter develops our framework for assessing these elements; it attempts to define more concisely what the daily centre in the middle of the picture should look like.

* The indicator of poverty used here is the child poverty rate, defined as the share of all children living in households with an income of 50% of less of the median. This definition is stricter than that used by the UK government, which considers a household to be low income if its income is less than 60% of the median.
The previous chapter establishes the potential for daily centres being important, given the needs they address and the outcomes they achieve. This chapter develops a framework for assessing daily centres. It draws on NPC’s charity analysis framework for activities and results, but also considers whether the daily centre is doing things in the right way, based on evidence of what is important for daily centres achieving their aims and objectives.

About the framework

We have developed a framework for assessing daily centres that is made up of three elements, each of which is assessed against several criteria. The first and third elements draw on NPC’s standard charity analysis framework, adapted in parts to make it more specific to daily centres. The second element of the framework is an addition, based on our research into which aspects of how daily centres do things are important for achieving their aims and objectives. This element therefore looks at some processes of the daily centre, but the interest is always how this is important for the daily centre achieving impact. A summary of the framework is given in Table 2.

The framework is designed to be flexible for use in a variety of contexts. Italian daily centres and similar charities in the UK could use it as a self-assessment tool, or funders could use it to assess the daily centres they fund, or are looking to fund. Funders could also use the framework to determine where daily centres could make the best use of resources.

Is the daily centre doing the right things?

The first part of the framework assesses whether the activities of the daily centre fit in with the needs it wants to address and the outcomes it wants to achieve. A good understanding of the context in which the daily centre is working is necessary here. The key questions to consider when assessing the daily centre’s activities are:

- Do the activities of the daily centre focus on the greatest needs?
- Does the range of activities match the aims and objectives of the daily centre?
- Will the daily centre continue to do the right things?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for analysis</th>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Activities        | • Do the activities of the daily centre focus on the greatest needs?  
|                   | • Does the range of activities match the aims and objectives of the daily centre?  
|                   | • Will the daily centre continue to do the right things? |
| Process           | • How are the young people who are in greatest need of the daily centre identified?  
|                   | • How are these young people motivated to attend?  
|                   | • How are these young people encouraged to derive maximum benefit from activities?  
|                   | • How are these young people prepared for life after attending the daily centre?  
|                   | • How are external relationships cultivated? |
| Results           | • Does the daily centre have a results culture?  
|                   | • Does the daily centre have actual results? |
## Table 3: Matching activities to outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Homework help (a quiet place for homework and computer access)</th>
<th>Curriculum-based study support (e.g., booster or revision classes)</th>
<th>Academic extension (e.g., extra maths for gifted pupils)</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Adventure/outdoor activities</th>
<th>University/careers access</th>
<th>Volunteering/community service</th>
<th>School councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop new skills &amp; interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater employability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved attitudes &amp; approaches to learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved communication &amp; social skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater confidence &amp; self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved relationships with peers, parents, teachers, &amp; other adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teamwork &amp; leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better behaviour &amp; motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved analytical skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved problem-solving ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased academic attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A safe, supervised place to go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better health &amp; fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for family learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare cover/supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Better relationships with teachers &amp; school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; educational opportunities for parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for family learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Better relationships with teachers &amp; school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school ethos &amp; citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced school ethos &amp; citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced school ethos &amp; citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less antisocial behaviour &amp; crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for community &amp; business involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to school resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for teachers to experiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher school profile &amp; greater resources (e.g., volunteers &amp; funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced school ethos &amp; citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School councils</td>
<td>Better relationships with teachers &amp; school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced school ethos &amp; citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school ethos &amp; citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
- Higher aspirations
- Improved communication & social skills
- Greater confidence & self-esteem
- Improved relationships with peers, parents, teachers, & other adults
- Improved teamwork & leadership
- Better behaviour & motivation
- Enhanced creativity
- Improved analytical skills
- Improved problem-solving ability
- Increased academic attainment
- A safe, supervised place to go
- Better health & fitness

**Benefit Categories:**
- Young Person
- Family
- Community
- School

**Potential Benefits:**
- Better health & fitness
- A safe, supervised place to go
- Improved academic attainment
- Improved analytical skills
- Enhanced creativity
- Better behaviour & motivation
- Improved communication & social skills
- Greater confidence & self-esteem
- Improved relationships with peers, parents, teachers, & other adults
- Improved teamwork & leadership
- Improved school ethos & citizenship
- Improved school performance
- Improved attendance
- Enhanced school ethos & citizenship
- Opportunities to develop new skills & interests
- Greater employability
- Higher aspirations
- Improved attitudes & approaches to learning
Activities focus on greatest needs

The best daily centres have a clear idea of who is in greatest need of their activities, and how they can make the biggest difference in these young people’s lives.

Understanding of need is ideally informed by research, whether formal or not. Indeed, it is often the case that daily centres have informal knowledge of the needs of young people in that area just from working there. As discussed in the previous chapter, daily centres in both countries see young people with difficulties at school or home as being in greatest need of their activities.

Further analysis indicates that daily centres in the two countries have different emphases here. The focus in Italy is more on problems at home, whereas the focus in the UK is more on problems at school. From the questionnaire responses, all the Italian daily centres saw their role as supporting parents in caring for their children. In contrast, the UK charities recognised that although problems at school often originate at home, their role was to help young people ‘reach their potential’, which is conventionally defined as doing well in school.

For a daily centre to make the biggest difference, its activities should reflect its understanding of how to fit in best with what others are doing to help young people learn and develop. Evidence strongly suggests that a daily centre cannot operate in a vacuum, but must have a defined role in relation to what it perceives to be the roles of families and schools. The best daily centres are also aware of what the government wants to do or is required to do to help the young people who attend, and develop their activities accordingly.

Range of activities matches aims and objectives

The best daily centres are able to link their activities to their aims and objectives. Although not yet sophisticated enough to relate particular activities with a definitive set of outcomes, the international evidence base on the benefits of ‘after-school’ activities is growing. NPC’s 2007 report on this topic, *After the bell*, used the available evidence to match some common after-school activities with potential benefits for young people and for their families, schools and communities. An adapted version is given in Table 3.

As illustrated in the table, research suggests that the type of activity does matter for what outcomes are achieved. This is particularly true for activities that are obviously geared towards achieving academic objectives being more successful than those that are just to provide a safe space for children in the ‘lag time’ between when they finish school and when their parents get home from work. These activities may be homework help or study support, but they may also be activities that are not so obviously geared towards academic outcomes, such as music and drama, as these activities help to develop non-cognitive or social skills, shown to be very important for academic success.

The best daily centres have also identified whether there are any gaps in provision that would prevent them from achieving their aims. To ensure all activities are identified, one approach is to ‘backwards map’ activities against outcomes. Backwards mapping starts with desired outcomes and assesses whether the scope of activities is appropriate. In contrast, a more standard approach takes activities as a given and assesses the outcomes of each. Figure 2 illustrates backwards mapping, compared to a more standard approach. Once these gaps are identified, a judgement must then be made about the organisational capacity of the daily centre to deliver these activities. Using this backwards mapping technique, Box 1 identifies some potential weak spots for daily centres in both countries.

Box 1: Covering all bases?

Our research suggests two potential gaps in provision—lack of activities involving the families and lack of activities designed to encourage independence—that could prevent daily centres from having the greatest possible impact. Many daily centres are offering these activities, and of course, those that are not may have valid reasons for doing so. But given the evidence that these activities are important for the outcomes that many daily centres want to achieve, it is worth considering whether activities could be adapted to incorporate the following:

The first identified weak spot, more noticeable in the UK than Italy, is a lack of activities involving the families. Of course, the daily centre may see itself more as substituting for, rather than complementing, the role of the parents in their child’s development. But if the daily centre has identified the need to support parents and has desired outcomes related to the family, then it seems logical that it has activities that involve the parents.

The second identified weak spot, more noticeable in Italy than the UK, is a lack of activities designed to encourage independence. The daily centre may want to be a ‘stable reference point’ in the child’s life, but should balance this with a progression towards independence. Many daily centres identify a need to help children generally in their development; it seems logical that activities are designed to encourage independence—eg, day trips to an unexplored part of the city, or preparation about what to expect when starting secondary school.
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**Activities will continue to be the right thing**

The best daily centres are also well-placed to continue to do the right things in the future. This may involve replicating activities that work well. Expansion is not a necessity, but is a sign that the daily centre is ambitious for social change. It may be accomplished by the daily centre itself, or by other organisations well-placed to do so.

Continuing to do the right things in the future may also involve adapting or even stopping activities, or starting new ones, in response to changing needs or new evidence of best practice.

**Is the daily centre doing things in the right way?**

The second part of the framework looks not so much at the things the daily centre does, but at the way in which the daily centre does things. Our research identifies a number of factors that are important in determining whether the aims and objectives of the daily centre are achieved.

The key questions to consider when assessing whether the daily centre is doing things in the right way are:

- How are the young people who are in greatest need of the daily centre identified?
- How are these young people motivated to attend?
- How are these young people encouraged to derive maximum benefit from the activities?
- How are these young people prepared for life after attending the daily centre?
- How are external relationships cultivated?

**Identifying young people with the greatest needs**

The best daily centres, having established which young people are in greatest need of their activities, have the procedures to ensure these young people attend.

Most daily centres accomplish this first through some sort of referral process. See Box 2 for some findings about referral processes. The best daily centres identify the best referral sources and the best mix of these referral sources, and have good relationships with these referral sources. They also have clear, objective criteria for participation.

Our analysis indicates that strictness of entrance criteria is related to how suitable the activities are to different types of young people, which underscores the importance of knowing whom the daily centre helps. It also seems to be related to desired outcomes; for example, a daily centre that aims to improve the self-confidence of the young people participating will have a much broader eligibility criteria than one that aims to prevent youth offending.

This is also seen in the criteria for at what ages children can attend the daily centre. For example, it makes sense for a daily centre that has identified children needing support in the transition between primary and secondary school to work with children of the ages to span this move. In contrast, if the daily centre only worked with children up until their move to secondary school, then this ‘double transition’ (ie, to secondary school and away from the daily centre) would exclude children needing help with entrance exams, or fitting into new surroundings.
Motivating these young people to attend

Once young people with the greatest needs are identified, they must be motivated to attend. The best daily centres ensure that young people engage with activities by identifying and addressing barriers to participation, and by encouraging young people to value activities.

Has identified and addressed barriers to participation

All the daily centres that we looked at are either directly or indirectly targeting young people from poor socio-economic backgrounds. Evidence suggests that there may be barriers to such young people participating in after-school activities, and so programmes must be well-designed to attract those that the daily centre wants to help.

In deciding when and where activities will take place, the best daily centres take into account whether this will exclude anyone from participating. It would make little sense for a daily centre to open only during the school day when most children will be at school; indeed, in both countries, all daily centres that we looked at have activities after school. By opening then, daily centres address the need, identified by young people themselves, of a ‘time lag’ after school.

The best daily centres also ensure that they are accessible to young people. More than just physical location, they are also places that encourage a sense of ‘belonging’. A 2007 review of provision of after-school activities by the UK charity 4Children reinforces this point, noting that ‘young people said that they wanted contemporary places designed for them in the community—somewhere that was visibly theirs and known.’

Research suggests that young people’s perceptions of the daily centre influence their enthusiasm for participation. A child is much more likely to attend if any stigma attached to doing so is minimised. Of course, this is often difficult, given the needs that daily centres are attempting to address. To counter this, some daily centres have other strands to their work that introduce children to what the daily centre is and whether it could help them in a non-threatening way; for example, a child taking part in the after-school study support of IntOUniversity may have previously attended one of the charity’s FOCUS programmes with his or her entire class. The Tullochan Trust has a weekly drop-in session open to young people who are not participating in regular activities.

A good introduction (or ‘induction’) to the daily centre can also ensure that young people, and their families, understand what the daily centre is and what attendance involves. Exactly how this introduction is accomplished will of course depend on the individual daily centre. The Diapason Cooperativa Sociale has an induction process tailored to the individual needs of the young person. Drop-off, or children and their families deciding that the daily centre is not for them, may be a good indicator of whether or not the induction process is working, but the type of young people that the daily centre is working with must be taken into account here.

Encourages young people to value activities

Our research identifies a common feature, in both Italy and the UK, of daily centres charging a small fee to the young person, or his or her family, to participate. This small contribution is designed to encourage user ownership. Most daily centres stress that the fee is waived if the young person or his or her family cannot afford to pay so that the fee is not prohibitive to participation, but rather encourages participants to value activities.

Daily centres also encourage young people to value activities through their attendance requirements. Having a formal attendance requirement can ensure that young people are committed to attending and that they will value the activities that are offered.

Box 2: Getting young people through the door

Young people may be referred to the daily centre from a variety of sources, the most common being schools and social services. Some daily centres take referrals from more specialised sources; examples include the police, youth offending teams, health visitors and child mental health services. Some daily centres also receive applications from young people themselves, or from their families.

Referral processes vary in their formality. Those daily centres with strong roots in the local community will take more self-referrals and referrals from families. Being firmly entrenched in the area in which they work mean that community organisations such as FARE and Diapason Cooperativa Sociale have a good informal knowledge of who may need their help, and inspire the necessary trust to generate more informal referrals. Taking referrals from these sources also makes sense, given that these daily centres often take the family as the starting point.

In contrast, those daily centres with objectives related to those of schools or social services will often take the majority of referrals from these sources. For example, a daily centre looking to achieve academic outcomes will take referrals from schools, which are probably best placed to identify which students are underperforming academically or at risk of being excluded from school.

Good relationships with referral sources are necessary to ensure that the right young people are referred. The Cooperativa Martinengo highlights having the same understanding of need as its referral sources as critical to the young people who the daily centre can help the most attending.
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Attendance requirement is seen as a defining characteristic of Italian daily centres. The reason given is that formalising expectations of what is required of all the relevant parties (the daily centre, young people, their families and sometimes the referral agency) means that everybody values the activity.

But not requiring attendance can also mean that young people value the activities offered. One of the main findings from NPC’s previous research on after-school activities is that young people attach a great deal of importance to activities being voluntary.11 Unfortunately, there is no hard evidence to suggest whether outcomes are better achieved through requiring or not requiring attendance, although there is evidence that how activities are structured matters—who leads them, whether activities have a group or an individual focus, and the extent to which activities are organised.11

It would seem that much depends on context; for example, IntoUniversity actually weighed up both approaches, and settled on making attendance voluntary, arguing that this was more conducive to cultivating a love of learning. In contrast, EYLA has a formal attendance requirement to ensure a network of support, consistency of expectations and standards of behaviour.

Ensuring young people derive maximum benefit from activities

Our research highlights three factors that are critical for young people to get the most out of attending a daily centre:

Choice in activities

There is good evidence that giving young people a choice in activities is important. It distinguishes the daily centre from the obligation of school, possibly encouraging attendance. It gives young people the opportunity to try new things, boosting self-confidence and developing different skills. It also encourages independence. Research suggests that choice in activities is the element that makes after-school activities special.16

However, the best daily centres balance choice with the appropriate structure. Daily centres may require participation in certain activities to underscore their importance in everyday life—eg, eating lunch together or doing homework. Making certain activities compulsory may also foster certain skills, such as leadership. EYLA requires boys to participate in most activities, believing that this promotes a sense of obligation. Daily centres may not give young people complete choice over activities, suggesting certain activities to encourage young people to try new things.

Positive relationships with staff

Daily centres provide an excellent opportunity for young people to develop positive relationships with adults other than their parents and teachers. This is particularly important when relationships with these traditional figures of support are poor. Even for those young people who do get on with their parents and teachers, having another adult, who is not perceived as having such an authoritative role, is beneficial for developing trust, and therefore contributing to improved behaviour, greater confidence and higher aspirations.

Whether or not young people develop these relationships depends largely on the characteristics of the staff. Staff should be able to inspire and challenge young people, but also have an awareness of needs and be seen as a safe person to talk to. Minimum staff qualifications and skills are determined by health and safety guidelines, but the best daily centres ensure that staff qualifications and skills are a reflection of the daily centre’s logical model. For example, if the daily centre wants to help children with mental health problems, then it will require a psychologist as a member of staff. Daily centres addressing particular issues will require staff to have the skill set to deal with the issues that come up.

A low child-to-staff ratio may also help young people to develop positive relationships with staff, as practically staff have more time to devote to them. This may in turn mean that needs are identified that would not be otherwise, and outcomes such as improved behaviour, greater confidence and higher aspirations, are achieved.

Again, the number of young people to staff is also determined by health and safety guidelines, but best-practice organisations tend to operate with ratios appropriate to activities.

A daily centre with ‘spirit’

Where activities take place should not be underestimated, as the physical space of the daily centre has the potential to be conducive to achieving desired outcomes. A well-designed space can reinforce the ethos of the daily centre, underscoring what the daily centre wants to achieve through the built environment. The quality of the physical space—the building, the furnishings, etc.—is important not just for
motivating young people to attend, but for encouraging them to make the most of activities when they are there.

For example, IntoUniversity has classrooms designed to feel like university lecture halls, reinforcing that higher education is a real option for the young people attending. Associazione Cometa is located on the grounds of the founding families’ home, emphasising that the daily centre is a place where children can feel at home.

Many daily centres do not have the luxury of a custom-built space; instead, they operate out of buildings that they rent or own in the local community. They are rarely suitable to all activities, particularly those that involve the whole centre, but almost all emphasise the importance of an accessible location. This ensures that young people attend, and the centre is seen as part of the community.

Preparing young people for life after attending the daily centre

The best daily centres have a defined criteria for when a child is ready to stop attending the daily centre. Activities with a set endpoint provide expectations of what should ideally be achieved and reduce the risk of the child becoming dependent on the daily centre. Evidence suggests that activities that have clear and well-defined aims and follow set goals are best placed to achieve them.\(^\text{8}\)

Of course, how defined these criteria are will depend on the logical model of the daily centre. For example, both EYLA and IntoUniversity aim for young people participating to go on to higher education, and so plan for young people to leave the daily centre after completing secondary school.

Cultivating good external relationships

The best daily centres connect with other places where children grow and develop, such as the family and school. They also consider their relationships with the government, other daily centres, and alumni.

With families and schools

The importance of good relationships with families and schools was highlighted in a 2007 report from the Study of Promising Programs, which states that ‘when all parties with responsibility for and interests in the welfare of youth, unite to engage them in high-quality after school experiences, they are more likely to succeed in promoting positive development for the highest number of children at risk.’\(^\text{2}\) The reasons are clear—by involving the family, school, and other organisations as appropriate (eg, social services), the daily centre is better able to identify young people with priority needs, motivate them to attend and prepare them to leave the daily centre.

How the daily centre chooses to involve the family and school will depend on its logical model. For example, the Cooperativa Martinengo sees its role as supporting families to care for their children; it therefore works directly with the families when required.

With the government

How the daily centre fits in with what the government is doing of course depends on the policy context. In both countries, the government’s duties towards children and young people are quite extensive. Although the government may have the responsibility, it may fund others actually to deliver the services. The best daily centres have good relationships with the relevant government bodies—for example, social services and local government—both to ensure statutory funding for the activities that the government is obliged to provide and to influence future government policy.

With other daily centres

Sharing best practice with other organisations with a similar activities is critical to improving quality. Comparison of approaches allows daily centres to pinpoint relative strengths and weaknesses, and adapt their own practices based on what others have found to have worked well.
Relationships with other daily centres may be informal, perhaps based on staff knowing each other, or formal—membership in a network or association, or attendance at conferences. Like all charities, daily centres operate in changing circumstances, and relationships with other daily centres can help them keep up to date.

With alumni

Maintaining good relationships with alumni, or young people who formerly attended the daily centre, allows the daily centre to understand, at least informally, whether its work has a long-term impact. It is also beneficial for those currently attending the daily centre, providing immediately accessible role models for the younger cohort. Alumni can also give feedback about which activities were most beneficial to them, and the daily centre can improve its services based on this information.

Is the daily centre measuring and learning from results?

The third and final part of the framework focuses on the results, or potential results, achieved by the daily centre. This part of the framework was taken from NPC’s charity analysis framework. It is assessed using two complementary criteria, as NPC recognises the reality that many charities find collecting and using results data on a systematic basis difficult.

The key questions to consider in assessing whether the daily centre is measuring and learning from results are:

- Does the daily centre have a results culture?
- Does the daily centre have actual results?

A results culture

Even if they are not yet at the stage of systematically collecting and using results data, daily centres can still be driven by achieving the best outcomes. In other words, they can still have a results culture. This means that staff at all levels—not just senior management—are committed to making the biggest difference for the young people who attend, and for their families, schools and communities. They are also committed to learning from their knowledge of what works in achieving the best outcomes. A results culture puts the daily centre in a good position to collect and use results data in the future.

Actual results

The best daily centres do systematically collect data on desired outcomes. They have good evidence of their impact, and use this data to make strategic decisions and further improve their activities and the activities of others. Our analysis indicates that daily centres in both countries often struggle here. The next chapter therefore recommends what could be collected systematically for daily centres to measure the results of their activities.

Using the framework

The complete framework is given in Appendix 2. Each of the assessment criteria is supplemented with some or all of the following so that the framework can practically be applied to the assessment of a daily centre:

- indicators of the assessment criteria to know concretely what the daily centre should be doing to fulfil the criteria;
- relevant parts of the questionnaire to suggest what questions would elicit evidence for these indicators;
- sources of evidence to know where to look for support for these indicators (eg, the daily centre’s logical model or the analyst’s understanding);
- red flags to look out for, suggesting that the criterion is not being fulfilled; and
- best practice examples from our research.

Our research suggests that the most important criteria of the framework—the ones that are critical to the success of the daily centre—are the daily centre having a good understanding of needs; staff developing positive relationships with the young people who attend; and the daily centre being well connected to families and the community. As mentioned, our analysis also indicates that daily centres in both countries often struggle to systematically collect data on desired outcomes. This is discussed in further detail in the next chapter, and we make some recommendations of what data daily centres could collect to measure their impact.
Measuring daily centres

The previous chapter develops a framework to understand the aims and objectives of daily centres and assess whether these are likely to be achieved. Whether these outcomes are actually achieved is largely an open question; this chapter looks at what daily centres currently measure and then makes recommendations about what they could measure to understand their impact.

Why measure?

The framework developed in the previous chapter is useful for assessing the aims and objectives of a daily centre, and whether it is likely to achieve these. Without evidence of impact, whether these outcomes are actually achieved is largely an open question. Are young people happier because of attending the daily centre? Do they have greater self-esteem? Do they do better in school? Do they go on to university, or become role models for the community?

How desired outcomes are achieved is also unknown. Is it better to require attendance if the objective is to improve behaviour? Is it better to focus on academic activities if the objective is to raise attainment? How much difference does involving the family make?

Finally, we do not know for whom desired outcomes are achieved. Who benefits most from attending a daily centre—those who are doing poorly at school or those with problematic family situations? Are families, schools and communities actually changed through young people attending the daily centre?

Answering these questions requires evidence of impact. NPC believes that it is important that charities measure their impact—to promote effective approaches so that the maximum benefit can be achieved for the people charities are trying to help.

What is measured

Daily centres in Italy and the UK do have some evidence of their impact. Our research suggests that a daily centre may already:

- have staff with enormous personal knowledge of the young people attending the daily centre—their needs and backgrounds, and individual stories of how the daily centre has made a difference to these young people;
- do some sort of needs assessment, whether this is systematically recorded or not;
- have a general perception of what different groups (eg, young people, their friends and peers, their families, funders and the local community) think of the daily centre;
- sometimes track progress at the daily centre—whether young people are completing activities successfully, whether behaviour is improving, whether positive relationships with staff are being formed;
- ask for feedback about whether young people enjoy activities.

Despite this, daily centres:

- rarely ask young people themselves whether participating in the activities makes them feel happier; and
- only sometimes ask schools or other relevant organisations (eg, social services) whether an improvement (eg, in behaviour) is noticeable.

What could be measured

Before considering what indicators a daily centre could collect, a prerequisite is to identify what outcomes the daily centre wants to achieve. Based on our findings about daily centres’ desired outcomes (see Chapter 1), we have developed a general template for daily centres to think about what outcomes their particular organisation wants to achieve.
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Figure 3: Potential outcomes for daily centres

Figure 3 illustrates the potential ambition of a daily centre. Depending on its own logical model, a daily centre may decide to focus on a particular category of outcomes (eg, well-being outcomes) or select outcomes across all categories.

Once the daily centre has identified its desired outcomes, it needs to consider how best to measure them. NPC proposes that the following indicators could be used to measure the impact of daily centres.

On the well-being of young people

We suggest that daily centres could measure their impact on the well-being of young people through several instruments. The most appropriate instrument (or instruments) will depend on the particular outcomes the daily centre wants to achieve.

NPC’s well-being questionnaire

NPC has developed a comprehensive, multi-dimensional questionnaire for charities to measure improvements in 11 to 16 year old children’s subjective well-being. The questionnaire is designed to capture the less tangible aspects of charities’ work. It contains seven stand-alone scales, measuring those aspects of subjective well-being that research has shown are most relevant to children and the charities that work with them. The domains of well-being measured by the questionnaire are:

- self-esteem;
- resilience;
- emotional well-being;
- peer relationships;
- family relationships;
- satisfaction with school environment; and
- satisfaction with home environment.

The questionnaire would therefore be the ideal instrument to capture many of the desired outcomes of daily centres—including self-esteem, resilience and peer and family relationships. However, it is still being piloted with five UK children’s charities to test whether questions are robust, valid and sensitive to change.*

Using the questionnaire in Italy would come with further caveats. In the UK, NPC is working in collaboration with the Children’s Society, which is conducting a biannual national survey of children’s well-being. The Children’s Society’s nationally representative survey will provide a baseline for the work of UK charities and allow the questionnaire to be standardised. Without such a national baseline in Italy, daily centres would not be able to put their work in context.

We therefore recommend that daily centres consider the individual scales that make up NPC’s well-being questionnaire to measure particular aspects of subjective well-being:

- Our self-esteem scale is derived from Marsh’s self-description questionnaire, which is designed to measure ‘self-concept’ or self-esteem.17, 18
- Our resilience scale is taken from Wagnild and Young’s original scale.19
- Our two relationships scales are both taken from Huebner’s Multi-dimensional Student Life Satisfaction Scale.20

* NPC’s well-being questionnaire will be available on its website from October 2009.
All these scales have been validated. Daily centres should bear in mind, however, that they are slightly time-consuming to complete; NPC uses shortened versions in its questionnaire as one of our aims is that it be quick and easy to administer.

**Goodman Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire**

Goodman Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a widely-used behavioural screening questionnaire for children aged 3 to 16. There are 25 items, divided equally among five scales measuring emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems and pro-social behaviour.

The questionnaire can be completed in 5 minutes by the parents or teachers of children aged 3 to 16; there is a self-report version for 11–16 year olds. It has been validated for use in many countries, including Italy and the UK, and is a useful outcome measure for a variety of purposes, including evaluation. The SDQ is therefore a good candidate for measuring the desired outcomes of peer relationships, behavioural problems and pro-social skills. The questionnaire must be used in full, however.

**On the academic outcomes for young people**

We suggest that daily centres measure their impact on the academic outcomes of young people by making use of data that schools already collect, when possible. Schools collect a wealth of data—eg, pupils’ discipline and attendance records and exam grades—to measure their own performance. Linking to this data would allow a daily centre to see whether its activities are translating into improvements at school.

There are several advantages to using data that schools already collect. It allows daily centres to track long-term outcomes more easily, and it allows them to prove that they are making a difference to the academic outcomes that schools and policymakers care about, allowing them to make a strong case for additional funding.

However, schools may not collect data to prove all the desired academic outcomes of daily centres. Indicators of attitudes towards school and aspirations to higher education, for example, may not be gathered by the school, or in a way that would point to attending the daily centre as being the reason behind improvements. This information may need to be collected by the daily centre itself. For example, to capture aspirations for the future, the daily centre could ask: What would you most like to do when you are 16 and can leave school? This question is asked in the Family and Children’s Study, an annual survey to investigate the circumstances of British families with dependant children.

**On the other outcomes for young people**

We suggest that daily centres measure their impact on other outcomes such as avoidance of anti-social behaviour by asking young people themselves when they start at the daily centre and then at regular points after that, questions that will indicate whether things have changed. Attributing this change to the daily centre may be difficult, but at the very least the daily centre will have a good idea of needs if it asks questions such as “Have you taken X drug in the past several months?” It is often useful with questions such as this, which rely on the integrity of the respondent, to ask directly how truthful he or she has been in answering the questions. The information from the young person may also be corroborated by others—eg, the police or parents.

**Issues to consider in measuring**

Our recommendations for what indicators could be collected are summarised in Table 4. This table also includes guidance about whom the indicator should be collected from and when it should be collected.

**From whom to collect data**

Data should be collected from the person who is best placed to provide the necessary information. For subjective well-being, this will be the young person him or herself. By definition, subjective well-being is experienced by the individual, and cannot be measured by another person or on an...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Suggested indicator(s)</th>
<th>Whom to collect from?</th>
<th>When to collect?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved cognitive skills (eg, literacy and numeracy)</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person, teacher</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better attitude towards and improved effort at school</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person, teacher</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less disciplinary action (eg, exclusion)</td>
<td>Disciplinary record at school</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better school attendance and less truancy</td>
<td>Attendance record at school</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater academic attainment</td>
<td>Exam grades</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of own abilities</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person, teacher</td>
<td>When relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining at school beyond the minimum leaving age</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>When relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations to higher education</td>
<td>Eg, what would you like most like to do</td>
<td>Young person, teacher</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in higher education</td>
<td>Enrolment in higher education</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>When relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved self-esteem</td>
<td>NPC's well-being questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up every 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater resilience</td>
<td>NPC's well-being questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up every 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better relationships with others, including peers, parents, teachers and other adults</td>
<td>NPC's well-being questionnaire; Goodman's Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person, parents, teacher</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up every 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased behavioural problems</td>
<td>Goodman's Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person, parents, teacher</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up every 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved pro-social skills</td>
<td>Goodman's Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person, parents, teacher</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up every 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Criminal record; questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person; police or youth offending team</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of offending behaviour</td>
<td>Criminal record; questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person; police or youth offending team</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of drug and alcohol misuse</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person; parents</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of gang membership</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater engagement in the local community</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved physical health</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better eating habits</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person; parents</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved mental health</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Young person; health professional</td>
<td>Baseline and follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
objective scale. NPC acknowledges that asking the young person him or herself can be difficult; common reasons for not doing so are that it is time-consuming and intrusive. Using a short and easy to administer questionnaire can help to mitigate these concerns.

Information about objective well-being does not necessarily need to be collected solely from the young person him or herself; a parent or teacher may be required to corroborate reductions in behavioural problems, for example. However, asking the young person him or herself is still valuable in understanding his or her ‘internal state’.

In contrast, hard academic outcomes, like greater academic attainment, do not need to be asked of the young person. Doing so would be time-consuming and could involve misreporting; asking the school to supply this information is easier and more accurate.

When it should be collected

The points at which data is collected depends on what is being measured. We recommend that well-being indicators are collected when the child starts at the daily centre and every six months after that. This baseline and regular follow-up will allow the daily centre to understand how the well-being of young people changes over time. We recommend that some other indicators (eg, school attendance) are also tracked over time.

Some indicators are not possible or appropriate to measure over time; for example, whether a young person stays at school beyond the minimum leaving age should be collected when the young person reaches this age (although the daily centre could also monitor whether the young person is still in school a year, or two years, later).

Other issues

Without a control group, proving true impact is hard. What would have happened anyway, without the daily centre, is unknown—many other factors in young people’s lives are also influencing the outcomes we have identified. One of the most important is simply growing up. Research shows that aspects of well-being such as self-esteem tend to decrease as children reach adolescence. Therefore, it may be that maintaining well-being scores at the same level constitutes a positive result.

Baseline datasets would allow daily centres to benchmark their results. A national survey such as the Children’s Society’s survey of well-being in the UK is an option here; so too is as many daily centres as possible measuring their impact. This would allow for changes in well-being scores, for example, to be understood and placed in context.
Conclusions

The potential for daily centres is great, but little is currently known about what impact, large or small, daily centres actually have.

What definition of a daily centre is applicable to both Italy and the UK?
What are the important elements for a daily centre in either country achieving its aims and objectives? This report aims to answer some questions, but it also seeks to pose another question: what difference are daily centres actually making to the young people who attend, and to wider society? We conclude with what we know and what we would like to know about daily centres in Italy and the UK.

A definition

From a UK perspective, a daily centre is quite literally a foreign concept. But if a ‘daily centre’ is defined not by features such as having a formal attendance requirement but by desired outcomes, then organisations that offer activities similar to those of daily centres do exist in the UK. Looking at organisations in both countries that offer places where children and young people can go on a regular basis to participate in a range of supervised activities outside the typical school day allows for some interesting cross-country comparisons. Italy appears to have a more immediate focus than the UK in terms of the outcomes daily centres want to achieve. The UK appears to place a greater emphasis on individualism, compared to the Italian focus on the family.

Daily centres in both countries mainly want to achieve outcomes for young people that can be grouped into two categories—well-being outcomes and academic outcomes. These outcomes fit with the needs that daily centres are addressing in terms of problems that young people experience at home or school. Given that much of childhood is spent in one of these places, we recommend that daily centres think about the wider benefits that they have or could have for families, schools and communities, and for society.

An assessment

Our research highlights that a prerequisite to any assessment of a daily centre is a clear understanding of its aims and objectives. These are often determined by context—particular local need, the social and political context, or the ethos of the organisation.

This understanding informs the assessment of what the daily centres does and the ways in which it does it. Our framework establishes a set of flexible criteria against which a daily centre can be assessed to evaluate whether it is doing the right things, in the right way, and with measurement and learning from results to achieve its desired impact. Our research indicates that there are examples of best practice from both countries, and that daily centres in Italy and the UK have much to learn from each other.

Measurement?

The potential for daily centres is great, but little is currently known about what impact, large or small, daily centres actually have. Does attending a daily centre mean that young people do better in school and have greater self-esteem? Is the well-being of the family improved because the daily centre helps both young people and parents? Do schools perform better and is the local community safer because of the existence of the daily centre? Only by measuring their impact will daily centres be able to prove where they are making a difference, and improve where they would like to make a difference.

This report is the first step in that direction, by looking at how daily centres could measure their impact, particularly on the well-being and academic outcomes of the young people who attend. By doing so, and by learning from their own and others’ results, daily centres would be well-placed to contribute to the present happiness and future success of young people in Italy and the UK.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

The questionnaire is divided into four sections: the first asks about the organisation, the second about the daily centre, the third about the outcomes of the daily centre and the last about the model of the daily centre.

Section A: Information about the organisation

1.0 When were you started?
   1.1 What was the original reason why you were started?
   1.2 What have been the main developments in your organisation’s activities since then?

2.0 What is your geographical coverage?
   2.1 What is the reason for this?

3.0 Who are you trying to help?
   3.1 How many beneficiaries do you work with over a year?
   3.2 How many of these do you regularly work with?

4.0 What was the income and expenditure of the whole organisation for the past three years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 What are the sources (government, trusts and foundations, etc.) of this year’s income? What percentage from each?

4.2 What have your reserves (usually net current assets) been for the past three years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserves (months of expenditure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 How many FTE (Full Time Equivalent) staff do you currently have?
   5.1 Generally, what qualifications/skills do require for the main front-line staff job descriptions?

6.0 How many volunteers do you currently have?
   6.1 What training do they receive?

Section B: Information about the daily centre

7.0 When were you started?
   7.1 What was the original reason why you were started?

8.0 What is your geographical coverage?
   8.1 What is the reason for this?
9.0 When are you open?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Open?</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before school</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During school</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.0 How many young people come to the centre in a year?

10.1 What age are they?
10.2 What is the split between boys and girls?
10.3 How many of these attend regularly?

11.0 How are you funded?

11.1 Is funding on a per child basis?
11.2 How restrictive is your funding?

12.0 How many FTE staff do you currently have?

12.1 What are their qualifications/skills?
12.2 If you require certain qualifications/skills, what is the reason for this?
12.3 What is the ratio of young people to paid staff?

13.0 How many volunteers do you currently have?

13.1 What training do they receive?

14.0 What need are you addressing with the daily centre?

14.1 How did you identify this need?
14.2 How do you ensure that those with this need come to the centre?
14.3 What are the most common presenting needs of the young people participating? (ie, why are they referred to you and you accept them?)

15.0 Who refers young people to you?

15.1 What percentage from each referral source?
15.2 Do you accept all young people who are referred? What is the reason for this?

16.0 How do you decide which young people participate?

16.1 Do all of these young people end up participating (ie, is there any drop-off)? What is the reason for this?
16.2 What are young people’s perceptions of you before they participate?
16.3 What is the induction process?
16.4 Does the young person (or his/her family) pay to participate? What is the reason for this?

17.0 Describe your activities.

17.1 Are activities individual- or group-focused, or a combination of both? What is the reason behind this?
17.2 Do young people have a choice of activities? What is the reason behind this?
17.3 Is there a progression through activities? (eg, a short ‘taster’ session followed by a more structured programme) What is the reason behind this?
18.0 Describe the physical space of the daily centre.
    18.1 Why are you located where you are?
    18.2 What are your priorities for this space?
    18.3 Do all activities take place here?

19.0 Are young people required to attend?
    19.1 What is this requirement?
    19.2 How formal is this requirement?
    19.3 Who is it between?
    19.4 What is the reason behind this?

20.0 How often do young people attend? For how long do young people attend?

21.0 Is a young person supervised by a particular member of staff?
    21.1 What does this supervision involve?
    21.2 Do young people have regular meetings with the member of staff? What do these meetings involve?
    21.3 Does this staff member act as an advocate for the young person outside the organisation too? What is the reason behind this?

22.0 Is behaviour a problem?
    22.1 How is this dealt with?

23.0 For how long do young people typically attend the daily centre?
    23.1 How do they ‘graduate’ or leave? (e.g., is it after certain time period, or after certain outcomes are achieved?)

24.0 Is the family involved?
    24.1 If yes, how many?
    24.2 If yes, how?
    24.3 What is the reason behind this?

25.0 Is the school/social services/etc. involved?
    25.1 If yes, how?
    25.2 What is the reason behind this?

26.0 What is your relationship with the local community?

27.0 With which other daily centres do you work?
    27.1 How do you know what other daily centres are doing?

Section C: What outcomes does the daily centre achieve?

28.0 What outcomes do you want to achieve?
    28.1 Do your funders require reporting on outcomes?

29.0 What results do you measure?
    29.1 What are these results?
    29.2 What are ‘successful’ results? How do you know?
    29.3 Do you learn from these results? How else do you adapt activities?

30.0 Do you measure well-being?
    30.1 Is so, how?
    30.2 If so, do you ask the young people themselves?
31.0 How are you regarded by those who participate? By their friends/peers? By their families? By the community? By government? By other funders?

31.1 How do you know?

Section D: What is the model of the daily centre?

32.0 How do you see different parts of what you do contributing to the outcomes you want to achieve?

32.1 What part would you single out as being most important? What are the other important parts?

32.2 How were parts of the model decided? (i.e., understanding of need, trial and error, understanding of results, funding requirement, historical accident)

33.0 How integral are the different parts? I.e., would your organisation still be your organisation if X were missing?

33.1 What sets your model apart?

34.0 For whom does your organisation work best? What is the reason for this? How do you know?

35.0 How do you see what you are doing fitting in with what the government is doing to help young people like the ones you work with? What other charities are doing?

36.0 How do you see what you are doing fitting in with the role of the family/school?

37.0 What do you think is the ideal size of a daily centre?
### Framing question: Is the daily centre doing the right things?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions to ask</th>
<th>Sources of evidence</th>
<th>Why important?</th>
<th>How decided why important</th>
<th>Red flags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities focus on greatest need</strong></td>
<td>Knows who it wants to help, and why.</td>
<td>What was the original reason why you were started? What need are you addressing with the daily centre? How did you identify this need?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Part of logical model.</td>
<td>Necessary for logical model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a position on how it fits in with the family and school.</td>
<td>How do you see what you are doing fitting with the role of the family/school?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Part of logical model.</td>
<td>Necessary for logical model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands its role in relation to what the government is doing.</td>
<td>How do you see what you are doing fitting in with what the government is doing to help young people like the ones you work with?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst’s understanding; knowledge of what the government is doing.</td>
<td>Part of logical model.</td>
<td>Necessary for logical model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of activities matches aims and objectives</strong></td>
<td>Knows what outcomes it wants to achieve.</td>
<td>What outcomes do you want to achieve?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Part of logical model.</td>
<td>Necessary for logical model; NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities match to desired outcomes.</td>
<td>How do you see different parts of what you do contributing to the outcomes you want to achieve?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Part of logical model.</td>
<td>Necessary for logical model; NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No gaps in provision, based on ambition and capability.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst’s understanding; backwards mapping.</td>
<td>Part of logical model.</td>
<td>Necessary for logical model; NPC framework.</td>
<td>Key activities missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities will continue to be the right thing</strong></td>
<td>Ability to adapt or innovate.</td>
<td>Have you ever had to adapt your activities? Have you ever piloted new activities? What was the reason behind this?</td>
<td>Hard evidence; future plans less convincing.</td>
<td>Activities need to be the best to achieve desired outcomes.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to grow or replicate.</td>
<td>How have you expanded your activities since you started?</td>
<td>Hard evidence; future plans less convincing.</td>
<td>Ambition to achieve social change.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identifying young people with the greatest need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions to ask</th>
<th>Sources of evidence</th>
<th>Why important?</th>
<th>How decided why important</th>
<th>Red flags</th>
<th>Best practice examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has identified best referral sources.</td>
<td>Who refers young people to you?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre's and analyst's understanding.</td>
<td>Needs to know who children with priority needs are to help them.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>FARE takes referrals from a variety of sources, but identifies self-referral and referral from families as best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has identified best mix of referral sources.</td>
<td>What percentage from each referral source?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre's and analyst's understanding.</td>
<td>Needs to know who children with priority needs are to help them.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>The Tullochan Trust gets mostly self-referrals, which it encourages as it thinks self-referral signals young people are choosing to attend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has good relationships with these referral sources.</td>
<td>What are your relationships with your referral sources like?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst's understanding.</td>
<td>Needs to know who children with priority needs are to help them.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>Info: University has good relationships with local schools; Cooperativa Martinengo has the same understanding of need as its referral sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has clear eligibility criteria for participation.</td>
<td>Do you accept all young people who are referred? What is the reason for this?</td>
<td>Evidence that the daily centre applies objective criteria to decide which children attend.</td>
<td>Needs to target activities at children with priority, not non-priority, needs.</td>
<td>Daily centres’ responses; good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>EYLA has clear, strict criteria for participation, as it knows that its programme will not work for all boys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivating these young people to attend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions to ask</th>
<th>Sources of evidence</th>
<th>Why important?</th>
<th>How decided why important</th>
<th>Red flags</th>
<th>Best practice examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stigma minimised.</td>
<td>What are young people's perceptions of you before they participate?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analyst's understanding.</td>
<td>Young people will be put off attending if have negative perception of the daily centre.</td>
<td>Daily centres’ responses; literature review; good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>EYLA has a ‘negative sell’ to encourage boys to attend; FARE uses its community café as an introduction and tries to keep activities mixed; the Tullochan Trust has a weekly drop-in centre for young people not attending regularly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Questions to ask</td>
<td>Sources of evidence</td>
<td>Why important</td>
<td>How decided why important</td>
<td>Red flags</td>
<td>Best practice examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good introduction to the daily centre.</td>
<td>What is the induction process?</td>
<td>Daily centre’s and analyst’s understanding; evidence that drop-off is minimised.</td>
<td>Young people will not continue to attend if they do not have a good introduction to the daily centre.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>Large drop-off.</td>
<td>Diapason Cooperativa Sociale has an induction process tailored towards individual needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Questions to ask</td>
<td>Sources of evidence</td>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td>How decided why important</td>
<td>Red flags</td>
<td>Best practice examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre’s and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of positive relationships with staff.</td>
<td>Daily centres’ responses; literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>FARE has staff work in teams, which means that young people see them performing different roles, making their relationships with staff stronger and happen faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is behaviour a problem? How is this dealt with?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre’s and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of positive relationships with staff.</td>
<td>Daily centres’ responses; literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Tullochan Trust has a ‘carrot and stick’ approach, rewarding good behaviour and not tolerating bad behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has a physical space that reflects the ethos of the daily centre.</td>
<td>Quality standards; logical model; daily centre’s and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of physical space.</td>
<td>Oliver Twist Foundation; literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>FARE and Diapason Cooperativa Sociale both have strong roots in the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are your priorities for this space?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre’s and analyst’s understanding.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of physical space.</td>
<td>Oliver Twist Foundation; literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Into University has classrooms designed to feel like university lecture halls, reinforcing that higher education is a real option; Associazione Cometa is located on the grounds of the founding families’ home, emphasising that the daily centre is a place where children can feel at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has identified when children are ready to leave the daily centre.</td>
<td>For how long do young people typically attend the daily centre?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre’s and analysts’ understanding.</td>
<td>Daily centre should encourage independence.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>Children remain at daily centre beyond typical age.</td>
<td>Cooperativa Martinengo ensures its age range spans the transition from primary to secondary school; EYLA and IntoUniversity have long-term approaches, having identified early intervention as best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do they ‘graduate’ or leave?</td>
<td>Daily centre should encourage independence.</td>
<td>Daily centre should encourage independence.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EYLA plans for boys to come back as mentors for younger cohorts after they have left.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Questions to ask</td>
<td>Sources of evidence</td>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td>How decided why important</td>
<td>Red flags</td>
<td>Best practice examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating good external relationships</td>
<td>Takes referrals from families and schools if appropriate.</td>
<td>Who refers young people to you?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre's and analysts' understanding.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of involving families and schools.</td>
<td>Daily centres' responses; literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Into: University has links with universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages a positive perception of the daily centre.</td>
<td>How are you regarded by young people's families? By their schools?</td>
<td>Feedback from families and schools.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of involving families and schools.</td>
<td>Daily centres' responses; literature review.</td>
<td>Families/schools have a negative perception of the daily centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involves families and schools in activities if appropriate.</td>
<td>Is the family/school involved? If yes, how? What is the reason behind this?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre's and analysts' understanding.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of involving families and schools.</td>
<td>Daily centres' responses; literature review.</td>
<td>Does not involve families and schools when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shares information about progress of young person with families and schools.</td>
<td>Do you meet regularly with the family/school? What does this meeting involve?</td>
<td>Daily centre's and analysts' understanding; evidence of how this information is shared.</td>
<td>Evidence of importance of involving families and schools.</td>
<td>Daily centres' responses; literature review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages a positive perception of the daily centre.</td>
<td>How are you regarded by government?</td>
<td>Feedback from government.</td>
<td>Logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government has a negative perception of the daily centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures its activities reflect what it sees its role in relation to what government is doing.</td>
<td>How do you see what you are doing fitting in with what the government is doing to help young people like the ones you work with?</td>
<td>Logical model; daily centre's and analysts' understanding.</td>
<td>Logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Questions to ask</td>
<td>Sources of evidence</td>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td>How decided why important</td>
<td>Red flags</td>
<td>Best practice examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares best practice with other daily centres.</td>
<td>With which other daily centres do you work? How do you know what other daily centres are doing?</td>
<td>Evidence of relationships with other daily centres, whether informal (e.g., staff knowing each other) or formal (e.g., membership in a network or association, attendance at conferences)</td>
<td>To improve quality and help the charity remain up to date.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>Works in isolation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains good relationships with alumni.</td>
<td>How do you what are alumni are doing?</td>
<td>Evidence of how these relationships are maintained.</td>
<td>To understand long-term impact and to provide role models for younger cohort.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td>No contact with alumni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves activities based on alumni feedback.</td>
<td>Do you ask alumni for feedback? How have you change activities based on this information?</td>
<td>Hard evidence; future plans less convincing.</td>
<td>Activities need to be the best to achieve desired outcomes.</td>
<td>Good programme practice; logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framing question: Is the daily centre committed to measuring and learning from results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions to ask</th>
<th>Sources of evidence</th>
<th>Why important?</th>
<th>How decided why important</th>
<th>Red flags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A results culture</td>
<td>Uses results to make strategic decisions.</td>
<td>How are results used to make strategic decisions?</td>
<td>Analyst’s understanding; user participation.</td>
<td>To achieve best outcomes.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has specific targets that it can measure.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Review of strategic and business plans.</td>
<td>To achieve best outcomes.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives priority to results at all levels of the organisation.</td>
<td>How is results measurement regarded by members of staff? How are results communicated, internally and externally?</td>
<td>Attitudes to results measurement at all levels of the organisation; communication of results internally and externally.</td>
<td>To achieve best outcomes.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td>Positive attitude to results measurement only at top level of organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses results data to improve its activities and the activities of others.</td>
<td>Do you learn from results?</td>
<td>How results data is used internally. Examples of how results data has led to better services. Use of results data to influence others.</td>
<td>To achieve best outcomes.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual results</td>
<td>For activities:</td>
<td>What results do you measure? What are these results?</td>
<td>In order of quality of evidence: regular systematic outcomes measurement, one-off evaluations, user feedback and demand levels, experience elsewhere, logical model for change. Quality of results compared to similar projects.</td>
<td>To understand whether making a difference, and to improve services.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievements against long-term organisational goals.</td>
<td>What are ‘successful’ results? How do you know?</td>
<td>Regular measurement system in place.</td>
<td>To understand whether making a difference, and to improve services.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you achieving desired results?</td>
<td>Progress against milestones.</td>
<td>To understand whether making a difference, and to improve services.</td>
<td>NPC framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Organisations participating in the research

This appendix gives some basic information about the organisations in Italy and the UK that participated in the research. It summarises their history, vision and purpose and clarifies what part of the organisation we looked at for the research. A brief overview of these activities is then given.

Eastside Young Leaders Academy

History, vision and purpose: Eastside Young Leaders Academy (EYLA) was set up in 2002 to improve the life chances of disadvantaged and disaffected Afro-Caribbean boys in Newham, east London. Its founder, Ray Lewis, had worked for many years in the prison service and was struck by the negative patterns of poor academic achievement and offending behaviour that characterised the lives of many of the young black men entering prison.

This research focuses on EYLA, and its core activities. There are now two more Academies—one in the London borough of Southwark, and another in Luton, a town about 50 kilometres from London. These academies are operationally independent, but were set up with the support of and using the same model as EYLA.

Activities: EYLA runs an after-school tutorial programme, which boys attend four times a week for classes in National Curriculum subjects such as maths, English and science, as well as other subjects such as black history. There is a quiet place for homework. Boys who participate after school are also required to attend the Saturday programme, which has more of a focus on leadership and social skills, and are invited to attend the holiday programme. Community service is a requirement, and work with parents and schools fits in with these core activities. The eventual aim is for 250 boys, aged 8 to 18, to attend the centre; currently 90 boys attend as the centre has yet to reach full capacity for the older age groups. All boys attend regularly.

Family Action in Rogerfield and Easterhouse

History, vision and purpose: Family Action in Rogerfield and Easterhouse (FARE) was founded in 1989 by local people in response to the lack of support and activities in the local community, especially for young people. Territorialism was later identified as limiting to all types of opportunities—including travelling to other neighbourhoods, doing well in school, getting a job and finding a house. FARE aims to improve the lives of people living in Easterhouse, a neighbourhood of Glasgow, and its surrounding area by providing a place for people to meet, participate in activities and get support.

This research focuses on activities that are targeted directly at young people, and take place primarily in the centre. FARE is a community organisation that works not just with young people but with the entire family to tackle the root causes of poor standards of living and territorialism. Its work with young people does not just take place in the centre; for example, FARE also does anti-gang work in primary schools.

Activities: FARE runs six youth clubs a week for a variety of age groups. Its centre-based activities include sports and physical games, arts and crafts, board games and IT workshops. About 180 children and young people, aged 4 to 18, attend the centre each year, of whom approximately 70% attend a minimum of one session a week. FARE is open all day, Monday to Friday, except for Friday evenings when the building is used for other activities. Friday evenings and weekend activities take place outside of the centre.

IntoUniversity

History, vision and purpose: IntoUniversity was founded in 2002 to provide educational and pastoral support to children and young people at risk of failing to reach their potential. The charity aims to be a ‘home away from home’ for children who would not otherwise receive after-school support with their homework, and to introduce young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to university early, to encourage them to consider higher education as a real option for when leave school.

This research focuses on the charity’s first centre in north Kensington. IntoUniversity also runs other centres in deprived areas of London, all based on the original model.
Activities: Into. University runs three types of activities for eight to eighteen year olds: academic support, providing a safe and stimulating place for young people to get tutored help with their studies; mentoring, pairing young people with undergraduate mentors from Imperial College; and its FOCUS programme of out-of-school activities on subjects such as sport, biology and World War II. It also runs school-based workshops for primary and secondary schools. About 500 young people attend the centre a year, of whom approximately half attend regularly. The split between boys and girls is about 60/40. The centre is open everyday after school from 3:30pm to 6:00pm, and sometimes during school and during school holidays.

The Tullochan Trust

History, vision and purpose: The Tullochan Trust was founded in 1996 to help some of the most disadvantaged eight to eighteen year olds in Scotland reach their potential.

This research focuses on the Network Community and Youth Centre, which opened as part of the Haldane project in 2003. The Centre has recently closed, due to subsidence, and activities now run out of a community centre shared by other organisations. It remains a good example of an established centre, which the charity has since replicated throughout West Dunbartonshire.

Activities: The Tullochan Trust offers activities to children and young people based on their interests. For example, the Haldane Project got young people involved in a mix of arts, drama, sports and community activities. Just over 200 young people attended this centre a year, of whom about 70 attended regularly. The split between boys and girls was about 40/60. The centre was open all day, Monday to Sunday, except for Friday afternoons and evenings.

Associazione Cometa

History, vision and purpose: Associazione Cometa was set up in 2000 by two families who had been fostering children for almost 20 years. It runs a number of services for children and families in Como and the surrounding area, all underpinned by the philosophy that the family should be a source of stability in a child's development.

This research focuses on the organisation's daily centre, which was also set up in 2000 to provide study support for children and help them with the ‘fatigue of everyday life’.

Activities: Children are collected from school and taken to the daily centre, where they are given lunch and do their homework. They then participate in various workshops, games and other recreational activities. Between 80 and 130 children, aged 6 to 17, attend the centre a year, most of them regularly. The split between boys and girls is 55/45. The centre is open everyday after school from 12:00pm to 6:30pm, and Monday to Friday during the school holidays from 9:00am to 6:30pm.

Centro Italiano Aiuti all’Infanzia

History, vision and purpose: Centro Italiano Aiuti all’Infanzia (CIAI) was founded in 1968 to promote international adoption. Since its beginning as an association for adoptive families, CIAI has expanded internationally and has run many conferences on adoption and childhood generally. It has recently turned its attention to Italy, where it is piloting the daily centre model.

This research focuses on a daily centre that CIAI set up in a district of Milan in January 2009, after consulting about local need. The aim is for the daily centre to provide primary school children who need support with school activities and relationships, a safe place to participate in educational and recreational activities supervised by responsible adults.

Activities: The daily centre offers children a place to do their homework and participate in activities such as games and music workshops. Local outings are also planned. Currently 22 children, aged 8 to 11, attend the daily centre. There is an even split between boys and girls. The centre is currently open Tuesday and Friday, 4:30pm to 6:30pm.

Cooperativa Martinengo

History, vision and purpose: The Cooperativa Martinengo was set up in 1986 by a group of nuns to support ‘families in difficulty’ in an area of southeast Milan through a home visiting service. Through this work, the organisation identified the need for a daily centre—somewhere that would serve as a ‘stable reference point’, especially during the transition to secondary school.
This research looks at the Casa di Sam daily centre, which the Cooperativa Martinengo started in 2007.

Activities: Children arrive at the daily centre after school, when they will have their lunch and talk about their morning. There will then be time for them to do their homework and get help with their studies, and participate in recreational activities, including film groups, music, cooking and model making. Trips and holidays are also offered, as well as work experience in the summer. Around 40 children attend the daily centre, of whom about 75% attend regularly. They are mainly aged between 11 and 15, although ten and sixteen year olds will also sometimes participate. The split between boys and girls is 60/40. The daily centre is open every day after school and during school holidays. It is also open at other times if required; for example, if children need help getting to school or being taken to hospital appointments.

Diapason Cooperativa Sociale

History, vision and purpose: The Diapason Cooperativa Sociale was founded in 1985 to improve the living conditions of young people, disabled people and their families from deprived backgrounds. More recently, it started working with immigrants. It focuses on those areas where it believes it can become a part of the community.

This research focuses on the organisation’s seven daily centres, which are collectively called Progetto Azimut. The Diapason Cooperativa Sociale operates in three decentralised zones of Milan, and each zone has daily centres accommodating children of different age groups.

Activities: At the daily centre, each child has an Individual Educational Project. This is supplemented with academic-focused activities such as homework help and exam preparation; recreational activities such as art, sport and drama; outings in the city and district; and more intensive individual help if required. Primary school children are transported to and from the centre, and lunch and dinner are provided when appropriate. Summer camps and holidays are offered during the school holidays. Across all seven daily centres, 113 children attend, aged 6 to 18. All of them attend regularly. The centres are open everyday after school, at weekends for special events and all day during the school holidays.
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Improving the charity sector
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- How are you getting on?: Charities and funders on communicating results (2009)
- Granting success: Lessons from funders and charities (2009)
- Valuing potential: An SROI analysis on Columba 1-400 (2008)
- More advice needed: The role of wealth advisors in offering philanthropy services to high-net-worth clients (2008)
- Turning the tables: Putting English charities in control of reporting (2008)
- Turning the tables: Putting Scottish charities in control of reporting (2008)
- On the bright side: Developing a questionnaire for charities to measure children’s well-being (2008)
- Advice needed: The opportunities and challenges in philanthropy for ultra high net worth individuals and family offices (2007)
- Funding success: NPC’s approach to analysing charities (2005)
- Surer Funding: Improving government funding of the voluntary sector (2004, published by acevo)
- Full cost recovery: A guide and toolkit on cost allocation (2004, published by NPC and acevo)
- Just the ticket: Understanding charity fundraising events (2003)
- Funding our future II: A manual to understand and allocate costs (2002, published by acevo)
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