

National Evaluation of Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects: Second Annual Report

Julie Nelson, Pauline Wade,
David Kerr and Graham Taylor
National Foundation for Educational Research
(NFER)

**Research Report
No 507**

***National Evaluation of Post-16
Citizenship Development Projects:
Second Annual Report***

***Julie Nelson, Pauline Wade,
David Kerr and Graham Taylor***

National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)

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

© Queen's Printer 2004
ISBN 1 84478 164 X

CONTENTS

	page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Method of Research	4
1.3 Structure of the Report	6
2. BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	9
2.1 Consortium-level Management of the Projects.....	10
2.2 Organisational-level Management	16
2.3 The Young People.....	21
3. CONCEPTUALISATION OF CITIZENSHIP.....	27
4. INTEGRATION OF CITIZENSHIP	35
4.1 Integration with Programmes, Curriculum and Ethos	36
4.2 Integration with Pre-16 Citizenship	40
4.3 Integration with External Agencies and the Wider Community.....	43
5. TEACHING AND LEARNING CITIZENSHIP	47
5.1 Approaches to Programme Development	48
5.2 Underlying Factors	49
5.3 Teaching and Learning Approaches and Use of Resources	53
6. AIMS AND OUTCOMES	57
6.1 Programme Aims, Objectives and Expectations	58
6.2 Strategies for Monitoring, Evaluation and Review	61
6.3 Recognition of Achievement.....	62
6.4 Outcomes for Young People	63
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	71
7.1 Management and status of citizenship	71
7.2 Definitions and Understanding of Citizenship	72
7.3 Integration of Citizenship	73
7.4 Teaching and Learning Citizenship	74
7.5 Suggested Approach to Development.....	75
APPENDIX A1	i
APPENDIX A2	ii
APPENDIX B1i.....	iii
APPENDIX B1ii.....	vi
APPENDIX B2i.....	ix
APPENDIX B2ii.....	xii
APPENDIX C	xv

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This paper summarises key research findings from the second year of a three year evaluation of the post-16 citizenship development projects¹ undertaken by the NFER. It is based upon interviews with 228 individuals across the Round 1 and Round 2 projects,² and upon management information (MI) data supplied to the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) by the projects. The evaluation aims to:

- ♦ Assess the extent to which the development projects were progressing in line with their action plans, and were working towards their own objectives.
- ♦ Identify the conditions necessary for the success of post-16 citizenship.
- ♦ Identify the forms of citizenship provision that appear the most effective.
- ♦ Examine the apparent impact of involvement in post-16 citizenship on young people's knowledge, understanding and skills.

Key Recommendations

The second year of the evaluation has provided evidence that the projects are developing a range of innovative approaches to active citizenship. From this evidence base it is possible to identify and summarise those factors that appear to underlie the most successful provision. The projects appear to be most successful where there is:

Management factors

- ♦ A flexible, yet rigorous, framework which recognises that projects are developing citizenship programmes in a wide variety of ways, from taught to more active approaches, according to the specific needs and circumstances of their organisations, staff and young people.
- ♦ Sufficient funding for local management of projects to be effective, including support for relevant agencies to act as brokers of information between pre- and post-16 citizenship providers.
- ♦ Encouragement of local networking and dialogue between those developing citizenship programmes, without establishing an imperative.

¹ For full background information on the development projects, see page 3 of this summary.

² Round 1 is the term used to describe the first cohort of development projects, which began developing post-16 citizenship in September 2001. Round 2 projects were those that began working with young people to develop post-16 citizenship more recently, in September 2002.

Institution-level factors

- ◆ A clear definition of what citizenship means, and what the programme seeks to achieve.
- ◆ Senior management support and a supportive organisational ethos.
- ◆ Sufficient time for staff to develop aims and objectives, teaching and learning strategies, assessment approaches and preferred outcomes.
- ◆ Sufficient funding, especially if citizenship is to be introduced on a wider scale with large numbers of young people.
- ◆ Dedicated and enthusiastic staff (these need not be specialists, but ideally should be willing volunteers). They would act as ‘champions’ to promote citizenship to staff and students.
- ◆ Appropriate and sufficient staff development and training opportunities.
- ◆ The tailoring of citizenship to the needs, skills, interests and experiences of young people.

Learning context-level factors

- ◆ Dedicated and enthusiastic staff, with the skills to facilitate as well as teach.
- ◆ A dedicated time slot for citizenship (whether as a discrete course, a module within a programme, or a specific project). The integration of citizenship into a wider tutorial scheme was generally regarded to have been a less effective approach, although there was one example of successful provision in this respect.
- ◆ An emphasis on combining knowledge, understanding and skills with practical action – what is termed a ‘political literacy in action’ approach, apposed to a narrower political knowledge approach.
- ◆ Involvement and participation of young people in decisions about their learning, and the development of a student voice.
- ◆ A focus upon critically active forms of learning, including discussion, debate, dialogue and reflection. The best examples were where young people were helped to think, reflect and take action.
- ◆ The use of a variety of experiential learning approaches, including project work, drama, role play, art, photography and exhibition work.
- ◆ The use of varied and interesting resources, ideally with relevance to the interests and experiences of young people.
- ◆ Links with the wider community through off site visits, the use of external speakers, and giving young people responsibility for working and negotiating with external partners.
- ◆ The involvement of young people in active participation in large-scale assemblies such as youth fora and student parliaments.
- ◆ Assessment strategies that are effective and realistic, based upon the needs, skills and capabilities of the young people.

Background

Citizenship education has been at the centre of a major debate and review over the past decade. The review centred on the work of the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools, set up in 1997 and chaired by Professor (now Sir) Bernard Crick. The final report of the advisory group³ recommended that citizenship education be developed around three separate but interrelated strands: social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. Citizenship has since become a statutory component of the National Curriculum at key stages 3 to 4. In 1999, a separate Advisory Group on Citizenship for 16-19 Year Olds in Education and Training was established, also chaired by Professor Crick. It reported in 2000⁴ and recommended that citizenship should become an entitlement for all young people aged 16-19. The report recommended that citizenship should be recognised as a key life skill alongside the six key skills already identified. The post-16 report built upon the principles of the pre-16 report, whilst recognising the specific context of post-16 education and training and the need for skills development and ‘active citizenship’ opportunities.

The Development Projects

A three year developmental phase of post-16 citizenship began in September 2001, when a first round of pilot projects began exploring ways of delivering citizenship in organisations providing education and training to 16-19 year olds. In September 2002, a new group of pilot projects began a second wave of development. The Round 1 projects consisted of 11 consortia, each with a Consortium-level Project Manager (CLPM) overseeing the development of a range of programmes across partner organisations. The Round 2 projects were organised rather differently, with no CLPM, but a Project Manager within each individual organisation. According to MI data, organisations involved in developing post-16 citizenship included 35 school sixth forms (24 Round 1, 11 Round 2), 30 FE colleges (14 Round 1, 16 Round 2), 15 voluntary organisations (13 Round 1, 2 Round 2), 15 training providers (nine Round 1, six Round 2), nine sixth form colleges (six Round 1, three Round 2) and five ‘other’ organisations (four Round 1, one Round 2).

Methodology

The evaluation adopts a largely qualitative methodology based upon the following research methods:

- ♦ In-depth strategic interviews conducted with 11 CLPMs across the 11 Round 1 consortia between October and December 2002, and with nine LSDA consultants across the 10 Round 2 consortia between March and May 2003.⁵

³ QUALIFICATIONS AND CURRICULUM AUTHORITY (1998). *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, 22 September 1998*. London: QCA.

⁴ FURTHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL (2000). *Citizenship for 16-19 Year Olds in Education and Training. Report of the Advisory Group to the Secretary of State for Education and Employment*. Coventry: FEFC.

⁵ One Consultant oversaw two consortia.

- ◆ In-depth interviews with operational staff and young people across 21 case-study organisations (one per consortium). These included discussions with citizenship coordinators/organisation-level project managers (20), staff delivering or facilitating programmes (24), young people (138) and, where relevant, external partners (2). These interviews were conducted between March and June 2003.
- ◆ Analysis of data received from the consortia up to August 2003 through their termly management information (MI) returns to the LSDA, which provided details of young people's participation rates, action plans, and progress.

The Findings

Participation

At the end of the academic year 2002-2003, the reported number of core participants across the Round 1 projects was 5,860 and across the Round 2 projects, was 3,043. The number of young people participating in Round 1 projects had increased substantially from 1,127 in the first year. This rise was accounted for, partly by more projects making returns in year two, and partly by some genuine increases in the numbers of young people catered for. Data received from the projects continued to be patchy, especially for Round 1 projects. Indeed, such large numbers of young people were unaccounted for by their sex (2,288) or their ethnicity (2,357), that it was not possible to make any meaningful comment on the characteristics of those involved. It appeared to be the case, however, that the majority were level 3 learners. The data for Round 2 projects was more comprehensive, and suggested that approximately 56 per cent of the young people were female and 44 per cent male. Around eight tenths appeared to be white, whilst the single largest category of learners (approximately half) was reported to be working at level 3, as would be expected in a post-16 project.

Management and status of citizenship

The input of LSDA consultants and CLPMs was generally welcomed by project staff, and in many cases the consultants and CLPMs reported sharing a positive working relationship. Factors that interviewees felt would help the overall management of the projects to run even more smoothly included:

- ◆ An agreement as to the respective roles of CLPMs and consultants, or anyone that might replace them in the future, realistically matched to available funding. Should they be regarded as administrators or developers?
- ◆ A consideration of the impact of reduced central management next year (through the removal of CLPMs). It may be necessary to have designated individuals whose sole responsibility is to help projects monitor their programmes if there is to be an ongoing requirement for self-evaluation.
- ◆ The encouragement of networking and coordination across projects without establishing an imperative. Round 1 organisations appeared to be more effective in cross-project cooperation, but it was not clear whether

this was due to the input of a CLPM or the fact that they had been developing links and relationships for longer than the Round 2 organisations.

- ◆ There is no evidence that either the Round 1 or Round 2 model of development was preferable. The relative effectiveness of each approach appeared to be dependent upon individual circumstances and personalities.

There was a fairly high level of senior management support for post-16 citizenship within the case-study organisations. However, the following factors were also considered crucial to ensuring that post-16 citizenship had high status. They were not always in place across the projects at this stage:

- ◆ A ‘champion’ to promote the importance of citizenship to staff and young people.
- ◆ Genuine enthusiasm on the part of delivery staff, and a desire to work in partnership with young people. This was felt by most interviewees to outweigh the need for specific expertise or knowledge.
- ◆ Ring-fenced time for coordinators to plan and organise, and for deliverers to develop their understanding of citizenship and to design interesting programmes. Lack of real time remains an issue across many of the projects at present.
- ◆ Good opportunities for staff development and training. This was a fairly underdeveloped area across the projects at present, with most organisations undertaking informal development activities, rather than providing formal training courses.

Definition and understanding of citizenship

There was a high level of awareness of the Citizenship Advisory Group reports, which are generally regarded as the key guidance on developing citizenship, across the case-study organisations. However, most organisations indicated that they had chosen to cover only one or two of the three strands of political literacy, community involvement and social and moral responsibility outlined in these reports. The main reason they gave was that:

- ◆ specific strands were felt most appropriate to the needs of their particular young people.
- ◆ Their programmes were too short (only a few weeks long in some instances) for all three strands successfully to be covered.

The message is that there is currently no single, simple or unified view of what constitutes post-16 citizenship. However, this was not considered problematic by most interviewees. Indeed, practitioners welcomed having the flexibility to interpret citizenship in such a manner as suited their organisations, young people and individual circumstances, and many had done so to good effect.

The majority of interviewees felt that the political literacy strand was the weakest element of their programmes. However, it was clear that the projects had actually developed programmes that were far more balanced in their approach to this strand than they realised. Many programmes sought to raise young people's awareness of general issues affecting them, including drugs, sex, health and inequality. By attempting to approach these issues from a 'political' rather than a 'personal' angle, the projects were helping young people to become politically literate (albeit not by developing a knowledge of government systems or processes). This finding suggests the importance of:

- ♦ A re-enforcement of the definition of citizenship (in particular the political literacy strand) linked, where possible, to real, practical case studies.⁶
- ♦ The need for a flexible, yet rigorous, framework for viewing post-16 citizenship developments.

Integration of citizenship and approaches to development

The programmes that were under development across the case-study organisations can be broken down into two broad categories:

- ♦ those that adopted a primarily classroom-based taught approach, often with 'active' elements (thirteen organisations)
- ♦ those that could be described as experiential learning/participation programmes with no formal taught element (eight organisations).

Those in the former group were normally integrated into an existing programme structure (for example A/S Level General Studies, or a wider tutorial programme), and were most common in schools, FE colleges and sixth form colleges. Those in the latter category tended to be either stand-alone activities, or integrated seamlessly into the wider ethos of the organisation. Organisations favouring this latter approach were youth work and voluntary organisations and some schools.

It was clear from interviews with young people that experiential learning programmes and discrete taught courses were the most popular, and also helped young people to develop the most comprehensive understanding of what citizenship meant. The greatest levels of negativity and poorest citizenship learning experiences were apparent where citizenship had been integrated into wider tutorial programmes. It is important to recognise that this finding reflects the nature of the case-study tutorial programmes (where young people felt that they did not understand how citizenship issues fitted with their wider programmes, that the learning approach adopted was uninteresting, and that staff were sometimes not highly motivated). It should not be taken to imply that the tutorial cannot provide a basis for effective citizenship provision. Indeed, there was one example of a successful approach to citizenship through a tutorial programme, which hinged around young

⁶ The work currently being undertaken by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) will be extremely valuable in this respect.

people developing an explicit understanding of what citizenship means, the use of interesting and interactive learning techniques, and student representation within the college. These findings have the following implications:

- ◆ Organisations with large numbers of students, such as FE and sixth form colleges, generally felt that, in the absence of large-scale funding, the only way to reach a substantial number of their students was to introduce citizenship into their tutorial programmes. Small, or specialist, organisations such as youth work organisations or special schools, were in the best position to develop programmes that were responsive to the needs and interests of their young people, due to their high staff: young person ratio.
- ◆ There are issues about the replicability of these latter responsive programmes with large numbers of young people, should post-16 citizenship be rolled out nationally. It is a cause of some concern that the programmes that attempted to reach the largest numbers of young people, through tutorial schemes, appeared to have had less success in engaging young people than other types of programme, as outlined above. Given that the tutorial will be a preferred option for many FE and sixth form colleges in developing citizenship in the future, it will be important to pay close attention to course content and learning approach across such programmes to ensure that they are as effective as possible.

The integration of citizenship into the wider community tended to be underdeveloped, with little reported interaction with national citizenship organisations, and some of the larger organisations reporting that they found it difficult to find suitable opportunities for community linking and activities for all their young people. A small number of case-study organisations, however, demonstrated that links with the wider community need not just be seen in these terms. They showed how new partnerships could be forged with long-standing partner organisations based upon the political aspects of their role, or could be developed with the organisations that provided services to the organisation, by giving young people responsibility for negotiating issues with them. In some cases, the organisation itself was seen as the ‘community’ within which young people were encouraged to take an active role. This suggests that:

- ◆ There may be some need for a re-enforcement of the meaning of community involvement, and some case-study examples of it being achieved in an imaginative way, which makes best use of existing contexts and resources.

Whilst virtually all interviewees saw the issue of integration between pre- and post-16 developments as important, especially in the longer term, very few practical links had yet been made. The main reasons appeared to be that there was a lack of understanding, on the part of non-school providers, of how schools operated, and what they sought to achieve at pre-16. Interviewees

indicated that there may be a need for an individual or agency to act as a broker between schools and post-16 organisations in future to assist with:

- ♦ the development of local citizenship networking groups
- ♦ the provision of baseline data from schools to post-16 providers on students' experiences and understanding of citizenship issues
- ♦ independent guidance on the development of post-16 citizenship programmes, which takes into account the baseline of pre-16 activity.

Teaching and Learning

A variety of teaching, learning and facilitation approaches had been developed across the projects. Case-study evidence suggests that the most successful approaches included the following features:

- ♦ A negotiation of key issues of interest with the young people.
- ♦ The development of a critically reflective learning environment, with scope for discussion and debate.
- ♦ The use of a variety of experiential learning experiences, including project work, drama, role play, art, photography and exhibition work.
- ♦ The use of varied and interesting resources, ideally related to, or growing out of, current events (whether local or national) which have relevance for young people.
- ♦ Facilitation of activities based on the active involvement of young people rather than the teaching of knowledge, understanding and skills.
- ♦ Links with the wider community through off site visits, the use of external speakers, and the allocation of responsibility to young people for working and negotiating with external partners.
- ♦ Involving young people in active participation in large-scale assemblies such as youth fora and student parliaments.

Aims and Outcomes

Most programmes' aims were concerned with discovering the most appropriate ways of facilitating post-16 citizenship, and seeking the best possible experiences and outcomes for their young people. Few had yet established rigorous systems for monitoring or evaluating effectiveness, and hence the following reported outcomes are based upon the judgements of practitioners and upon the views of the young people themselves, rather than on any 'hard' evidence of impact. Round 2 projects generally felt that it was too early for them to comment on outcomes. However, Round 1 practitioners reported a number positive impacts, as outlined below.

- ♦ The development of technical, social and life skills.
- ♦ Increased knowledge of political, social and democratic issues.

- ♦ Increased awareness, on the part of young people, of their ability to contribute to society, influence decision making and affect change.
- ♦ Increased maturity, self-esteem and responsibility among young people involved in the projects.

Young peoples' expectations were reported to include a wish to: develop new knowledge and understanding; develop new skills; raise awareness of citizenship and gain qualifications. A minority of young people had no particular expectations of their programmes. In spite of reported concerns about a lack of political literacy across the projects, all the young people that identified a wish to develop new knowledge and understanding demonstrated that they had done so at some level. Active citizenship skills were also clearly being developed, and young people reported successes in raising awareness of citizenship and related issues within their organisations and the wider community. There was little evidence yet of young people gaining qualifications or certificates, but this was mainly a reflection of the timing of the interviews, which took place between April and June 2003.

Conclusion

The pilot development projects have made considerable progress in addressing and providing answers to the key challenges involved in developing citizenship programmes for young people involved in a variety of education, training and work-based routes. It is hoped that the lessons learnt will prove invaluable not only for any planned national roll-out of post-16 citizenship but also for the development of pre-16 citizenship. In a climate of growing discussion about, and planning for, provision not just 16-19 but increasingly 14-19, it is vital that the outcomes of the development phase are applied as widely as possible. Indeed, it is hoped that there are still further valuable lessons to emerge as the projects enter their third (Round 1) and second (Round 2) years of development.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report marks the end of the second year of a three year evaluation of the DfES funded post-16 citizenship development projects in England undertaken by a team of researchers at NFER. It builds upon interim reports circulated to the DfES and LSDA in February and June 2003⁷ and reflects an increasingly complex situation in terms of both the development of citizenship education and post-16 educational provision.

1.1 Background

Citizenship education has been at the centre of a major debate and review concerning its purpose, location and practice over the past decade. The review centred on the work of the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools, set up in 1997 and chaired by Professor (now Sir) Bernard Crick. The final report of the advisory group⁸ recommended that citizenship education be developed around three separate but interrelated strands: social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. Citizenship has since become a statutory component of the National Curriculum at key stages 3 to 4. In 1999, a separate Advisory Group on Citizenship for 16-19 Year Olds in Education and Training was established, also chaired by Professor Crick. It reported in 2000⁹ and recommended that citizenship should become an entitlement for all young people aged 16-19, who should be given effective opportunities to participate in activities relevant to the development of their citizenship skills. The report recommended that citizenship should be recognised as a key life skill alongside the six key skills already identified. The post-16 report built upon

⁷ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report.

NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report.

⁸ QUALIFICATIONS AND CURRICULUM AUTHORITY (1998). *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship*, 22 September 1998. London: QCA.

⁹ FURTHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL (2000). *Citizenship for 16-19 Year Olds in Education and Training. Report of the Advisory Group to the Secretary of State for Education and Employment*. Coventry: FEFC.

the principles embedded within the pre-16 report, whilst recognising the specific context of post-16 education and training and the need for skills development and 'active citizenship' opportunities.

The pilot projects, which began trying out a range of ways of delivering post-16 citizenship in September 2001, consisted of 11 consortia, each with a consortium-level Project Manager (CLPM) and action plan as well as project level objectives (these are referred to later as Round 1 Projects). They have now had two years in which to develop the programmes that best suit their young people.

Meanwhile, in September 2002, citizenship became a statutory component of the National Curriculum at key stages 3 to 4. This has given some urgency to the issue of progression between pre- and post-16 citizenship and has created a belief in some of the post-16 projects, that as from September 2003, young people will have greater knowledge and experience of citizenship. At the same time (September 2002), a new group of post-16 pilot projects (referred to as Round 2 Projects), began a second wave of development of post-16 citizenship provision. These projects have a quite different method of organisation to those in the Round 1 phase. They have an LSDA consultant who works with them, but no CLPM, and their action plans are produced at organisation and not consortium level.

A further significant development has been the publication of the White Paper *14-19 Opportunity and Excellence*,¹⁰ which has implications for the future organisation of secondary education and the place of citizenship studies within it. In particular, it will make the issue of continuity between pre- and post-16 citizenship more urgent and could change the way in which schools, colleges and training providers work as independent units.

Thus, the post-16 projects have found themselves caught up in a much wider policy review, which has, to a certain extent, shaped external expectation of what they might, and might not, achieve. In spite of the growing focus on a 14-19 curriculum, and on continuity between pre- and post-16 citizenship provision, it is important that developments within the post-16 sector should be considered within a context which is quite distinct from that at pre-16:

¹⁰ DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS (2003). *14-19: Opportunity and Excellence. Volume 1*. London: DfES.

- ♦ **Diversity of provision** – There is huge diversity amongst the institutions that make up the post-16 education and training sector. Even between school sixth forms, Sixth Form Colleges and Further Education Colleges, there are considerable differences in the types of courses offered, staffing levels and experience, tutorial systems and links with external organisations. Training Providers and Youth and Community groups, with their completely different structures, add still further to the complexity of this sector.
- ♦ **Non-compulsory provision** – As citizenship is not a compulsory requirement, the numbers of young people involved vary widely from one institution to another and citizenship courses are often not curriculum-based. Participation in citizenship activities is frequently voluntary and often done in the young person's own time and with variable degrees of supervision.
- ♦ **Diversity of aims and objectives** – The nature of the post-16 projects, which is exploratory and developmental, means that their aims and objectives have also been extremely diverse. Depending on the nature of the institution and the type of young people involved, some have been small-scale and very specific, others large-scale and ambitious, some have linked with other post-16 initiatives such as key skills and some have involved visits abroad or links with different age groups and organisations. There has also been a variety of assessment methods, and a mixture of accredited courses and non-accredited schemes.

Thus, although there will be some overlap and similarity between pre-and post-16 citizenship provision, there will also be key differences. The distinct nature of the Round 1 and Round 2 projects also needs to be taken into consideration in interpreting the findings of this evaluation. The 11 Round 1 consortia have now had two years in which to develop citizenship programmes and to try and deal with any particular problems that have arisen as a result of the way in which they are organised, whereas the Round 2 projects are only in their initial year of development. Additionally, the looser consortium arrangement in Round 2 means that some operate entirely individually, only meeting their project partners for occasional steering committees, while in other areas there are much closer links between the partners.

Thus it is clear that the Round 1 and Round 2 projects are at different stages of development and that their progress cannot be compared directly. The Round 1 projects have the benefit of longer involvement and so have had more time to determine what type of programmes work well and why. On the other hand, the Round 2 projects have benefited from the experience of Round 1, particularly because eight of the Round 2 consultants have also worked with Round 1 projects. As a result, they have gained knowledge and insight which

they have been able to pass on to the Round 2 projects in the hope of assisting them to develop their programmes more quickly and more smoothly. Another advantage to starting later has been a greater clarity as regards what constitutes post-16 citizenship, which the Round 2 projects have been able to build into their programme objectives from the beginning.

The concluding point to make in this opening section is therefore, that post-16 citizenship finds itself in an increasingly complex and fluid situation. This report has been produced in such a way that, it is hoped, the significant strands emerging from the second year of the evaluation, as they relate to both Round 1 and Round 2 projects, can be clearly demonstrated and understood.

1.2 Method of Research

The evaluation upon which this, and previous reports, is based has been commissioned by the DfES in order to:

- ◆ Assess the extent to which the development projects have progressed in line with their agreed action plans, and are meeting their own objectives.
- ◆ Identify the conditions necessary for the success of post-16 citizenship.
- ◆ Identify the forms of citizenship provision which appear to be most effective.
- ◆ Examine the impact of involvement in post-16 citizenship on young people's skills, attitudes and knowledge.

In order to address these objectives, this report builds upon the first annual report and interim reports circulated to the DfES and LSDA in February and June 2003.¹¹ It is based upon detailed interview data gathered from strategic interviews with Round 1 Consortium-level Project Managers (CLPMs) in the Autumn Term 2002, and with Round 2 LSDA Consultants in March and April 2003. It also draws upon in-depth interviews conducted across 21 case-study organisations that have been developing post-16 citizenship programmes (11 in Round 1, and ten in Round 2) between April and June 2003.

¹¹ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report.
NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report.

The profile of organisations visited during the course of the evaluation was as follows:

- ◆ 5 FE Colleges (1 Round 1, 4 Round 2)
- ◆ 5 School Sixth Forms (2 Round 1, 3 Round 2)
- ◆ 4 Sixth Form Colleges (3 Round 1, 1 Round 2)
- ◆ 3 Training Providers (2 Round 1, 1 Round 2)
- ◆ 2 Youth Services (1 Round 1, 1 Round 2)
- ◆ 1 Connexions Service (Round 1)
- ◆ 1 School for the physically disabled (Round 1).

Three of the Round 1 case-study organisations were changed this year, two on the advice of CLPMs, and one, because of the complete re-structuring of a consortium, and the introduction of a new group of project organisations. Interviews were undertaken with 228 individuals as outlined below:

- ◆ **CLPMs** (those who managed the range of citizenship development projects within Round 1 consortia) (11).
- ◆ **LSDA Consultants** (those who acted in an advisory capacity to Round Two consortia (9).¹²
- ◆ **Citizenship coordinators** (those who managed citizenship development projects within individual organisations) (11 Round One, 9 Round Two).
- ◆ **Delivery/facilitation staff** (those who work directly with young people to develop post-16 citizenship) (8 Round One, 16 Round Two).
- ◆ **External partners** (agencies that worked with individual organisations to offer help, guidance or community service opportunities for young people) (1 Round One, 1 Round Two).
- ◆ **Young people** (core participants in the citizenship development programmes) (75 Round One, 63 Round Two).

The evaluation also drew upon data received from the projects through their termly management information (MI) returns to LSDA, and on information received from the *Eurydice* education information network in Europe (of which the UK unit is based at NFER). (See Appendix C).

The following chapter outlines the structure for reporting the findings from the research outlined above.

¹² One of the consultants is responsible for two of the ten consortia.

1.3 Structure of the Report

Given that advice will shortly be being presented to Ministers on the future of post-16 citizenship, this report seeks to draw out, as far as is possible based upon available evidence, indications of factors that appear to enable or hinder successful development. It also presents some suggested approaches to effective provision.¹³ It is hoped that these evidence-based recommendations will contribute to decision making about the future of post-16 citizenship. However, it should be stressed that they are based upon the experiences of the projects at a relatively early stage of their development,¹⁴ and hence that they should not be viewed as definitive at this stage.

The report has been structured around key themes that have emerged through interviews with Consultants, CLPMs, practitioners and young people, and which have been highlighted in previous evaluation reports. These themes appear to underlie much of what is pertinent to the relative success of post-16 citizenship and its implementation, and provide a useful frame within which to assess:

- ♦ The degree of effectiveness of individual projects and the development project as a whole.
- ♦ Generic factors which appear to enable successful practice and outcomes across all projects.
- ♦ Specific factors which aid development within particular organisational settings, with specific groups of young people or across particular types of programme.

The themes around which the report are based are: the way in which the projects are managed and organised (Chapter 2); the ways in which citizenship is understood, defined and conceptualised (Chapter 3); the extent to which citizenship is integrated into the organisation, programme or community (Chapter 4); the approach to the teaching, learning or facilitation of citizenship (Chapter 5) and the impact of citizenship on organisations and young people (Chapter 6). The report concludes by pulling together the key thematic findings in order to make recommendations regarding the conditions and factors appearing to underlie successful provision, and provides some effective approaches to effective provision. Unless otherwise stated (for example, in

¹³ Given the complexity of the post-16 sector into which these development projects have been introduced, it was felt more appropriate to describe potential **approaches** to citizenship development, which can be applied flexibly according to individual circumstances, than to identify specific **models** of provision, which might imply a rather more rigid framework for development.

¹⁴ This is especially true of Round 2 projects.

Sections 2.3 and 6.1), the evidence in the report is based upon the detailed face-to-face interviews undertaken by NFER researchers, rather than upon the MI data received from the projects.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Summary of findings:

There were a number of factors that interviewees felt would help the central management of the projects, which included:

- ◆ An agreement as to the respective roles of consortium-level project managers (CLPMs) and consultants. Should they be regarded as administrators or developers? Expectations of what each might be expected to achieve, matched to realistic funding, was felt to be important.
- ◆ A consideration of the impact of reduced central management in the third year of development. It may be necessary to have designated individuals whose sole responsibility is to help projects monitor their programmes if there is to be an ongoing requirement for self-evaluation into the future.
- ◆ The encouragement of networking and coordination across projects without establishing an imperative. It should be recognised that developing and nurturing effective networks takes time. Networks were more developed in Round 1 than Round 2 projects at this stage.
- ◆ There is no evidence that the Round 1 or Round 2 model of development was preferable. Relative effectiveness appeared to be dependent upon individual circumstances and personalities.

There appeared to be a fairly high level of senior management support for post-16 citizenship. The following issues were raised as factors that would further improve the status of post-16 citizenship. They were not felt to be present across all projects at this stage:

- ◆ A 'champion' to promote the importance of citizenship to staff and young people.
- ◆ Genuine enthusiasm amongst delivery staff and a desire to work in partnership with young people.
- ◆ Ring-fenced time for coordination, planning and programme development. Lack of real time remains an issue across many of the projects at present.
- ◆ Opportunities for staff development and training across a wide range of topics, themes and approaches.

This chapter considers how the Round 1 and Round 2 projects have developed during the last year and draws on information from the fourth and fifth termly reports and the interviews carried out with case-study organisations.

2.1 Consortium-level Management of the Projects

This section is based on the views of Round 1 consortium-level project managers (CLPMs) and Round 2 consultants with regard to the funding, staffing and organisation of their projects.

2.1.1 Funding and staffing

a) Round 1

As explained in a previous evaluation report,¹⁵ Round 1 consortium funding had presented some concerns for the CLPMs, who claimed they had found it difficult to fulfil both a developmental and administrative role within the limitations of their budgets. As a result, they felt that they either had to find non-LSDA-funded support to supplement their funding, or to focus on specific, rather than all, features of a project manager's role. However, a positive development during the second year was that five of the CLPMs felt that their role had shifted from a largely **administrative** to a more **developmental** one. The reasons for this change of emphasis were reported as:

- ◆ The appointment of administrative assistants (non-LSDA-funded)
- ◆ That their projects had become better at self-management and in particular more efficient in compiling their MI returns.

The second point would suggest that experience and time were having a beneficial effect in at least some of the Round 1 consortia. However, as outlined in a previous evaluation report,¹⁶ the reduced role of CLPMs in compiling MI returns may go some way to explaining the reduced scope of the MI returns during the second year of development.

b) Round 2

All but one of the consultants to the Round 2 projects (eight) also said that the available funding did not cover all the work they undertook. However, they accepted that their budget allocation was reasonable and they were philosophical about doing more than they were paid for. Their general attitude

¹⁵ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (pp. 4-5)

¹⁶ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (p. 4)

was that the satisfaction of giving good support to their projects outweighed the fact that they worked longer than their contracted hours. Some had not charged for travel time, despite covering long distances to visit core partners, while others had taken training sessions without charging. Only one said that the support and guidance given to projects was dictated by available funding and that s/he would have liked to have been able to do more.

All nine consultants felt that their role was a complex, and rewarding, one which involved a combination of strategic planning, direction, facilitation and guidance, dependent upon the particular needs of each project.¹⁷ However, three consultants drew attention to what they felt was a **tension** between the supportive and directive elements of their role - mainly because they had to chase projects for their MI returns. Of these three; two accepted this task as tedious, but necessary, while the other rather resented it, because it was felt to have turned this consultant into a '*chase agent and moaner*'. The tension referred to here was a reflection of the different management structure in Round 2 where there were no CLPMs to do the '*chivvying*' necessary to get returns in on time.

As seven of the Round 2 consultants were also involved in some way with the Round 1 system, they were in an ideal position to compare the merits of both models. All agreed that there were key differences. In particular, the absence of a CLPM in Round 2 was felt to have had a significant impact on their role in a number of ways. Positive benefits were felt to be:

- ◆ More direct access to their individual projects and the staff and young people in them (most interviewees).
- ◆ Freedom from the burden of having to spend time and effort supporting the CLPM rather than the projects (two consultants).
- ◆ Reduced conflict over issues where it was unclear if it was a management or a consultant concern (one consultant).

However, other consultants were less happy about the removal of CLPMs in Round 2, as follows:

¹⁷ For a more detailed description of the role of Round 2 Project Consultants see NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report. (pp. 3-4).

- ◆ Concern over increased managerial responsibility, which detracted from the consultant's strategic development role (two consultants).
- ◆ Missing the good relationship developed with their Round 1 CLPM, which had enabled the exchange of ideas which helped innovation and a strategic overview (two consultants).
- ◆ Missing the CLPM's role in identifying key areas for the consultant to work on with the projects, so giving a clearer focus on how best to assist them (two consultants).

There was no clear message as to whether Round 1 or 2 was a better model of operation. In the end it came down to the efficiency of the CLPM and consultant, and the relationship between the two. If the CLPM was effective, with, for example, a clear working understanding of active citizenship, and the ability to support core partner organisations through the various phases of their development, and to administer their consortium effectively, then the Round 1 model was felt to have worked well. If not, it was often felt to add an extra layer of unnecessary bureaucracy.

2.1.2 Management Structures

a) Round 1

The Round 1 projects had seen some changes in **formal management structures** since the first year of operation:

- ◆ Some consortia had expanded their advisory groups to include representatives from external agencies, such as Connexions, local businesses and Youth Enterprise – perhaps an indication that they were becoming increasingly outward looking.
- ◆ All projects were still holding steering group meetings and while some still held separate core partner and advisory group meetings, the majority had combined to create one large steering group. The frequency of meetings varied between one and six months.
- ◆ Two consortia reported that their steering groups were now much more driven by young people. Each core partner organisation was sending representatives from amongst their young people to the steering group, a development seen as highly encouraging by the CLPMs.
- ◆ In one area an entirely new project group had formed after the disintegration of the original consortium.

With regard to **cross-project networking**, nine consortia reported that more had taken place than in the first year. Five project managers stressed how important this was for developing good practice and even for simply raising

awareness of what citizenship was. This view was echoed by one of the case-study organisations which commented on the benefits of the different projects getting together, especially when they were such diverse institutions, because it made some of them realise that: *'Citizenship is not only for young people in mainstream education who had GCSEs and high self-esteem and confidence'*.

Three of these CLPMs thought that they were the prime movers behind developing networking and that without them it would not be happening. (If this were proved correct, it would have considerable consequences for Round 2 projects). However, the counter view to this was provided by one Round 1 project coordinator, who thought that too much pressure to cooperate from CLPMs was counter-productive: *'It's ok if you want to do something together, but if you're forced to do it, it's not good and doesn't work. Having to be linked in all the time with what is happening in different organisations with completely different kids is not useful'*. By contrast, three other CLPMs reported that there had been much more informal networking in their consortia, which was an encouraging sign of the projects becoming less dependent on their input. Examples of such cross-project cooperation included one consortium that was looking at links between pre- and post-16 citizenship and another, where one project coordinator thought informal networking was very important in an area of racial and religious tension.

The second year had also seen more formal **cross-project events** and these had brought together different organisations and groups, often in a highly successful way. Most of these events had focused around the young people and issues of concern to them. For example, in one consortium, the students had organised several events on their own and with only a minimum of adult supervision – an encouraging sign of how their skills were developing. Examples of non young people-centred events were: an awareness raising session for senior personnel in the community on consultation between adults and young people; and a successful conference which had encouraged information sharing and brought about more direct contact between core partners.

b) Round 2

All nine consultants in Round 2 valued the opportunities to meet, discuss and think critically about their role, especially through the termly Keep In Touch

(KIT) meetings organised by the LSDA.¹⁸ However, there was quite a varied picture with regard to wider contacts across the Round 2 areas. The relationship between individual projects and their consultants was reported positively in all but one area. There were also regular meetings for project coordinators. However, the level of cross-project cooperation fostered through these meetings appeared low, as described below:

- ♦ They were limited to planning particular joint events (four coordinators). One went so far as to say that steering group meetings were entirely taken up with planning a citizenship conference, but felt that if that was not the focus of their attention, s/he '*was not sure they would still be talking about anything*'.
- ♦ They drew together disparate organisations (one coordinator): '*We are too unlike. Their projects are very different. It is a nice sounding board, but it's a purely artificial construct*'.
- ♦ There had initially been some collaboration between the projects, to organise a series of events for the young people. However, the young people participating had changed by the time of the second event, so they lost continuity and cooperation dropped away (one coordinator).
- ♦ Formal meetings were attended regularly, but partners worked independently and did not have the time to be involved in joint activities.

Only in three areas was there any sign of real cross-project cooperation:

- ♦ One had a steering group to which Student Union Presidents from all participating organisations were invited. The coordinator here commented on how useful meetings were for sharing '*interesting practice and ideas*'.
- ♦ The second area had adopted a collaborative approach from the beginning. All three institutions worked together as a team, holding frequent formal and informal meetings as well as joint training courses.
- ♦ The third provided the only example of a project that was undertaken jointly across three institutions, with each one concentrating on one particular element. There was also an advisory group, similarly useful and which included a number of external partners.

Two of the areas mentioned above had partners from similar institutions, in one place schools and in the other FE colleges. This probably made cooperation less complicated than across very diverse organisations. In the third case, although there was a mixture of types of institution, they had a

¹⁸ For further details see NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report. (pp. 9-10)

previous history of working together and two of the projects actually shared the same premises, which obviously facilitated networking.

The question of why it was only these three areas that had been able to develop a more collaborative system is interesting, particularly bearing in mind the comment, referred to above from the Round 1 CLPM. The fact that there were **no overall consortium action plans or CLPMs** to encourage networking could be seen as a contributing factor to the greater emphasis on independent development in Round 2. However, it should be noted that it took Round 1 projects until the second year of their development to begin networking more informally, as contacts and confidence levels increased. This may also happen across the Round 2 projects in time. Additionally, the case-study organisations visited did not appear to regret their lack of close ties and would perhaps agree with the coordinator from the Round 1 institution who talked about the dangers of being forced into collaboration when it was not wanted and did not work. As long as there was the machinery for cross-project meetings and a willingness to learn from others, the view seemed to be that closer cooperation would develop as and when it was considered to be in the projects' interests.

There are a number of points emerging from this section which merit policy consideration:

- ◆ Several Round 1 CLPMs and Round 2 consultants referred to a **tension** between their administrative (collation of MI data) and developmental roles and felt that greater clarity would be helpful in terms of what they might realistically be expected to achieve, matched to the funding they received. One of the reasons why consultants reported spending more than their allocated time assisting their projects was because they felt they were pulled in several directions. Although consultants reported being prepared to work longer than they were paid for at present, such goodwill was unlikely to last for ever.
- ◆ The impact of **reduced central management** next year needs to be considered, especially in relation to the monitoring and evaluation of projects. It may be necessary to have designated individuals whose sole responsibility is to help projects monitor their programmes if there is to be an ongoing requirement for self-evaluation into the future.
- ◆ There is no evidence that either the Round 1 or Round 2 **model** is preferable. Their effectiveness or ineffectiveness seems to be dependent upon individual circumstances and personalities.
- ◆ Networking and coordination across projects was seen as useful by some organisations, but not by others. The main lesson was that it **should not**

be forced. Its biggest successes appeared to be across similar organisations or programmes, where there was a previous history of cooperation, or where the young people themselves were involved. Round 1 organisations appeared to be more effective in cross-project cooperation, but it was not clear whether this was due to the input of a CLPM or the fact that they had been developing links and relationships for longer than the Round 2 organisations.

2.2 Organisational-level Management

The Round 1 and 2 case-study organisations, visited during the Spring of 2003, were asked for their views on how they thought their projects were developing and on the perceived status of citizenship.

a) Senior management support

There was strong senior management support across most of the case study projects; in fact, in two schools amongst the Round 2 organisations, deputy head teachers were involved in delivering citizenship, while in three Round 1 organisations, (schools and colleges) the coordinator was part of the senior management team. Other organisations which often had a less formal management structure did not always comment directly, but the only difficulty generally seems to have been where there had been recent major changes in management.

In Round 1 organisations where there was strong senior management support, the status of citizenship was high, with encouragement for a citizenship ethos throughout the institution. Most non-academic institutions also reported that citizenship had a high profile because it was closely related to the work in which they were involved. In one organisation (a college) the coordinator and delivery staff were committed and they felt student interest was increasing, but citizenship was ignored by those not directly involved: *'This year, I don't think it had even rippled the water'*. The coordinator added that there had been a similar problem in other partner institutions, to the extent that two of them had dropped out of the consortium. The interviewee felt this was because the staff concerned had not had sufficient time or funding and citizenship was *'just another job that is put onto somebody's timetable without any money or time allocated to it'*. The coordinator in another case study organisation (a school) also complained about the lack of time (and by implication) the lack of status attached to his work; he was given one hour each fortnight, which he described as a *'gesture'*.

Amongst the Round 2 projects, there was one organisation which stood out as having given citizenship a particularly strong focus.

Round 2 School Sixth Form

At this school, which prides itself on its innovative approach to learning, the headteacher was responsible for the initial development of a partnership of organisations within the local area, focusing on different aspects of citizenship learning. Within this school, there was a good combination of strong senior management support, good cooperation between partners and a 'team spirit' approach, with the consultant, the coordinator and the delivery staff all dedicated to making the project work well and relate as directly as possible to the needs and interests of the young people.

There was plenty of commitment and enthusiasm from other coordinators and delivery staff too, but there were also complaints about lack of time and recognition as already quoted from Round 1. There were too, a substantial number of staff from Round 2 case study organisations who had little or no experience of citizenship and admitted that they and their projects were developing together.

b) Time

Time was an issue which concerned a large number of staff in all types of institutions. Coordinators especially, often felt under pressure because they did not have enough time allocated to their role and had to try and fit in planning and administration around their other responsibilities. Many of the staff delivering citizenship also felt that they did not have sufficient time for preparation and planning and sometimes even for attending training. The following comment summed up what was a general opinion: *'It is always bolt-on. You have your main job which always carries on, and anything that is citizenship has got to be squeezed in'*.

For schools and colleges that had students doing academic courses, there was a perception from non-citizenship staff that 'their' subjects were more important and this was why some organisations had decided not to timetable citizenship at all. For others fitting it into tutorials or enrichment programmes was the only way forward. There was a similar problem for students taking vocational courses, with training providers especially often feeling constrained by the heavy work load of their young people and by the expectations of employers.

c) Funding

Funding did not appear to have raised any serious concerns across the case-study organisations. There had been a specific problem for one Round 2 area, where a number of organisations had joined the project at different times and there had been some disputes over funding percentages. Some organisations mentioned that they had been successful in finding alternative sources of funding which has helped to alleviate budgetary concerns. The nature of these additional sources of funding will be explored in detail during the final year of the evaluation.

d) Staffing

With a few exceptions, the staff who were coordinating citizenship activities within the various Round 1 and Round 2 projects were volunteers. This was especially the case in non-academic organisations. As regards delivery of citizenship, whether those involved were volunteers or conscripts depended largely on the way in which the programme was organised.

Those institutions which delivered citizenship through a tutorial system obviously relied heavily on conscripts; for example a large college could have 80 tutors involved, with none of them volunteers. Also institutions where citizenship was run as an examination course tended to rely on teaching staff from particular disciplines. Similarly, Training Provider staff were often 'conscripted' when their organisations joined a partnership.

The level of experience of both coordinating and delivery staff varied widely both within and across projects. Lack of experience of citizenship was mentioned more frequently by Round 2 organisations, but that could be partly because of their more recent involvement with the post-16 Project. Again, a lot depended on the type of citizenship courses being run and the nature of the organisations. To some extent, in Round 2 especially, organisations had developed programmes which matched up to the experience and expertise of the staff who were coordinating and delivering them. Most of the coordinators interviewed thought that specialist staff were not generally necessary for delivering citizenship; it was more important to have commitment and enthusiasm, especially as there were so many resources available. Several also commented that the type of pilot projects they were involved in required some measure of staff and young people working together to see what best suited their organisations. One explained, *'Enthusiasm is more important than*

recruiting specialist staff to deliver citizenship. If you have motivated staff, you've got it cracked because they can teach citizenship. They'll learn what they need to know'.

e) Staff development

Most coordinators referred to the national conferences and training events as having been useful for their own development and some said that they had also been responsible for organising training for delivery staff in their own institutions. Such training was usually quite informal, for example, tutor preparation or information on running active citizenship schemes, rather than formal training courses.¹⁹ However, some organisations had brought in external trainers (sometimes their consultants) and there had been some specific training undertaken, for example, in how to use the Be Real game or how to integrate drama into citizenship.

Only one organisation had invested in what they described as 'radical staff training', which had included counselling courses and training in how to facilitate different learning styles. This organisation was involved in the training of disadvantaged young people and perhaps therefore had a particular incentive to tackle such a comprehensive staff training scheme.

However, there were five Round 1 and five Round 2 organisations where there had been no training at all for staff delivering citizenship. Reasons were said to be because:

- ◆ it was not thought necessary
- ◆ of a lack of time, with one college reporting that their staff had to come in during their Christmas holidays to receive the training that was provided
- ◆ substitute cover could not always be found even if funding was available, as there were no substitute teachers available for most vocational courses
- ◆ the courses were at an experimental stage and it would be better to wait until they had become more permanent, before spending money on training.

One Round 2 coordinator explained that delivery staff, in this case tutors, had been '*afraid*' of their new responsibilities at first. However, if young people

¹⁹ This finding is corroborated, and explored in greater detail, in the latest report of the cross-cutting strand evaluation relating to staff development and training. NORMAN, L. (2003). Post-16 Citizenship Training and Development Cross-Cutting Project: Sixth Report. Unpublished report.

were themselves determining the programme, then *'everyone is learning as they go along'* and what was required was *'awareness raising'* rather than training. The need to adapt to different teaching and learning styles was actually referred to by one project (a school), as being a training requirement that they would need to consider in future, because if citizenship was to be successful, it would need to break away from the *'typical classroom mould'*.

In terms of considering future requirements, there were two organisations (one Round 1 and one Round 2) that thought individual staff support, perhaps through a mentoring scheme, would be more useful than training courses. Another suggestion was for more sharing of good practice across all projects, with a request that the LSDA might be able to facilitate this.

There was one project (a sixth form college), which had developed a tutor training scheme, including observations and feedback with mentoring. Such a scheme could be the type of staff development that would interest other institutions. Finally, on the issue of training, there were four organisations that admitted that if post-16 citizenship were to be extended, staff development would have to take a much higher profile, a view that was endorsed by Round 2 consultants.

The key messages that seemed to be emerging were:

- ♦ Ideally organisations needed clear and/or **strong senior management support**, or area-level support where citizenship was introduced into one course area in a large organisation. A 'champion' was required to promote the programme and encourage staff and young people to see value in it.
- ♦ It was felt to be more important for delivery staff to have **enthusiasm** than expert knowledge of citizenship. Also skills relating to the particular type of programme, or the young people involved, were felt to be of benefit. Most projects had been able to draw on staff with these attributes, but those that had introduced citizenship through wider tutorial programmes reported that it had been difficult to motivate staff.
- ♦ There was a need for an inbuilt facility for **coordinators to plan and deliverers to develop** interesting schemes and ideas. The major problem faced by many of the organisations was that non-core subjects such as citizenship attracted low levels of funding and were not felt to be operating on the same footing as other subjects, especially in schools and colleges. This meant that it was difficult to devote serious time for development and delivery.
- ♦ Staff development and training seemed to have a fairly low profile and was often organised on an ad hoc basis. Such informal schemes might need to

be developed if citizenship is to be adopted more widely at post-16 level in the future.

2.3 The Young People

The following information is based on the MI data supplied to LSDA by project organisations. This data was not consistently provided by all participants, and often no information was given as to the characteristics or learning levels of the young people identified by the projects. The following figures should therefore be seen as indicative rather than definitive. Whilst they give some idea of the relative proportions of young people involved, it is not possible to comment with certainty about the overall exposure of young people to post-16 citizenship, or about the representativeness of provision.

Appendix B1i shows that across Round 1 projects, the core number of participants had risen from 4,107 to 5,860 this term. However, this was largely accounted for by one sixth form college programme (B) which was allegedly catering for 1,850 students (compared to 40 last year). It is not possible to say anything reliable about the gender of these young people, because 2,288 of them were not described as either male or female, nor about their ethnicity, as 2,357 were not described by their ethnic grouping. Appendix B1ii shows that a smaller number of young people (713) were unaccounted for by the levels at which they were learning, so it is possible to contend that the majority (3,215) were learning at level 3, a substantial increase since last term. This, however, was mainly accounted for by Programme B, all of whose 1,850 learners were described as working at level 3.

With the Round 2 projects there had been less obvious change, with a slight decrease in the number of core participants from 3,541 to 3,043 (see Appendix B2i). The number of males and females summed up to slightly more than the total number of core participants, but it is still possible to say with some certainty that around 56 per cent were female and 44 per cent were male. Only 228 of the young people were unaccounted for by their ethnicity, and 295 by the levels at which they were learning therefore the following distributions should be considered fairly reliable:

- ♦ The vast majority of young people (2,332) were white, with smaller numbers being described as Pakistani (234), black African or Caribbean (117), Indian (55), Bangladeshi (34), Chinese (23) and mixed race (20).
- ♦ As with Round 1, the majority of young people in Round 2 were learning at level 3 (1,393). There were 23 at pre-entry level, 140 at entry level, 413 at level 1, 751 at level 2 and 28 at level 4.

These numbers are reflective of the types of institutions and different geographical areas involved in the development projects. As there were far more schools, sixth form colleges and FE colleges than training providers and voluntary organisations, it was not surprising that level 3 learners outnumbered all others. Similarly, while organisations in areas such as London and the North-west had quite substantial numbers of ethnic minority students, those in rural areas, especially in the West and East Anglia, had very few. As the numerical returns are incomplete and sometimes inconsistent, it is not possible to use them as a basis for more detailed comment. Therefore, the following observations are based on data collected during the **case-study visits** which were chosen, as far as possible, to reflect all the projects.

It would be true to say that there were more young people who could be described as ‘**academic**’ than other types of learners. The school sixth forms and sixth form colleges had students who were mainly following AS and A2 programmes. However, even across this type of institution, there was considerable diversity. For example, one Round 1 organisation was a selective school with a strong academic ethos and in an area with only small ethnic minority representation. This contrasted with a sixth form college in an economically deprived part of London, where there were considerable social problems and where almost all the students were from ethnic minority backgrounds. Understandably, these two institutions were following very different citizenship programmes, but both were attempting to cover all three citizenship strands and both were engaging their learners and giving them responsibility and self-confidence. Students doing AS/A2 courses were usually those that were working towards examination-based citizenship courses where those were being offered (GCSE/AS level citizenship or AS/A2 level General Studies). There were, though, plenty of opportunities for such students to be involved in non-examination courses and sometimes there was a deliberate policy to encourage experiential learning programmes as a complement to academic studies.

Young people doing **vocational** courses were represented across a wide range of institutions, from sixth form and FE colleges to training providers and a local council. They were also representative of many types of course from college-based GNVQs to Modern Apprenticeships and basic skills training.

According to the MI returns, there were no young people with **Special Educational Needs (SEN)** or **English as a second or other language (ESOL)** within the post-16 citizenship development projects. However, as the following examples illustrate, such young people were certainly being catered for in some of the case-study organisations, showing that they were not overlooked, as might have been inferred from an initial reading of the MI returns.

Round 1 Special School

Here, physically disabled students had played a leading role in consortium steering group meetings, the local Youth Forum, a residential course and a meeting of the local council. As a result they had greatly increased their own self-confidence and ended the feeling of isolation which had existed previously. In addition, other students in the consortium had been given the opportunity to mix with disabled young people for the first time and to gain some insight into the types of problems they faced in society, not least the difficulties of physical access to public buildings. A mutually supportive atmosphere had developed, which was one of the particular strengths of this consortium.

Round 2 FE College

Becoming representatives in a college student parliament had given young people with ESOL practical experience of citizenship and a large boost to their self-confidence. This was particularly reported to have been the case when suggestions for college improvements were acted on by senior management.

Projects across Round 1 and 2 had also drawn in young people who came from disadvantaged backgrounds and who could be described as ‘disaffected’. There were three organisations that had programmes for those who were **not in education, employment or training (NEET)** and another three that were providing training for socially and educationally deprived groups. While not all were having the same degree of success in engaging these young people, they were all attempting to include individuals who arguably most needed to be included. One of these organisations had established a largely discussion-based programme which was mainly following the political literacy strand. The young men involved had responded well and felt that they had gained

useful social skills, explaining how, *'It has helped us to argue and debate things and get knowledge of more points of view than your own'*.

Another example of successful inclusion was a lifeskills programme for disengaged young people, some with social and learning needs. Although they had been reluctant at first, their interest had now been awakened and they had, for example, been *'really stirred up'* after attending a debate at the town hall.

These examples indicate that although the actual number of young people such as these may be relatively small, efforts have been made to include them and that there are programmes that work with them. The reasons for the success of such programmes would seem to be:

- ◆ A **dynamic coordinator/deliverer** who can relate to disadvantaged young people.
- ◆ Keeping groups fairly **small and manageable**.
- ◆ **Perseverance**, as often it is some time before any success begins to show.

Looking at the programmes overall, there were more young people for whom citizenship was compulsory than there were volunteers. Again this was often determined by the type of institution or the way in which citizenship was integrated, into an obligatory course for example, or a tutorial programme which effectively meant that the programmes were compulsory. Training providers also usually had compulsory schemes, sometimes because it was easier to organise but also because the numbers involved would otherwise be too low. FE colleges varied, with some making examination accredited schemes voluntary, but also running tutorial schemes, while others had concentrated on particular vocational courses, again often simply for ease of organisation or because of available staffing or limited funds. With youth groups there was a clear difference between those that had voluntary participation and those that were dealing with particularly vulnerable young people on lifeskills schemes.

On the subject of 'conscription', most organisations that had adopted this method pointed out that despite initial grumbles from some students, once they became involved, young people generally accepted the value of their citizenship programmes. This was supported by many of the young people

themselves when they were interviewed. The following comment was made by a young person on a work- based learning and lifeskills programme where young people had been encouraged to make constructive criticism of their organisation: *'If you really want something to change and you work together you can get what you want and push for things'*.

It is perhaps worth pointing out as a concluding remark, that organisations (mostly in Round 2), that had started off with a selective approach to participation, were hoping to extend citizenship programmes more widely once the pilots proved successful. The staff involved in all the case-study organisations were very supportive of the philosophy behind citizenship and accepted that it should be available to all who wanted it. However, convincing other staff was not so easy and proving that schemes could work was often necessary before programmes could be introduced on a wider scale.

3. CONCEPTUALISATION OF CITIZENSHIP

Summary of findings:

- ◆ There is currently no single, simple or unified view of what constitutes post-16 citizenship. This was not considered problematic by most interviewees who welcomed having the flexibility to interpret citizenship so that it suited their individual circumstances.
- ◆ There was a high level of awareness of the Citizenship Advisory Group reports. However, most organisations were covering only one or two of the three stands of political literacy, community involvement and social and moral responsibility outlined in those reports. This was often a conscious strategy, related to meeting the perceived needs of specific groups of young people.
- ◆ The political literacy strand was reported to be the weakest element of most programmes. However, many projects had clearly developed programmes that were more balanced than they realised, with good examples of ‘political literacy in action’ being demonstrated. Practitioners tended to assume that if they were not teaching about government systems or processes, they were not covering political literacy.
- ◆ The previous point suggests that there may be a need for a central re-enforcement of the definition of citizenship, and that post-16 citizenship developments need to be assessed within a flexible, yet rigorous, framework.

In order to place the Round 1 and Round 2 projects’ activities in context, and to make informed judgements about factors that might contribute to effective approaches, it is important to consider the various ways in which post-16 citizenship has been defined and understood by the projects.

All staff interviewees were asked to comment upon the post-16 Citizenship Advisory Group report, which is generally regarded as the key guidance on developing citizenship across the sector. Interviews indicated that at least one member of staff in eight of the Round 1 and nine of the Round 2 projects was familiar with the report. However, familiarity did not always mean that individuals knew the report in detail. As one FE college coordinator stated:

‘Rather like the case for the Euro, I haven’t ploughed my way through it.’²⁰

Neither did familiarity necessarily equate to a complete endorsement of the

²⁰ This corroborates the view of two project consultants, summarised in the fifth termly evaluation report, of uncertainty as to whether the principles of the report were ‘*embedded in the mind of day-*

report's principles. As one FE college senior manager commented: *'There is a difficulty in all three streams [political literacy, social and moral responsibility and community involvement] having equal weight. I think that would be a very difficult thing to bring about without resorting to having a set of criteria for each of the three strands.'* Neither did all interviewees specifically attempt to put the report's principles into practice. As one school citizenship coordinator explained: *'There's no way we've attempted to cover all aspects of citizenship... We've adopted much more of a haphazard approach!'*

Indeed, it could only be said that five organisations (three in Round 1 and two in Round 2) were covering **all three strands** outlined in the Advisory Group report. These represented all organisation types, two sixth form colleges, an FE college, a youth work organisation and a school, and so it would not appear to be the case that one type of organisation was more pre-disposed to adopting this approach than another. The example of the youth work organisation is given below. Here, the key coordinator was confident that one aspect of the programme, in particular, was: *'a good example. It covers all three strands. All three totally interface with each other.'*

Round 1 Youth Work Project, based around youth consultation evenings

This project's coordinator described how his organisation's citizenship programmes were constantly evolving. There were currently three separate projects in operation, of which the youth consultation evenings were one. One evening event had so far taken place, with a further six planned. During this event, a group of volunteer young people hosted a consultation of young people from the locality on issues of local concern (which enhanced the political awareness of many). As a result, a video was compiled, which was presented before a panel of local councillors and police representatives, and matters of concern were discussed and voted upon by the young people. Here the young people were said to be extending their involvement in the community, whilst acting in a socially and morally responsible manner. Their vote was carried on a couple of key issues, which meant that the young people had been able to extend their influence through negotiation with key members of the community. In summing up what he regarded as a highly successful project, the coordinator stated: *'There has been a real willingness to engage, because they set the agenda.'*

to-day activities of the practitioners.' NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report, (p. 17).

The majority of projects however, were focusing on one or two strands. In line with what was reported by Round 1 CLPMs in an earlier report,²¹ four projects reported that **community involvement** predominated in their programmes. In these organisations, practitioners tended to have interpreted post-16 citizenship as being about young people ‘*doing things*’ - taking part in their local communities, contributing to society or benefiting others in some way. These activities often focused around community service opportunities, being involved in a youth forum or providing a service to other young people. When asked their views on what ‘active citizenship’ meant to them, young people also tended to talk in terms of ‘doing things’. Young people across seven Round 1 and four Round 2 organisations mentioned ‘*helping in the community*’, ‘*making a difference*’, ‘*getting involved*’ and ‘*participating*’, often regarding active citizenship as an act of altruism.

On the face of things, these might be seen as ‘volunteering’ activities which, devoid of underpinning understanding and awareness, could be regarded as contrary to the spirit of the Advisory Group report. However, one FE college coordinator, working with students with learning difficulties and disabilities, defended his community service interpretation of post-16 citizenship as follows:

Bernard Crick’s bête noire is the Christmas party organised by students for old age pensioners. But some of my students have organised a Christmas disco and got a lot of satisfaction out of it...In my view it’s about everyone operating at their own level and it’s different things for different people. But the one thing it has in common is making a contribution to society whether it be local, national, regional or global.

A smaller number of young people across the projects demonstrated a more sophisticated understanding of what it meant to be an active citizen. Their definitions included:

- ♦ Being **prepared** to do things in the organisation or community - as one young person commented: ‘*none of my business is the worst sentence in the world,*’ and knowing **why** doing these things matters. (These comments were made by young people across three Round 1 and two Round 2 organisations).

²¹ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (p. 14).

- ◆ Being aware of how one's actions can **impact on others**. This view was held by trainees attending a Round 2 training provider – the only organisation that reported focusing specifically on the social and moral responsibility angle.

In three organisations (two in Round 1 and one in Round 2) **political literacy** was said to predominate. Interestingly, all these organisations were schools, which suggests that organisations tending towards formal, class-based curriculum approaches to learning may be best suited to delivering this strand. However, this also depends upon one's definition of political literacy. One FE college, in which the CLPM felt that political aspects had been the weak element of the programme, went on to provide an excellent example that, in fact, young people's 'political' awareness (albeit not of government systems and processes), had been enhanced through their programme. This example is illustrated below:

Round 2 FE college with a programme focused on an eight week citizenship module within the tutorial programme, and the creation of a student parliament.

During tutorial sessions students were encouraged to consider certain issues from a political, rather than a personal, viewpoint. Representatives from a local drugs agency and a young person's housing association came to the college to talk about:

- ◆ Local strategies to combat drug use on the streets through outreach programmes.
- ◆ How young people find themselves homeless, and what strategies are in place to avoid homelessness.

The project manager described how students would normally look at issues such as these from a purely personal perspective – how to avoid drug dependency for example. In this instance, the citizenship programme had encouraged them to look at these issues from a different angle, which, it could be said, enhanced their 'political' awareness and understanding of issues related to drug abuse and homelessness.

Indeed, a common theme that ran through interviews across around three quarters of the organisations was that post-16 citizenship should be about raising young people's knowledge, awareness and understanding of general issues affecting them – what one project coordinator described as '*youth issues*', and what another saw as factors directly affecting young people's communities: '*Making them totally aware of what is going on on their doorstep*'. When the young people were asked what they thought citizenship

education, as distinct from active citizenship, might be, those who had a view (only eight Round 1 and four Round 2 groups),²² tended to reinforce these staff views. Most of these young people viewed it as being about developing a knowledge and understanding of the wider world, so that they might be enabled to function within it and make informed decisions in the future. Two groups saw it specifically as learning about politics and the law, whereas a further two groups felt that it was about developing the skills and confidence to enable them to have a voice. As one young person commented: *'It's about opening doors to help you participate.'*

Staff interviewees hoped that an increased knowledge, awareness and understanding of youth and community issues would enable the young people concerned to:

- ◆ Develop an interest in a wide range of topics and broaden their horizons and life choices
- ◆ Become able to evaluate their lives and issues affecting them
- ◆ Challenge issues, situations and decisions, either actively or mentally, through *'critical engagement.'*
- ◆ Learn how to take responsible, informed actions, and ultimately to want to *'make a difference.'*
- ◆ Realise that they have a voice, enabling them to become empowered and engaged.

It is interesting that, in spite of these definitions and aspirations, so few projects saw themselves as attempting to tackle the political literacy strand. This seems to have emerged from an interpretation of the Advisory Group report that political literacy means learning about party political systems and the workings of local and national government only. One youth work coordinator illustrated this by saying: *'At the moment there is a gap between the coalface and academia,'* with an FE college tutor adding: *'At the moment it's quite academic and technical.'* Another FE college programme coordinator commented: *'I don't want to teach politics, in the same way the kids don't come on [name of college course] to learn politics. The schools will very much go down that route anyway, so I wanted to focus on youth issues that schools don't, or can't, tackle.'* The key finding here is that political

²² The other groups claimed not to know the term, not to have had their programme explained to them properly, or thought it was the same as key skills. Students with little or no idea of what citizenship education meant tended to be in FE or sixth form colleges (four Round 2 groups and one Round 1 group), where citizenship had been introduced as a module within a wider tutorial programme.

literacy appears more developed across the projects than might previously have been thought, but that the projects themselves tend not to see themselves as focusing on this strand.

Just one organisation had decided to focus primarily on the **social and moral responsibility** strand, with the remaining organisations having focused on two of the three stands in varying combinations.

Round 2 Training Provider

The Project Manager within this organisation understood the principles embedded within the Advisory Group report, but felt strongly that they were not wholly relevant for work-based trainees. Reasons for this were said to be that:

- ♦ The trainees only attended their training provider on a limited part-time basis, so there was no time for community involvement.
- ♦ Employers only valued work-related qualifications and experience, and it was felt that they would not value evidence of political awareness and understanding.

For these reasons, this training provider had chosen to focus its citizenship provision specifically around issues to do with industrial responsibility (focusing on pollution issues) with a view to developing trainees with a responsible attitude towards their working environment, and an awareness of how their work practices might impact more globally. This provides an excellent example of how citizenship education can work within a part-time training context, whilst also highlighting the importance of local flexibility to decide what citizenship education means, and how it might best be approached.

Indeed, staff across four Round 2 organisations (two schools, one FE college and one youth work organisation) voiced concerns about any kind of common definition of post-16 citizenship being developed. They felt strongly that central prescription about what post-16 citizenship should look like was neither feasible nor desirable, and called for the flexibility to determine the shape of post-16 citizenship locally should it be rolled-out on a national scale.

In conclusion, there is currently no single, simple or unified view of what constitutes post-16 citizenship. This was not considered problematic by most interviewees. Indeed, practitioners liked having the flexibility to interpret citizenship in such a manner as suited their organisations, young people and individual circumstances, and many had done so to good effect as illustrated throughout this chapter. The majority of practitioners and young people saw

citizenship as a vehicle to raise young people's awareness of the world around them, in particular their local communities, and to get engaged and interested in issues that affected them. The interesting point here is that the projects tended not to identify this as 'political literacy', although it could arguably be defined as such. The following chapters look at how the projects sought to achieve these goals through their organisational and learning approaches.

4. INTEGRATION OF CITIZENSHIP

Summary of findings:

- ◆ The programmes across the case-study organisations can be broken down into two broad categories: those that adopted a primarily classroom-based taught approach, often with 'active' elements (thirteen organisations), and those that could be described as experiential learning/participation programmes with no formal taught element (eight organisations).
- ◆ Those in the former group were normally integrated into an existing programme structure, whilst those in the latter category tended to be either stand-alone discrete activities, or integrated seamlessly into the wider ethos of the organisation.
- ◆ Interviews with young people indicated that those in the latter category, and programmes that were taught discretely, were the most popular, and also helped young people to develop the most comprehensive understanding of what citizenship meant. Those in the former category were less popular, with the greatest levels of negativity, and poorest citizenship learning experiences being apparent across general tutorial programmes. This has implications for national roll out, given that the programmes that sought to reach the largest numbers of young people appeared to have had the lowest levels of success.
- ◆ The integration of citizenship into the wider community tended to be an underdeveloped area. Many projects saw community links as being about young people undertaking community service. However, a small number of case-study organisations had augmented their existing links with long-standing partner organisations by focusing on the political aspects of their role. Others had given young people responsibility for negotiating various issues with those agencies that provided services to their organisations. This suggests that there may be some need for a central re-enforcement of the meaning of community involvement, and examples of it being achieved in an imaginative way.
- ◆ Whilst virtually all interviewees saw the issue of integration between pre- and post-16 developments as important, very few practical links had yet been made, often because there was a reported lack of understanding, on the part of non-school providers, of how schools operated, and what they sought to achieve at pre-16.
- ◆ In relation to the previous point, interviewees indicated that there may be a need for an individual or agency to act as a broker between schools and post-16 organisations in future to assist with the development of local citizenship networking groups, the provision of baseline data from schools to post-16 providers on students' experiences and understanding, and independent guidance on the development of post-16 citizenship programmes, which takes into account the baseline of pre-16 activity.

This chapter considers the various means by which citizenship had been integrated into the programme structures, curriculum and general ethos of the case-study organisations, as well as links that had been made with pre-16 developments and the wider community. This, along with issues discussed in previous chapters, will go some way towards understanding what helps individual programmes to develop successfully.

4.1 Integration with Programmes, Curriculum and Ethos

The programmes being developed across the 21 case-study organisations were extremely varied, but can broadly be broken down into two categories: those that were primarily, although not solely, theory/classroom based **taught courses**, and those that could be described as **experiential learning programmes**, or which had a **project-based focus** with no formal taught component.²³ The Round 1 projects were divided fairly evenly, six favouring a primarily taught approach and five having adopted an experiential learning approach. The Round 2 projects tended to be more focused around taught programmes. Seven had adopted this approach, with three having developed an experiential learning approach. Features of the taught-style programmes (13 in total) were that they:

- ♦ had a tendency to be mainstream providers of education (three Round 1 and one Round 2 sixth form colleges, one Round 1 and three Round 2 FE colleges, one Round 1 and three Round 2 schools and, the only exception perhaps, one Round 1 training provider)
- ♦ tended to offer compulsory or recommended programmes
- ♦ were geared up to catering for sizeable numbers of young people
- ♦ were usually classroom-based, focusing on the development of knowledge, often with supporting enrichment, youth forum or community service activities. (It should be noted that the Round 2 projects had a tendency to be slightly more interactive than the Round 1 projects - the learning topics for example were more often negotiated).

²³ Young people's descriptions of their programmes broadly matched those of staff in their organisations, although they tended to outline the 'active' components of their programmes more than their tutors did. For example, it was often clear from staff interviews that the main thrust of a programme was, for example, a discrete taught course with supporting enrichment activities. The young people however, often referred to the latter only. For further details see NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report. (pp. 23-25)

The experiential learning projects, of which there were eight, adopted rather a different series of approaches. Common features included:

- ♦ a tendency to be specialist providers (one Round 1 special school, one Round 1 and one Round 2 youth work organisation, one Round 1 Connexions Service, one Round 1 and one Round 2 training provider – each working with the disengaged or socially excluded). The exceptions were two mainstream schools
- ♦ a tendency to be focused around voluntary programmes, developed in consultation with the young people, and working with small numbers of young people
- ♦ a project-based focus, such as the design of a citizenship evaluation tool or the creation of a disability website
- ♦ an involvement of young people in challenges or debates around key issues
- ♦ attempts to raise the profile of citizenship within an organisation or community
- ♦ the provision of a service by young people for other young people, the organisation or the community.

There appeared to be a pattern as to the wider integration of each citizenship programme. Those in the former category – the taught programmes – were mainly integrated into a **specific programme** (usually A/S General Studies or a vocational course such as AVCE travel and tourism), or into the organisation's tutorial scheme. In contrast, those in the latter category tended to be one of the following:

- ♦ **stand-alone discrete activities** (as in the case of a Round special school where students were involved in developing a citizenship website, a Round 1 youth work organisation where young people were involved in a radio station, a confidential helpline for young people and a series of evening consultation evenings, and a Round 2 youth work organisation where disadvantaged young people attending an evening youth club worked on graffiti boards and question time events)
- ♦ **integrated seamlessly into the wider ethos of the organisation** and many of its programmes or curriculum areas.

Four of these latter organisations might be described as 'citizenship communities', in that they aimed for a citizenship ethos to run through all aspects of their organisation, their work with young people and their links with the wider community. This also appeared to be true of one of the Round 1

sixth form colleges favouring a taught approach to citizenship outlined above. This was a particularly good example and is illustrated below:

Round 1 Sixth Form College

This is a newly founded organisation, which opened in 2002 on the grounds of a former college that was reported to have had a very poor academic record and reputation. Serving a deprived community with a diverse ethnic mix, the new college aims to improve standards, instil a sense of pride in the young people and help them to broaden their horizons. Citizenship has been introduced as a formal aspect of the curriculum - a regular two-hour weekly slot is devoted to aspects of political awareness and literacy, including general knowledge of government as well as issues such as race, AIDS and inequality awareness. In addition, all the young people are encouraged to undertake citizenship-related activities through a wide-ranging enrichment programme. According to a college senior manager, these key strands are pulled together through an overarching ethos that the college itself is a community development project, that seeks the involvement of all involved parties in its development: *'All members of staff from cleaners to the principal and all students are involved.'* Students hold positions as student governors, on a buildings and resources committee with senior managers and on a committee looking at ways to re-brand the college. Additionally, the catering committee is chaired by a student. *'We let students be involved in policy making and hold budgets.'*

The success of the citizenship project was felt to derive from the fact that the formal programme and enrichment activities linked with the wider college ethos, and a sense that all staff and students were building an organisation to be proud of together. The students were very enthusiastic about their programme and college. They saw direct links between the two, and felt that most of their wider college involvement was about citizenship.

So what might be regarded as the best approach to post-16 citizenship development? On the face of things, an example such as that of the sixth form college above, where a citizenship ethos was reported to run right through the organisation, might be seen as the epitome of good practice. However, this approach would not be feasible in a great many of the organisations visited, particularly the larger FE colleges, where citizenship tended to have been introduced into one or two subject areas only for logistical, financial and practical reasons. This particular sixth form college also benefited from the fact that it was an embryonic organisation, developing as a community project. To a large extent, it is almost impossible to prescribe one desirable approach to integrating citizenship, given the tremendous variety of:

- ♦ organisation types involved
- ♦ numbers of young people for which they cater
- ♦ full- and part-time learning experiences

- ♦ prior learning experiences and achievement levels of the young people involved
- ♦ institutional circumstances - including senior management support, staffing and funding.

However, the young people's reactions to their programmes, their overall understanding of citizenship-related issues, and the degree to which they saw linkage between their main programmes of study or learning and their citizenship involvement gives some insights into approaches that may or may not be working well. Interestingly, a pattern emerged with regard to young people's views of their respective programmes. Across 20 case-study organisations,²⁴ there were seven where young people were both very positive about their programmes and citizenship experiences **and** able to demonstrate a relatively sophisticated understanding of what citizenship meant to them (as outlined in Chapter 3). These programmes had the following features, which may give some guidance as to ways that projects might think about developing in the future:

- ♦ They tended to be viewed by the young people as activities which were either completely **independent from their other studies** (six organisations), and therefore considered to provide a welcome change, or **seamlessly integrated** with their wider curriculum and with the institution's ethos (one organisation).
- ♦ They tended to be **project-based** (four organisations) or **discrete taught citizenship programmes** normally leading to a qualification (three organisations).
- ♦ They tended to be **voluntary**. Only two (both training providers) were compulsory programmes.

There was no particular pattern in terms of organisational type with three being schools, two being training providers, one being a sixth form college and the other being an FE college.

In contrast, there were three examples of programmes where the young people were both very negative about their experiences **and** unable to articulate a view of what citizenship meant to them. There was one common feature to all their programmes – they were all examples of citizenship being integrated into a **wider, often compulsory, tutorial programme**. The students were often

²⁴ Young people were not available for interview in one of the case-study organisations.

not aware that they were involved in citizenship learning, failed to understand how citizenship issues fitted into the wider programme, and generally saw the lessons as boring or a waste of time. Two different students described their experiences as: *'pointless and boring'* and *'a chance to catch up on your sleep!'* These points should not be viewed as definitive. Indeed there were positive comments from other young people involved in tutorial programmes, but it was clear that the greatest levels of citizenship engagement and understanding came about where young people were volunteers and working on experiential learning programmes or taught stand-alone courses.

4.2 Integration with Pre-16 Citizenship

As outlined in previous reports, Round 1 CLPMs and Round 2 Project Consultants believed unanimously in the importance of achieving continuity and progression between pre-16 citizenship, which was introduced as a statutory element of the National Curriculum from September 2002, and post-16 citizenship developments.²⁵ This was felt to be particularly pertinent within the context of the recent white paper: *14-19 Opportunity and Excellence*. Citizenship coordinators and delivery staff across 19 of the 21 case-study organisations also believed that such linkage was desirable in principle in order to aid progression and avoid duplication. As one FE college senior manager commented: *'It is important. If there isn't liaison between the two, and at the moment, liaison is limited and patchy, you could easily find you could be covering the same thing. The students coming through will say - 'we've done this'.'*

However, in line with the comments of CLPMs and Consultants made in previous reports, case-study interviewees indicated that, in the main, there had been few practical moves made towards achieving this goal. Sixteen of the organisations (eight in each of the Round 1 and Round 2 projects) indicated that there had been no development yet. They gave the following explanations:

- ♦ A lack of awareness in FE colleges of what citizenship education amounts to in schools at pre-16 (two FE college interviewees). One citizenship

²⁵ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (p. 16)

NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report. (pp. 18-19)

course coordinator in an FE college confessed: *'Who knows? I don't know what's going on in schools!'* This re-enforces the view of one Project Consultant that: *'There is no tradition of post-16 paying much attention to what went before.'*

- ◆ It was perceived to be *'too early'* yet to be worrying about building links. This view was based on the fact that no young people had yet come through to post-16 with experience of citizenship within the National Curriculum (one FE college and one Training Provider). The view of one interviewee in an FE college that this issue was *'not yet relevant'* may prove rather short sighted in the medium term.
- ◆ A difficulty in matching to pre-16 because of the special needs of the post-16 groups in question who were at a level lower than that which might be anticipated at the end of key stage 4 (one special school and one youth work organisation).
- ◆ A tendency for schools' curricula to be based around key stages rather than key themes. Hence it was invariably the case that the individual with responsibility for citizenship at key stages 3 and 4 was different to the individual with responsibility for post-16, and there was often reported to be a poor channel of communication between the two (four school interviewees). This re-enforces earlier comments made by one Round 1 CLPM.²⁶ Many of the post-16 coordinators in schools were frustrated by this structural hindrance.

Only across five case-study organisations (three in Round 1 and two in Round 2) did interviewees feel that plans for pre- and post-16 citizenship continuity were taking shape. In these organisations this had been facilitated by:

- ◆ The post-16 citizenship coordinator having responsibility for citizenship across all the key stages in one school (an unusual occurrence). In this instance, sixth form students were undertaking peer-led citizenship education programmes for students at key stage 4. The coordinator stated: *'I think the students themselves are a great resource to promote greater linkage in provision across the key stages.'*
- ◆ Similarly, students from one sixth form college were undertaking mentoring activities with younger students in local schools.
- ◆ In one sixth form and one FE college, attempts had been made to explore the nature of pre-16 provision, in one case through local network meetings, and in the other, through direct contact with the LEA citizenship coordinator, in order to map provision for next year.
- ◆ In one FE college, attempts had been made to baseline the levels of citizenship awareness of this year's intake. The problem with this was that

²⁶ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (p.16).

the information was gained too late for the planned programme to be significantly altered if needed.

If pre- to post-16 linkage is considered valuable and desirable for the future, there would seem to be serious issues for consideration in terms of **systems** that need to be put in place to help various organisations develop their programmes in partnership.

There are clearly issues surrounding the traditional structuring of schools' staffing, which tend to be based around year groups and academic subject departments. This tends to militate against cross-curricular approaches, and against the implementation of thematic programmes, which cut across all the key stages. One citizenship coordinator gave an interesting example of a 14-19 pathfinder project, which was underway within his school, staffed by the Head of Year 10 and Head of sixth form, who rarely communicated with each other. In principle, the pathfinder might have proved a useful vehicle within which to explore a continuous entitlement to citizenship education from 14 through to 19, but in practice the staffing structures within the school ensured that citizenship would be dealt with separately at pre- and post-16.

There is also a serious issue about how the key features of pre-16 school citizenship education in each area might be conveyed to post-16 providers other than schools, in order that they can build upon this understanding in developing their own provision in the future. It is unlikely that many providers will be able to find the time or the inclination to explore this in detail if left unassisted. Therefore consideration might need to be given to:

- ♦ The development of local networking groups - involving key citizenship coordinators from a range of organisations.
- ♦ The provision of baseline data from schools to post-16 providers on students' experiences and understanding of citizenship issues.
- ♦ Independent guidance on the development of post-16 citizenship programmes, which takes into account the baseline of pre-16 activity.

There was certainly a sense amongst interviewees that there may be a need for an individual or agency to act as a broker between post-16 organisations and schools, to assist with the necessary flow of information, and to offer advice and guidance on developing citizenship across the 14-19 continuum. The question is who might best be placed to fulfil such a role in the future,

especially if geographical consultants and project managers are not a feature of any future national roll-out of post-16 citizenship. It may be that LEA citizenship advisers, the Connexions Service, LLSCs or Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs) would be able to play a role, but further evaluation would be needed to ascertain the views of CLPMs, Consultants, coordinators and delivery staff on this matter. It is clear however, that some structures will need to be put in place if continuity between pre- and post-16 provision is to be achieved in the longer-term.

4.3 Integration with External Agencies and the Wider Community

As outlined in a previous report,²⁷ all the Round 1 consortia had links with external agencies, but it was rare for these organisations to be those national agencies with considerable experience of offering expertise on the context and content of citizenship education. These organisations include the Citizenship Foundation, Institute for Citizenship, Community Service Volunteers and Hansard Society.²⁸ Most consortia had drawn on the support of local organisations, charities or businesses, which usually offered practical support, community service opportunities or training, or on the support of national organisations with experience of developing active service opportunities for young people, such as Changemakers, the Prince's Trust, Timebank and Millennium Volunteers. This pattern was followed through in those case-study organisations that had formed external links, as outlined shortly. However, the majority (11 organisations) said that they either had no external links at all, or that they considered their links to be underdeveloped. There was no distinction between Round 1 and Round 2 organisations in this respect. Reasons were reported to include:

- ♦ a purported lack of time to investigate relevant agencies and what they might be able to offer
- ♦ a view that there was no need for external links because the projects in question did not have an 'active' or community-based focus
- ♦ a need to concentrate on developing the programme internally, before broadening out to include the wider community. One citizenship deliverer

²⁷ NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (pp. 6-7).

²⁸ Reasons for this are unclear but may be related to the costs charged by these organisations for their services.

in an FE college explained: *‘We have kept our heads down and tried to move forward within the college. It’s an approach, but it’s not inclusive.’*

Of those organisations with a more outward-looking focus (ten), two had drawn upon the support of one or more specific agencies to offer technical or practical support, such as technical guidance on the design of a website. A further four worked with a small range of charities and community organisations, but had done so for many years, and said that the development of post-16 citizenship had nothing to do with this. One coordinator stated: *‘They are PSHE links, PSHE are better than this than we are.’* This seems to represent something of a missed opportunity, given the potential opportunity for PSHE-related issues to be presented and understood as political, as well as personal concerns, as outlined in the previous chapter. Schools, colleges and other providers may well be able to tap into existing external links in the future, but in such a way as to draw out the political aspects of the work these organisations undertake.

Only four organisations had developed a wide range of external links as a feature of their programmes. All these organisations were very different (one sixth form college, one training provider, one school and one FE college) and their approaches to involving external agencies were quite varied. Two particularly good examples are provided below

Round 1 Sixth Form College

This organisation was described earlier in this chapter, and might be described as a ‘citizenship community’. In addition to involving all members of staff and students in important decisions about the development of the college, there is an emphasis upon the college as a facility serving, and being served by, a wider community. As such, students are involved in discussions and decision-making with catering and cleaning contractors as well as architects, community organisations and the police. Staff described the relationship with the local community as *‘excellent’*. The college has an open-door policy, so that members of the public can come in to view plans and discuss the college’s work.

Round 1 Training Provider

This organisation, which provides NVQ training for young people, is based, unusually for a training provider, around weekly two hour taught sessions on political awareness and understanding so that, in the words of the citizenship coordinator, the young people can '*gain power and challenge and understand their world.*' He explained how work-based training routes can lead to narrow and specific options for young people, which in turn can lead to social exclusion. The focus of the citizenship programme is therefore about broadening the young people's education and horizons, but in a way that is very different to what they experienced at school, so that the sessions have pace and plenty of opportunity for discussion and debate. An integral feature of the programme is bringing the NVQ trainees and members of the community together - examples given included a teamworking workshop with new refugee arrivals, and active links with a new, local, young Asian mayor.

This section has demonstrated that the integration of citizenship programmes with the wider community need not just be seen in terms of buying in the 'expert advice' of national citizenship organisations (although there does appear to have been a missed opportunity in this respect). For imaginative and outward-looking organisations, new links can also be forged with long-standing partner organisations, based upon the political aspects of their role, or can be developed with the organisations that provide services to the organisation (such as a cleaning company for example), by giving young people responsibility for negotiating various issues with them. There was a tendency for some of the larger organisations to claim that external links could not easily be forged because there were simply not enough community service opportunities for all their young people. This section has hopefully demonstrated that external partnerships need not necessarily involve young people going off site to a whole host of different organisations to experience what they do. There is scope for a wider integration of citizenship learning both within the organisation, if young people are given opportunities to participate, and with the wider community, if this is interpreted in the broadest of terms.

The following chapter outlines the various teaching and learning approaches that had been adopted by the case-study organisations.

5. TEACHING AND LEARNING CITIZENSHIP

Summary of findings:

A variety of teaching, learning and facilitation approaches had been developed across the projects. Case-study evidence suggests that the most successful approaches included the following features:

- ◆ A negotiation of key issues of interest with the young people.
- ◆ The development of a critically reflective learning environment, with scope for discussion and debate.
- ◆ The use of a variety of experiential learning experiences, including project work, drama, role play, art, photography and exhibition work.
- ◆ The use of varied and interesting resources, ideally related to, or growing out of, current events (whether local or national) which had relevance for young people.
- ◆ Facilitation of activities based on the active involvement of young people rather than the teaching of knowledge, understanding and skills.
- ◆ Links with the wider community through visits off site, the use of external speakers, and the allocation of responsibility to young people for working and negotiating with external partners.
- ◆ Involving young people in active participation in large-scale assemblies such as youth fora and student parliaments.

As outlined in the previous chapter, there were a wide variety of approaches to post-16 citizenship development. The majority of case-study organisations (13) favoured a primarily classroom-based, theory or taught approach. However, within this approach was a wide range of programmes, which varied in the extent to which they had supporting ‘active’ elements. A smaller number of organisations (eight) focused specifically on an experiential learning approach, and tended to have no particular taught element. Again, there was substantial variety here in terms of the types of activities and projects in which the young people were involved. These are outlined in greater detail in the following section, which builds upon information provided in the previous chapter, and aims to help assess those approaches that work well within different contexts.

5.1 Approaches to Programme Development

Four ‘models’ of programme delivery were discernable across the case-study organisations. The first three fell within the broader category of taught courses, whilst the fourth represented programmes that were entirely experiential in nature:

- ◆ Programmes that focused primarily around a **taught** or theory-based approach to post-16 citizenship development had the following characteristics:
 - **Citizenship themes covered through a general tutorial programme.** This approach had been adopted by five organisations (four in Round 2 and one in Round 1), all FE or sixth form colleges. All the programmes were poorly received by students, with only one exception where the students had enjoyed their programme, but demonstrated a limited understanding of what citizenship meant to them. Most of these programmes had supporting ‘active’ elements – community service opportunities in two cases, enrichment activities in one, and involvement in a student parliament in the other. It was in this latter case that the students were positive about their involvement.
 - **Citizenship as a module or theme within an existing course or programme, which was normally accredited.** This applied across four organisations (three in Round 1 and one in Round 2) - two sixth form colleges, one FE college and one school. With only one exception, these modules were well received by the students, and in two of the organisations they were able to present a relatively sophisticated view of post-16 citizenship. In three of the programmes, young people had also been involved in organising a youth fair, a youth conference, or in enrichment activities.
 - **Citizenship as a discrete programme.** Four organisations (three in Round 1 and one in Round 2) had focused on developing citizenship as a discrete stand-alone course, separate to young people’s other studies or programmes. The young people across all these organisations were very positive about their programmes, and in two cases presented a well-rounded view of what citizenship meant to them.
- ◆ Organisations that had adopted a primarily **experiential** approach to the development of post-16 citizenship tended to be the non-mainstream, or part-time providers of post-16 education. For example, two were youth work organisations, one was a training provider, one a Connexions Service and one a special school. There were only three exceptions - all school sixth forms. It was noticeable that the young people across all eight of these organisations were very positive and enthusiastic about their programmes, and that in four cases they were able to present a clear and sophisticated view of what citizenship meant.

This was a particularly positive finding, given that young people in this last category were often not the most highly achieving or articulate of the young people interviewed across the projects.

5.2 Underlying Factors

There was clearly a wide range of issues effecting the decisions taken by different organisations when developing their programmes. However, three major factors appeared to underlie many of their decisions. These were:

- ◆ Organisational type
- ◆ The needs and characteristics of the young people
- ◆ The skills and expertise of staff.

5.2.1 Organisational type

It was clear that different types of post-16 provider had very different motivations and reasons for introducing post-16 citizenship programmes.

Large organisations such as **FE and sixth form colleges** tended to have two choices - either to attempt to reach the whole student body with a citizenship programme, or to focus on young people who were studying one particular course or programme within their organisation. For practical and financial reasons, the only means of introducing a full entitlement to citizenship education for large numbers of students, was by integrating citizenship into an existing structure, such as a wider tutorial scheme. Alternatively, it was possible for a selected group of young people to receive exposure to citizenship through its integration into a specific programme of study, which often lent itself to such an approach.²⁹ Whilst this latter approach was fairly well received by young people, the former tended not to be. This has implications for any future national roll out of post-16 citizenship and attempts to introduce it to large numbers of young people. It would appear that post-16 citizenship is unlikely to be successfully introduced on a large scale without considerable financial support.

Medium-sized organisations such as **school sixth forms and training providers** appeared to have more flexibility in terms of how to introduce

²⁹ The most commonly given examples were AS Level General Studies and vocational programmes such as AVCE travel and tourism.

citizenship. Working with smaller numbers of young people overall, they appeared to have made a choice about whether they wanted their programmes to reach:

- ♦ all their young people (as in the case of two training providers and one school which offered discrete citizenship taught programmes)
- ♦ most of their young people (as in the case of one school, which integrated citizenship into its General Studies programme), or
- ♦ a small group of young people (as in the case of three schools and one training provider, which encouraged small groups of young people to develop a citizenship project or work on a specific activity).

Whilst it was feasible for such organisations to encourage a small group of volunteer students to engage in a citizenship project, larger organisations such as FE colleges probably took the view that such an approach would have an extremely limited impact upon their organisation as a whole, if this were their sole approach to citizenship development.

Small, or specialist, organisations such as **youth work organisations**, **special schools** and **training providers working with the disadvantaged**, were in more of a position to reach all the young people with which they worked, due to the smaller numbers for which they catered. The relatively high staff: young person ratio in such organisations meant that they were in a strong position to develop programmes that were responsive to the needs and interests of the young people, and which enabled them to work on an individual or small-group project basis. Whilst some of the most innovative, and popular, programmes were to be found within this sector, there is an issue about the extent to which such programmes could be replicated on a larger scale were post-16 citizenship to be rolled out nationally.

5.2.2 Needs and characteristics of the young people

This leads on to the next point, which is that in commenting upon successful approaches to post-16 citizenship development, one needs to be mindful of the young people that each programme attempted to reach. For the larger FE and sixth form colleges that adopted a wide-scale tutorial approach, the issue of learner needs appeared to be secondary to the wider goal of universal entitlement. However, other organisations targeted specific groups of young people as follows:

- ♦ **Enthusiastic/reliable volunteers.** Such young people were a particular feature of school programmes that were based around experiential learning projects rather than taught programmes. In one high achieving grammar school, for example, two small groups of Year 12 students had, respectively, been given responsibility for designing a learner document to help other students evaluate their citizenship-related experiences, and developing a manifesto for the school, in consultation with younger students. These students were selected on the basis of being highly motivated, self-starting, enthusiastic and reliable. Whilst this led to a very successful project in this school, it could be argued that such an outcome was not surprising, given the skills of the young people involved.
- ♦ **Those working towards specific qualifications.** Young people working towards nationally recognised, accredited courses, which were felt to have the scope to cover citizenship-related topics were targeted by a number of colleges and schools. This ensured that a fairly large number of young people received exposure, whilst building upon existing resources and expertise.
- ♦ **Those not in education, employment or training (NEET) or with special educational needs (SEN).** Although these young people appeared small in number in terms of the overall post-16 citizenship development project,³⁰ a number of the case-study organisations were specifically geared up to working with such young people. Interviewees stressed the challenges of working with young people with few traditional achievements, or from socially excluded backgrounds, and indicated the importance of viewing their approaches and the young people's achievements within this context.
- ♦ **Work-based trainees.** One training provider had taken on the challenging role of attempting to develop a citizenship programme with part-time NVQ trainees, who were based in industry for the majority of their working week. This provider illustrated the intense time pressure that his organisation and the young people were working under, and the need to tailor citizenship provision carefully to their employer's expectations, rather than to centrally held views of what a citizenship programme should encompass.³¹

It appears, from the available evidence, that those programmes that targeted specific groups of young people or individuals, and that were able to tailor programmes to meet their skills and needs, were the **most successful**. The fact that those programmes that attempted to reach large numbers of young people were those that **most struggled to engage them**, indicates that careful thought will need to go into any decisions about how a citizenship entitlement for all young people in post-16 education and training might best be achieved.

³⁰ As far as can be established from the MI returns, which are not fully comprehensive.

³¹ This was a specific reference to the three strands of citizenship outlined in the Advisory Group reports.

5.2.3 Skills and expertise of staff

Finally, it was clear from the research that the project-based and discrete taught programmes were the most likely to be being developed by **knowledgeable, enthusiastic** or **volunteer staff**. These programmes tended to have been newly developed rather than having been integrated into existing programmes or course structures, and as such needed the input of one or more members of staff with a genuine interest in the area and, often, with a variety of interpersonal skills. That young people involved in these types of programme tended to be the most enthusiastic was clearly not only a reflection of the content of their programmes, but also of the characteristics of the staff that were running them. As one otherwise disengaged group of young men commented: *'He's a cool geezer'* and *'he doesn't talk down. He is on a level with us – he's young.'* Another group of young people working on a youthwork project commented: *'If we have ideas we tell [name of facilitator] and he doesn't think, silly kids. He listens to us, so it's good to voice our opinions.'* It was not clear whether sufficient structures were in place within all of the organisations to maintain this positive energy in the event of the key facilitator leaving the organisation. In some cases, the programmes appeared to be carried by one dynamic individual.

It is perhaps no surprise that in those organisations where citizenship had been introduced on a wide scale, through existing course structures or tutorial programmes, staff were the most likely to be described as **non-specialists, lacking in enthusiasm** or **conscripts**. There were examples of such programmes being very well received by young people but, in the main, it was in these instances that young people tended to be at best neutral about their programmes and at worst bored by them or unaware that they were involved in any type of citizenship activity. One school coordinator explained how citizenship had been introduced into A/S Level General Studies, but in an implicit fashion so as not to draw it directly to the attention of students, or interestingly, staff. The concern was that if the General Studies team thought they were being asked to do something 'extra' they would protest, but that if they covered a few sessions, which were not labelled as citizenship, the programme would be covered. The students in this school had no real concept of what citizenship meant to them, or of whether they were developing any citizenship-related skills or understanding. Additionally, the coordinator, in answer to a question about the ability of staff to assess students' citizenship

learning when they were unaware that they were involved in such a programme themselves conceded: *'yes, that is a big issue!'*

5.3 Teaching and Learning Approaches and Use of Resources

Across the variety of organisations and programme types there were a great many approaches to the teaching and facilitation of citizenship learning and to the development and use of resources.

5.3.1 Use of resources

In an earlier report,³² many CLPM's were reported to have lacked awareness of the variety of resources available to them in developing post-16 citizenship programmes. It was therefore encouraging that interviewees in five case-study organisations (most of which were in Round 2 areas) mentioned, without prompting, that they had found the LSDA website and pull-out section of Citizenship News helpful, and had drawn upon a number of external resources in developing their programmes. These included the Be Real Game, Channel 4 publications and materials from the Citizenship Foundation and the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT). The majority of organisations, however (11), had chosen to develop their own resources,³³ either because of a reported lack of time or money to identify, evaluate and purchase externally produced resources, or because of the specific nature of their programmes, and a reported need for in-house tutor packs that could easily be accessed by non-specialist staff.

Seven organisations had drawn upon resources including the internet and newspapers, which were felt to be the most appropriate resources given the 'current' and 'changing' nature of the issues covered in their programmes. There was a general lack of reference to traditional resources such as books, articles or textbooks, which it was felt by many, went out of date too quickly, or were inappropriate for use with their young people. Young people tended to confirm the views of staff, with many saying that they had used the internet as a major resource, and very few reporting having used books. A smaller

³² NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (pp. 10-12)

³³ This finding is corroborated, and explored in greater detail, in the most recent report of the cross-cutting strand evaluation for resources. FETTES, F. (2003). Cross-Cutting Resources Project: End of Year 2 Report. Unpublished report.

number said that they had developed their own resources as a feature of their programme involvement. Examples included a citizenship evaluation tool, a disability website and a citizenship manifesto. Five groups of young people also mentioned that they had learned a lot from external visits, from the views of other young people and from external speakers that visited their organisations - points that tended not to be made by their tutors. The issue of resources appeared to be almost a 'non-issue' as far as most interviewees were concerned. Most seemed happy and confident with what they had accessed or were developing, and did not demonstrate concern if they had accessed very little that had been externally produced.

5.3.2 Teaching and learning approaches

This section presents some actual examples of the teaching and learning approaches developed across the four models of citizenship provision outlined in Section 5.1 above. Each is presented as one of the best case examples of each type of provision. The first is an example of citizenship when integrated into an organisation's wider tutorial programme. It represents the only example of this type of provision where students reported being interested in their citizenship programme.

Round 2 FE College

In this organisation citizenship is taught as an eight-week module which forms part of the college's wider tutorial programme. At present, as this is the first year of development for this organisation, the module is being run with 12 pilot tutor groups, although there are plans possibly to roll the programme out to all students next year. The module has a pre-defined structure, but also responds to issues raised by the students and aims to use a variety of approaches including debate and discussion, active project work within the organisation, theatre work, conference organising and exhibition work. It comprises an introductory session exploring what citizenship is, a short project based around critical evaluation of the college using photography, which culminated in an exhibition, a focus on issues in the local community, resulting in local stakeholders being invited in to a conference, and a series of charity events and activities. Additionally, each tutor group elects one student to represent them on a student parliament whose remit is to discuss issues to do with the college raised by the students, and to take matters of concern to the college's senior management.

Students' most positive comments about the programme were to do with having actively been involved in photographing aspects of college life that they liked, or which caused concern, and having been able to develop a voice through the student parliament. The success of this tutorial approach would appear to be in its active, as opposed to passive, approach to learning.

The following example is of citizenship being successfully integrated into an existing taught programme.

Round 1 Sixth Form College

This organisation has developed a range of approaches to the development of post-16 citizenship, including an enrichment programme and an A/S Level Citizenship short course. However, one of the main approaches is through the college's General Studies programme, which, in this second year of development accounted for some 800 students. Themes within the General Studies syllabus (such as society and politics for example) are used to tie in relevant citizenship issues. Lesson plans have been developed, so that the wide range of staff involved have a structure to follow, and tutors have been '*buddied up*' so that they can discuss ideas and strategies. The programme is essentially classroom-based, with a focus on discussion and debate.

The students interviewed were positive about the programme, essentially because they felt that they had generated a positive atmosphere themselves: '*because we were a lively lot, there was a lot of debating - a lot of views coming in at the same time.*' However, some students felt that '*there is a lot of talking from the teacher, with only some input from us students.*' The relative success of this type of programme, which had no obviously 'active' elements, appears to hinge very much upon the ability of the member of staff concerned to facilitate discussion rather than 'teach', and on the willingness of the students to get involved.

In the following organisation, citizenship is taught as a discrete subject, quite distinct from other aspects of the NVQ programmes that the young people are engaged in.

Round 1 Training Provider

In this organisation, citizenship is taught as a stand-alone two-hour weekly session. The programme is divided up into units so that trainees can complete between one and three units over the course of the year, which can contribute to their integrated studies module. As many as 140 young people are currently progressing through the course. Two key members of staff have jointly prepared a series of detailed lesson plans based around political awareness and understanding. The tutors have developed many of their own resources and also feel that their approaches have moved on since last year, with greater use of DVDs and videos, reference to ACT's materials, wider external links and a variety of new teaching strategies designed to generate discussion and debate around issues such as power and influence. They also feel that they have developed a more effective assessment portfolio, which attempts to balance trainees' attendance and participation with what they actually achieve when they turn up to sessions.

The young people in this organisation pointed out that they would have been disinterested in political issues in the past, but that they had found this course lively, interesting and though provoking. As one young man stated: '*It has helped us to argue and debate things and get knowledge of more points of view than your own. Sometimes it's interesting to listen to what other people*

think. You don't have to agree with them', but you can respect what they have to say.' This represents a significant learning achievement for these young people.

The final example is of citizenship being developed through an activity-based project with no formal taught element. It was very difficult to find one best-case example of this type of approach, given that there were so many reported successes. The following has been chosen as an example of non-mainstream provision.

Round 2 Youth Work Organisation

This organisation became involved in the development project because, in the words of the coordinator: *'The whole of our business is about citizenship - promoting neighbourliness and so on.'* The programme takes place within the context of a youth club evening, with activities focusing around graffiti boards (where young people can put up messages of issues of concern to them, which are then discussed, facilitated by a youth worker). The young people have also been preparing for two question time events with MPs in London. The young people were said to be becoming more and more engaged, with the coordinator having noticed: *'a really positive change in their interaction with each other. They are more willing to talk and stay focused.'* However, he also pointed out the difficulties of assessing their learning outcomes. Pre- and post- question time evaluation sheets and a benchmarking scheme for self-grading had proved problematic, especially for those within the NEET group. But comments young people had written on the graffiti boards had given a *'generalisable view'* of their increased levels of engagement.

The young people certainly felt that they had learned more about a range of social issues and had developed their confidence since attending the youth club, but admitted that it was hard to be certain how much this could be attributed to the citizenship work, as distinct from the general ethos of the organisation.

This section has demonstrated that citizenship can successfully be introduced in a number of ways across a variety of different types of programmes and organisations. The greatest challenges, in terms of engaging staff and young people, would appear to be in attempting to introduce citizenship as an entitlement for a large number of young people in the absence of a major injection of finance. It may be possible for citizenship to be successfully integrated into existing programme structures such as tutorial schemes or other academic/vocational courses. However, if all the staff that are likely to be involved are to be helped to develop imaginative programmes which encourage young people to be critical and active in their learning, there will be significant staff development, training and resource implications associated with this approach.

6. AIMS AND OUTCOMES

Summary of findings:

- ♦ The majority of the programmes' aims were concerned with discovering the most appropriate ways of facilitating post-16 citizenship and seeking the best possible experiences and outcomes for their young people.
- ♦ Few had yet established rigorous systems for monitoring or evaluating the effectiveness of their programmes, so reported outcomes tended to be based upon the subjective judgements of practitioners, rather than on any 'hard' evidence of programme impact, and upon the views of the young people themselves. Round 2 projects generally felt that it was too early for them to make judgements about programme outcomes.
- ♦ Round 1 practitioners reported a number positive impacts including the development of technical, social and life skills, increased knowledge of political, social and democratic issues, increased awareness, on the part of young people, of their ability to contribute to society, influence decision making and affect change, and increased maturity, self-esteem and responsibility.
- ♦ Young peoples' expectations of their programmes were reported to include a wish to develop new knowledge and understanding, develop new skills, raise awareness of citizenship and gain qualifications. A minority of young people had no particular expectations of their programmes.
- ♦ In spite of reported concerns about a lack of political literacy across the projects, all the young people that identified a wish to develop new knowledge and understanding demonstrated that they had done so at some level. Active citizenship skills (including confidence, communication, social, interpersonal and skills of representation and advocacy) were also clearly being developed, and young people reported successes in raising awareness of citizenship and related issues within their organisations and the wider community. There was little evidence yet of young people gaining qualifications or certificates, but this was mainly a reflection of the timing of the interviews, which took place between April and June 2003.

This chapter discusses the outcomes of the citizenship programmes as reported by the young people, programme coordinators and deliverers. It also draws on comments made by CLPMs and consultants and on information contained in the MI data. Firstly, it deals with the extent to which hard evidence exists for the outcomes they reported.

6.1 Programme Aims, Objectives and Expectations

At the beginning of the academic year 2002-2003, the Round 2 case-study organisations all produced organisation-level action plans through their MI returns to LSDA, which detailed the objectives of their individual projects. Whilst some Round 1 organisations also completed individual action plans, most produced action plans at the level of the consortium, as they had done in the academic year 2001-2002. Only one of the Round 1 case-study organisations produced an organisation-level action plan, and its objectives are discussed later. Between them the ten Round 2 case-study organisations produced a total of 55 action points. The majority of these objectives can be grouped into two categories:

- ◆ Those relating to the facilitation of post-16 citizenship (23)
- ◆ Those relating to the young people themselves (21).

Aims that focused upon the **facilitation of post-16 citizenship** included objectives based around methods for delivery, staffing issues and accreditation. One FE college (i) planned *‘to develop curriculum content and modes and methods of delivery that will support student learning from foundation studies to A level.’* A school sixth form (ii) proposed *‘to raise awareness of the concept of citizenship activities so that it can be successfully embedded post-16,’* whilst a further FE college (iii) wanted *‘to develop an assessment method for citizenship activities.’* The progress made against these objectives as reported through MI returns was mixed, ranging from achievement of the aims to little, if any progress. Whilst organisation (iii) reported that its objective had been fully achieved (*‘the Progress file/LSDA Active Citizenship self assessment sheets have been explored and agreed as a key monitoring assessment tool. The tool has been piloted and award ceremonies were successfully run’*) neither of the other organisations reported much progress against either of their objectives. Organisation (i) wrote in its latest MI return, *‘tutorial paperwork guidance has been amended to include a request for citizenship/community/social activities to be encouraged’* whilst organisation (ii) did not report any further progress to its objective since its original MI return, when staff development activities were reported to have taken place.

Action points focusing upon **the young people themselves** included factors related to their development, representation within individual organisations and involvement with external youth fora. An FE college (iv) indicated that it wanted to ‘*develop citizenship knowledge, understanding and skills*’ of the young people, whilst a youth service (v) sought for ‘*young people to be able to understand the issues that impact upon their lives and their communities.*’ Some institutions wanted to utilise citizenship as a vehicle for introducing and developing young people’s representation. A training provider (vi) planned ‘*to have an active Learner Advisory Group within the organisation*’ and a school sixth form (vii) hoped ‘*to encourage two Year 12 students to campaign for National Youth Council and hold in-school elections.*’ Progress against these objectives reported through the MI returns, was again sketchy. Whilst there had been some apparent progress in organisation (iv) where students had become involved with Age Concern, progress elsewhere appeared minimal. Organisation (v) cited staffing issues and lack of motivation among the young people as reasons for not participating in a question time event, whilst organisation (vii) did not report any progress at all. The Learner Advisory Group planned by organisation (vi) was now reported to be ‘*not practical*’, although plans for representation were still afoot.

Additional action plan objectives were related to:

- ◆ Community activities (5)
- ◆ Producing directory or database resources (2)
- ◆ Specific activities, for example attending conferences (2)
- ◆ Establishing a steering group or developing an institution-wide citizenship policy (1 each)

In the one Round 1 case-study organisation that produced its action plan at an organisation level, the action points identified matched the broad categories identified above. They included three objectives related to the facilitation of post-16 citizenship (including one objective related to accreditation) and two objectives focused upon the young people themselves (including the establishment of a student forum.)

During interviews undertaken in the case-study organisations, citizenship coordinators were also asked to explain what they considered the aims and objectives of their development projects to be, in order to gauge the extent to

which these had changed or developed.³⁴ Whilst the responses of the interviewees matched very closely to the objectives outlined in the project action plans, the majority of organisations (six in Round 1 and six in Round 2) now appeared to be focusing specifically upon objectives related to the young people themselves. For these organisations, common aims were, as a coordinator from one FE college put it, *'getting students to take ownership and to develop new skills and knowledge.'* Objectives such as these cut across the different types of organisations developing post-16 citizenship. A coordinator from a school sixth form commented *'we want to broaden the insular attitudes of young people.... think outside of the area they live in'* whilst a training provider sought *'to empower young people, to break down barriers to learning, develop self confidence and give a sense of direction in life.'*

Only five of the case-study organisations mentioned that they had objectives related to the delivery and facilitation of post-16 citizenship. These were not exclusive to either phase of the development programme (two were in Round 1 and three were in Round 2) or to a particular type of organisation. A youth service remarked that it was their *'main priority to educate the educators to understand the process of citizenship and how to use it in a way of engaging with the young people.'* An FE college felt that the *'aim of the project is to look at feasible ways of implementing it [post-16 citizenship]'* whilst a training provider saw its role as *'to give feedback about how citizenship education may be introduced into workplace learning.'*

As the organisations did not always report their progress against action plans in sufficient detail for these to be used as evidence, the measurement of how the organisations have progressed has been derived, in the main, from other sources. These included the interviews carried out with the coordinators and deliverers of citizenship programmes, and discussions undertaken with young people across the 11 Round 1 and 10 Round 2 case-study organisations.

³⁴ Twenty coordinators were interviewed. Seventeen of these gave some indication of the aims and objectives of their projects.

6.2 Strategies for Monitoring, Evaluation and Review

The Round 1 and Round 2 organisations were asked to comment on the monitoring and self-evaluation systems that they had in place for their citizenship activities and on their assessment procedures.

One Round 1 organisation claimed that ‘*everything they* [the young people] *do*’ is evaluated, based around the active citizenship cycle, which focuses on activities from planning stage to action, then reflection and review. All the students involved in citizenship were said to be using this system to evaluate their programmes. Such a thorough system was, however, unusual. Most other Round 1 organisations either monitored their young people’s progress through the tutorial system, or the coordinator and delivery staff tracked progress by talking to participants or checking their portfolios or other records of activities. Some organisations did this more frequently than others, for example, once a week rather than once a term. Three Round 1 organisations admitted that the whole area of monitoring and evaluation was still weak.

With the Round 2 organisations there was even less in the way of established monitoring systems, although given the earlier stage of their development, this was not altogether surprising. Four said they had no real monitoring procedure at present, but would be attempting to improve on this next year. Three had some measure of self-evaluation as a result of linking their programmes to key skills, while the remaining three had a form of self-assessment linked to the tutorial system or observation of the young people. It is therefore worth pointing out that the programme outcomes reported later in this chapter are mainly based upon the subjective judgements of practitioners, rather than on any ‘hard’ evidence of programme impact at this stage. However, most Round 2 organisations reported that they were intending to undertake a review of their programmes at the end of the first year of operation.

6.3 Recognition of Achievement

Assessment continued to be a sensitive and controversial area for many organisations and there were also a variety of views from consultants and CLPMs on this issue. The Round 1 CLPMs interviewed towards the end of last year³⁵ reported that there was still considerable concern about the dangers of young people ‘passing’ or ‘failing’ some sort of citizenship test, with the result that the majority of their projects were adopting a light-touch approach to assessment with little in the way of certification or formal accreditation. Where accredited schemes were being used they tended to be either ASDAN qualifications or connected to organisations such as Millennium Volunteers or the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award.

The consultants to Round 2 projects, interviewed earlier in 2003,³⁶ were united in their belief that, whilst there should be no compulsory accreditation for citizenship, it should be available for those young people who wanted it. They also drew attention to the problem, faced particularly by schools and colleges, that, without accreditation, the status and funding of a subject could suffer. There was unanimity in their view that some form of assessment, whether formal or informal, was essential to help young people reflect upon and learn from their experiences. As with Round 1 organisations, there was considerable variation in assessment and accreditation practice. Some organisations were using national accreditation schemes such as A/S level General Studies or Citizenship or ASDAN qualifications while others were using Progress File or had linked in with key skills delivery. Additionally, there were a whole mixture of informal strategies such as student portfolios, observations and monitoring through the tutorial system.

All the case- study organisations reported that they had some system for assessment in operation, although these varied considerably in scope and formality. Where accreditation was involved, the assessment procedures were generally more formal and had been in place long enough for the organisations to have some idea of whether they were appropriate or not. A problem had arisen in one organisation where there was linkage with key skills, over

³⁵ See NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (pp. 12-13)

³⁶ See NELSON, J., WADE, P., TAYLOR, G. and KERR, D. (2003). Evaluation of the Post-16 Citizenship Development Project: Draft Fifth Termly Report. Unpublished report. (pp. 15-17)

differences between the internal and external verification systems. As a result, the majority of students' portfolios had been 'failed' and this had cast a shadow over the entire assessment procedure. It was exactly this type of problem which had led many organisations to adopt a much more informal system, sometimes based on an individual's self-assessment, or on tutor interviews in order to see what progress was being made. Much also depended on the type of young people involved in the programme and their expectations and attitudes. Whereas some on academic courses wanted and expected at least a certificate, if not an accreditation at the end of their programme, there were others for whom, as one coordinator said, assessment '*has to be subtle*'. One example of the latter was provided by an organisation that was working with young people who were mainly NEET. This organisation marked individual achievement with such awards as First Aid and Health and Safety certificates which encouraged self-confidence while avoiding the pitfalls of a more obvious accreditation system.

With the assistance of their consultants and/or CLPMs, organisations had either developed the assessment procedures that best suited their young people or were in the process of introducing changes which would help the process develop in the future. An important lesson emerging from the evaluation was that a pre-determined system was not something that organisations themselves wanted, nor was it likely to work given the huge diversity of the post-16 sector.

6.4 Outcomes for Young People

This final section considers the reported outcomes and impact of the citizenship programmes, especially in terms of the skills, knowledge and understanding being developed by young people. The fact that interviewees tended to identify impact on the young people, as opposed to their organisations more broadly, reflects the general focus of their programme aims, outlined above.

a) Round 1

The Round 1 CLPMs were generally reluctant to comment on programme outcomes, as most felt it was still too early to make any judgements, or felt that they had only occasional contact with the young people, usually at consortium-level events such as conferences, when they could only observe

the young people *en masse*. However, most of the CLPMs thought that they had detected some signs of positive impact at such events, especially in terms of the development of skills.³⁷ The coordinators and delivery staff in the Round 1 projects also thought that the acquisition of **skills** was one of the most significant outcomes of their programmes. These were reported to have encompassed:

- ♦ technical skills such as handling telephone, radio station and computer equipment
- ♦ social skills such as constructive discussion, communication, teamwork, advocacy, public speaking and assessing ideas and concepts
- ♦ ‘life skills’ and personal skills such as time-keeping, self-confidence, problem solving, patience and how to organise themselves and others.

Most of the staff directly involved in the Round 1 projects thought that their participants had also acquired new **knowledge** which they could apply in their everyday lives as a result of their programmes. In some cases this was described as knowledge of the political system at local and national level, which was imparted either through ‘taught’ courses, or through visits to local council meetings and the Houses of Parliament and often a mixture of both. The practical value of this was clear to some of the coordinating and delivery staff. As one commented, ‘*they come to us with no knowledge at all at the moment of the legal system, or the political system*’. There were a number of comments about young people having no idea about the work of the Citizens’ Advice Bureau, or of MPs’ and local councillors’ surgeries, or of how the legal system operated. Knowledge of this nature, which often overlapped the areas of political literacy and ‘life skills’, was seen as especially significant for young people who were regarded as ‘vulnerable’, including for example, those with disabilities or the disadvantaged. In other organisations there was more emphasis on trying to develop, through application, knowledge of democratic concepts and the importance of participating in democratic processes. This was often facilitated through involvement in the establishment and running of student unions, youth assemblies and parliaments. Knowledge of how to access information relating to rights and responsibilities was also an important outcome of many programmes, according to those involved in delivering them.

³⁷ For details see NELSON, J., KERR, D., WADE, P. and DARTNALL, L (2003). Evaluation of Round 1 Post-16 Citizenship Development Projects – Fourth Termly Report, February 2003. Unpublished report. (p. 21).

The extent to which **understanding** had been imparted or acquired was particularly difficult to determine. However, several practitioners talked about the young people having had '*their minds opened*' to what it meant to be part of a community and how each individual could play an active part in improving it or in having a negative effect. One programme deliverer spoke of how the young people involved had become '*more aware of how they play into society*', and were reported to think more about issues such as disability access and how pressure groups could influence policy decisions. Another described how their young people were '*learning to look at situations constructively and see how they can be improved*', rather than just complaining about them. This indicates an important move from apathy or cynicism to evidence of informed scepticism. The significance of this positive approach to society was described by a programme deliverer, who worked with young people with a socially disadvantaged background, as '*understanding about power and influence*', and if they could become part of this system, then they were far less likely to become socially excluded. There were comments too about other unquantifiable impacts such as an increase in maturity, self esteem and sense of responsibility.

The importance of young people recognising that they could play a part as individuals within their own communities and neighbourhoods and how this linked in to national and global citizenship could be seen as being at the heart of what these programmes were trying to achieve. It was therefore a positive development that so many of the people involved in delivering the programmes felt that they were making progress in this direction. The question of whether the young people themselves felt they were achieving these outcomes is considered at the end of this section.

b) Round 2

Round 2 practitioners raised a strong note of caution about the outcomes and impacts of their programmes, on the grounds that they were at a very early stage of development and that evaluation processes were still developing. Most of the coordinators spoke about what they **hoped** their programmes would achieve, rather than what they had **actually** achieved. There was a general recognition that they had made a start, but that there was still a long way to go.

The most obvious outcomes were again the acquisition of **skills**, with a particular emphasis on increased confidence, self esteem and ability to organise. When it came to **knowledge** and **understanding**, there were only three organisations out of the ten visited that really felt they had progressed very far down this route as yet and, in one of these, the young people interviewed did not fully support this view. All the Round 2 case-study organisations felt that they were engaged in an important attempt to encourage participation in society at various levels and to help young people understand how they fitted in to a democratic system. However, seven of them admitted that they had, so far, made limited progress. As with the Round 1 organisations, there was a genuine desire to ‘*open the minds*’ of the young people involved and there was a sense of optimism from most that they would eventually achieve this, at least for some of them, but it required time and a great deal of effort. A lot depended on how the enthusiasm and interest of the young people could be captured, and for some organisations this meant avoiding schemes of imparting political literacy as political knowledge. One coordinator admitted that their students’ knowledge of the political system was ‘*appalling*’, but felt that it was not their job to teach this, and that dealing with ‘*youth*’ concerns was the best way to capture their interest. Others hoped that political knowledge and the ‘*understanding of what being a citizen means*’ would come about as a result of involvement in ‘community activities’ – the development of what might be termed ‘applied political literacy’.

As the monitoring and evaluation procedures in many organisations were still being developed and assessment schemes varied widely, much of the evidence for the outcomes and impact of citizenship programmes came from the young people themselves. Their views are reported in terms of their aspirations and what they felt they had achieved so far.

Young people’s reported expectations can broadly be grouped into five areas as follows:

- ♦ **To develop new knowledge and understanding** of social, economic and political systems, and an **awareness** of how things work (six Round 1 and six Round 2 groups).
- ♦ **To develop new skills** (four Round 1 and three Round 2 groups).³⁸

³⁸ It was clear that a number of these young people answered the question with the benefit of hindsight. It is not clear how many of them would have identified skills development as a desired programme outcome at the outset of their programmes.

- ♦ **To raise awareness of citizenship and related issues**, to help others and generally ‘make a difference’ (two Round 1 and three Round 2 groups).
- ♦ To gain a **qualification, certificate or UCAS points** (four Round 1 and six Round 2 groups).
- ♦ **No particular aspirations** (six Round 1 and three Round 2 groups).

The aspirations of young people across Round 1 and Round 2 projects were very similar, with two notable differences. Round 1 students were more likely not to have any particular expectations of their programmes, whilst Round 2 students were more likely to hope to gain a qualification or certificate from their involvement. A general pattern, emerging across both cohorts, was that young people with little or no understanding of the terms ‘citizenship education’ and ‘active citizenship’ were very likely to have no particular expectations of their programmes. In contrast, those demonstrating a relatively sophisticated understanding were most likely to fall into the group hoping to raise awareness of citizenship and related issues and to ‘*make a difference.*’

There were some positive indications that a number of the aspirations outlined above **were being realised**. Young people also reported a number of learning experiences over and above those they had anticipated. As far as Round 1 projects were concerned, there was a very close relationship between young people’s expectations and their reported learning experiences. Whilst there were a number of reported positive outcomes in Round 2 projects, these were less closely tied to the aspirations described by the young people. Young people’s reported learning experiences, mapped against their initial expectations, are discussed below:

- ♦ New knowledge and understanding of social, economic and political systems, and an awareness of how things work, developed through experiences and involvement in activities. It was striking that all 12 Round 1 and Round 2 groups identifying this aspiration felt that their programmes had helped them to develop some level of new knowledge, understanding and awareness. A number of examples were given, some of which included:
 - a newly developed knowledge of human rights, social issues, politics and current affairs. One interviewee commented: ‘*You take into consideration that you actually have views on the matter.*’
 - a deeper understanding of the workings of national and local political systems. One young man described this understanding as gaining a

perspective on the *'real world'* and on the systems that help to tackle *'real issues.'*

- a better understanding of how to go about affecting change within the community. As one young man stated: *'We've learned about how you can join up with other people - friends and family - to protest or get your views across. Having knowledge and understanding helps you do this.'*
- ◆ **Skills.** All four of the Round 1 groups, and two of the three Round 2 groups that identified this expectation felt that they were learning new skills, or developing existing ones, through their involvement. The skills they felt they were developing were plentiful, but the main ones included:
 - Confidence - Comments included: *'It gives you confidence...A few of us had to stand up in front of quite large audiences. You get used to it after a while,'* and *'I personally wouldn't have been able to talk like this six months ago.'*
 - Communication - Including debating skills, negotiation techniques, presentation skills and conversational techniques. As one young person commented: *'You are able to communicate better with people because you are used to dealing with people you've never spoken to before. It's just easier.'*
 - Social and interpersonal skills, including knowing how to meet and greet people, talking on the telephone and *'working with others - working in a team.'*
 - Skills of representation and advocacy. One young person's example was: *'We re-enacted a meeting that took place, so we learned how to represent views and compromise.'*
 - Organisational, planning and ICT skills.
- ◆ **Raising awareness of citizenship and related issues, helping others and generally *'making a difference'*.** Both the Round 1 groups, and one of the three Round 2 groups that identified this expectation indicated that they felt they were being successful in their aims. Their experiences were as follows:
 - In one school, Year 12 students had held discussion groups with students from all the lower year groups to consult with them on the development of a citizenship manifesto for the school. The manifesto was reported to be well underway, having raised the profile of citizenship within the school, and taking on board the views of all students.
 - In one special school, students felt that they had succeeded in raising the profile of disability issues on the local Youth Forum and through a disability website, which they had designed.
 - In a further mainstream school, Year 12 students were running lunchtime workshops on website design for younger students in order to provide a service to the school. The sessions were said to be popular and well attended. As one student stated: *'There are several teachers that come along too because they are interested.'*

-
- ♦ **Qualifications, certificates or UCAS points.** There were no references to qualifications, certificates or UCAS points having been achieved yet. This was probably a reflection of the timing of the interviews in the Spring Term 2003 and the fact that most of the young people outlining this aspiration were in Round 2 projects, and therefore only half way through the first year of their programmes. Only one group reported a frustration that their course would not be certificated, although they said they would have valued such an outcome. The other groups indicated that they were anticipating some form of accreditation at the end of the programmes.
 - ♦ **No particular aspirations.** Although nine groups across the Round 1 and Round 2 projects said that they had no particular expectations of their programmes, five of these groups (four Round 1 and one Round 2 projects) indicated that they had actually learned something through their involvement. All five groups highlighted specific skills that they had acquired, such as the ability to *'open up and be heard'*, work with others, behave maturely and communicate more effectively, with two adding that they had also acquired some new knowledge. As one young person said: *'I'm now more aware of what's going on out there.'* One group of disaffected young people were coming to realise the importance of their collective voice, and reported being surprised that others were willing to listen to their views.

In addition, those young people who had anticipated definite outcomes indicated a number of learning experiences over and above those they had expected. These normally reflected a development of various personal and inter-personal skills, and occasionally a development of new knowledge, understanding and awareness. Overall, interviews with the young people indicated that the development projects were leading to a number of positive learning experiences for the young people, with only four groups across the Round 1 and Round 2 projects stating that they had gained nothing from their programmes. In all of these cases, the young people had no expectations of their programmes from the outset and, generally, had very little prior understanding of the concepts of 'citizenship education' or 'active citizenship.'

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This second year of the evaluation has provided much evidence that the post-16 citizenship development projects are developing a range of interesting and innovative approaches to active citizenship. There is also evidence that the Round 1 projects have developed their understanding of, and approaches to, citizenship since the first year, and that the Round 2 projects have been able to build upon this understanding in developing their own programmes. There is currently a wide variety of provision across the projects, not least because of the different types of organisations involved, differing needs and learning levels of the young people and variable levels of staff expertise and enthusiasm. Some of this variety is good, and to be expected across a diverse sector. However, some of the variety is explained by the fact that certain approaches to post-16 citizenship development have been more effective than others.³⁹ This section attempts to identify those factors that appear to have led to the most successful provision, and concludes by providing some recommendations on approaches to post-16 citizenship development.⁴⁰

7.1 Management and status of citizenship

The LSDA Consultants and CLPMs played a fundamentally important role in guiding projects through the various stages of their development. Their input was generally welcomed by project staff, and in many cases the consultants and CLPMs reported sharing a positive working relationship. There were a number of reported factors that interviewees felt would help the overall management of the projects to run even more smoothly, which included:

³⁹ A note of caution should be added here. The Round 2 projects were only two terms into their development at the time of the case-study visits, and hence it would be unwise to comment definitively upon the overall effectiveness of their programmes, which are likely to develop as they grow into a second year.

⁴⁰ Given the complexity of the post-16 sector into which these development projects have been introduced, it was felt more appropriate to describe potential **approaches** to citizenship development, which can be applied flexibly according to individual circumstances, than to identify specific **models** of provision, which might imply a rather more rigid framework for development.

- ♦ An agreement as to the respective roles of CLPMs and consultants, or anyone that might replace them in the future. Should they be regarded as administrators or developers? Expectations of what each might be expected to achieve, matched to realistic funding, was felt to be important.
- ♦ A consideration of the impact of reduced central management next year, especially in relation to the monitoring and evaluation of projects. It may be necessary to have designated individuals whose sole responsibility is to help projects monitor their programmes if there is to be an ongoing requirement for self-evaluation into the future.
- ♦ The encouragement of networking and coordination across projects without establishing an imperative. The most important factor appeared to be the existence of a machinery for cross-project meetings so that closer cooperation could develop as and when it was considered to be in the projects' interests. It should be recognised that developing and nurturing effective networks takes time.

There appeared to be a fairly high level of senior management support for post-16 citizenship within the case-study organisations. In terms of ensuring effective organisation-level management, and a high status for post-16 citizenship, the following factors were also felt to be crucial:

- ♦ The need for a '**champion**' to promote the importance of citizenship to staff and young people.
- ♦ The importance of **genuine enthusiasm** on the part of delivery staff, and a desire to work in partnership with young people. This was felt by most interviewees to outweigh the need for specific expertise or knowledge.
- ♦ The need for **ring-fenced time** for coordinators to plan and organise, and for deliverers to develop their understanding of citizenship and to design interesting programmes. Lack of real time remains an issue across many of the projects at present.
- ♦ The importance of opportunities for **staff development and training** across a wide range of topics, themes and approaches.

7.2 Definitions and Understanding of Citizenship

There is currently no single, simple or unified view of what constitutes post-16 citizenship across the projects. This was not considered problematic by most interviewees. Indeed, practitioners welcomed having the flexibility to interpret citizenship in such a manner as suited their organisations, young people and individual circumstances, and many had done so to good effect as illustrated throughout the report. It was clear that many of the projects had actually developed programmes that were far more balanced than they

realised. Although many felt that they had not been able to cover all the strands outlined in the Citizenship Advisory Group reports, in particular the political literacy strand, there were plenty of examples of projects basing their approach around their young people and the knowledge and understanding they need in order to play an active role in society. This could well be described as *political literacy in action*. This finding suggests the importance of:

- ♦ A re-enforcement of the definition of citizenship linked, where possible, to real, practical case studies.⁴¹
- ♦ The need for a flexible, yet rigorous, framework for post-16 citizenship developments.

7.3 Integration of Citizenship

Case-study organisations had integrated citizenship programmes in a variety of different ways, from taught modules attached to existing tutorial or subject programmes, through discrete taught citizenship courses to projects with an entirely experiential focus. There were examples of each approach having been successful within a particular context. However, it was also clear that the most popular approaches, which appeared to lead to the greatest levels of engagement and learning, were those that were either entirely experiential learning project-based programmes, or those that were taught discretely. The poorest evidence of success was where citizenship had been integrated into wider existing tutorial programmes.

The integration of citizenship into the wider community tended to be an underdeveloped area across the projects, with little reported interaction with national citizenship organisations, and some of the larger organisations reporting that they found it difficult to find suitable community service opportunities for all their young people. However, a small number of the case-study organisations demonstrated that the integration of citizenship programmes with the wider community need not just be seen in these terms. They showed how imaginative new links could also be forged with long-standing partner organisations based upon the political aspects of their role, or could be developed with the organisations that provided services to the

⁴¹ The work currently being undertaken by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) will be extremely valuable in this respect.

organisation, by giving young people responsibility for negotiating various issues with them. These findings have the following implications:

- ◆ Some of the most innovative, successful and popular programmes were those that had adopted an experiential learning or project-based focus, based on the needs and experiences of young people, and catered for small numbers of young people. There are clearly issues about the replicability of such programmes should post-16 citizenship be rolled out nationally. This is particularly pertinent given that the programmes that attempted to reach the largest numbers of young people, the tutorial programmes, appeared to have had the lowest levels of success.
- ◆ There may be some need for a re-enforcement of the meaning of community involvement, and some case-study examples of it being achieved in an imaginative way, which makes best use of existing resources.

Whilst most interviewees believed that it was important for there to be integration between pre- and post-16 citizenship developments to ensure continuity and progression, very few links had yet been made, for a variety of reasons. There was a sense, among interviewees, that there may be a need for an individual or agency to act as a broker between schools and post-16 organisations in the future to assist with:

- ◆ The development of local networking groups - involving key citizenship coordinators from a range of organisations.
- ◆ The provision of baseline data from schools to post-16 providers on students' experiences and understanding of citizenship issues.
- ◆ Independent guidance on the development of post-16 citizenship programmes, which takes into account the baseline of pre-16 activity.

7.4 Teaching and Learning Citizenship

A variety of teaching, learning and facilitation approaches had been developed across the projects, which were largely dependent upon the type of programme developed, the relative experience of staff and the needs of the young people. Case-study examples provided throughout the report indicate that the most successful approaches included the following features:

- ◆ A negotiation of key issues of interest with the young people.
- ◆ The development of a critically reflective learning environment, with scope for discussion and debate.

- ◆ The use of a variety of experiential learning experiences, including project work, drama, role play, art, photography and exhibition work.
- ◆ The use of varied and interesting resources, ideally related to, or growing out of, current events (whether local or national) which had relevance for young people.
- ◆ Growing facilitation of activities based on the active involvement of young people rather than the teaching of knowledge, understanding and skills.
- ◆ Links with the wider community through visits off site, the use of external speakers, and the allocation of responsibility to young people for working and negotiating with external partners.
- ◆ Involving young people in active participation in large-scale assemblies such as youth fora and student parliaments.

7.5 Suggested Approach to Development

It is hoped that the evidence presented throughout this report will prove helpful in the development of advice to ministers about the future of post-16 citizenship. The following is presented as a suggested approach to development, based upon evidence derived from the evaluation. It is hoped that this guidance will help policy makers and most providers of post-16 citizenship to ensure that the programmes developed in the future are as effective as possible. The evaluation has suggested that there is a need for development at a number of different levels.

Management factors

- ◆ A flexible, yet rigorous, framework which recognises that projects will need to develop citizenship programmes in a wide variety of ways, from taught to more active approaches, according to the specific needs and circumstances of their organisations, staff and young people.
- ◆ The provision of sufficient funding for local management of projects to be effective, including support for agencies to act as brokers of information between pre- and post-16 citizenship providers.
- ◆ The encouragement of local networks and dialogue between those developing citizenship programmes.

Institution-level factors

- ◆ A clear definition of what citizenship means, and what the programme seeks to achieve.
- ◆ Senior management support and a supportive organisational ethos.
- ◆ Sufficient time for staff to develop aims and objectives, teaching and learning strategies, assessment approaches and preferred outcomes.
- ◆ Sufficient funding, especially if citizenship is to be introduced on a wider scale with large numbers of young people.

- ◆ Dedicated and enthusiastic staff (these need not be specialists, but ideally should be willing volunteers). These would act as 'Champions' to promote citizenship to staff and students.
- ◆ Appropriate and sufficient staff development and training opportunities.
- ◆ The tailoring of citizenship to the needs, skills, interests and experiences of young people.

Learning context-level factors

- ◆ Dedicated and enthusiastic staff, with the skills to facilitate as well as teach.
- ◆ A dedicated time slot for citizenship (whether as a discrete course, a module within a larger programme, or a specific project). The integration of citizenship into a wider tutorial scheme was generally regarded to have been a less effective approach.
- ◆ An emphasis on combining knowledge, understanding and skills with practical action – what was termed a 'political literacy in action' approach, as opposed to a narrower political knowledge approach.
- ◆ Involvement and participation of young people in decisions about their learning, and the development of a student voice.
- ◆ A focus upon critically active forms of learning, including discussion, debate, dialogue and reflection. The best examples were where young people were helped to think, reflect and take action.
- ◆ The use of a variety of experiential learning experiences, including project work, drama, role play, art, photography and exhibition work.
- ◆ The use of varied and interesting resources, ideally with relevance to the interests and experiences of young people.
- ◆ Links with the wider community through off site visits, the use of external speakers, and giving young people responsibility for working and negotiating with external partners.
- ◆ The involvement of young people in active participation in large-scale assemblies such as youth fora and student parliaments.
- ◆ Assessment strategies that are effective and realistic, based upon the needs, skills and capabilities of the young people.

If a decision is taken to roll citizenship out nationally, it is important to remember that the post-16 projects (especially those in Round 2) are still under development, and will require further monitoring and review as they progress. The development phase has been, and will continue to be, a powerful learning experience, which should be drawn upon to pass key messages on to those working at national and institutional levels, and to the young people themselves. This is not only relevant at post-16 level, but also in relation to pre-16 citizenship, which stands to learn much from the practical and very real experiences from the post-16 projects. The post-16 projects also have considerably more development work to undertake themselves in terms of:

- ◆ **Developing a clear and confident view about what citizenship means** – especially about what political literacy means in practice
- ◆ **Improving continuity and progression from pre- to post-16**
- ◆ **Deciding how best to integrate citizenship** – into their organisations, and with the wider community
- ◆ **Devising teaching and learning approaches** – that are the most effective for their organisations and young people
- ◆ **Involving young people** – deciding how to negotiate with young people over their learning and assess their outcomes
- ◆ **Developing assessment strategies** – considering how to report citizenship outcomes in such a way as to fit with the aims and teaching and learning approaches of the organisation.

Overall, the report confirms the wisdom of having had a development phase for post-16 citizenship. The pilot development projects have made considerable progress in addressing and providing answers to the key challenges involved in developing citizenship programmes for young people involved in a variety of education, training and work-based routes. It is hoped that the lessons learnt will prove invaluable not only for any planned national roll-out of post-16 citizenship but also for the development of pre-16 citizenship. In a climate of growing discussion about, and planning for, provision not just 16-19 but increasingly 14-19, it is vital that the outcomes of the development phase are applied as widely as possible. Indeed, it is hoped that there are still further valuable lessons to emerge as the projects enter their third (Round 1) and second (Round 2) years of development.

APPENDIX A1 – Round 1 Partner Organisations April – July 2003

The following figures are based upon information supplied in projects' MI returns. This term, projects were asked to provide details of the numbers of organisations and young people participating only where there had been a change since last term. Therefore, where either a blank form, or no form, was returned, it was presumed that there had been no change in participation since last term. Reported changes in participation are indicated throughout Appendices A1 to B2.

Consortium	School sixth forms	Sixth form colleges	FE colleges	Training providers	Employers	Voluntary	Others	No. of Programmes	External partners
A	2	-	1	-	-	1	1	5	-
B	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	5	5
C	1	-	4	-	-	1	-	6	14
D	-	-	2	3	-	4	-	7	8
E	2	2	2	-	-	2	-	8	5
F	2	-	1	2	-	-	-	5	6
G*	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	10	7
H**	-	1	1	2	-	1	-	8	4
I	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	5	3
J	12	-	2	-	-	-	1	15	10
K	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	7
Total	24	6	14	9	0	13	4	77	69

Note - MI reports were received from all consortiums except consortium I.

* Consortium G reported 10 programmes running across four institutions involved in the project.

* Consortium H reported eight programmes running across four institutions involved in the project. This data was included for the first time this term

APPENDIX A2 – Round 2 Partner Organisations April – July 2003

Consortium	School Sixth forms	Sixth form colleges	FE colleges	Training providers	Employers	Voluntary	Others	No. of Programmes	External partners
AA			3					6	
BB			1	2			1	6	
CC		1		1		1		3	
DD*			3	1				14	3
EE	6		1					9	2
FF			3					7	2
GG	1	2	1					14	3
HH	1		1	1				5	
II*	3					1		9	1
JJ			3	1				5	1
TOTAL	11	3	16	6	0	2	1	78	12

* Note that in consortiums DD and II there were four partner organisations but only three sent MI reports.

APPENDIX B1i – Round 1 Programme Participants, gender and ethnicity

It is important to note that the information in this table is based solely on details provided by each consortium and their partner institutions. As indicated in Appendices A1 and A2, data has not been provided by every institution, nor by every consortium. Numbers should therefore be seen as *indicative* rather than *definitive*.

Citizenship programmes provided by type of partner in consortium	Core Participants	Fringe participants	Male	Female	White	Chinese	African	Caribbean	Black other	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Asian	Mixed	Other
School sixth forms															
Consortium Ai ⁵	110 ⁵	100 ⁵	51 ⁵	59 ⁵	80 ⁵		2 ⁵	10 ⁵		2 ⁵	6 ⁵				
Consortium Aii ⁵	24 ⁵	30 ⁵	0 ⁵	54 ⁵	50 ⁵					1 ⁵	1 ⁵				2
Consortium Bi	12 ³	4	9 ³	3 ³	12 ³										
Consortium Bii	71 ⁴		42 ⁴	29 ⁴	63 ⁴	2 ⁴		2 ⁴		1 ⁴					3 ⁴
Consortium C	104 ⁴				104 ⁴										
Consortium Ei ⁴	5 ⁴	11 ⁴	3 ⁴	2 ⁴	1 ⁴					4 ⁴					
Consortium Eii ⁴	5 ⁴	151 ⁴		5 ⁴	5 ⁴										
Consortium Fi ⁴	8 ⁴	160 ⁴	1 ⁴	167 ⁴	5 ⁴		1 ⁴							1 ⁴	1 ⁴
Consortium Fii ⁴	20 ⁴	240 ⁴	14 ⁴	6 ⁴	11 ⁴		2 ⁴	1 ⁴		1 ⁴	4 ⁴				1 ⁴
Consortium G ⁴	10 ⁴	20 ⁴		30 ⁴	3 ⁴		1 ⁴			1 ⁴		5 ⁴			
Consortium Ji ²	10 ²		7 ²	3 ²	10 ²										
Consortium Jii ²	21 ²		3 ²	18 ²	21 ²										
Consortium Jiii ²	14 ²		4 ²	10 ²	14 ²										
Consortium Jiv ²	15 ²		6 ²	9 ²	15 ²										
Consortium Jv ²	23 ²		12 ²	11 ²	23 ²										
	452³	716³	152³	406³	417³	2	6	13		10	11	5		1	7
6th form college															
Consortium B	1850														
Consortium C ⁴	50 ⁴	30 ⁴	29 ⁴	21 ⁴	50 ⁴										
Consortium Ei ⁴	20 ⁴	80 ⁴	16 ⁴	4 ⁴	2 ⁴					18 ⁴				1 ⁴	
Consortium Eii ⁴	15 ⁴	200 ⁴	3 ⁴	12 ⁴	5 ⁴					10 ⁴					
Consortium Gi ⁴	50 ⁴	500 ⁴													
Consortium Gii ⁴	100 ⁴	450 ⁴													
Consortium Giii ⁴	12 ⁴														
Consortium Giv ⁴	67 ⁴	483 ⁴													
Consortium Gv ⁴	17 ⁴	150 ⁴	3 ⁴	14 ⁴	4 ⁴					12 ⁴				1 ⁴	
Consortium H ⁵	266 ⁵	854 ⁵	92 ⁵	174 ⁵	181 ⁵	1 ⁵				8 ⁵	34 ⁵	29 ⁵	1 ⁵	9 ⁵	3 ⁵
	2447³	2747¹	143¹	225¹	242¹	1				48	34	29	1	11	3

Programmes B and Bi have been rotated since last term, as it became apparent that each had been entered under the wrong partner type.

Citizenship programmes provided by type of partner in consortium	Core Participants	Fringe participants	Male	Female	White	Chinese	African	Caribbean	Black other	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Asian	Mixed	Other
FE colleges															
Consortium A ⁵	11 ⁵		1 ⁵	10 ⁵	8 ⁵			1 ⁵					1 ⁵	1 ⁵	1 ⁵
Consortium Ci ⁴	6 ⁴	3 ⁴	3 ⁴	3 ⁴	5 ⁴						1 ⁴				
Consortium Cii ⁵	50 ⁴			50 ⁴	49 ⁴										1 ⁴
Consortium Ciii ⁵	140 ⁵	1156 ⁵													
Consortium D	25 ¹		15 ¹	10 ¹	15 ¹										10 ³
Consortium Ei ⁴	5 ⁴	50 ⁴	1 ⁴	4 ⁴	2 ⁴					4 ⁴					
Consortium Eii ⁴	167 ⁴	167 ⁴	9 ⁴	23 ⁴	14 ⁴		1 ⁴			17 ⁴					
Consortium F ⁴	32 ⁴		17 ⁴	15 ⁴	30 ⁴				1 ⁴	1 ⁴					
Consortium Gi	7 ¹	585 ³	5 ¹	2 ¹	1 ¹		6					6 ¹			
Consortium Gii	85 ⁴	1076 ⁴	30 ⁴	55 ⁴	20 ⁴		9 ⁴	11 ⁴				45 ⁴			
Consortium Giii	3 ⁴		1 ⁴	2 ⁴								3 ⁴			
Consortium H ⁵	1970 ⁵	200 ⁵	1084 ⁵	886 ⁵	1396 ⁵		41 ⁵				265 ⁵	186 ⁵			82 ⁵
Consortium Ii	No information available for this programme														
Consortium Iii	No information available for this programme														
Consortium J ²	12 ²	60 ²	6 ²	6 ²	12 ²										
	2513¹	3297³	1172¹	1066¹	1552¹		57	12¹	1	22¹	266¹	240¹	1	1	94³
Training providers															
Consortium B	14			1 ¹											
Consortium Di	15 ¹		9	6 ¹	15 ¹										
Consortium Dii	20 ⁴		10 ⁴	10 ⁴	20 ⁴										
Consortium Fi ⁴	136 ⁴		76 ⁴	60 ⁴	42 ⁴	1 ⁴	25 ⁴	35 ⁴		5 ⁴	7 ⁴				21 ⁴
Consortium Fii	109	20	76	33	29 ¹	1 ³	66			4	4			2	3
Consortium Hi ²	12	5	7	5	10							2			
Consortium Hii ²	10		6	4	7					1				2	
Consortium I	No information available for this programme														
Consortium Ji	27 ¹	6 ³	20 ¹	7											
Consortium Jii ⁴	8 ⁴		6 ⁴	2 ⁴	7 ⁴										1 ⁴
	351¹	31³	210¹	128¹	130¹	2³	91¹	35		10	11	2		4	25

Type of partner	Core Participants	Fringe participants	Male	Female	White	Chinese	African	Caribbean	Black other	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Asian	Mixed	Other
Voluntary Organisations															
Consortium A ⁵	20 ⁵	40 ⁵	19 ⁵	1 ⁵				1 ⁵			4 ⁵			1 ⁵	
Consortium B	7 ⁴		2 ⁴	5 ⁴	7 ³										
Consortium D ⁵	7 ⁵		4 ⁵	3 ⁵	7 ⁵										
Consortium Ei ⁴	30 ⁴	150 ⁴			25 ⁴					5 ⁴					
Consortium Eii ⁴	2 ⁴	3 ⁴	3 ⁴	2 ⁴	3 ⁴					2 ⁴					
Consortium G ⁴	5 ⁴		2 ⁴	3 ⁴	4 ⁴						1 ⁴				
Consortium H ⁵	8 ⁵	10 ⁵	5 ⁵	3 ⁵	2 ⁵							6 ⁵			
Consortium I	No information available for this programme														
Consortium Iii	No information available for this programme														
Consortium J ²	10 ²		5 ²	5 ²	10 ²										
	89¹	203¹	40¹	22¹	58			1		7	5¹	6¹		1	
Other organisations															
Consortium A ⁵	8 ⁵	4 ⁵	8 ⁵		8 ⁵										
	8	4	8		8										
TOTAL	5860³	6998³	1725¹	1847¹	2408¹	5³	154¹	61¹	1	97¹	327¹	282¹	2	18	129³

¹ Number of participants has fallen since last report.

² Included for the first time this term.

³ Number of participants has increased since last report.

⁴ Projects reported no change in participation since last term – the figures presented here are as in the last report.

⁵ Projects gave no indication within their MI return of whether there had been any change in participation since last term. The figures included here are as they were presented in the last report – this may or may not be an accurate reflection of participation across these projects

APPENDIX B1ii – Round 1 Programme Participants, learning needs and levels

It is important to note that the information in this table is based on details provided by each consortium and their partner institutions. As indicated in Appendix A, data has not been provided by every institution, nor by every consortium. Numbers should therefore be seen as *indicative* rather than *definitive*.

Citizenship programmes provided by type of partner in consortium	EAL	Other	SEN	pre entry	entry	Level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4	AS/A level	GNVQ
School sixth forms											
Consortium Ai ⁵								110 ⁵			
Consortium Aii ⁵								20 ⁵			
Consortium Bi							12 ³				
Consortium Bii											
Consortium C							18 ⁴	86 ⁴			
Consortium Ei ⁴							5 ⁴				
Consortium Eii ⁴							2 ⁴	3 ⁴			
Consortium Fi ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium Fii ⁴								20 ⁴			
Consortium G								30			
Consortium Ji ²								10 ²			
Consortium Jii ²								21 ²			
Consortium Jiii ²								14 ²			
Consortium Jiv ²								15 ²			
Consortium Jv ²								23 ²			
							37³	352³			
6th form colleges											
Consortium E							mixture				
Consortium C ⁴							12 ⁴	38 ⁴			
Consortium B								1850 ³			
Consortium Ei ⁴						16 ⁴	4 ⁴				
Consortium Eii ⁴								15 ⁴			
Consortium Gi ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium Gii ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium Giii ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium Giv ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium Gv ⁴								17 ⁴			
Consortium H ²								266			
							16	16	2186³		

Citizenship programmes provided by type of partner in consortium	EAL	Other	SEN	pre entry	entry	Level 1	level 2	Level 3	level 4	AS/A level	GNVQ
FE college											
Consortium A ⁵						11 ⁵					
Consortium Ci							6 ⁴				
Consortium Cii					No further data provided						
Consortium Ciii					No further data provided						
Consortium D				25 ¹							
Consortium Ei ⁴								6 ⁴			
Consortium Eii ⁴						26 ⁴	6 ⁴				
Consortium F ⁴									32 ⁴		
Consortium Gi							1 ¹	6 ¹			
Consortium Gii ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium Giii ⁴								3 ⁴			
Consortium H ²					341	432	561	636			
Consortium Ii					No further data provided						
Consortium Iii					No further data provided						
Consortium J ²								12 ²			
				25 ¹	341 ¹	469	574 ¹	663 ¹	32		
Training provider											
Consortium B											
Consortium Di				15 ¹							
Consortium Dii							20 ³				
Consortium Fi ⁴					33 ⁴	62 ⁴	37 ⁴	4 ⁴			
Consortium Fii				10	63	35	1				
Consortium Hi ⁵							12 ⁵				
Consortium Hii ⁵					1 ⁵	6 ⁵	3 ⁵				
Consortium I					No further data provided						
Consortium Ji						24 ³	3 ¹				
Consortium Jii ⁴				8 ⁴							
				33 ¹	97 ¹	127 ¹	76 ³	4 ¹			

Citizenship programmes provided by type of partner in consortium	EAL	Other	SEN	pre-entry	entry	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4	AS/A level	GNVQ
Voluntary Organisation											
Consortium A ⁵							20 ⁵				
Consortium B					mixture						
Consortium D ⁵				2 ⁵	1 ⁵		4 ⁵				
Consortium Ei ⁴							20 ⁴	10 ⁴			
Consortium Eii ⁴							2 ⁴				
Consortium G ⁴					No further data provided						
Consortium H ²				8							
Consortium I					No further data provided						
Consortium Iii					No further data provided						
Consortium J ²							10 ²				
				10	1	10¹	46	10			
Other organisation											
Consortium A ⁵				12 ⁵							
				12							
TOTAL				80¹	439¹	622¹	749¹	3215³	32		

¹ Number of participants has fallen since last report.

² Included for the first time this term.

³ Number of participants has increased since last report.

⁴ Projects reported no change in participation since last term – the figures presented here are as in the last report.

⁵ Projects gave no indication within their MI return of whether there had been any change in participation since last term. The figures included here are as they were presented in the last report – this may or may not be an accurate reflection of participation across these projects

APPENDIX B2i – Round 2 Programme Participants, gender and ethnicity

It is important to note that the information in this table is based on details provided by each consortium and their partner institutions. In some cases not all individual institutions, or indeed consortia, provided information on young people involved in the citizenship projects. Therefore the numbers will be under represented.

Citizenship programmes by type of partner	Core Participants	Fringe participants	Male	Female	White	Chinese	African	Caribbean	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Asian	Mixed	Other
School sixth form														
Organisation EE1 ⁵	199 ⁵		102 ⁵	97 ⁵	180 ⁵	4 ⁵	2 ⁵	1 ⁵	3 ⁵					6 ⁵
Organisation EE2 ⁴	30 ⁴													
Organisation EE3	12 ³													
Organisation EE4	4 ¹													
Organisation EE5	6 ³													
Organisation EE6 ⁴	8 ⁴													
Organisation GG1 ⁴	270 ⁴	40 ⁴		270 ⁴	22 ⁴	4 ⁴	21 ⁴	4 ⁴	11 ⁴	163 ⁴	8 ⁴			
Organisation HH1	70 ³	300 ³	25 ³	35 ³	60 ³	3 ²	2 ²		4 ³	3 ³				
Organisation II1	17 ¹	80 ¹	6 ¹	11 ¹										
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme													
	616³	420¹	133¹	413¹	262¹	11³	25¹	5¹	18¹	166¹	8¹			6
6th form college														
Organisation CC1 ⁴	41 ⁴	1130 ⁴	17 ⁴	24 ⁴	41 ⁴									
Organisation GG2 ⁴	31 ⁴	740 ⁴	11 ⁴	20 ⁴	21 ⁴	1 ⁴		1 ⁴	2 ⁴	3 ⁴			1 ⁴	2 ⁴
Organisation GG3 ⁴	177 ⁴		70 ⁴	107 ⁴	145 ⁴					32 ⁴				
	249	1870	98	151	207	1		1	2	35			1	2

Citizenship programmes by type of partner	Core Participants	Fringe participants			White	Chinese	African	Caribbean	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Asian	Mixed	Other
			Male	Female										
FE college														
Organisation AA1 ⁴	149 ⁴		76 ⁴	73 ⁴	141 ⁴		3 ⁴		2 ⁴					3 ⁴
Organisation AA1 ⁴	17 ⁴		9 ⁴	8 ⁴	17 ⁴									
Organisation AA1 ⁴	47 ⁴		28 ⁴	19 ⁴	46 ⁴				1 ⁴					
Organisation AA1 ⁴	38 ⁴			38 ⁴	38 ⁴									
Organisation AA2 ⁴	35 ⁴	105 ⁴	13 ⁴	22 ⁴	33 ⁴		2 ⁴							
Organisation AA3	50 ⁴		25 ⁴	25 ⁴	47 ¹		2 ³						1 ⁴	
Organisation BB1	50 ¹		1 ¹	49 ¹	50 ¹									
Organisation DD1	14 ¹		3 ³	12 ¹										
Organisation DD1	124 ⁴		44 ⁴	80 ⁴										
Organisation DD1	No information available for this programme													
Organisation DD1	No information available for this programme													
Organisation DD1	3													
Organisation DD2	No information available for this programme													
Organisation DD3 ⁵	12 ⁵	50 ⁵	5 ⁵	7 ⁵	12 ⁵									
Organisation EE7	15 ¹	8	15 ¹		15 ¹									
Organisation FF1	84 ⁴		24 ⁴	60 ⁴	32 ²		6 ²	6 ²	2 ²	1 ²			1 ²	1 ²
Organisation FF2 ⁵	216 ⁵		123 ⁵	93 ⁵	201 ⁵	2 ⁵	5 ⁵		1 ⁵				4 ⁵	3 ⁵
Organisation FF2 ⁵	30 ⁵		19 ⁵	11 ⁵	26 ⁵	1 ⁵							2 ⁵	1 ⁵
Organisation FF2 ⁵	216 ⁵		123 ⁵	93 ⁵	201 ⁵	2 ⁵	5 ⁵		1 ⁵				4 ⁵	3 ⁵
Organisation FF2 ⁵	38 ⁵		27 ⁵	11 ⁵	36 ⁵		1 ⁵						1 ⁵	
Organisation FF3	This organisation has withdrawn from the Post 16 Citizenship Development Programme													
Organisation FF4 ⁵	140 ⁵		75 ⁵	65 ⁵	59 ⁵	1 ⁵	9 ⁵	21 ⁵	12 ⁵	24 ⁵				14 ⁵
Organisation FF4 ⁵	61 ⁵		24 ⁵	37 ⁵	27 ⁵	1 ⁵	7 ⁵	10 ⁵	2 ⁵	7 ⁵				7 ⁵
Organisation GG4 ⁴	216 ⁴		116 ⁴	110 ⁴	180 ⁴	3 ⁴	1 ⁴	2 ⁴	2 ⁴	2 ⁴	26 ⁴			2 ⁴
Organisation HH2 ⁴	47 ⁴		13 ⁴	34 ⁴	44 ⁴	1 ⁴	1 ⁴							1 ⁴
Organisation JJ1	This programme appears to have been discontinued													
Organisation JJ1 ²	3 ²		1 ²	2 ²	3 ²									
Organisation JJ1 ²	10 ²		7 ²	3 ²	10 ²									
Organisation JJ3 ⁵	10 ⁵	46 ⁵	35 ⁵	21 ⁵	52 ⁵		1 ⁵		2 ⁵					1 ⁵
Organisation JJ4	This programme appears to have been discontinued													
Organisation JJ4	115 ¹		64 ¹	50 ¹	107 ¹		1 ⁴		7 ¹					
	1740¹	209¹	870¹	923¹	1377¹	11¹	44³	39¹	32¹	34¹	26		14¹	35¹

Citizenship programmes by type of partner	Core Participants	Fringe participants	Male	Female	White	Chinese	African	Caribbean	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Asian	Mixed	Other
Training provider														
Organisation BB2	5 ³	38 ³	33 ³	10 ³	43 ³									
Organisation BB2	This programme appears to have been discontinued													
Organisation BB3 ⁴	14 ⁴		14 ⁴		14 ⁴									
Organisation CC2	250 ³		104 ³	156 ³	248 ³					1 ³			1 ⁴	
Organisation DD4 ⁴	75 ⁴	25 ⁴	60 ⁴	40 ⁴	97 ⁴								3 ⁴	
Organisation HH3	No information available for this programme													
Organisation JJ2	25 ²	12 ²	12 ²	13 ²	24 ²									1 ²
	369³	75³	223³	219³	426³					1³			4³	1¹
Voluntary														
Organisation CC3	30 ¹	30 ¹	20 ³	10 ³	29 ³									1 ³
Organisation I13	14 ¹	7 ¹	10 ¹	4 ⁴	6 ¹		2 ⁴	1 ³	3 ¹	1 ⁴			1 ⁴	
	44³	37¹	30¹	14³	35³		2	1	3¹	1			1	1¹
County Council														
Organisation BB4 ⁵	15 ⁵		2 ⁵	13 ⁵	15 ⁵									
Organisation BB4 ⁵	10 ⁵		2 ⁵	8 ⁵	10 ⁵									
	25		4	21	25									
TOTAL	3043¹	2611¹	1358¹	1741¹	2332¹	23¹	71³	46¹	55¹	234¹	34¹	0	20¹	45¹

* These young people are not included in the total figures, because no indication of the actual *numbers* participating were given.

¹ Number of participants has fallen since last report.

² Included for the first time this term/new programme.

³ Number of participants has increased since last report.

⁴ Projects reported no change in participation since last term – the figures presented here are as in the last report.

⁵ Projects gave no indication within their MI return of whether there had been any change in participation since last term. The figures included here are as they were presented in the last report – this may or may not be an accurate reflection of participation across these projects.

Note, Training provider BB2 and DD4 gave ethnic data for core AND fringe participants, hence the number of white participants being higher than the number of core participants.

APPENDIX B2ii – Round 2 Programme Participants, learning needs and levels

It is important to note that the information in this table is based on details provided by each consortium and their partner institutions. In some cases not all individual institutions, or indeed consortia, provided information on young people involved in the citizenship projects, therefore the numbers will be under represented.

Citizenship programmes by type of partner	EAL	Other	SEN	pre entry	entry	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
School sixth form									
Organisation EE1 ⁵								199 ⁵	
Organisation EE2							1 ⁵	29 ⁵	
Organisation EE3							1 ⁵	10 ⁵	
Organisation EE4								6 ⁵	
Organisation EE5								5 ⁵	
Organisation EE6								8 ⁵	
Organisation GG1 ⁴					19 ⁴	33 ⁴	69 ⁴	144 ⁴	
Organisation HH1							4 ³	66 ³	
Organisation II1									
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation II2	No information available for this programme								
					19	33	75³	467³	
6th form college									
Organisation CC1 ⁴							10 ⁴	31 ⁴	
Organisation GG2					5 ⁴	2 ⁴		14 ⁴	10 ⁴
Organisation GG3						30 ⁴	147 ⁴		
					5	32	157	45	10

Type of partner	EAL	Other	SEN	pre entry	entry	level 1	level 2	Level 3	level 4
FE college									
Organisation AA1 ⁴						31 ⁴	31 ⁴	87 ⁴	
Organisation AA1 ⁴						13 ⁴	4 ⁴		
Organisation AA1 ⁴								47 ⁴	
Organisation AA1 ⁴								38 ⁴	
Organisation AA2 ⁴						15 ⁴		20 ⁴	
Organisation AA3					10 ⁴	30 ⁴	10 ⁴		
Organisation BB1							54 ⁵		
Organisation DD1					2	5 ³	8 ¹		
Organisation DD1	No information available for this programme								
Organisation DD1	No information available for this programme								
Organisation DD1	No information available for this programme								
Organisation DD2	No information available for this programme								
Organisation DD3 ⁵						2 ⁵	2 ⁵	7 ⁵	1 ⁵
Organisation EE7							15 ³		
Organisation FF1 ⁴					5 ⁴	17 ⁴		62 ⁴	
Organisation FF2							216 across levels 2&3*		
Organisation FF2 ⁵								38 ⁵	
Organisation FF2									
Organisation FF2 ⁵								30 ⁵	
Organisation FF3	This organisation has withdrawn from the Post 16 Citizenship Development Programme								
Organisation FF4 ⁴						45 ⁴	44 ⁴	51 ⁴	
Organisation FF4					4	7	13	37	
Organisation GG4 ⁴								216 ⁴	
Organisation HH2 ⁴							47 ⁴		
Organisation JJ1	This programme appears to have been discontinued								
Organisation JJ1 ²							3 ²		
Organisation JJ1 ²					10 ²				
Organisation JJ3 ⁴								56 ⁴	
Organisation JJ4	This programme appears to have been discontinued								
Organisation JJ4					3 ²	25 ²	33 ²	37 ²	15 ²
					13²	46³	198³	376³	812¹
									3

Type of partner	EAL	Other	SEN	pre entry	entry	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
Training provider									
Organisation BB2				5 ³	28 ³	10 ³			
Organisation BB2	This programme appears to have been discontinued								
Organisation BB3 ⁴							6 ⁴	8 ⁴	
Organisation CC2				5 ³	36 ³	103 ³	90 ³	16 ³	
Organisation DD4					5 ⁴	25 ⁴	25 ⁴	30 ⁴	15 ⁴
Organisation HH3									
Organisation JJ2					1 ³	12 ³	12 ³		
				10³	70¹	150³	133³	54³	15³
Voluntary									
Organisation CC3		No information available for this programme							
Organisation II3		No information available for this programme							
County Council									
Organisation BB4 ⁵								15 ⁵	
Organisation BB4 ⁵							10 ⁵		
							10	15	
TOTAL				23³	140³	413³	751³	1393¹	28³

* For the purpose of totalling the figures, this figure has been divided by two, so that 108 young people are assumed to have been studying at level 2 and 108 at level 3 respectively.

** These young people are not included in the total figures, because no indication of the actual *numbers* participating were given.

¹ Number of participants has fallen since last report.

² Included for the first time this term.

³ Number of participants has increased since last report.

⁴ Projects reported no change in participation since last term – the figures presented here are as in the last report.

⁵ Projects gave no indication within their MI return of whether there had been any change in participation since last term. The figures included here are as they were presented in the last report – this may or may not be an accurate reflection of participation across these projects.

APPENDIX C



Citizenship Education in Europe



Council of Europe: European Year of Education through Citizenship

The Council of Europe has recently announced that 2005 will be the European Year of Citizenship through Education. The year will be held within the framework of the Council's *Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC)* programme.

The year will focus on promoting various educational activities in the member states as a means of educating people for active citizenship and democratic participation. The Council has stated that it will encourage member states to modify educational programmes and introduce legislative reforms to improve educational policies and practices regarding democratic citizenship.

Within the overall framework of the year, both the Council of Europe and member states are expected to organise a range of activities including:

- ♦ making available and disseminating information on EDC;
- ♦ organising awareness raising and training seminars;
- ♦ developing and distributing educational materials for EDC; and
- ♦ providing legislative assistance to member states aspiring to carry out reforms in the field of EDC.

The event will target specific groups in the field of education for democratic citizenship, including teachers and headteachers, parents, students, youth associations, other representative bodies and non-government organisations.

Further information about the Council of Europe's *Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC)* programme is available from:

http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/E.D.C/

Institute for Citizenship

The Institute for Citizenship is a UK-based organisation with charitable status which works to promote active citizenship and participation in democratic society. The Institute's work embraces awareness-raising about European citizenship issues. Recently this has included the *Speak out! On European Citizenship* project which aimed to engage young people across Europe in the public debate about the future of European Union. Regional debates on the issues were held in the UK during February and March and a web-based discussion forum have been used to exchange views with participants across Europe.

More information about the European aspects of the organisation's work is available from:

<http://www.citizen.org.uk/europe.html>



Further information:
Tel: + 44 (0) 1753 612112
Fax: + 44 (0) 1753 531458
E-mail: eurydice@nfer.ac.uk
<http://www.nfer.ac.uk/eurydice>



Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications
P.O. Box 5050
Sherwood Park
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60
Fax: 0845 60 333 60
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60

© Queen's Printer 2004

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN: 1 84478 164 X
Ref No: RR507

www.dfes.go.uk/research