THE CONNECTED SCHOOL
A DESIGN FOR WELL-BEING

Supporting children and young people in schools to flourish, thrive and achieve

Edited by Colleen McLaughlin

PEARSON

ncb

Working with children, for children

THE CONNECTED SCHOOL

A Design for Well-Being – Supporting Children and Young People in Schools to Flourish, Thrive and Achieve

Edited by Colleen McLaughlin

ABOUT PEARSON

Pearson is the world's leading learning company. Our education business combines 150 years of experience in publishing with the latest learning technology and online support. We serve learners of all ages around the globe, employing 45,000 people in more than seventy countries, helping people to learn whatever, whenever and however they choose. Whether it's designing qualifications in the UK, supporting colleges in the USA, training school leaders in the Middle East or helping students in China learn English, we aim to help people make progress in their lives through learning.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES

The Chief Education Advisor, Sir Michael Barber, on behalf of Pearson, is commissioning a series of independent, open and practical publications containing new ideas and evidence about what works in education. The publications contribute to the global discussion about education and debate the big 'unanswered' questions in education by focusing on the following eight themes: Learning Science, Knowledge and Skills, Pedagogy and Educator Effectiveness, Measurement and Assessment, Digital and Adaptive Learning, Institutional Improvement, System Reform and Innovation, and Access for All. We hope the series will be useful to policy-makers, educators and all those interested in learning.

CREATIVE COMMONS

ABOUT THE NATIONAL CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The National Children's Bureau (NCB) is a leading charity that for over fifty years has been improving the lives of children and young people, especially the most vulnerable. Working with children, and for children, the NCB strives to reduce the impact of inequalities by influencing government using extensive research and expertise, being a strong voice for young people and practitioners and inspiring creative solutions on issues including health, early years and social care. Every year the NCB reaches more than 100,000 children and young people through its membership scheme, links with voluntary, statutory and private organisations, and the specialist membership programmes it hosts. For more information, visit www.ncb.org.uk, their Facebook page, www.facebook.com/ncbfb, or follow them on Twitter: @ncbtweets.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

In the twenty-first century, we need every young person to flourish and achieve their potential; the well-being of young people is certainly an issue of our time. We are proud to publish this collection of short essays brought thoughtfully together by the National Children's Bureau, which explore through seven think pieces the role of schools, educators and wider society in young people's lives.

The authors seek to answer the question, 'How can we improve the lives of children and young people?' and examine how these elements 'connect', putting forward compelling arguments for them working more closely with each other towards better well-being outcomes. The essays have a conversational tone yet retain a theoretical edge that will stimulate debate. *The Connected School* is a must-read for everyone who wants a deeper understanding of the fragmentation and dislocation in young people's lives, especially the most vulnerable, and who want to see children's lives transformed.

The authors don't claim to have all the answers but they advance the case for greater focus on the 'well-being agenda'. We congratulate the National Children's Bureau for setting out bold guiding principles for reform and important questions for reflection, which have the potential to shape the contours of the next political cycle and the advancement of the 'well-being' agenda.

Pearson, April 2015

INTRODUCTION
Colleen McLaughlin

The chapters in this collection are intended to stimulate debate about national and school policy by key thinkers writing and researching today. They are not about the finished translation of these ideas into practice, and hopefully they will be seen in that spirit and will be catalytic. We do hope that they will inform the development of new practice. The detail of what is being said can be followed up through the references after each chapter.

The authors are arguing against fragmentation and dislocation in young people's lives, particularly their schooling. This argument is for seeing the relationships and the significance of the links between the worlds of young people in their particular contexts. The connections explored are:

• between social and educational complexity and schooling;

• between the economic context, poverty and school processes;

• between the community and the school;

• between those working outside of school and those working inside;

• between the early experiences of expression and decision-making in school and later practices and experience of democracy;

• between our frameworks for thinking and our practice;

• between the environment for learning, people and learning itself;

• and, finally, between the inner and outer worlds of young people or between body and mind.

The central argument is that everything is connected and that these connections matter greatly to education and to young people's development.

The first chapter by Colleen McLaughlin and John Gray focuses upon the relational world of school and argues that the old frameworks for schooling do not engage with the complexity of young people's lives, poverty and complexity itself. Relational is used in two senses: (1) to emphasise the interconnection between elements such as assessment policy and practice and well-being, or between inspection, league tables and what attainment or measures are valued in schools; and (2) to emphasise the importance of the human. A new approach, one that emphasises relationships, connection, control and meaning is a better model for the social and educational world young people are in. 'If there is one overriding message …, however, it is that the most important factor affecting young people's wellbeing relates to the cultures of support their schools develop and sustain' (Gray et al. 2011: 107). The concerns about child well-being have been the subject of much discussion in this country through the Good Childhood Inquiry (Layard et al. 2009; Pople 2009) and the UNICEF Innocenti reports (UNICEF 2007, 2013, 2014), where in international comparisons the UK does not fare at all well.

The next two chapters focus on aspects of the links between economics, inequality, poverty and education. Robert Shiller, Nobel Prize-winning economist, argued that 'the most important problem we are facing now, today, . . . is rising inequality' (quoted in Wilkins 2013). This has been mirrored in a 2014 UNICEF study on the impact of the recession and the rise in poverty amongst children. The report shows that the number of children entering into poverty during the recession is, '2.6 million higher than the number that have been able to escape from it since 2008 (6.6 million, as against 4 million)' and that approximately, '76.5 million children live in poverty in the 41 most affluent countries' (UNICEF 2014: 9). 'Poorer children suffer most. The poorest and most vulnerable children have suffered disproportionately. Inequality has increased in some countries where

overall child poverty has decreased, suggesting that tax changes and social transfers intended to help the poorest children have been relatively ineffective' (UNICEF 2014: 3).

Alan Dyson and his team remind us in Chapter 2 that it has long been known that children from economically poorer backgrounds do less well than their more advantaged peers in terms of educational (and many other) outcomes. Also,

> while poverty can be found anywhere, there are concentrations in particular places … The risk in all of them, however, is that whatever disadvantages children face by reason of their economic circumstances will be further compounded by restricted opportunities, struggling schools and services, poor facilities, and issues around community safety and cohesion.

Therefore, they argue, we need 'a "connected" approach, one which understands children's lives "in the round", which can connect schools and partner organisations and, equally, can connect children's lived experiences and professional knowledge.'

Anne Edwards (Chapter 3) gives examples of fragmentation that have implications for children and young people, captured in one study when a teacher described her work as 'passing on bits of the child' (Edwards et al. 2009). She shows that the complexity of disadvantage and its potential consequences (poor patterns of school attendance and lack of engagement as learners) necessitates professionals linking closely and that we need relational expertise and relational interprofessional responses to support 'the trajectories of vulnerable children and young people'.

The next two chapters are more philosophical in character and are about how we conceptualise our aims and aspirations as well as about the relationship between school processes,

our society and its processes of democracy. Michael Fielding (Chapter 4) advocates 'a richer and more varied partnership between adults and young people in schools'. It is, in essence, an argument for the need 'to place the participatory tradition of democracy at the heart of all that we do in schools: if democracy matters it must be seen to matter'. He too argues for a wider conception of the goals and aspirations of education. 'The nature, quality and legitimacy of the outcomes we seek within our education system must be linked demonstrably and insistently to democracy as the manner, means and humanly fulfilling aspiration of our way of life.'

Rosie Peppin Vaughan and Fergus Crow (Chapter 5) examine the capabilities approach as a 'distinctively relational' one, 'essentially connected to concepts of choice and meaning for children and young people'. They argue there is a need to think about how to develop policy and practice 'that speaks directly to … new approaches, and that has value for children and young people themselves'. This would also involve a re-examination of the goals of education.

Chapters 6 and 7 look at connections between particular aspects of schools and education and how they connect to both well-being and learning. Louise Thomas (Chapter 6) writes of design and the learning environment: 'Schools are about more than learning: they are about connecting generations with one another, connecting young people to their futures, and ensuring that they are equipped with the fundamentals to live fully connected lives.' As she points out, the school building has not changed in centuries and is a disconnected environment. She argues for a redesign of the school in order to let students connect in different ways and for the benefit of learning: learning in ways that are fit for purpose in the twenty-first century. Katherine Weare (Chapter 7) focuses specifically on well-being and mindfulness. Her chapter shows the now-much-researched benefits of uniting our bodies and our minds. By focusing

on the present and the workings of our minds and bodies we can connect to ourselves and others in constructive ways that benefit our own and other people's well-being 'and with their own resources for surviving and thriving in the complex and challenging social world of the school'.

These different perspectives are an argument for a wide conception of education and schooling. They are about the notion of the curriculum and the aims of the school that were laid out in the opening clauses of the 1988 Education Act:

> (2) The curriculum for a maintained school satisfies the requirements of this section if it is a balanced and broadly based curriculum which – (a) promotes the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society; and (b) prepares such pupils for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life.

The argument is that only by reconnecting up the human, cognitive and relational aspects of education can we help young people to live in a world that requires a great deal of them socially, morally, personally and as learners and citizens. A narrow view of the purpose of schools and of the nature of school experience is to be resisted.

I end with a paraphrase of the three assumptions underpinning Michael Fielding's contribution and one that underpin all the chapters I think. First, that relationships matter; second, that, in its richest and most fully developed sense, learning is a deeply mutual undertaking; third, that what is enacted in schools and their surrounding communities on a daily basis matters and shapes the personal and social development of young people. We have concluded with specific principles for reform and policy-making and with reflective questions for school leaders and practitioners.

REFERENCES

Edwards, A., H. Daniels, T. Gallagher, J. Leadbetter and P. Warmington (2009) *Improving Interprofessional Collaborations: Multi-Agency Working for Children's Wellbeing*, London and New York: Routledge.

Gray, J., M. Galton, C. McLaughlin, B. Clark and J. Symonds (2011) *The Supportive School: Wellbeing and the Young Adolescent*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Layard, R., J. Dunn and the Panel of the Good Childhood Enquiry (2009) *A Good Childhood: Searching for Values in a Competitive Age*, London: Penguin Books.

Pople, L. (2009) *The Good Childhood Inquiry: What Children Told Us*, London: Children's Society.

UNICEF (2007) *An Overview of Child Well-Being in Rich Countries: A Comprehensive Assessment of the Lives and Well-Being of Children and Adolescents in the Economically Advanced Nations*, Geneva: UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre.

—— (2013) *Child Well-Being in Rich Countries: A Comparative Overview*, Geneva: UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre.

—— (2014) *Children of the Recession: The Impact of the Economic Crisis on Child Well-Being in Rich Countries*. Innocenti report card 12. Geneva: UNICEF.

Wilkins, B. (2013) 'Nobel Prize Winner Shiller: Inequality Biggest Problem Facing US', *Digital Journal*, 16 October. Available at http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/360347 (accessed 13 April 2015).

Colleen McLaughlin *is Professor of Education and Head of the Department of Education at the University of Sussex.*

1. ADOLESCENT WELL-BEING AND THE RELATIONAL SCHOOL

Colleen McLaughlin and John Gray

A general compulsory education offers opportunities for emancipation and development and it is also a prerequisite to many other political and civic rights … Many students experience school failure … from which it may be difficult to recover. These failures are typically regarded as individual failures, but they should be seen as failures of the educational system, and the negative consequences which follow not only afflict the individuals, but the whole educational system and the entire society.

(Gustafsson et al. 2010: 156)

SUMMARY

This chapter examines the research on schools and their impact upon young people's lives and well-being. Studies of young people's lives today suggest that the old frameworks for schooling do not engage with the complexity of young people's lives, poverty and complexity itself. A new approach, one that emphasises relationships, connection, control and meaning is a better model for the social and educational world young people are in.

INTRODUCTION

Trends in child and adolescent mental health can be seen as a barometer of the success of society's efforts to improve children's well-being and life chances.

(Collishaw 2012: 9)

Schools are powerful institutions in the lives of young people, and they impact on their present and future development. Much attention has been given to researching the effectiveness of schools in terms of their impact

on achievement but far less to the school's contribution to well-being and life chances. Young people today have higher levels of emotional and behavioural problems than in the past. The increase has begun to level off, but it is still significantly higher than in the 1970s and 1980s (Collishaw 2012), and the UK is rated sixteenth out of the world's twenty-nine richest countries in terms of well-being (UNICEF Office of Research 2013). About 10 per cent of young people will experience serious emotional or behavioural difficulties (and we know this group will struggle more in school than their peers), but even more of them (between 20 and 30 per cent) express worries about their school experiences which can affect their well-being and achievement. There is a growing body of research on these experiences and on the school's role, albeit not a large body of research-based knowledge. We will try to summarise and draw conclusions from that body of evidence and will examine the following questions:

- What is the school's contribution to well-being?
- Does it have sufficient prominence?
- Have schools as institutions kept up with the challenges of the changing and changed world, and are they meeting the needs of adolescents in terms of developing their well-being appropriately?

THE CONNECTED RELATIONAL SCHOOL

The idea of the relational school comes from examining research on the factors in schools that contribute to well-being. The word 'relational' is being used in two different and important ways: first, to signal the centrality of relationships in well-being in schooling (and this includes relationships between adults and children, between children and their peers and between the school and its community); and, second, to signal that it is the relationship between the different elements of what the school does that is important, i.e. how do issues of assessment, reading policy, grouping policy or organisational structures affect well-being? We know they do.

CONNECTEDNESS: THE CENTRALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS

School connectedness has emerged as being influential in young people's well-being. It describes a linked group of activities and experiences, including relationships between peers and with teachers, levels of pupil satisfaction with school experience and feelings of membership and belonging to the learning community of the school and the classroom. It is about making a valued contribution, which, in turn, can develop a sense of agency. Pupils who feel valued, connected to school and cared for by people at school have a higher degree of well-being. The ability of the child to connect to the school and have a significant relationship to it is also a key protective factor that enhances later life chances and lowers health risk behaviour. School connectedness is related to later reduced violence, less risky sexual behaviour, less drug use, less dropping out and less anti-social behaviour. Positive relationships with adults in school and with peers are equally important, but some studies suggest that attachment to teachers is the more significant. So there is a downward and an upward spiral here. Young people who have a sense of voice, agency, who feel they belong and can contribute, who have good relationships with adults and peers are building a sound developmental base for present and future well-being, as well as academic achievement. Those who have poor relationships with teachers and peers are likely to have a higher risk of having an emotional difficulty and to engage in socially disruptive behaviour with long-term consequences. We know that emotional and behavioural difficulties are stable over time after adolescence.

THE NATURE OF THE RELATIONSHIPS AND THEIR IMPORTANCE

The characteristics of the relationships with teachers that matter to young people are as follows:

- They are perceived as supportive and fair.
- There is respect, trust and listening present.
- They engender feelings of competence.
- They engage the young person in decision-making and cultivate agency.
- The other is seen as acting like an advocate who will intervene on the pupil's behalf.
- They are positive.

The perception of support is a key one. The majority of adolescents in the reviewed studies did feel supported by their teachers and other adults. However, there was a significant minority who did not. The other major area is peer relationships. The capacity to form friendships and have positive peer relationships both within and outside school has a direct effect on how children cope with crisis and on their levels of well-being. In past decades, schools have taken these relationships seriously as the programmes and policies on bullying and helping children

to form friendships attest. Finally, the relationships between schools and their communities is an area for development, especially where the school may be struggling and the community too. These relationships matter because they impact on both well-being and academic achievement and pupil motivation. Early research showed the strong connection between school success and later social development. Many of the factors that play a part in shaping school success are also factors that shape well-being.

There are some indicators that suggest that for some young people connectedness to school has become more problematic, and the rise in exclusion rates for young people since 1990 is one major indicator. This is also an example of the other meaning of relational.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PARTS

Many of the major factors in influencing well-being have been examined by researchers, but in isolation from

each other. This is true of both school practices and educational reforms. The consequences of practice and policy on young people's well-being are not often debated. There tends to be a focus on improving educational achievement and yet we know that there is a strong relationship between academic achievement and mental health. The practices in schools and classrooms cannot be falsely divided. The well-being of pupils merits being an educational end in itself, not just a servant to academic achievement.

The aspects of schooling that research has shown merit consideration in terms of their impact on well-being and life chances are as follows.

Assessment and testing. The move to increased testing seems to be part of a pressure on young people in the UK, and it is not found to the same extent elsewhere in Europe. Young people in the UK report being under pressure and that this is demotivating. The Swedish review argues for the diminishing of the dominant role of exams and testing (see Gustafsson et al. 2010).

Individual failure and how it is handled. Here the work is to interrupt 'trajectories of failure', which are so powerful and long-lasting. This includes examining issues such as truancy, school failure and drop-out. Failure at school has knock-on effects and can cause internalising and externalising mental-health problems. Good well-being and academic outcomes are associated with high levels of intervention to mitigate failure.

Extra support for learning and inclusive practices in the classroom. Reading emerges as key to both academic achievement and well-being. Early and intensive support for reading is a feature of supportive schools.

Transitions from primary to secondary as well as from secondary to higher education, further education or vocational routes. The increase in pupil unemployment and the numbers of

young people who are without further education post-sixteen or work is a recent priority and one that needs support and examination. Transition is not necessarily a negative experience, but the support is key as is the monitoring of vulnerable pupils who are at risk of failure and withdrawal at this point.

The impact of organisational and classroom structures. This includes the grouping of pupils, the processes for organising schools and classrooms, the style of leadership and the culture of the school and classrooms.

A NEW FRAMEWORK

Studies of young people's lives today suggest that the old frameworks for schooling do not engage with the complexity of young people's lives, poverty and complexity itself. A new approach, one that emphasises relationships, connection, control and meaning is a better model for the social and educational world young people are in (see Wyn 2013).

KEY IDEAS

- There is incontrovertible evidence that schools have a serious role to play in the development of well-being, although much more research is needed.
- The research suggests that we have set up Chinese walls between well-being and learning; this is deeply unhelpful and impacts on both well-being and learning.
- All the school's processes matter and contribute to well-being, and supportive schools integrate these to the benefit of well-being and learning.
- The well-being of pupils needs to be established by the educational processes that drive practice, e.g., Ofsted, as an end in itself.

We need to engage young people in these developments.

This writing draws on research done for the Nuffield Foundation 'Changing Adolescence' Programme (http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/changing-adolescence) (see Hagell 2012).

REFERENCES

Collishaw, S. (2012) 'Time Trends in Young People's Emotional and Behavioural Problems, 1975–2005', in A. Hagell (ed.), *Changing Adolescence: Social Trends and Mental Health*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 9–26.

Hagell, A. (ed.) (2012) *Changing Adolescence: Social Trends and Mental Health*, London: Nuffield Foundation.

Gustafsson, J.-E., M. Allodi Westling, B. Alin Åkerman, C. Eriksson, L. Eriksson, S. Fischbein, M. Granlund, P. Gustafsson, S. Ljungdahl, T. Ogden and R. S. Persson (2010) *School Learning and Mental Health: A Systematic Review*, Oslo: Swedish Academy of the Social Sciences.

UNICEF Office of Research (2013) *Child Well-Being in Rich Countries: A Comparative Overview*, Innocenti Report Card 11. Florence: UNICEF Office of Research.

Wyn, Johanna (2013) unpublished keynote lecture at the British Association for Educational Research. Brighton, 5 September.

Colleen McLaughlin is Professor of Education and Head of the Department of Education at the University of Sussex. **John Gray** is Professor of Education at the University of Cambridge.

2. CHILDREN'S COMMUNITIES AND EQUITABLE OUTCOMES

Alan Dyson and Kirstin Kerr, with Chris Wellings

SUMMARY

In order to respond effectively to the multiple factors that compound the impact of poverty on children and young people living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, it is necessary to connect differently with the complexity of children's lives in these localities; to connect up local services and provision; and to connect with local factors that create and sustain poorer outcomes.

Children's Communities draw on the successful Harlem Children's Zone concept to create a response which is 'doubly holistic', built around local partnerships and locally owned. By focusing on the interdependence of a wide range of outcomes for children and young people, the Children's Communities model has considerable potential to support the development of innovative approaches to improving well-being and learning outcomes.

BACKGROUND

It has long been known that children from economically poorer backgrounds do less well than their more advantaged peers in terms of educational (and many other) outcomes. We also know that, while poverty can be found anywhere, there are concentrations in particular places. These might be small neighbourhoods, or much larger parts of towns and cities, each of which has its own individual characteristics. The risk in all of them, however, is that whatever disadvantages children face by reason of their economic circumstances will be further compounded by restricted opportunities, struggling schools and services, poor facilities and issues around community safety and cohesion.

If children's well-being and learning outcomes are to be improved in these places, there are two core challenges which must be met. The first is to understand the social complexity of children's lives and the factors and processes at work locally that help to create and sustain poor outcomes. The second is for schools and their partners to be able to develop responses that match this complexity, so that they can begin to improve outcomes by engaging more effectively with children's lives. This calls for a 'connected' approach, one that understands children's lives 'in the round', that can connect schools and partner organisations and, equally, can connect children's lived experiences and professional knowledge.

A concern to tackle the concentrations of poor outcomes found in particular places is far from new, and, since at least the 1960s, there have been efforts to do so through intensive localised intervention. These efforts reached a peak in the 2000s with a succession of initiatives sponsored by central government – Education Action Zones, Extended Schools, Sure Start Children's Centres and the like – which enjoyed varying degrees of success. The change of government in 2010 has largely seen the end of such centrally driven initiatives, with the emphasis now switching to local decision-making. This brings with it a danger that the achievements of the past decade and a half will be lost. However, it also creates opportunities for local policy-makers and practitioners to develop their own powerful and creative responses to poor outcomes, as they are well positioned to connect to local contexts in ways which centrally driven initiatives struggle to achieve.

Against this backdrop, Save the Children and the University of Manchester have developed a model for improving children's outcomes in disadvantaged places, across all aspects of their lives. The model, called 'Children's Communities', is based on a series of principles that draw on learning from the Harlem Children's Zone and Promise Neighborhoods in the USA and the

long experience of initiatives in England. Like many previous initiatives, Children's Communities bring together a wide range of partners to work on improving outcomes locally. However, they are also distinctive in a number of ways.

- They see outcomes as interdependent, concerning themselves with a wide range of outcomes rather than focusing narrowly on, say, education, health or employment.
- They develop a 'doubly holistic' approach. This means that rather than engaging with children only at particular ages and phases, or only in school, they work with children and young people from birth to young adulthood, and across all the aspects of children's lives that are important for them to do well.
- They focus on an 'area' that makes sense locally, defined by a common set of issues facing children and young people rather than by a line drawn on a map.
- They develop a joint strategy with

partners to be sustained over time and base their strategy on a deep analysis of the local factors and processes at work that can limit outcomes and life chances.

- They operate as entities in their own right, having their own leadership and governance arrangements. This allows them a degree of autonomy that enables them to focus on the task at hand without being overly distracted by external imperatives.

The Children's Community model is underpinned by a powerful evidence base, and there is good reason to believe that it can lead to sustained improvements in well-being and learning outcomes. First, to demonstrate that there is a strong rationale for Children's Communities, we have drawn on the wider evidence about the mechanisms through which social disadvantage, and the distinctive dynamics of particular places, are linked to poor outcomes. Second, to demonstrate that Children's Communities can make a difference, we have reviewed the most comprehensive,

publicly available studies on similar approaches in the USA and the UK. A summary of these evidence bases follows.

THE RATIONALE FOR CHILDREN'S COMMUNITIES

Disadvantage and outcomes

Although there is a strong association between children's backgrounds, the places where they live and the outcomes they enjoy, the connections between these are complex. As Bronfenbrenner (1979) points out, children's social environments are made up of a series of interrelated and interacting 'systems' – for instance, the family, the school, the neighbourhood and the wider social and cultural context in which these are located. A helpful analogy is to think of this as being akin to an 'eco-system', with the term 'social-ecology' being used to encompass the different systems, and the interactions between them, that shape children's outcomes. In disadvantaged places, these systems tend to have limited capacity to ensure that children do well. However, this is not the case for every child. Some will have families, teachers, parents or friends who support them well, or will have positive experiences in or out of school, or will have talents that are nurtured effectively. These children will go on and do well. In other words, they will be 'resilient' in the face of the 'risks' they experience (Schoon 2006).

Resilience in this sense need not be a matter of luck. It is possible to strengthen supportive systems and reduce risks. Schools can be made more effective, parents can develop greater skills, youth employment prospects can be enhanced, communities can be made safer. Doing these things separately may improve outcomes to some extent, but, because they are interrelated, the issues that are not tackled are likely to undermine any gains which are made. There is a good case, therefore, for tackling all of these things together so that improvements in one aspect of a child's life are supported by improvements in other aspects. The aim of such wide-ranging and coordinated

interventions is to transform the social environments of children at risk and maximise the chances of their achieving good outcomes.

This aim can and should be pursued through national-level policies and programmes. However, it is also the case that different areas create different dynamics, pose different challenges and offer different opportunities. This means that different approaches will need to be adopted in different places and that particularly intensive interventions may be needed in the most disadvantaged places. It also means that, even in places with similarly high levels of economic disadvantage, the differences between those places will need to be taken into account.

Putting all this together offers a powerful rationale for Children's Communities. Their aim is to undertake wide-ranging interventions to reduce the risks and strengthen the protective factors in children's social ecologies so that they achieve good outcomes. While they are not intended as alternatives to supportive national policies, they develop approaches which are customised to the dynamics, difficulties and opportunities of the most disadvantaged places.

EVIDENCE ON INTERVENTIONS

Robust and comprehensive evaluations of local children's communities will be essential in order to see whether and how they fulfil their promise. In the meantime, however, there is a substantial evidence base on interventions with children facing disadvantage and the places where they live. This gives us reason to believe that the children's community approach is likely to prove effective. There are three levels at which this evidence base needs to be considered:

1   evidence on 'stand-alone' single-issue interventions;
2   evidence on transferred outcomes; and
3   evidence on multi-stranded interventions.

These are addressed in turn.

'STAND-ALONE' SINGLE-ISSUE INTERVENTIONS

Although Children's Communities require a connected, 'doubly holistic' approach, this in no way precludes them from integrating effective, evidence-based interventions into their overall strategies. In particular, there is already a considerable body of knowledge Children's Communities can draw on about 'stand-alone' single-issue interventions, i.e. interventions used to target short-to-medium-term outcomes in a single aspect of a child's life. There is good evidence that it is possible to make a difference to, among other things, children's risky behaviours, health, social skills, emotional well-being, engagement in criminal activity, educational attainments and aspirations, as well as to their families' nurturing skills. In fact, the evidence is sufficiently robust for it to be possible in some cases to produce guides that compare the effectiveness and costs of different interventions (Higgins et al. 2013; Allen 2011). This suggests there is much that could be achieved simply by deploying a range of high-quality interventions to address particular factors in children and young people's local contexts.

TRANSFERRED OUTCOMES

There is good evidence that single-issue interventions can have impacts well beyond their target outcomes. For instance, improving children's health can have an impact on their school attendance (Nicholas et al. 2005). Likewise, intervening to ensure good learning experiences early in a child's life can bring benefits throughout childhood and adolescence, and on into adulthood (Schweinhart et al. 2005). Because of the interactions between different systems in children's social ecologies, these 'transfers' may often be cumulative. Changing one aspect of the ecology enables other parts to have more positive effects. So, for instance, a child who comes to school a little better prepared or attends more often has more positive experiences, feels more confident, does better in school and has greater opportunities post-school. The original gain is thus multiplied many times over.

A Children's Community – as an entity in its own right, and with a place-based remit – has the potential to connect interventions strategically so that these wider gains can be capitalised upon, and a network of supports, spanning childhood and engaging with children's social ecologies, can be created.

MULTI-STRANDED INTERVENTIONS

There are good reasons to believe that properly coordinated approaches with multiple strands of action addressing different aspects of children's ecologies can maximise these transfers and minimise the risk of gains in one aspect of the child's life being undermined by failures in others.

Customised to local conditions, these can be more effective still. Good evaluations of approaches of this kind are not common, but there is a large amount of indicative evidence. Initiatives such as the Tulsa Area Community Schools initiative (Adams 2010) and City Connects (Boston College Center Child

Family and Community Partnerships 2009; Boston College Center for Optimized Student Support 2011, 2012; City Connects 2011) in the USA, or the Full Service Extended Schools initiative in England (Cummings et al. 2007; Cummings, Dyson and Todd 2011), all involve linking educational interventions with interventions in other aspects of children's social ecologies. All can demonstrate significant improvements in outcomes for the most disadvantaged children. Likewise, whatever the limitations of the available evidence, the Harlem Children's Zone itself can point to large numbers of children and their families accessing services, to improved health outcomes, parenting practices and school readiness, and to impressive levels of educational attainment and participation (Whitehurst and Croft 2010; Dobbie and Fryer 2011; Harlem Children's Zone 2011).

THE WAY FORWARD

Highly disadvantaged places and the children who live in them are under enormous pressure. Across the country,

however, local practitioners and policy-makers are deciding that it is not necessary to wait on central government before taking action, and a range of local initiatives are springing up. We are suggesting that the development of Children's Communities offers a highly promising direction for these initiatives to take. The framework created by the Children's Community model has considerable potential to support the development of innovative approaches to improving well-being and learning outcomes. There are already some places where the model is beginning to be used in this way, and their outcomes will be eagerly anticipated.

REFERENCES

Adams, C. (2010) *The Community School Effect: Evidence from an Evaluation of the Tulsa Area Community School Initiative*, University of Oklahoma, The Oklahoma Center for Educational Policy.

Allen, G. (2011) *Early Intervention: The Next Steps. An Independent Report to Her Majesty's Government*, London: The Cabinet Office.

Boston College Center for Child Family and Community Partnerships (2009) *The Impact of Boston Connects: Summary Report 2008–9*, Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Boston College.

Boston College Center for Optimized Student Support (2011) *The Impact of City Connects: Annual Report 2010*, Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Boston College.

—— (2012) *The Impact of City Connects: Progress Report 2012*, Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Boston College.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979) *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

City Connects (2011) *City Connects: The Lasting Impact of Optimized Student Support*, Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Boston College.

Cummings, C., A. Dyson, D. Muijs, I. Papps, D. Pearson, C. Raffo et al. (2007) *Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative: Final Report, Research Report RR852*, London: Department for Education and Skills.

Cummings, C., A. Dyson and L. Todd (2011) *Beyond the School Gates: Can Full Service and Extended Schools Overcome Disadvantage?* London and New York: Routledge.

Dobbie, W. and R. G. Fryer (2011) 'Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Increase Achievement among the Poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone', *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3 (3): 158–87.

Harlem Children's Zone (2011) 'Harlem Children's Zone Evaluation Highlights: from July '10–June '11', available at http://www.hcz.org/images/stories/Evaluation_Highlights_FY_11.pdf (accessed 1 July 2012).

Higgins, S., M. Katsipataki, D. Kokotsaki, R. Coleman, L. E. Major and R. Coe (2013) *The Sutton Trust–Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit*, London: Education Endowment Foundation.

Nicholas, S. W., V. E. Hutchinson, B. Ortiz, S. Klihr-Beall, B. Jean-Louis, K. Shoemaker et al. (2005) 'Reducing Childhood Asthma through Community-Based Service Delivery: New York City, 2001–4', *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 54 (1): 11–14.

Schoon, I. (2006) *Risk and Resilience: Adaptations in Changing Times*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schweinhart, L. J., J. Montie, Z. Xiang, W. S. Barnett, C. R. Belfield and M. Nores (2005) *Lifetime Effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through Age 40*, Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 14, Ypsilanti, Mich.: High/Scope Press.

Whitehurst, G. J. and M. Croft (2010) *The Harlem Children's Zone, Promise Neighborhoods, and the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education*, Washington, DC: Brown Center on Education Policy at Brookings.

Alan Dyson is Professor of Education at the University of Manchester. He is also Co-director of the University's Centre for Equity in Education. **Kirstin Kerr** is Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Manchester's Centre for Equity in Education. **Chris Wellings** is UK Head of Policy at Save the Children.

3. INTERPROFESSIONAL WORKING IN AND AROUND SCHOOLS

Anne Edwards

SUMMARY

The risk of social exclusion for children and young people frequently arises from a combination of factors including poverty, housing and parental mental health and is often linked with poor patterns of school attendance and lack of engagement as learners. These complex arrays of disadvantage cannot be tackled by schools on their own. This essay offers examples of relational interprofessional responses to social exclusion that have schools as key partners in supporting the trajectories of vulnerable children and young people.

WORKING WITH SCHOOLS TO PREVENT SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Education policies alone cannot tackle educational disadvantage. Cross-sector synergies are required, to link what schools can do with what employment, finance, youth, health justice, housing, welfare and other services can offer.

(Jan Truszczyński, quoted in Edwards and Downes 2013: 7)

SCHOOLS' ROLE IN PREVENTING SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Schools are a country's major preventative agency. Sound education can disrupt intergenerational cycles of poverty and disadvantage. But schools cannot achieve this outcome alone. Equality of opportunity is only part of the story: children, young people and their families need to be able to recognise and embrace the opportunities offered, and many need help to do so.

The focus of this essay is social inclusion, i.e. taking up and contributing to the opportunities offered by mainstream society; it is not about how children with special educational needs are included in classrooms. The idea of social inclusion emerged from OECD discussions in the 1990s and was recognised as a UK policy priority with the establishment of the Social Exclusion Unit in 1997. It was taken forward in the decade that followed through a series of initiatives, including the Children's Fund and On-Track, and through legislation, particularly the Children Act (2004). These developments have contributed to a major reconfiguration of services for children and families across the UK, with only slight differences in focus and pace between the four constituent nations.

A key feature in these developments is a new interpretation of 'early intervention' to mean intervening at the first signs of vulnerability to prevent more serious outcomes (Home Office 2000). Vulnerability is difficult to recognise, often seen only when looking across the whole of a child's life, and so is most likely to be recognised by those who are in daily contact with a child. Yet, despite a 2007 policy review of services for children and young people (HM Treasury and Department for Education and Skills 2007), which argued for the central role of schools as a universal service in the early identification of vulnerability, in England at least schools have not taken up this preventative role. Vulnerable children are often seen as problems for schools, and schools rarely see themselves as part of the child-centred systemic response argued for in the Munro Review of child-protection services (Munro 2011).

Developments such as 'Team around the Child' and the 'Common Assessment Framework' have helped link schools with other support agencies when problems become too great for schools to handle, and the 'Extended Schools' initiative had the potential to engage schools more closely in capacity-building in their communities, helping families to be able to take advantage of educational opportunities (Cummings et al. 2011).

Despite these efforts, there is little evidence that schools see themselves as part of local systemic responses to problems of social exclusion.

This fragmentation has implications for children and young people, captured in one study when a teacher described her work as 'passing on bits of the child' (Edwards et al. 2009). Being seen as a problem that requires the school to call in extra help cannot be good for children. Research on resilience tells us that being taken seriously as a person with values and intentions is key to children's well-being (Luthar 2003). The self-regulation that arises when this happens is also essential for academic success. This chapter is not an argument for diverting schools from their main mission of developing children and young people as enthusiastic learners; instead, it suggests that early intervention by an connected school alongside other agencies to achieve social inclusion can support that mission.

A key concept arising from Edwards' work on schools and multi-agency working is the need for what she terms 'relational expertise' (2010, 2012). She argues that responsive work with vulnerable children calls for the ability to take the standpoint of other professionals and of families, to recognise their specific expertise and to align what they bring to supporting inclusion with what others can offer. Relational expertise is in addition to one's core expertise as a social worker or teacher but allows for the professional strengths of both to be brought into play to respond to the complexities of children's vulnerability.

RESOURCEFUL SCHOOLS

The summaries that follow draw on a review of research for the European Commission on interprofessional collaborations for social inclusion involving schools across Europe (Edwards and Downes 2013). They show how schools as universal services have drawn on and worked with other agencies in the cause of prevention.

THE NETHERLANDS: YOUTH CARE ADVISORY TEAMS

These youth care advisory teams include a teacher or other member of school staff, a social worker, a youth worker, a health-care worker and a police and truancy officer. They are attached to schools and work with the aims and practices of the school. They are part of a whole-school approach to prevention, often described as 'multi-service schools', and support vulnerable pupils. A recent evaluation of twenty-one pilots by van Veen (2011) showed improved achievement, well-being and service delivery. They worked best when there was complementary expertise and a clear focus on contributing to support structures for teaching and learning in schools and networks of schools, but there was a danger of a shift in focus away from prevention to work on the more serious cases.

GERMANY: AN ECOLOGICAL APPROACH

One Square Kilometre of Education is a networked intervention focused on education initiated in Berlin in 2006 by the Freudenberg Foundation, Karl-Konrad-and Ria-Groeben Foundation and RAA Berlin in cooperation with the Berlin Senate Department for Education, Science and Research. There are now two projects in Berlin, and the idea was extended to Wuppertal, Herten and Mannheim in 2009. Evaluation so far is through monitoring and self-evaluation.

The approach centres on five questions:

1   How can processes of education in a city district be organised so that they can be integrated, interconnected and ensure the success of children and adolescents?
2   How can the quality in child centres, youth welfare centres and schools be improved and controlled with the participation (if possible) of all groups involved?
3   How can the participation of parents be ensured?
4   Under what conditions can different approaches be integrated in and transferred from the programme?

5   How can municipalities, state administrative offices, foundations and civic society cooperate in this connection?[1]

IRELAND: TARGETING A COMMUNITY

The Familiscope project in Dublin brings together specialist services such as speech and language therapy, family support and targeted interventions such as Incredible Years. Evaluations of the project by Downes show how a mixed portfolio of interventions can be responsive and beneficial (see Edwards and Downes 2013). For example, giving outreach support for the 'hard-to-reach' families of students who were not attending school and at risk of early school drop-out was successful in improving attendance, while another recent initiative involved speech and language therapists working as part of a multidisciplinary team based in schools with children, teachers and parents. They developed teachers' language strategies through child language groups, collaborative classroom delivery (speech and language therapist and teacher), informal advice on language difficulties and teacher workshops, as well as direct speech support for the child with well-attested benefits for the children.

OTHER EXAMPLES OF THIRD-PARTY HELP FOR SCHOOLS

- In Sweden, social workers are placed in schools to undertake what are termed 'school social interventions' through collaborations between teachers, social workers, students and their families.

- In Belgium, community schools were subsidised by the Flemish Minister of Education between 2006 and 2009. Seventeen schools created local networks from across the sectors to support children's development, with children and their parents central to the networks.

- In Germany, the Elbe Island Training Offensive in Hamburg see schools as central to large-scale community regeneration. Schools network and integrate provision and look outwards to their roles in a

community that is changing around them.

There is an increasing recognition for greater integration of schools into communities for the benefit of children and young people. The Education Council of The Netherlands has, for example, suggested that, given the academic pressure on teachers, there is a need for third-party help. 'Other external parties, such as the social elite and businesses, could also contribute more to education than they may now perhaps realise' (Education Council of the Netherlands 2010: 2).

GREATER INTEGRATION TO OVERCOME BARRIERS TO INCLUSION

A major problem with the one-off initiatives of the previous fifteen years has been their short-term nature. Short-term funding meant interprofessional links were limited and sustained engagement with the most vulnerable children and families was difficult. Complex problems of vulnerability

call for sustained systemic approaches centred in and around schools as a universal service. These approaches bring resources to schools. They also engage schools in long-term capacity-building in communities so that children and families are supported as active citizens, able to contribute to and take up the opportunities available.

This chapter argues that schools need to do more than operate as sites for other initiatives. Preventative activities need to be central to schools' missions. In that way, schools give a non-stigmatising stability to a system of responses that put children and young people at the centre. There are challenges for schools, but there are many examples of schools that encourage and enable children and young people to be active and responsible citizens, able to take control of their own futures as learners. Schools, in turn, benefit from attracting resources that work with the grain of the school's intentions and have a vested interest in strengthening the communities from which schools draw their catchments.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Prevention is important but can all too easily find its resources diverted to serious cases. It therefore needs strategic support. A recent National Foundation for Educational Research international review of service integration reported:

> Systems that focus on prevention seem better equipped to maintain a focus on the family as a whole, and to allow agencies to work together, than systems that focus on child protection. In countries that focus on prevention and family support, the time that practitioners spend on communication and exercising professional judgement is valued at a strategic level.
>
> (CfBT Education Trust 2010: 29)

Joined-up working therefore needs joined-up government at every level. The same report found that systems where services are provided by the state have the highest levels of integration, with this being most evident in the Nordic countries. They found that integration is much more difficult when communities rely on the voluntary sector and other local actors.

This essay is arguing for an overarching, government-led framework that brings together a range of partners to work relationally on prevention. The framework would expect schools to look outwards to contribute to and benefit from the resources that strengthen their local communities. These resources would include statutory services, the voluntary sector, local commercial and business interest and, above all, children, young people and their families. In that way, children and young people would not be segmented and 'passed on' but would be expected to be and would be rewarded for being active and responsible citizens. For a quantitative analysis of the social benefits accruing from building networks around early education centres in New York, see Small (2009).

NOTES

1. The interim evaluation can be downloaded at http://www.ein-quadratkilometer-bildung.org/ stiftung/english (accessed 13 April 2015).

REFERENCES

CfBT Education Trust (2010) *An International Perspective on Integrated Children's Services,* Reading: CfTB Education Trust. Available at http://www.cfbt.com/evidenceforeducation/pdf/2646_childrens_ services_web.pdf (accessed 5 January 2013).

Cummings, C., A. Dyson and E. Todd (2011) *Beyond the School Gates: Can Full Service and Extended Schools Overcome Disadvantage?*, London and New York: Routledge.

Education Council of the Netherlands (2010) *Extended Education.* Available at http://www. onderwijsraad.nl/upload/english/publications/extended-education.pdf (accessed 5 January 2013).

Edwards, A. (2010) *Being an Expert Professional Practitioner: The Relational Turn in Expertise*, Dordrecht: Springer.

—— (2012) 'The Role of Common Knowledge in Achieving Collaboration across Practices', *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1 (1): 22–32.

Edwards, A. and P. Downes (2013) *Alliances for Inclusion: Cross-Sector Synergies and Inter-professional Collaboration in and around Schools*, Brussels: European Commission.

Edwards, A., H. Daniels, T. Gallagher, J. Leadbetter and P. Warmington (2009) *Improving Inter-professional Collaborations: Multi-agency Working for Children's Wellbeing*, London and New York: Routledge.

HM Treasury and Department for Education and Skills (2007) *Policy Review for Children and Young People: A Discussion Paper*, London: HM Treasury.

Home Office (2000) *Report of the Policy Action Team 12: Young People*, London: Home Office.

Luthar, S. (ed.) (2003) *Resilience and Vulnerability*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munro, E. (2011) *The Munro Review of Child Protection: Final Report. A Child-Centred System*, CM 8062, London: Department for Education.

Small, M. L. (2009) *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Veen, D. (2011) 'Rebound Programmes for Youth at Risk Preventing Drop-out and Violence in Dutch Secondary Schools', Seminar, 12–14 January, Universidad de Alicante.

Anne Edwards *is Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of Oxford.*

4. STUDENT VOICE AS DEEP DEMOCRACY
Michael Fielding

SUMMARY

The particular form of connectedness this chapter advocates is a richer and more varied partnership between adults and young people in schools. It argues in particular for the importance of intergenerational learning and for the need to develop a more creative mutuality in that process. Its main justification has to do with the need to place the participatory tradition of democracy at the heart of all that we do in schools: if democracy matters it must be seen to matter. The nature, quality and legitimacy of the outcomes we seek within our education system must be linked demonstrably and insistently to democracy as the manner, means and humanly fulfilling aspiration of our way of life.

CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

There are many and various reasons why we should not only listen to young people but also encourage an increasing reciprocity between generations. Here are three of the most compelling. First, as instanced by the past four years' annual Cambridge University international Student Voice conferences, evidence from cutting-edge, successful innovation in schools in the past decade points to its powerful, immensely positive educative potential for adults and young people alike. Second, post-2008, the growth of widespread disparity of circumstance and possibility between generations give credence and urgency to calls for structured intergenerational dialogue promoting active listening, recognition of shared concerns and collective responsibility for developing solutions. Third, and most important of all, are matters of principle that reflect an emerging crisis of democracy. Confidence in its established machinery and the integrity of those tasked with

its daily work is less secure than it has been for some time. The resonance and bravery of Francis Williams' insistence, in the early years of the Second World War, that 'Democracy is not only something to fight for, it is something to fight with' (Williams 1941) still has much to teach us today. What this might mean and how it might be accomplished in the challenges and opportunities sketched out above underscore the deeply relational nature of democracy (see Fielding 2014) and its necessary enactment in the person-oriented commitments of the Connected School.

YOUNG PEOPLE AS AGENTS OF CHANGE

For the past twenty years, successive UK governments of varying political persuasions have advocated and supported the increasing involvement of young people in a wide range of ways in the development opportunities and accountability structures in, for example, education and schooling, youth work, social services, the health service and local government.

Of course, there have been and still are very different reasons for this, which are reflected in the language and in the arguments used. In the context of schools, the rise of governmental interest in and support for what is often referred to as 'student voice' owes much to the steady emergence of the market as a key lever in holding professionals to account. There were also entirely different rationales for widening student involvement in domains that had previously been the preserve of fellow professionals. These drew on educational and political traditions with much longer histories immersed in progressive struggles for justice and democracy going back to the early decades of the twentieth century and beyond. In part a synthesis of these two narratives, many contributors to the Connected School exemplify an inclusive orientation that sees a necessary synergy between values and outcomes (see Fielding 2012 for a recent articulation of this author's view of their proper relation).

RELATIONSHIPS, MUTUALITY AND THE DEMANDS OF DEMOCRACY

Before addressing the nature and consequence of these different approaches to student voice more directly, it is important to make three key overarching points that stand above the differences and connect with contemporary challenges of crisis and opportunity. These are, first, that relationships matter; second, that, in its richest and most fully developed sense, learning is a deeply mutual undertaking; third, that democracy matters too, matters enough to require not just a voice in societal conversation but a special place, embodied and enacted on a daily basis in the arrangements and aspirations of schools and other key parts of our educational system.

Relationships matter intrinsically and fundamentally. They also matter instrumentally, quietly and necessarily because they provide the conditions in which rights become real. The remarkable range of work inspired by the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child enables and extends justice and democracy only in so far as the felt realities of human encounter express and invite a more creative, more generous way of being in the world.

Mutuality matters, not only because teaching and learning presume an attentive and creative reciprocity but also because of emerging evidence about the fruitfulness, not just the ethical and existential desirability, of what I call intergenerational learning. Here research points to the mutual gains for young people and adults accruing from a deepening collaboration, which, in its most fulfilling manifestations, returns us to the dynamic reciprocity of richly conceived notions of education.

Lastly, and pervasively, democracy. If democracy matters, it must be seen to matter. Its aspirations require the dignity and eloquence of articulation; its legitimacy requires enacted practical arrangements and humane dispositions that embody its living reality. In the words

of Alex Bloom, one of the greatest head-teachers the UK has ever seen,

> It is a vital part of our belief that the modus vivendi claims paramount importance. We are convinced that not only must the overall school pattern – the democratic way of living – precede all planning, but that it proclaims the main purpose of education in a democracy. Our aim is that children should learn to live creatively, not for themselves alone, but also for their community.
>
> (Bloom 1949: 170)

The nature, quality and legitimacy of the outcomes we seek within our education system must be linked demonstrably and insistently to democracy as the manner, means and humanly fulfilling aspiration of our way of life. Democracy as a means of living and learning together cannot be left to chance or the vain belief it will follow inevitably or dutifully in the wake of arrangements that lack the will or imagination to name and require its priority.

PATTERNS OF PARTNERSHIP: MAKING DEMOCRACY REAL

One way of illustrating these kinds of developments and affirming not just their educational and societal desirability but also their practicability and power is to briefly look at Fielding's 'Patterns of Partnership' typology (2011), which explores six forms of interaction between adults and young people within school and other educational contexts.

Pattern 1, Students as Data Source, points to the crucial importance of teachers taking significant account of the specifics of each student's attainment, not just the generalities of group performance. A whole-school-level example of Pattern 2, Students as Active Respondents, would be the increasingly thoughtful and sophisticated involvement of students in the appointment of new members of staff. Pattern 3, Students as Co-enquirers, is compellingly illustrated by the now well-established Students as Learning Partners scheme in which schools enable teachers to enlist the support of students in observing their

practice. The move from the frequent frustration and sterility of parents' evenings to a highly sophisticated process of student-led reviews in which young people themselves are equipped to take on the responsibility of preparing for, organising and leading an annual review of their work provides a particularly powerful example of Pattern 4, Students as Knowledge Creators. The distinction between Pattern 5, Students as Joint Authors and Pattern 6, Intergenerational Learning as Lived Democracy, is more one of emphasis and values than one of method. Both involve a genuinely shared, fully collaborative partnership between students and staff. Leadership, planning and conduct of research and the subsequent commitment to responsive action are embraced as both a mutual responsibility and energising adventure. In Pattern 5 – as, for example, in follow-up work to a successful visit, where a class, their teacher and museum staff co-plan a visit for younger students – the egalitarian, collaborative nature of the joint work is paramount. In Pattern

6, those other-regarding orientations not only become explicit commitments to the furtherance of the common good, they also entail a receptivity and reciprocity between generations as, for example, in an action research project in which young people identified and responded to loneliness amongst old people in their community.

One of the key points about Fielding's 'Patterns of Partnership' is the insistence that attention be paid not just to the differentiated forms of collaboration it embodies but also to the values teachers and others bring to the context of their day-to-day work, to the inevitability and desirability of underlying societal and educational perspectives informing the realities of how they are interpreted and enacted in practice. Thus, a classroom-level example of a performance-driven, market-led approach to Pattern 1, Students as Data Source, invites teacher preoccupation with test scores and other performance data. By contrast, a teacher working within more holistic traditions of

democratic fellowship would seek a wider frame of reference. Here the inclination would be to go beyond test data and draw on the teacher's emerging knowledge and understanding of the student's range of involvement in many areas of the curriculum, and on her developing knowledge and appreciation of the young person in both formal and informal and school and non-school situations, including those in which she is developing her agency as a public actor in communal and interpersonal contexts. Which of these or other value frameworks predominate will, of course, be shaped by dominant national contexts, particular local circumstances, and the values orientation of those involved. Many would also argue that those orientations, whatever they may be, are not mutually exclusive: instead of either/or perspective they offer the possibility and desirability of an and/and way forward.

'DEMOCRACY IS NOT ONLY SOMETHING TO FIGHT FOR, IT IS SOMETHING TO FIGHT WITH'

Francis Williams' call, which opened this chapter, is not primarily about structures. As Benjamin Barber so arrestingly reminds us, 'Voting … is the least significant act of citizenship in a democracy' (1987). Democracy is fundamentally a way of living and learning together. The challenges facing education today are ill served by the insistent drum beat of delivery. Education, in both its principled and pragmatic senses, requires a more subtle mutuality and a more holistic, more humanly fulfilling orientation. Its rigour is relational rather than directive, its urgency collaborative rather than commanding. The outcomes we seek must be matched, morally and experientially, by the encounters we encourage and enact in the here and now of lived experience. The actuality

and future development of education in and for democracy depend on our willingness to not only name democracy as the touchstone of our endeavour but to weave its threads into the fabric of our daily work. It cannot be an occasional or exclusive task, subservient to commandeering talk of economic 'races' or invitational discretion. This is an intergenerational task and a shared responsibility. It presumes and provides the generosity and creativity of an egalitarian human fellowship on which the future not just of our society but of our species depends.

REFERENCES

Barber, B. (1987) *Strong Democracy*, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Bloom, A. (1949) 'Compete or Co-operate?' *New Era*, 30 (8): 170–2.

Fielding, M. (2011) 'Patterns of Partnership: Student Voice, Intergenerational Learning and Democratic Fellowship', in N. Mockler and J. Sachs (eds.), *Rethinking Educational Practice through Reflexive Research: Essays in Honour of Susan Groundwater-Smith*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 61–75.

—— (2012) 'Education as If People Matter: John Macmurray, Community and the Struggle for Democracy', in M. Fielding (ed.), *Learning to Be Human: The Educational Legacy of John Macmurray*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 23–40.

—— (2014) 'Democratic Fellowship and the Practice of Human Possibility', in R. Marples, J. Suissa and Carrie Winstanley (eds.), *Philosophy, Education and Wellbeing: New Perspectives on the Work of John White*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 54–69.

Williams, F. (1941) 'Introduction', in J. Macmurray, *Challenge to the Churches: Religion and Democracy*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, pp. v–vi.

Michael Fielding *is Emeritus Professor of Education at the Institute of Education, University College London.*

5. THE 'CAPABILITY APPROACH' AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN EDUCATION

Rosie Peppin Vaughan and Fergus Crow

SUMMARY

In considering frameworks for schooling which are distinctively relational and essentially connected to concepts of choice and meaning for children and young people, we need a way of thinking about how to develop policy and practice that speaks directly to these new approaches and that has value for children and young people themselves.

In this chapter, we suggest that the capability approach provides such a way of reorienting our perspective on what the goals of education are, allowing us to engage with the big issues in education policy from a new direction: that our focus should be on developing the capabilities people have to do or be what is valuable to them.

INTRODUCTION

Developed by the Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya Sen (1992, 2001) and the political philosopher Martha Nussbaum (2000, 2011), the capability approach was at first mainly used in studies of 'developing', low-income countries, but it is now being drawn on by policy-makers working on deprivation and inequality in 'developed' or 'rich' countries. It is increasingly being used by education researchers and practitioners seeking to probe more deeply and evaluate issues such as educational equality, values, agency and participation.

EXPLORING 'CAPABILITIES': KEY CONCEPTS

The core premise of the capability approach is that there is greater equality when there is parity in people's capabilities to do or be what

is valuable to them. A key concept in the approach is people's 'functionings': the 'beings' or 'doings' that are important and valuable to them; this can be anything from getting enough food to being able to move around or to reading a newspaper. The capability to achieve a functioning with any particular set of commodities or resources will depend on a range of personal and social factors that vary between individuals.

Focusing on the individual's capability to achieve a functioning that has value to them enables us to make equality our starting point while at the same time recognising and taking into account differences between people: the different resources available to them, the different circumstances they may be in, the different personal preferences they may have. So, even though people may make different choices, we can measure equality by comparing their 'capability sets'.

This offers a more nuanced approach than measurements of equality based on the amount of resources or money people might have (as different people have different needs) or thinking about equality in terms of happiness or subjective well-being (because people can become accustomed to deprivation, in circumstances where there are divisions of resources that might be considered unfair).

THE CAPABILITY APPROACH AND EDUCATION

As a starting point, there are a number of enduring, underlying questions about education which the capability approach can help us to answer:

- What is the ultimate aim of education, what goals should guide education reform?
- What would 'fairness' and equality in education really look like?
- What values should be embedded in our education system?

Using the concept of capabilities offers several advantages over existing approaches to thinking about these. Many of the main arguments about the

goals of education reform are centred on the economic benefits of investment in education such as individual income earned later in life, or numbers in employment, or increased productivity and national economic growth.

Seen from a capabilities perspective, an approach to education which is focused on economic returns alone would come under question: does this singular focus came at the expense of the full set of wider capabilities for each individual?

Amartya Sen's critique of existing approaches to development takes this as its starting point, and the growing interest in capabilities in education reflects its potential in helping us refresh and reframe our view. Rather than education being a means to the end of economic growth, our goal should be the expansion of people's capabilities, which a good education is an essential aspect of. Economic or financial gains, whether at the individual or national level, should be considered for their role in the means to this end, and not as the end itself:.

The starting point for the capability approach is to question what the benefit to well-being would be (from a human-development perspective) of a particular policy or reform goal. This is not to say that education policy needs to abandon economic aims, it is to argue that the overall frame of evaluation can be different. In short, we need to think about and measure outcomes in terms of capabilities, not just economic returns.

This is important for the following reasons.

- Having an education system solely geared towards economic growth does not necessarily lead to better outcomes for everyone.
- An education system targeted towards growth in individual incomes or employment status may not enhance individual freedoms, opportunities and well-being.
- Not everyone gets the same economic 'returns' from the same educational input, due to a range of wider external, social factors

including gender, vulnerability or social and economic background.

So, the capability approach offers a way for us to engage with these long-standing problems. Our ultimate goal in education, then, should be expanding the capabilities people have.

Education reforms may already be thought of as guided by 'fairness' in terms of ensuring equal distribution of teaching inputs (such as numbers of teachers, qualifications of teachers, school resources and funds, pedagogy and curriculum). This is sometimes thought of in terms of every child's 'right' to an education.

However, children have different abilities, personal circumstances and needs and therefore need different inputs to achieve the same skills and levels of learning and opportunities later in life. Moreover, guaranteeing the material foundations of learning – that teachers are well trained and well paid, teaching materials, good pedagogic practice

and curriculum – does not mean that learning outcomes will be equally distributed.

We tend to think about 'fairness' in terms of equal outcomes to teaching, for example:

- the numbers passing exams or specific tests;
- the numbers of qualifications of individuals (pupils or teachers);
- having a national curriculum and a certain set of values embedded in the school system.

But children and young people have different personal interests, goals and values. How do we measure fairness in outcomes while taking these into account?

The advantage in using the concept of capabilities is that by focusing on the opportunity of someone to do what is valuable to them, we are encouraged to think about equality and fairness at the same time as taking into account

different abilities, needs, values and interests.

It is important to note that the capability approach does not help us think about why or how things can change – it is not a social theory. It provides a framework for conceptualising and measuring equality between people in different circumstances and a definition of 'social justice' in education. We can think both in terms of children's capability to achieve an education and in terms of whether education contributes equally to children's capabilities later in life. There are two areas of the current debate where the capability approach may be particularly useful in thinking about education in England: (1) issues of fairness and equality, and (2) the idea of values.

DEBATES ABOUT FAIRNESS AND EQUALITY

The problem of closing the gap in attainment between different groups of children, with a focus on how to provide the right inputs for disadvantaged children across their experience of being educated has been central to successive governments and their programmes of reform. This leads us to the following questions:

- How do we take into account children with different needs, or from different backgrounds?
- With increasing diversity and autonomy in the school system, what are the additional implications for our understanding of 'fairness' and 'equality' in terms of educational outcomes (e.g., where schools deploy different levels of resources, design different curricula, have different parent 'capital', etc.)?

The capability approach offers a clear realm in which this should be measured: capabilities. So, we can ask whether two children from different backgrounds have the same ability to benefit from schooling. Do they have the same capabilities to access learning, and do they gain the same capabilities from their education? Recent work by the National

Children's Bureau (2013) and others has highlighted that this is not yet the case in the UK, and progress towards narrowing the gap in educational attainment between children and young people from advantaged and disadvantaged groups could be well informed through applying the concept of capabilities to educational reforms and their impact.

For example, take two children (one from a disadvantaged background) who are attending the same school. This school may be well resourced but to evaluate how 'fair' the situation is, using a capabilities-based approach, we would look not at the inputs each child receives, or the outcomes, but at their capabilities within that educational environment (or their 'capability to be educated'). How well are they able to access and use the educational resources and convert them to a capability? It is still true that a child with the same language background, or with a supportive home environment, or highly educated parents, is more likely to be able to convert the educational 'resources' available (such as teachers,

materials, classes) into the capability of 'being educated'. Therefore, attention would be drawn to how to enhance the capability of learners with different backgrounds or family profiles to make similar conversions of the resources available to them in order to ensure that their capability to be educated is not compromised.

DEVELOPING VALUES

The issue of children's and young people's values is another element of the educational debate that the capability approach can help with. In thinking about both relational dynamics in schools and how connectedness occurs both through planned and ad-hoc social and relational opportunities in schools, it is necessary to consider what the underlying values base is in a school and how these values are constructed. This leads us to a number of further questions:

• Much discussion has been about schools explicitly embodying particular values, but what values are being imparted by mainstream

school processes and practices?

- Are particular preferences being implicitly formed through schooling? How do we balance national and individual values, interests and ambitions?
- Does our current schooling system enable children to develop reasoning and explore and voice their own ideas?

These are fundamental to the capability approach and to ensuring that children and young people can build relationships of value and meaning with each other and with the community around them.

Central to the capability approach is the importance of what is valuable to the individual: that individuals should have a choice of functionings, rather than already having prescribed which functionings should be the outcome to education. We look for equality in the capability set rather than particular functionings. Individual values, and the ability to recognise and voice these, are key. Schools should enable students to develop autonomous thought and

reasoning through exercising the ability to question, critical thinking, developing their own voices and engaging with others.

These are also critically important for a truly 'connected' school: respecting the values of others, critically debating and scrutinising your own ideas alongside those of your fellow students and learning to engage in a positive, productive way. Moreover, such skills are crucial not only for a connected school but for a flourishing and fully functioning democracy in wider society. Indeed, education has an extremely important (but often unvoiced) role in enabling public discussion and public reasoning, which are central to democracy. This therefore raises important questions about the role of education in allowing and enabling children to develop their own value systems and the extent to which they are empowered to 'voice' these values in a connected environment.

For example, let us consider a school which has decided through its leadership

on an ethos of particularly strong, traditional values. There may be a number of benefits for the students: perhaps a strong focus on discipline within the classroom and high expectations of self-discipline both in learning and in personal activities. These are values prized at the organisational level as those which may provide the most likely conditions for a 'successful' (i.e. disciplined, high-achieving) education for individuals. But the question to be asked of the school's traditional values is whether they will also enhance individual students' capabilities in terms of voice, agency and critical reasoning which are crucial for engagement and connection both within the school and in wider society.

WHERE NEXT? THE CAPABILITY APPROACH AND CONNECTEDNESS

As capabilities and education is a developing field of research, detailed studies using the capability approach to look at specific issues within the education system, such as outcomes for children with special educational needs,

migrant children, gender and the impact of socio-economic disadvantage are necessary.

The measurement of capabilities in and through education is an important field of enquiry and should be pursued as part of a wider process of looking for alternative ways to show a broad and person-orientated measure of the value of education on children and young people's capabilities which could be used to put the summative testing of knowledge into a wider framework of personal and human development outcomes.

More work can now be done on existing longitudinal data, utilising the capability approach to assess the longer-term impact of education on capabilities later in life. Some real-world research on capabilities in the context of major policy issues for future educational reform may also be possible.

- Choice, such as parental choice. As we saw above, the capability

approach places great emphasis on the importance of individual values and choice. However, this must be genuine choice. What is the range of options available to all parents? How large is the capability set that they are making the choice from? What levels of educational goods and resources are actually available, and what influences may there have been on their preferences? Does greater diversity in the educational marketplace lead to greater choice in real terms for all families?

- Social mobility, for example through greater employability – the capability to get particular jobs. If our aspiration is for education to act as a leveller, giving opportunities for all to rise according to their ability and interests, then the capability approach gives us not only a way to conceptualise this, such as what is the real and actual impact of education on the capability to get a particular job or into a profession, but also suggests ways in which we might measure this to help us compare between existing contexts or the effectiveness of various initiatives.

These are early days, and this is a new and growing field. It has considerable potential for applications in education, particularly in providing a new framework for understanding and analysing a different set of outcomes of education that places focus on the genuine capability of children to participate; helps to identify, develop and give voice to their own values in their educational journey; and expands the capabilities that education gives them in all aspects of their life after school.

REFERENCES

National Children's Bureau (2013) *Greater Expectations: Raising Aspirations for Our Children*, London: National Children's Bureau.

Nussbaum, M. (2000) *Women and Human Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—— (2011) *Creating Capabilities*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. (1992) *Inequality Re-examined*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—— (2001) *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosie Peppin Vaughan is Lecturer in Education and International Development at the Institute of Education, University College London. **Fergus Crow** is Director of Partnerships at the National Children's Bureau.

6. DESIGN FOR LEARNING
Using design principles to transform school
Louise Thomas

As long as the responses to school change only bend, rather than break, the traditional model, any changes brought about in a school are living on borrowed time. It will be easier to go back than to go forward.[1]

SUMMARY
Schools are about more than learning: they are about connecting generations with one another, connecting young people to their futures and ensuring that they are equipped with the fundamentals to live fully connected lives. We contend that school as traditionally designed does the exact opposite: it separates types of knowledge, disconnects young people from the real world and, too often, segregates them from one another based on prior attainment or background. We contend that to challenge this disconnection we need to redesign school. Here's how.

INTRODUCTION
The design of schools is about more than buildings and classrooms. It is about how time is used, how staff are structured and organised, how students are grouped and allocated – and about the belief systems that drive it all. If we want students to be connected to one another, to their learning and to their school, then schools need to be designed differently. Schools are designed institutions, but today they are designed by default: what school is like is taken for granted, and the connectedness of young people to school, and of school design to purpose, is often missing. The default design is one well suited to the delivery of content: the

dominant feature is the hour lesson where one subject is taught to around thirty students by one subject specialist teacher in a mode that allows some to succeed and others to struggle. However, content delivery is no longer the only, or even the main, unique selling point of a school, and achievement only for some is no longer acceptable. This chapter will look at some examples of what a school might look like if it is designed around deep learning, around individual students and around the building of relationships. It will then look at some components of great school design and the key processes involved. It will end by outlining examples of how design principles for schools have been used as a vehicle for school-to-school collaboration in the attempt to transform whole systems of schools.

SCHOOLS DONE DIFFERENTLY BY DESIGN

While debates about curriculum and structures rage in England and across the USA, at High Tech High in California, a new design for school is being implemented across the twelve High Tech High schools. At first glance, the scene confronting a visitor is confounding. Students are grouped in rooms full of clutter, sitting on tables, chatting to one another in groups, lying on the floor under tables with laptops and headphones jacked in. Students call teachers over, excitedly, by their first names, to see what they're working on. Often it is difficult to identify the teacher in the room full of busy people.

But, looking beneath the apparent haphazardness and informality, we can start to see a very intentional new design for school. Teachers work with a teacher partner to teach two classes of students all year. (One teacher has one class for English and Humanities in the morning, while the other teaches the second class Maths and Science. In the afternoon they swap.) These pairs of teachers have complete freedom to design projects and lessons based on the needs of their students and their respective subject specialisms. They have an hour together every day before

school to design, refine and adapt the learning they have planned according to the needs of individual students.

Because of this design of time and staffing, students are profoundly well known – and they feel it. By bringing teachers closer to the design of learning and closer to the students they teach, more precise and nuanced monitoring and differentiation is possible. Long periods of time in the day allow students to engage in independent study, field visits or input from experts outside school. Annual state tests in all subjects (which make the English accountability system look lax in comparison) find that students at High Tech High perform well above average. More importantly, by its own standards (the quality of student work and college readiness), High Tech High students perform off the scale. Ninety-eight per cent of High Tech High students go on to university, 75 per cent to full four-year courses at great universities, and 85 per cent of their free-school-meals students achieve degrees.[2] This compares with a California state average of 40 per cent of students attending university at all and many fewer than that completing a full course.[3]

SOMETHING PROFOUND IS HAPPENING

The complexity and depth of learning that a visitor to High Tech High will witness is enabled by a deceptively simple design, all informed by the four non-negotiable design principles:

1   personalisation of student learning;
2   a shared intellectual mission;
3   adult-world connections;
4   teacher as designer.

The founder and CEO of High Tech High, Larry Rosenstock – a lawyer and a carpenter by trade – is clear about the rationale behind the use of staff and time at High Tech High. 'Complex structures beget simple behaviours', he states in a video setting out how John Dewey has influenced his educational vision.[4] No one who has tried to grapple with a

secondary-school timetable in England could argue with the complexity of the task. On the other hand, Rosenstock states, 'Simple structures beget complex behaviours.' In other words, the messy complexity of human lives interacting in an institution are best accommodated by intentional design that allows space for a community to thrive. Schools designed to control, specify and standardise are unlikely to contain thriving communities.

THE MET SCHOOL IN PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Meanwhile, across on the East Coast of the USA, students at another successful school are spending two days of every week based outside school pursuing their interests. Not Saturdays and Sundays, but Tuesdays and Thursdays. Monday, Wednesday and Friday are spent in school. Projects pursued in real-world settings are assessed and graded by school, and the adults who mentor students in their placements work closely with teacher-advisers and students to construct an individual learning plan

for every single student. Students are connected – to their interests, to their learning, to their peers within school and to adults from outside school who share their passions.

And the Met is not alone. There are at least sixty other schools in the USA implementing this design, a further forty in Australia and others in Israel, The Netherlands and South Korea. All of these schools are influenced by the Big Picture design for schooling, which takes the principles 'one student at a time' and 'education is everybody's business' and really means them.

The results are almost disconcertingly impressive. Not only do Big Picture schools consistently outperform local and national averages on school graduation and university acceptance rates, they even surpass standardised English and maths test averages. And this with the students who have usually been pushed out or failed by other local schools.[5]

DESIGN THINKING AND DESIGN PRINCIPLES

These radically different and better designs for school do not happen by accident. They were created by people from other sectors thinking rigorously about how to respond to a specific challenge or problem. Two processes are at work in our examples:

1   design thinking, which combines a set of design disciplines with a learning mindset;
2   design principles, which arise from the insights of design thinking but which enshrine also the non-negotiable values and beliefs of the school.

Design thinking requires that we:

•   be prepared to question old assumptions: a sense of the possible, including a willingness to question received ideas;
•   start with the user: a way of working that starts with needs and experiences of the user rather than the requirements and assumptions of the provider;
•   create a culture that encourages enquiry and experimentation: empower practitioners to learn, iterate and prototype as part of their professional practice, drawing on insights from students, parents and others.

Thought of this way, design thinking is more an attitude of mind and set of processes than a closed professional discipline. It is a means of generating new insights that challenge historical assumptions and ways of working. At High Tech High, for example, their day-to-day practices model powerful learning practices: they enquire with students as to the impact of the work they do, they constantly experiment and have active, embedded action enquiry norms built into the professional practice they expect from teachers. So, while the principles are fixed, the design is not. It evolves, iterates and learns. The design principles arising from this process

become the new organisational and behavioural architecture that informs school norms and practices.

In 1996, the US Department of Education Office of Vocational and Adult Education launched the New Urban High School project in partnership with the Big Picture Company and other participating sites. It asked the question, 'What would a school look like that prepared all its students for the future?'[6]

The result was not only a set of case studies from schools and classrooms that had tackled this challenge but also, more significantly, a set of design principles to inform a process of school creation and school transformation. The project defined design principles as principles that connect 'how' with 'why'. The principles identified included personalisation, adult-world immersion, community partnership and teacher ownership. Both High Tech High and Big Picture schools have emerged from this work, along with New Tech Network, Rocketship Learning, Expeditionary Learning and more.

For Big Picture, the highly unusual use of time, location and personnel by a school is a result of the 'aggressive implementation' of the principle of personalisation. If every student is to be enabled to engage in learning – including and in particular those who have been failed or underserved by mainstream schooling – then what does school need to be like? It needs to embrace the learning the students do when not in school and connect students to adults inside and outside school who really know and care about them.

For High Tech High, the driving principles include integration: of hand and mind, of students by ability and background and of school and community. When teachers, parents and students lobby for maths classes set or streamed by ability (and this happens all the time), Larry Rosenstock has to say 'no'. Because, very soon, the knock-on effect would be a segregated school, which High Tech High was set up as an alternative to. What happens instead? A teacher experimented in his own classroom

and created 'Judo Math', a programme where students at different levels in the same class can progress through 'belts' in maths, eventually becoming a sensei who learns by teaching others. When a student progresses to a new belt, the whole class celebrates.

Anyone who wishes to transform learning and outcomes for their young people could do worse than apply design thinking to how they approach the question of what their school could, and should, be like. But it is design principles that enable us to turn those insights and ideas into coherent models that really change what we do on the ground.

Design principles are particularly useful to those who want to 'break' the traditional model of school in order to create something more connected, more human-scale, more able to respond to the needs of diverse young people and their communities and economies – or to generate a model that transcends the achievement norms of conventional school. In both examples given, the principles have been used by leaders to create and sustain certain kinds of change in the face of pressures to do otherwise, to revert to the norm. As Tom Donahoe says in this chapter's opening quote, it is easier to go back than to go forward. But going forward is possible if your decisions are aligned with values that are widely shared.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES IN SUPPORT OF SCALE: REPLICATION AND COLLABORATION

Exceptional and inspiring examples of schools are not hard to come by. Too often, however, they are isolated examples, vulnerable to a change of leadership or policy context. Really great designs are replicable and transferable because the same set of core principles can be taken and used to design in a different context. However, despite the success of KIP (Knowledge Is Power) programme in the USA, and some of the Academy Chains in the UK, and Kunskapsskolan in Sweden, the fidelity

model of scaling has a patchy record of success for a number of very obvious reasons. No two contexts are the same; it is difficult to recruit high-quality leaders willing to implement a model with fidelity; the capacity to adapt over time is not always built in; and the demands on the core functions of such an organisation are difficult to resource sustainably.

Design principles are an alternative way of enabling multiple schools to innovate or to learn their way forward together. Elliot Washor, co-founder of Big Picture Learning, calls what they support schools to do a design, not a model. Each Big Picture school looks different to the others, but the commitment to starting with student interests and learning in the real world remains the same. Taken to their natural conclusion, these principles tend to lead to common design features (internships, advisory, independent learning courses), and the network of schools is able to support schools embarking on this journey. They each have a wealth of other schools to draw upon to help them problem-solve how

to implement, how to lead change, how to work with parents and employers and how to engage students in their particular context.

Design principles have also more recently allowed very different schools to collaborate meaningfully around a set of common ideas. New York's iZone and Australia's Learning Frontiers programme are just two examples of programmes run by official state organisations which are using design principles to help schools innovate on behalf of the whole system. For example, schools exploring new ways to personalise learning and those experimenting with new ways to involve employers in schools are linked with one another by their common commitment to the principles but then are also enabled to work systematically with other schools to help spread the new practices.

Design thinking and processes are increasingly making their way into public policy debates. The Innovation Unit has worked on redesigning hospital

services and services provided by mental-health charities and on applying design principles to major innovation programmes internationally. Innovation in schools, particularly in the UK, is usually confined to what can be delivered within the current design and, as such, is doomed to fail where it challenges rather than breaks the model and will only succeed where it does neither.

On the other hand, if we want to transform schools to be more connected, internally and externally, better able to support every single student to be successful and to be responsive to changing economic, political and social realities, then they need to be better designed.

NOTES

1. T. Donahoe (1993) 'Finding the Way: Structure, Time and Culture in Schools', *Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 75 (4): 298–305, at p. 298.

2. See http://www.hightechhigh.org/about/results.php (accessed 13 April 2015).

3. See http://www.cpec.ca.gov/studentdata/collegegoingrates.asp (accessed 13 April 2015).

4. See http://www.edutopia.org/high-tech-high-larry-rosenstock-video (accessed 13 April 2015).

5. See http://www.bigpicture.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Big-Picture-Brochure.pdf (accessed 13 April 2015).

6. See http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED423351.pdf (accessed 13 April 2015).

Louise Thomas is Programme Manager for Education at the Innovation Unit.

7. BUILDING CONNECTION THROUGH BEING PRESENT
The role of mindfulness in schools
Katherine Weare

INTRODUCTION

Mindfulness has hit the Zeitgeist and is impacting everywhere, not least in education, and the past ten years have seen a proliferation of conferences, publications, programmes and research on mindfulness in schools. This chapter will outline what mindfulness is and the evidence for its many and varied impacts on students and staff. It will focus particularly on ways in which it can help students and staff connect, through getting more in touch with their inner lives and the workings of their own minds and bodies, with the thoughts and feelings of others, and with their own resources for surviving and thriving in the complex and challenging social world of the school.

WHAT IS MINDFULNESS?

Mindfulness aims to connect us directly with our lived experience in the here and now (a state of mind that is increasingly rare in our buzzing and distracting modern world). The term refers to the ability to direct the attention to experience as it unfolds, moment by moment (Kabat-Zinn 1996). Mindfulness can be developed through practices, meditations in effect, that help increase the ability to be aware of and sustain close attention to our shifting mind states and perceptions, to our passing thoughts, emotions and physical sensations and to our impressions of the outside world. This close attention is supported by an attitude of open-minded curiosity and kindness. It is in contrast to a state of circular mind

chatter, habitual 'autopilot' reactivity and critical and premature judgements within which most of us live our lives.

There are now mindfulness interventions for all ages, short and long, within a wide range of contexts, not only schools but also health, therapy, the workplace and public services. Interventions include face-to-face courses, self-help, on-line and even apps. The core practices throughout these interventions are similar in content, although the detail is adapted for different contexts and audiences. Learners are invited to pay open-minded and curious attention to their changing experience, starting usually with the sensation of the breath in the body and moving on to the inner stream of thoughts, feelings and bodily sensations, and then to the 'everyday' and usually automatic experiences of walking, moving, eating, listening to sounds and being with other people. Over time, any human activity or mind state can potentially be experienced more mindfully.

Regular mindfulness practice modifies habitual mental and behavioural patterns as well as enhancing positive mind states such as kindness, compassion, calm, acceptance and happiness. MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) or brain-scan studies suggest that mindfulness meditation reliably and profoundly alters the structure and function of the brain to improve the quality of both thought and feeling. It develops the cognitive and emotional areas of the brain associated with attention, self-awareness and introspection, and with kindness, compassion and rationality, while decreasing activity and growth in those areas involved in anxiety, hostility, worry and impulsivity (Davidson et al. 2003; Davidson and Lutz 2008).

MINDFULNESS PROGRAMMES IN SCHOOL

As an indicator of growing interest, the Garrison Institute database in the USA currently lists forty-five programmes, a number which is steadily increasing (Garrison Institute 2014). Most of the programmes include school staff as well

as students, including some in teacher education. There are currently at least four programmes running in the UK, the most widespread being the Mindfulness in Schools Project, with ten-week programmes for primary, secondary and adults.[1] Other UK programmes include Mind with Heart, which focuses particularly on compassion, Wake Up Schools, which focuses on teacher support and developing whole-school approaches, and Mindup, which integrates mindfulness with social and emotional learning.[2] The evidence and consensus is that school staff need to be well trained and to continue to practise mindfulness themselves before teaching it to their students (Albrecht et al. 2012). Mindfulness has recently been recommended by an All Party Parliamentary Group on Wellbeing Economics (2014) for the education of all trainee teachers in the UK.

IMPACTS OF MINDFULNESS ON SCHOOL STAFF

Research on the results of mindfulness for adults is now extensive, and well-conducted research, including many randomised control trials (RCTs), which are generally seen as by some as the most rigorous test, have shown clear and positive impacts on a very wide range of mental and physical health outcomes and on well-being (Baer 2006; Khoury et al. 2013). Studies of mindfulness for school staff teachers are still relatively few but are rapidly increasing in number, and findings echo that of research with adults in general. At the time of writing (October 2014), there are currently thirteen published studies of mindfulness with school staff in peer-reviewed journals. Their findings (summarised in Weare 2014) show that mindfulness for school staff can bring about:

- reductions in stress, burnout and anxiety, including a reduction in days off work and feelings of being under pressure, improved ability to manage thoughts and behaviour, an increase in coping skills, motivation, planning and problem-solving, and taking more time to relax;
- better mental health, including less

distress, negative emotion, depression and anxiety;

- greater well-being, including life satisfaction, self-confidence, self-efficacy, self-compassion and sense of personal growth;
- increased kindness and compassion to others, including greater empathy, tolerance, forgiveness and patience, and less anger and hostility;
- better physical health, including lower blood pressure, declines in cortisol (a stress hormone) and fewer reported physical health problems;
- increased cognitive performance, including the ability to pay attention and focus, make decisions and respond flexibly to challenges;
- enhanced job performance, including better classroom management and relationships with students.

THE IMPACT OF MINDFULNESS ON SCHOOL STUDENTS

Promising results are emerging from research with children and young people in health and educational settings, with over fifty published research studies, several reviews (e.g., Greenberg and Harris 2012; Weare 2013) and two meta-analyses (Zenner et al. 2014; Zoogman et al. 2014). The evidence is that, when well designed, properly implemented and expertly taught, mindfulness interventions for children and young people can:

- have a small but positive impact on universal populations (i.e. for everyone) and a medium impact on targeted populations (i.e. those with problems);
- fit into a wide range of contexts in schools, be enjoyed by both students and staff and, to date, not do harm;
- improve the mental health of children and young people, with reductions in depression, stress, anxiety, behaviour problems, reactivity, hyperactivity, eating disorders and sleep problems;
- improve well-being (being more mindful tends to accompany more positive emotion, greater popularity and having more friends, while specific interventions have brought

greater calmness, relaxation and sense of personal well-being);

- increase self-awareness and self-acceptance, empathy and compassion;
- develop cognitive and performance skills and executive function, including greater attention, focus, better thinking skills, reasoning, planning and problem-solving and improved working memory.

The rest of this chapter will suggest some of the specific implications of these impacts for school connectedness.

HELPING TO MANAGE STRESS, INCLUDING THAT CAUSED BY 'CONNECTEDNESS'

Mindfulness has been shown reliably to reduce stress in both students (Kuyken et al. 2013) and staff (Manas et al. 2011), providing a tool that increases the sense of control and developing strategies to cope under pressure. This is sorely needed, as staff and student stress has reached epidemic proportions, and many of its causes and the accompanying sense of lack of control come from the forces outside of the school that set targets and scrutinise outcomes (Bowers 2004; Hagell 2012). However, there are pressures within too, and in some senses the very nature of schools and indeed their 'connectedness' poses a potentially stressful challenge. Surviving successfully in schools, especially secondary schools, is a fundamentally social skill and the day a relentless stream, or sometimes snowstorm, of interactions which must be managed in situ as they arise. The interactions routinely involve uncertainty and actual or potential conflict. To survive in schools, as staff or pupil, requires a great deal of emotional and social capacity and intelligence and to keep in touch with one's own and others' thoughts, behaviour and emotional reactions and respond appropriately. To negotiate this successfully involves constant shifts of the attention, moment-by-moment decisions and careful regulation and management of thoughts, responses and emotions. The habits of mind that mindfulness can engender, such as resilience, mental

flexibility, emotional regulation and relationship-management skills (Roeser et al. 2012) are clearly helpful to staff and pupils in surfing the waves of the high seas of the school day.

MINDFULNESS AS THE 'MISSING KEY' FOR SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL EDUCATION

Mindfulness has shown a particularly promising impact on core social and emotional skills, such as self-awareness, self-management, emotional and behavioural regulation; on resilience, optimism, goal-setting; and on improving relationships and sociability in staff and students (Broderick and Metz 2009; Schonert-Reichl and Lawlor 2010). It is increasingly seen as the 'missing piece', with the potential to deepen the reach of social and emotional learning that may otherwise stay at the level of the theoretical, cerebral and wordy. The evidence is that a relatively small amount of mindfulness can help social and emotional learning, better reach hearts and minds, imparting a depth that comes from the inner exploration of mind

and body. Through objectivity comes a relaxed and acceptant awareness of passing thoughts, feelings and sensations, and empowerment comes from developing the inner self-management techniques to take charge of one's own growth and development (Garrison Institute 2008; Lantieri and Nambiar 2012).

MINDFULNESS FOR SCHOOL STAFF

Teachers are driven people in a heavily scrutinised profession and tend to be hard on themselves. Mindfulness has been shown to help school staff develop the vital attitude of self-compassion, relating more kindly to themselves and being more accepting of their own mistakes, fears and vulnerabilities through the development of non-judgmental acceptance of their passing thoughts and feelings (Benn et al. 2012).

Working effectively with young people is centrally concerned with the ability to communicate, to make relationships with students, to motivate them and

to create a connected or 'pro-social classroom' (Greenberg and Jennings 2009). Mindfulness has been shown to deepen the classroom skills of teachers. At the cognitive level it can improve their classroom management and organisation, their ability to prioritise, to see the whole picture and to be more self-motivated and autonomous. At the emotional and social level, it allows them to attune more closely to students' needs, to achieve better relationships and to see behind the superficial behaviour to its emotional drivers and the child within.

As an example of the widespread effects of a programme for staff, the Cultivating Awareness and Resilience in Education (CARE) programme for teachers was evaluated with an RCT involving fifty-three participants (Jennings et al. 2013). The programme impacted on teachers' well-being, stress, burnout, satisfaction with life, physical health symptoms and sense of efficacy in the classroom, all of which were associated with reported improvements in student and classroom outcomes.

WHERE NEXT? CONNECTING MINDFULNESS INTO THE CURRICULUM AND SCHOOL LIFE

Non-cognitive approaches in schools often suffer from being seen as 'bolt on' and low status, when to be maximally effective they need to be embedded, integrated and connected into mainstream whole-school processes (Weare and Nind 2011). An obvious starting point for integration of mindfulness is with other 'non-cognitive' areas such as well-being and social and emotional learning and personal, social and health education. In the longer run, integrating mindfulness with the subject-based curriculum is likely to result in improvements in students' learning and achievement (Zenner et al. 2014), which will drastically raise its significance and centrality to hard-pressed schools. Beyond this there are links to be made to wider aspects of whole-school life on which mindfulness has been shown to have impact, such as school ethos and atmosphere, improving behaviour, classroom management, leadership and

mindfulness for parents (Meiklejohn et al. 2012). The suggestion that mindfulness be integrated into the education of teachers (All Party Parliamentary Group on Wellbeing Economics 2014) would seem genuinely helpful, so long as the teaching is well designed, substantial enough and taught by trained mindfulness teachers to ensure quality and authenticity. There are no quick, cheap fixes in this field, or any other.

CONCLUSION

Mindfulness in schools shows great promise as an effective way for children, young people and school staff to develop a sense of connection and bonding, resourcing them to deal with immediate challenges, building their resilience for longer term, promoting well-being and promoting sound teaching and learning. We need the dissemination of existing and demonstrably effective programmes, the creation of more and better programmes and a steady move to integrate mindfulness into the mainstream of school life and into the education of all teachers.

NOTES

1. See http://mindfulnessinschools.org (accessed 27 October 2014).

2. See http://mind-with-heart.blogspot.co.uk (accessed 27 October 2014); http://wakeupschools.org (accessed 29 March 2015); http://thehawnfoundation.org/mindup (accessed 29 October 2014).

REFERENCES

Albrecht, N. J., P. M. Albrecht and M. Cohen (2012) 'Mindfully Teaching in the Classroom: A Literature Review', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37 (12): 1–14.

All Party Parliamentary Group on Wellbeing Economics (2014) 'Wellbeing in Four Policy Areas'. Available at http://parliamentarywellbeinggroup.org.uk (accessed 27 October 2014).

Baer, R. A. (ed.) (2006) *Mindfulness-Based Treatment Approaches: Clinical Guide to Evidence Base and Applications*, London: Elsevier Academic Press.

Benn, R., T. Akiva, S. Arel and R. W. Roeser (2012) 'Mindfulness Training Effects for Parents and Educators of Children with Special Needs', *Developmental Psychology*, 48 (5): 1476–87.

Bowers, T. (2004) 'Stress, Teaching and Teacher Health', *Education*, 3–13 (32): 73–80.

Broderick, P. C. and S. Metz (2009) 'Learning to BREATHE: A Pilot Trial of a Mindfulness Curriculum for Adolescents', *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, 2 (1): 35–45.

Davidson R. J., J. Kabat-Zinn and J. Schumacher (2003) 'Alterations in Brain and Immune Function Produced by Mindfulness Meditation', *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 65 (4): 564–70.

Davidson, R. and A. Lutz (2008) 'Buddha's Brain: Neuroplasticity and Meditation in the Spotlight', *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 25 (1): 171–4.

Garrison Institute (2008) *Garrison Institute Report Envisioning the Future of Contemplative Education*. Available at http://www.garrisoninstitute.org/contemplation-and-education/ce-reports (accessed 2 May 2014).

—— (2014) *Contemplative Education Programme Database*. Available at https://www.garrisoninstitute.org/contemplation-and-education/contemplative-education-program-database (accessed 27 October 2014).

Greenberg, M. and T. Jennings (2009) 'The Prosocial Classroom: Teacher Social and Emotional Competence in Relation to Student and Classroom Outcomes', *Review of Educational Research*, 79 (1): 491–525.

Greenberg, M. T. and A. R. Harris (2012) 'Nurturing Mindfulness in Children and Youth: Current State of Research', *Child Development Perspectives*, 6 (2): 161–6.

Hagell, A. (2012) *Changing Adolescence: Social Trends and Mental Health*, Bristol: University of Bristol Policy Press.

Jennings, P. A., J. L. Frank, K. E. Snowberg, M. A. Coccia and M. T. Greenberg (2013) 'Improving Classroom Learning Environments by Cultivating Awareness and Resilience in Education (CARE): Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial', *School Psychology Quarterly*, 28 (4): 374–90.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1996) *Full Catastrophe Living*, London: Piakus Books.

Khoury, B., T. Lecomte, G. Masse, M. Fortin, P. Therien, V. Bouchard, M. Chapleau, K. Paquin and S. G. Hofmann (2013) 'Mindfulness-Based Therapy: A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis', *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33 (6): 763–71.

Kuyken, W., K. Weare, O. Ukoumunne, R. Lewis, N. Motton, R. Burnett, C. Cullen, S. Hennelly and F. Huppert (2013) 'Effectiveness of the B.mindfulness in Schools Program: A Non-Randomized Controlled Feasibility Study', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 203: 126–31.

Lantieri, L. and M. Nambiar (2012) *Social Emotional Learning and Mindfulness-Based Contemplative Practices in Education*. Available at http://whatmeditationreallyis.com/index.php/home-blog/item/380 (accessed 10 February 2014).

Manas, I. M., C. F. Justo and E. J. Martinez (2011) 'Reducing Levels of Teacher Stress and the Days of Sick Leave in Secondary School Teachers through a Mindfulness Training Programs', *Clinicia Y Salud*, 22 (2): 121–37.

Meiklejohn, J., C. Phillips and M. L. Freedman (2012) 'Integrating Mindfulness Training into K-12 Education: Fostering the Resilience of Teachers and Students', *Mindfulness*, 3 (4): 291–307.

Roeser, R. W., E. Skinner, J. Beers and P. A. Jennings (2012) 'Mindfulness Training and Teachers' Professional Development: An Emerging Area of Research and Practice', *Child Development Perspectives*, 6 (2): 167–73.

Schonert-Reichl, K. A. and M. S. Lawlor (2010) 'The Effects of a Mindfulness-Based Education Program on Pre- and Early Adolescents' Well-Being and Social and Emotional Competence', *Mindfulness*, 1 (3): 137–51.

Weare, K. (2013) 'Developing Mindfulness with Children and Young People: A Review of the Evidence and Policy Context', *Journal of Children's Services*, 8 (2): 141–53.

—— (2014) 'Evidence for Mindfulness: Impacts on the Wellbeing and Performance of School Staff', available at http://mindfulnessinschools.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Evidence-for-Mindfulness-Impact-on-school-staff.pdf (accessed 13 April 2015).

Weare, K. and M. Nind (2011) 'Mental Health Promotion and Problem Prevention in Schools: What Does the Evidence Say?' *Health Promotion International*, 26 (S1): 29–69.

Zenner, C., S. Herrnleben-Kurz and H. Walach (2014) 'Mindfulness-Based Interventions in Schools: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5: 1–20.

Zoogman, S., B. Simon, S. Goldberg, W. Hoyt and L. Miller (2014) 'Mindfulness Interventions with Youth: A Meta-analysis', *Mindfulness*, 1–13.

Katherine Weare *is Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of Southampton and Honorary Visiting Professor of Education at the University of Exeter.*

PRINCIPLES FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM
Enver Solomon and Fergus Crow

The introduction to the chapters in this paper establishes their role in stimulating debate. Although they are not about finished practice, we have also provided a set of reflection points that will help catalyse discussions about the practical implications of these ideas in school (see p. 67).

Generally, the conclusion of publications like this includes a set of recommendations for policy-makers. But we think it is not more policy that is needed; rather, it is wiser and more enduring policy that is needed: policy attuned to the changing nature of children's lives, to the impact of fragmentation and disconnection around them and to the positive role that schools can play in supporting their well-being.

As we have argued, through providing and prioritising 'connectedness' in and through schooling, educators will in turn benefit from the authentic participation of children and young people in all aspects of school life, impact on the quality of the relationships that children and adults enjoy in school, improve well-being and resilience across school communities and ensure that children and young people's journeys through school really do prepare them to live flourishing lives now and in the future.

So, instead, what we set out here is a series of guiding principles for educational reform in key areas that should drive or frame the next cycle of change and which must frame the discussions that we need to have.

OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES

Our guiding principle is that any reform must demonstrably be in the best interests of children and young

people's well-being and that children and young people should have an active part to play in shaping the direction of future reforms. Reforms should have due regard to the relevant rights of the child (as set out in the UN Convention). But our principles for reform also link directly back to the premise that we set out at the start of this paper, that there is increasing disconnectedness and fragmentation in children's lives and that a legitimate and necessary function of the school is to attend to this disconnection. That schools can and should play this role is another of our guiding principles.

LEARNING AND CURRICULUM

Reforms should ensure that schools genuinely have the greatest freedom possible to use their curriculum learning journey to innovate. This means giving permission (and support) to think differently about the design for learning, the kinds of learning that are valued, prioritised and measured, and listening to pupils and teachers about what is best.

Curriculum reforms must set innovation goals connected to well-being, so that schools can really deliver the best curriculum for the twenty-first century. Reforms should be able to articulate a compelling vision for how the curriculum will offer support children to reconnect, and how it will enable children to learn how to flourish in a complex, fragmented world.

Any reforms to the National Curriculum should only proceed on the basis of seeking an equal weighting towards pupils' intellectual, physical, social and emotional development, providing the flexibility to enable pupils to direct their own learning, supported by their teachers, parents and carers.

TEACHERS AND TEACHING

Reforms to teaching must be good for the teacher. Healthy, happy teachers are a child's greatest asset in school. Their well-being is so fundamental to the well-being of their students that this relationship should be considered as a priority within any debate over the

development and implementation of future educational reform.

Reforms should make a link directly to the essential importance of good relationships in schooling and be framed within relational thinking. We would seek to know always how children will see and experience any proposed changes in their day-to-day lives in (and out) of school.

School leadership reforms should be based on a principle that strong leadership is also distributed leadership and that this principle will (in practice) impact on the quality and connectivity of relationships and well-being across a school.

OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Outcomes matter. Reforms must set a broad vision for what is possible and should support schools to be bold, brave and ambitious in establishing an understanding of what can be achieved in contributing to the well-being of

students and communities. This is not easy: well-being outcomes are hard to measure but we need to find a way through this challenge.

Reforms should be supported by investment in innovation to empower schools to work together to develop and take forward new models for understanding and delivering outcomes. This includes investigating greater opportunity for place-based solutions and ways in which communities can come together to support schools in delivering on their responsibilities.

PREVENTION

Schooling and the school experience is as much about providing children with effective early help before problems escalate as it is about ensuring they achieve academically. Reforms should position (and resource) schools to act as the primary location for prevention and early intervention in children's lives.

Reforms should seek to incentivise and prioritise authentic collaboration with

other professionals. The concept of joint working across agencies needs to be embedded in a school's ethos and working culture so that they are closely linked up with other services and so that prevention and early intervention support is provided for every child who needs it.

Enver Solomon is Director of Evidence and Impact at the National Children's Bureau. Fergus Crow is Director of Partnerships at the National Children's Bureau.

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS AND PRACTITIONERS

Tom Middlehurst and Chris Smith

Developed by the research team at the Schools' Network (SSAT), these provide a reflective tool for school leaders and teachers to consider the practical implications of each chapter. SSAT works with thousands of practitioners across its network to improve educational outcomes for all students.

1. ADOLESCENT WELL-BEING AND THE RELATIONAL SCHOOL

- In what ways do you track students' relationships with teachers, other staff and their peers?
- Have you asked your staff to identify individual students they feel they have a good, supportive relationship with, and then identified those students who are left out?
- When implementing a change of school policy, curriculum or structure, how do you measure the potential impact on students' well-being?

2. CHILDREN'S COMMUNITIES AND EQUITABLE OUTCOMES

- In what ways do you 'understand children's lives in the round' and use this information to inform intervention plans?
- Have you considered the different 'areas' that make up your whole school catchment? Have you written pen portraits of them?
- Which local organisations do you work with to ensure equitable outcomes for all students?

3. INTERPROFESSIONAL WORKING IN AND AROUND SCHOOLS

- What are your systems for identifying vulnerable children and intervening early?
- Is your school just a 'site for other initiatives' or are 'preventive activities central to your school's mission'?
- What strategies do you use to engage parents and carers?

4. STUDENT VOICE AS DEEP DEMOCRACY

- How do you ensure 'democracy is seen to matter' in your school?
- Which of the six forms of interaction best reflect the current patterns of partnership in your school?
- How are students' experiences at school co-constructed between themselves and teachers?

5. THE 'CAPABILITY APPROACH' AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN EDUCATION

- What is your school's vision and what goals guide this vision? Would all staff and all students be able to articulate the same vision when asked?
- What does fairness and equality mean in your school context?
- What would a 'capabilities approach' look like in your school? What would be the inputs and the outputs?

6. DESIGN FOR LEARNING: USING DESIGN PRINCIPLES TO TRANSFORM SCHOOL

- Has one member of SLT ever shadowed one student for the entirety of a school day?
- How can you design space and time to allow your school community to thrive?
- How can you build flexibility into the curriculum plan to allow students to experience learning outside of school?

7. BUILDING CONNECTION THROUGH BEING PRESENT: THE ROLE OF MINDFULNESS IN SCHOOLS

- Has your school adopted a mindfulness programme? If so, what has been the impact?
- If not, how else do you promote the mental health of both staff and students?
- How can non-cognitive processes become embedded in the school and subject curricula, not merely a bolt-on?

Tom Middlehurst is Head of Research at SSAT. **Chris Smith** is Student Leadership Co-ordinator at SSAT.