Transition Hub to support the education of looked after children

University of Plymouth and University of Exeter

Principal investigators: Nick Axford and Vashti Berry

YOUTH
ENDOWMENT
FUND

Pilot study plan template

University of Plymouth, University of Exeter

Nick Axford, Vashti Berry, Lynne Callaghan, Kate Allen, Sarah Rybczynska-Bunt, Jane Horrell, Kristin Liabo

Project title	*Transition Hub to support the education of looked after children*
Developer (Institution)	*St. Mary's University, Twickenham*
Evaluator (Institution)	*University of Plymouth, University of Exeter*
Principal investigator(s)	*Nick Axford, Vashti Berry*
Evaluation plan author(s)	*Nick Axford, Vashti Berry, Lynne Callaghan*
Evaluation setting	*School-based*
Target group	*11-17 years, in or on the edge of care, moved school and/or placement, unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC)*
Number of participants	*2 hubs, ~40 young people*

Study plan version history

Version	Date	Reason for revision
1.2 [*latest*]		
1.1		
1.0 [*original*]		*[leave blank for the original version]*

Any changes to the design need to be discussed with the YEF Evaluation Manager (EM) and the developer team prior to any change(s) being finalised. Describe in the table above any agreed changes made to the evaluation design, research questions and approach, and the rational for these.

Introduction

The Looked After Children (LAC) Transition Hub offers a personalised programme of education and support to young people aged 11-17 years who are new to care or experiencing a change in their care and/ or school placement. It does this through a multi-agency team including a Lead Teacher, Senior Learning Mentor, two Learning Mentors and an Educational Psychologist who provide support to children/young people, their carers and schools (via designated teachers).

Depending on the young person's situation, they either receive:

(1) "inreach" support (in a physical hub) for up to 6 weeks followed by 5 months of "outreach" support in their school:
   a. Young people who are new to care and where a school change takes place (who live within the borough or close enough to travel to the physical hub)
   b. Young people already in care but who experience a school change (who live within the borough or close enough to travel to the physical hub)
(2) "outreach" support only (6 months):
   a. Young people who are new to care but there is no school change (within borough or within sufficient travel distance)[1]
   b. Young people who are new to care and school change but out of borough (and within sufficient travel distance)
   c. Young people whose foster care placement changes but with no school change (within or within sufficient travel distance)

More information about the hub can be found on the Transition Hub website:

https://www.stmarys.ac.uk/research/areas/education-and-teaching/transition-hub/welcome.aspx

Target group

The programme targets young people aged 11-17 years who: (1) are going into care for the first time; or (2) are in care and have experienced a school placement change; or (3) have experienced a care placement change; and/or (4) are unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC). It also supports the carers and designated teachers (DTs)/form tutors of the

---

[1] Some young people can be place more than 200 miles away from their borough making support not possible for this pilot.

young people in the aforementioned groups. The young person may be located within the borough where the hub is located or out of borough *if* it is deemed feasible to conduct outreach visits with that young person.

Activities

The programme provides personalised support for young people, carers and designated teachers. This means that the intervention is personalised to meet a young person's individual needs through active involvement of the young person, carer and designated teacher and through initial assessments conducted as part of the programme which aim to guide intervention content and delivery. However, support follows a broad pattern, as follows:

- During their time in the hub, young people take part in lessons focusing on academic skills (literacy and numeracy), pre-learning on topics they will be studying in schools (English, Maths, Science, History, Geography – so that young people can begin their classes in school confidently), social-emotional learning, sport and performing arts.
- There are also transition-specific activities, such as planning and practising routes to school, meeting new staff, tours of the school and eventually visits to, and taster sessions in, school.
- Once in their (new) school, visits by the young person's key worker focus on continued support with each young person's Journey Planner targets. Examples of targets might include a focus on attendance, support with core curriculum subjects, guidance with homework, making new friendships and joining extra-curricular activities in and out of school. For older students it might include assistance with choosing the right college course and with writing college applications.
- Carers and school staff receive support and training focused on transitions in adolescence.
- There are also individual and group activities during all school holidays except Christmas and Easter (e.g., cooking sessions, canoeing courses, weekly tea party in the hub).
- The tailored programme is informed by detailed and ongoing assessment and monitoring (including hub staff interaction with social workers in inter-agency meetings).
- At six months a reflection meeting (attended by the student, carer, DT, social worker, Learning Mentor and Lead Teacher) is held to celebrate the achievements of the student, carer and school, decide when the young person will exit and agree and put in place actions to support that exit and full handover to the Virtual School.
- All students formally graduate from the hub.

Location

There are currently two programme delivery sites: London Borough of Barnet (LBB) and Achieving for Children (AfC; Kingston, Richmond, Windsor and Maidenhead). Delivery takes place in multiple settings. There are two physical hubs in the respective study sites; these are classrooms in secondary schools with adjoining space for staff and breakout sessions. The hubs are hosted in LBB by Whitefields school and in AfC by Turing House School. Young people receive lessons in the hubs, and carers and staff in the young person's new school (designated teacher / tutor) are also invited to meetings in the hub. Hub staff also visit carers and young people at their homes and visit the young person's new school. There is also offsite activity for extracurricular activities for young people.

Frequency[2]

During the "inreach" phase lessons take place daily during the school week. During the "outreach" phase school visits by the learning mentor take place weekly for the first six weeks and monthly for the remaining four months.

Dosage[3]

The programme lasts six months. During the "inreach" phase (6 weeks) young people take part in lessons from 9am to 3pm. During this time, visits to the new school will be built up over time. If a student is ready to attend their new school full-time before the six weeks this is supported. In the "outreach" phase (up to six months depending on the young person's situation) school visits by learning mentors typically take one hour. "Outreach" lasts six months for young people who only receive outreach support.

Format

The programme is delivered to young people face-to-face and includes both individual- and group-based sessions. The delivery team also works face-to-face with the school and carer and delivers outreach sessions to young people whilst they are in school/at home. During COVID-19 lockdowns content was delivered online.

---

[2] Subject to variation according to personalisation.
[3] Subject to variation according to personalisation.

Providers

The programme is delivered by multiple staff. In each hub there is a Lead Teacher, a Senior Learning Mentor and two Learning Mentors. They are supported by an Educational Psychologist (one in AfC, two in LBB) one day per week. The work is supported by a Business Support Officer / Administrator and overseen by a Project Coordinator. The hub team seeks to establish strong working relationships with key partners in the local authority, notably the Virtual School team, host school Head Teacher and social care. The hub teams come under the employment and leadership of the Virtual Schools in the respective sites. Each young person has a Learning Mentor who provides relational stability across the four transition stages.

Training and quality assurance

All hub staff must have experience working with children/young people. The Lead Teacher should have at least six to eight years' experience working with vulnerable children/young people; the Senior Learning Mentor should have at least five years' experience working with vulnerable children/young people; and the Outreach Learning Mentors should have at least two to three years' experience working with vulnerable children/young people. In addition to relevant experience (as described above), LAC Hub staff are required to complete the following essential training:

- Safeguarding Course (Level One)
- Understanding social care
- How a Virtual School works
- The role of the Designated Teacher
- Understanding transitions
- Trauma informed practice
- Pre-teaching and learning
- Key worker
- Programme delivery

Regular CPD meetings are held to ensure ongoing learning and these CPD meetings are shaped by the needs of the hub staff and can include such topics as:

- Literacy and numeracy teaching
- Teaching young people with special educational needs
- Building relationships with carers.

The hub Educational Psychologist provides supervision for hub staff on both an individual (monthly) and group (fortnightly) basis and provides some of the CPD.

Materials

There is a programme manual to support activities (available on request from Dr. Catherine Carroll, programme developer). Key materials include:

- The Journey Planner (planning and assessment tool, mapped against the Positive Youth Development (PYD) framework with sections for the student, carer and school); individual targets are set at the start of the programme for each section and progress is monitored each month.
- User guide for Journey Planner
- Assessment tools (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), and Pupil Attitude to Self and School (PASS))
- A bespoke Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Curriculum
- Resources for DTs and carers
- Welcome letters and information (including Privacy Notice)
- Keeping to the programme fidelity checklist

Logic model / theory of change

Ultimately, a *long-term* (distal) outcome (1) is preventing/reducing risk for violence, crime and anti-social behaviour (thereby reducing young people's involvement in the youth justice system). *Medium-term* outcomes (2, 3) are increased stability in education and living arrangements. *Short-term* outcomes are: *young person* (4) – achieving targets, improved attendance, reduced exclusions, settling/progressing at school; *carer* (5) – improved knowledge/understanding of how to support their young person through transitions, and greater confidence and competence in doing so; and *school* (6) – improved transition practice at the teacher/tutor and whole school levels. In essence the programme has three elements. The full programme package (7) for the young person based on a personalised transition plan, starts in the hub but transitions over time into the young person's new school (reducing to weekly then monthly monitoring visits part way through) and includes support with literacy/numeracy, curriculum catch-up, transition and well-being (behaviour), as well as planned recreation. The second element, for carers (8), involves Learning Mentor visits and training in support for the young person's transitions. The third element, for schools (9), involves training for designated teachers in supporting the young person's transitions.

The programme is underpinned by three principles:

(1) Transition (and change) is not a one-off event, but an *on-going process* that requires tailored support before, during and after a placement move.

(2) Successful transition requires *all* to prepare and be ready - in the programme it is called "student ready", "carer ready", and "school ready".

(3) Every interaction and every relationship matters.

The structure and delivery of the programme is based on the four stages of transition (McLellan & Gatton, 2015):

(1) Preparation stage (before the young person starts the programme)

(2) Initial school encounters (first six weeks)

(3) Adjustment phase (months 3-4)

(4) Stabilisation (months 5-6)

The programme is also informed by the PYD framework. This is based on research suggesting that certain "protective factors" can help young people succeed. According to this research young people may be better prepared for a successful transition to adulthood if they have a variety of opportunities to learn and participate at home, at school, in community and in their neighbourhoods. It is premised on a strengths-based approach and promotes positive outcomes for young people by providing opportunities, fostering positive relationships and providing the support needed to build on their leadership strengths. All elements of the Transition Hub programme and activities have been designed to incorporate all of the six 'C's of the PYD Framework: connection, confidence, character, competence, contribution and caring.

Policy and practice context

The *Children and Families Act* 2014 required each local authority to establish a Virtual School to champion the education of looked after children in their care. However, provision is patchy, especially for children in transition between placements and/or schools. For example, a recent empirical survey in England showed that while Virtual School Heads provide emotional and mental health support for looked after children they could do more to support foster carers in the education domain (Drew & Banerjee, 2019).

Moreover, according to practitioners and stakeholders interviewed in the feasibility phase of this evaluation, usual provision for looked after children in transition involves little support for the young person, carer or school; such support can be rushed and unplanned, leading to young people's education being disrupted. School staff knowledge of looked after children is often limited and they tend not to be trained in a trauma-informed approach. Additionally, high caseloads prevent Virtual School staff building deep relationships with young people.

Prior evidence

Youth involved in offending and antisocial behaviour have poor outcomes[4] (e.g., Maughan et al., 2014) and generate significant costs for society (e.g., Snell et al., 2013). Looked after children (LAC) are a vulnerable population (more likely to experience early trauma, mental health difficulties, early parenthood, exclusion from school) and are over-represented in the young offender population (e.g., YJB, 2015; Dixon, 2008; Meltzer et al., 2003). Those most at risk enter care in adolescence and experience multiple or disrupted placements. These vulnerabilities place looked after children at risk of academic 'failure' (Berridge et al., 2008; Jackson, 2010).

LAC[5] lag behind their peers on a range of educational measures (O'Higgins et al., 2015; Sebba et al., 2015a; Jay & McGrath-Lone, 2019).[6] Multiple reasons for the gap have been identified, including pre-care experiences (e.g., abuse/neglect), elevated rate of special educational needs (SEN) and transitions between placements and schools (Drew & Banerjee, 2019). LAC do no worse educationally than children in need, suggesting that it is not care *per se* that contributes to poor educational outcomes (Sebba et al., 2015). Rather, key factors include school exclusion, care/school placement changes and behavioural/emotional difficulties (which contribute to exclusions/transfers) (Sebba et al., 2015a; Drew and Banerjee, 2019). It is therefore important to help foster carers support children with their behaviour and social-emotional well-being (Sebba et al., 2015).

Barriers to improving educational outcomes for LAC include placement/school instability, lack of training for carers in how they can support education, limited or no catch-up opportunities following missed schooling and poor joint-agency working (Jackson, 2010). Further, recent research shows that parent/carer engagement in children's education contributes to educational and wider (e.g., social-emotional) outcomes, with families of marginalised children likely to benefit most from interventions to improve parent/carer engagement (Axford et al. 2019). Systematic reviews have found little robust evidence of the effectiveness of interventions to support LAC in school (Liabo et al., 2013; Evans et al., 2017).

Thus, there is a need for interventions that can address the barriers identified above and support carers with their children's learning in order to improve educational outcomes for children in or on the edge of care. The Transition Hub offers one such approach. Research into the value of transition support for LAC, particularly those transitioning to

---

[4] For example, they are more likely to misuse drugs, lack qualifications, be unemployed, develop mental health disorders and physical illnesses, and be involved in crime as adults.

[5] There are approximately 70,000 looked after children in England, three-quarters of whom are in foster care.

[6] For example, in 2016 14% LAC in England achieved five A*-C grade GCSEs, compared with 53% of non-LAC children (DfE 2017).

independence, finds that young people in care who received transition support services were more likely to complete compulsory education with formal qualifications, be in current employment and be living independently, and less likely to be young parents (Everson-Hock et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2011). There was no reported effect of the impact of this support on crime or mental health, and mixed findings for homelessness. However, the quality of research in this field limits the extent of the conclusions that can be drawn and this project will, in time, contribute to the wider evidence base on these important questions of long-term impact (ibid.).

Prior to the feasibility study funded by the YEF, in 2017-18 Achieving for Children conducted and published a case study as part of the PALAC (Promoting the Achievement of Looked After Children) programme with young unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC) that addressed the facilitators and barriers to supporting their transition and education. The young people spoke positively about a hub and the opportunity to have a phased transition into care and education. Barnet had also seen the benefits of targeted and specific transition support through their UASC programme and were considering how it might be adapted for all 11-14 coming into care. The feasibility phase of this evaluation showed that the hub programme can be delivered and that it is acceptable to providers, carers and other stakeholders. However, it also recommended strengthening aspects of the programme, for example around communication with designated teachers and training in use of the Journey Planner.[7]

Research questions and/or objectives

The pilot outcomes phase of the evaluation has three aims:

1. to test whether the intervention has promise in terms of the proximal outcomes (i.e., the potential to contribute to desired outcomes, in particular young people's engagement in education and their social-emotional well-being and behaviour)
2. to build on the feasibility phase by (a) describing key aspects of programme implementation and (b) exploring how much young people and carers engage with it (why / why not), and if young people and carers perceive it to be acceptable and helpful (why / why not)
3. To inform decisions about future intervention implementation and development and a next-stage evaluation

---

[7] Results from the feasibility phase were shared with the YEF in June 2021.

Success criteria and/or targets

We will report on the following criteria:

- the numbers of participants (YP) recruited by site and their characteristics
- the percentage of intervention participants who consent to taking part in the research
- the completeness of the outcome assessments collected by the Project/Hub teams

The quantitative outcome data (SDQ and PASS) will be used to estimate mean scores, standard deviations and correlations between baseline and follow-up scores, all parameters for estimating sample size for a future evaluation phase. In addition, we will report on pre-post-test change as an indicator of potential promise of the intervention. This will complement qualitative data gathered as part of the feasibility study to show the degree to which the intervention can be implemented as designed and is acceptable to providers and users (this information will be used to make any necessary revisions to the intervention).

Methods

Overview

The evaluation will involve analysing quantitative data on outcomes and programme participation collected routinely by the hubs as part of regular service delivery. As an extension to the feasibility evaluation phase, it will also entail conducting and analysing qualitative data from a small number (~10) of interviews with carers and young people, focusing on implementation, acceptability and impact.

Recruitment

Young people and their carers will be recruited to the intervention by the respective organisations involved in the project, namely AfC and LBB. Participants are eligible if they are aged 11-17 years, living in the borough / local authority (or out of area but close enough for outreach visits) and either (i) entering care/foster care for the first time or (ii) in care and experience a change in placement/school or (iii) UASC.

All participants in the intervention (~40 young people) are eligible to participate in the evaluation. At the point of entry to the hub, carers will be given a Privacy Notice. This informs them that their contact details and routinely collected programme data (including outcome data) will be shared with the evaluation team for evaluation purposes (effectively a service evaluation). For those who enrol on that basis, the evaluation team will send carers an information sheet and consent form for them and the young person in their care,

and arrange either for (a) the carer and young person to complete and return it to the evaluation team or (b) a call (online/phone) during which the evaluation team can obtain verbal informed consent from the carer and young person. For those who additionally consent in this way – that is, to participate in the YEF evaluation study – we will archive personal data and (for a subset) collect qualitative experience data.

Quantitative measures

Outcomes

- Standardised education/well-being measures (completed at baseline and six months later):
  - *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (SDQ; www.sdqinfo.org), a 25-item questionnaire with five subscales (hyperactivity, conduct problems, emotional well-being, prosocial behaviour, peer relations), a total difficulties score and an impact supplement (the project uses the version for young people only);
  - *Pupil Attitudes to Self and School* (PASS; https://www.gl-assessment.co.uk/assessments/pass/), a short student self-completion measure used to gain insight into attitudes that could be hindering achievement. It creates nine attitudinal scores: feelings about school; perceived capability; self-regard; prepared for learning; attitudes to teachers; work ethic; confidence in learning; attitudes to attendance; and response to curriculum demands.
- School performance:[8]
  - Percentage attendance before joining hub (baseline, previous 6 months) and at exit (previous 6 months)[9]
  - Number of exclusions before joining hub (baseline, previous 6 months) and exit (previous 6 months)
  - Making 'expected progress' (yes/no) in term before joining hub (baseline) and at exit
  - Working at age-appropriate levels (yes/no) in term before hub (baseline) and at exit

Implementation

- Programme-specific data (e.g., inreach/outreach, SEN support, key worker)

---

[8] Completed by Virtual School Deputy at baseline and by student's school at exit. Where data are missing at baseline the gaps are completed (where possible) following a Professionals' Meeting.
[9] Effectively during the 6 months of the programme.

- Intervention contacts by individual – number, who with (young person, carer, school, social worker), and focus of session.

Other

- Socio-demographic data (e.g., child DOB, gender, ethnicity, age in hub, UPN)

Interview schedules

The interview schedules for young people and carers comprise open-ended questions focusing on the following issues: understanding of the purpose and approach of the hub; acceptability of the approach (e.g., what they like/dislike); fidelity/adaptation (e.g., what they do in the hub, how often they meet with their learning mentor, what support the carer received); perceived impact (on young person and carer); engagement in the programme; endings (e.g., how contact with the hub ended); and other support received.

Data collection

Quantitative data will be collected by the delivery team as part of routine service delivery. It will be shared in raw form with the evaluation team for the purpose of analysis using Excel and SPSS or Stata software packages.

Qualitative data will be collected by the evaluation team. Specifically, semi-structured interviews will be conducted with (i) ~5 young people and (ii) ~5 carers. Topic guides include questions related to the feasibility, acceptability, and impact of the intervention. Depending on the evolving COVID-19 situation, practicalities and participant preference, interviews will be conducted remotely using platforms agreed by the hubs (Zoom, telephone) or in person. Qualitative data will be organised using the NVivo 12 software package[10] and subjected to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Methods for minimising bias

Practitioners who collect data as part of routine service delivery will receive training from the Project Coordinator in how to do this (e.g., not asking leading questions, not influencing answers). The measures have proven validity and reliability and data from different sources (teachers, carers and young people) using the same measure (SDQ) will allow us to triangulate reports. Interviews will be conducted by experienced and trained staff, and

---

[10] NVivo qualitative data analysis software; QSR International Ply Ltd. Version 12, 2018.

participants will be told that the information they provide will be confidential and their comments reported anonymously.

Data analysis

As a mixed methods study, all findings will be considered together to inform a decision about the need for and value of further intervention development and evaluation. Interviews will be transcribed and analysed thematically using NVivo software, while data from pre-post measures (SDQ and PASS) will be scored and subjected to descriptive and inferential statistical analysis (using paired sample t-test). This will include total and subscale scores, and the impact supplement for the SDQ. Missing data will not be imputed. Quantitative outcome data will show whether and by how much outcomes improve during the intervention, and the number/proportion of completed measures at pre- and post-test. Quantitative and qualitative data will show the degree to which the intervention is implemented as designed and is acceptable to providers and users.

Methods overview

Research methods	Data collection methods	Participants/ data sources (type, number)	Data analysis methods	Research questions addressed
Routine service delivery data	Dataset shared with evaluation team	Self-completed questionnaires (SDQ, PASS) and key programme delivery data	Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis	(1) Whether outcomes improve during the intervention (i.e., between baseline and follow-up) (2a) Delivery of key aspects of the programme
Interviews	Interviews with young people and carers	Young people (~5), carers (~5)	Thematic analysis	(2b) The degree to which the young people and carers engage with the intervention (why / why not), and if they perceive it to be acceptable and helpful (why / why not)

Outputs

The method and results from the pilot outcome evaluation phase will be presented to the YEF as a slide deck. Results from the feasibility and pilot outcomes phases of the evaluation will be written up in a final peer-reviewed report for the YEF (using the YEF pilot study report template), which can also be shared with sites and project partners.[11] Both the slide deck and report will include recommendations regarding future intervention development and evaluation (including potential efficacy evaluation). As necessary, the final report will include an updated version of the intervention logic model.

Ethics and registration

The Faculty of Health Research Ethics and Integrity Committee at the University of Plymouth approved the ethics submission for the feasibility phase of the evaluation (Ref: 19/20-1301, dated 17th December 2020). An ethics amendment for the outcomes phase of the evaluation was submitted to the same committee for Chair's Action (Ref: 21/22-3071, dated 20th October 2021). We need to make minor revisions based on these comments before final sign-off. Additionally, we are required to obtain sign-off from the AfC Research Board.

Data protection

Legal basis

The legal basis to collect and process personal and sensitive information for this project is 'public task' i.e., research carried out in the public interest. In the UK, section 8 of the *Data Protection Act* 2018 says that the public task basis can cover processing that is necessary for, among other things, 'the exercise of a function of the Crown, a Minister of the Crown or a government department.' This project is funded by the Home Office (via the YEF) in the exercise of their statutory powers to assist victims, witnesses or other persons affected by offences. On this basis, the YEF has recommended the use of public task as the lawful basis for all evaluations of their grantees.

---

[11] If the YEF prefers, two separate reports could be produced.

Confidentiality

Each participant will be assigned a Pseudo ID known only to the evaluation team. The Master Index linking PseudoIDs to personal identifiers (first name; family name) will be stored in a file separate to the evaluation data on the secure shared drive.

It is a requirement of the funding that limited identifiable data are shared with the Department for Education (DfE) for the purposes of data archiving. Specifically, the research team must share a dataset containing the following data: child's name, DOB, gender, Unique Pupil Number (UPN), level of participation in the intervention (e.g., sessions completed), and outcome data (pre/post). Once this reaches the DfE it will be pseudonymised. After the dataset with identifiable data has been securely transferred to the DfE we will delete it.

Anonymity

For young people and their parents/carers, no real names or other identifiers/distinguishing features of participants will be used on any reports, presentations or papers. Discussions with the Transition Hub teams will not contain specific details of cases but will focus on issues raised to preserve anonymity.

Regarding data in the YEF archive, no-one who looks at information in the archive will know the identity of participants.

Data quality

Procedures for collecting routine data (outcomes, implementation) as part of service delivery are overseen by the Transition Hub Project Coordinator. In practice, this includes providing staff with training in (i) how to administer measures so as to minimise bias and (ii) how to enter data into the Transition Hub data management system. Data are analysed on a monthly basis and any issues identified so that they can be rectified as quickly as possible.

Regarding primary data collected by the evaluation team, staff have previous experience of using such methods and receive additional training on the specific tools.

Data sharing and storage

Data will be shared by AfC and LBB with the University of Plymouth according to data sharing agreements. Primary data will be stored in password protected files on the University of Plymouth's secure server (on Microsoft Sharepoint) and accessible only from a University of Plymouth password protected computer. Data will only be accessible to evaluation team members. Any hard copy data (e.g., consent forms) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in a locked office on University of Plymouth property. After the research is complete, a dataset (containing outcome data (pre/post), level of participation in the programme and identifying information (child name, gender, date of birth, Unique Pupil

Number) will be transferred securely to the Department for Education for deposit (in pseudonymised form) in the ONS Secure Research Service.

Personnel

Delivery team

Catherine Carroll (Project Lead, St. Mary's University, Twickenham) - Project oversight, staff training/support, intervention design/adaptation, liaison with evaluation team

AfC

Affan Malik (Project Administrator, Achieving for Children) - Administration of project, including data management

Lauren Allen (Lead Teacher, Achieving for Children Transition Hub) - Leadership of programme in respective hubs, including staff support and liaison with host school and Virtual School

Kelly Holloway (Senior Learning Mentor, Achieving for Children Transition Hub) - Recruitment and support of young people, liaison with designated teachers in new schools

Tarquinn Reid-Albert (Learning Mentor, Achieving for Children Transition Hub) - Delivering hub curriculum and supporting young people in new school

Susan Cambridge (Learning Mentor, Achieving for Children Transition Hub) - Delivering hub curriculum and supporting young people in new school

Sara Freitag (Education Psychologist, Achieving for Children Transition Hub)

Amanda Gaukroger (Education Psychologist, Achieving for Children Transition Hub)

Barnet

Hassan Sufi (Lead Teacher, Barnet Transition Hub) - Leadership of programme in respective hubs, including staff support and liaison with host school and Virtual School

Affan Malik (Project Administrator, Barnet Transition Hub) - Administration of project, including data management

Amy Wight (Senior Learning Mentor, Barnet Transition Hub) - Recruitment and support of young people, liaison with designated teachers in new schools

Nathanael Ribas (Learning Mentor, Barnet Transition Hub) - Delivering hub curriculum and supporting young people in new school

Samuel Okine (Learning Mentor, Barnet Transition Hub) - Delivering hub curriculum and supporting young people in new school

Chenelle Collins (Education Psychologist, Barnet Transition Hub)

Emma Sagzan (Education Psychologist, Barnet Children Transition Hub)

Evaluation team

Nick Axford (Co-PI, University of Plymouth) – Evaluation oversight, including design, liaison with YEF and sites, write-up

Vashti Berry (Co-PI, University of Exeter) – Evaluation oversight, including design, liaison with YEF and sites, overseeing quantitative data analysis, write-up

Lynne Callaghan (Project Manager, University of Plymouth) – Ethics, data management, liaison with sites, overseeing qualitative data collection and analysis, write-up

Kate Allen (Research Fellow, University of Exeter) – Recruitment, qualitative data collection and analysis

Sarah Rybczynska-Bunt (Research Fellow, University of Plymouth) – Recruitment, qualitative data collection and analysis

Jane Horrell (Research Associate, University of Plymouth) – Recruitment, qualitative data collection and analysis

Kristin Liabo (PPI Lead, University of Exeter) – Consultation with young people and carers

Risks

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
COVID-19 and/or other issues lead to delay or other complications with hub delivery	Medium	High	Means of delivering hub online learnt in feasibility phase could be used again. Numbers coming in monitored.

Low sign-up to evaluation by carers / young people	Medium	High	Online carer evenings hosted by evaluation team (opportunity for questions). Video for carers/young people. Information sheets and consent forms made as simple as possible. Persistence by evaluation team. Support from hub team as needed.
Low participation in data collection by young people / carers	Medium	High	Good use of routinely collected data. Students given options for qualitative data collection (in-person, online, telephone).

Timeline

Dates	Activity	Staff responsible/ leading
By 15.12.21	Set-up, including ethics approval and refinement of design for pilot outcome evaluation phase	NA, VB, LC
1.10.21 to 30.6.22	Recruitment of young people to project and evaluation	Hubs and JH
1.11.21 to 31.12.22	Collection of qualitative data from participants as specified in study plan	LC, SRB/JH

1.11.21 to 31.12.22	Collection of quantitative data from participants as specified in study plan	Hubs and VB, KA
1.10.22 to 31.3.23	Analysis of qualitative data	LC, SRB/JH
1.1.23 to 31.1.23	Analysis of quantitative data	VB
1.1.23 to 31.3.23	Write-up of findings	NA, VB, LC
31.3.23	YEF receipt of first draft of final evaluation report (feasibility + pilot study findings)	NA, VB, LC
31.5.21	YEF receipt of final, peer reviewed evaluation report	NA, VB, LC

References

Axford, N., Berry, V., Lloyd, J., Moore, D., Rogers, M., Hurst, A., Blockley, K., Durkin, H. and Minton, J. (2019) *How Can Schools Support Parents' Engagement in their Children's Learning? Evidence from Research and Practice*. London: EEF.

Berridge, D., Dance, C., Beecham, J., Field, S. (2008) *Educating Difficult Adolescents: Effective education for children in public care or with emotional and behavioural difficulties*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2), 77-101.

Dixon, J (2008) Young people leaving care: health, wellbeing and outcomes. *Children and Family Social Work*. 13 (2) pp207-217.

Drew, H. & Banerjee, R. (2019) Supporting the education and well-being of children who are looked-after: what is the role of the virtual school? *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 34(1), 101-121.

Evans, R., Brown, R., Rees, G. And Smith, P. (2017) Systematic review of educational interventions for looked after children and young people: recommendations for intervention development and evaluation. *British Educational Research Journal* 43(1), 68-94.

Everson-Hock, E. S., Jones, R., Guillaume, L. *et al.* (2011) Supporting the transition of looked-after young people to independent living: a systematic review of interventions and adult outcomes. *Child Care Health Development*, 36 (6), pp 767-79.

Jackson, S. (2010) Reconnecting care and education: from the Children Act 1989 to Care Matters. *Journal of Children's Services,* 5 (3), 48-60.

Jay, MA. and McGrath-Lone, L. (2019) Educational outcomes of children in contact with social care in England: a systematic review. *Systematic Reviews* 8 (155), online only https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-019-1071-z

Jones R, Everson-Hock ES, Papaioannou D. *et al.* (2011) Factors associated with outcomes for looked-after children and young people: a correlates review of the literature. *Child Care Health Development*, 37 (5) 613-622.

Liabo, K., Gray, K. And Mulcahy, D. (2013) A systematic review of interventions to support looked-after children in school. *Child & Family Social Work* 18, 341-353.

Maughan, B., Stafford, M. Shah, I., & Kuh, D. (2014). Adolescent conduct problems and premature mortality: follow-up to age 65 years in a national birth cohort. *Psychological Medicine*, 44, 1077–1086.

Meltzer, H., Gatward, R., Corbin, T. et al. (2003) *The Mental Health of Young People*. London: HMSO.

O'Higgins, A., Sebba, J. & Luke, N. (2015) *What is the Relationship between Being in Care and the Educational Outcomes of Children: An International Systematic Review*. Oxford: Rees Centre.

Sebba, J., Berridge, D., Luke, N., Fletcher, J., Bell, K., Strand, S., Thomas, S., Sinclair I. & O'Higgins, A. (2015a) T*he Educational Progress of Looked After Children in England: Linking Care and Educational Data*. Oxford/Bristol: Rees Centre / University of Bristol.

Sebba J, Berridge, D, Luke N, *et al.* (2015b) The educational progress of looked after children in England: linking care and educational data. Technical report. University of Bristol. Available from https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/educational-progress-looked-after-children[Accessed 26 September 2019].

Snell, T., Knapp, M., Healey, A., Guglani, S., Evans-Lacko, S., & Fernandez, J.-L., . . . & Ford, T. (2013). Economic impact of childhood psychiatric disorder on public sector services in Britain. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 54, 977–985.

YJB (Youth Justice Board) (2015) *Keeping children in care out of trouble: an independent review chaired by Lord Laming. Response by the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales to the call for views and evidence*. London: YJB.

YOUTH ENDOWMENT FUND

Impetus

Home Office

🌐 **youthendowmentfund.org.uk**

✉️ hello@youthendowmentfund.org.uk

🐦 @YouthEndowFund