

MEASURING THE SOCIAL IMPACT OF SCHOOLS OUTREACH – UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

Sharon Clancy, University of Nottingham, Communities Unit

‘A society of many virtuous but isolated individuals is not necessarily rich in social capital’ - Putnam

“Not all that is counted counts, and not all that can be counted counts” – Einstein

Context and Philosophy

The University of Nottingham has a proactive interest in schools outreach. One of its most important objectives is to encourage high quality student recruitment and, in line with its Widening Participation strategy and targets, it has an additional drive towards reaching out to young people from non-traditional learner backgrounds, and especially those identified as ‘gifted and talented’. It has also embraced the Academy agenda, despite the move away by some research-intensive Universities such as Cambridge from such developments, with the suggestion that their rightful focus is national, not local. The University of Nottingham, instead, has become the co-sponsor for an Academy school in the deprived Bilborough ward in the city – the Nottingham University Samworth Academy (NUSA).

The University was also recently successful in attracting HEFCE funding for a schools engagement research initiative, to look at models of best practice for schools outreach, with a view to their dissemination and roll out in other parts of the country, by examining three examples of current schools outreach activity. In this model, NUSA is configured as the ‘nascent’ element of the partnership, Active Communities as the ‘developing’ element and Widening Participation as the ‘mature’ element.

The Department of Schools, Children and Families have recently examined attitudinal barriers to familial engagement with schools and have identified that those with few or no qualifications are much less likely to value education and to attribute importance to staying on after 16. Research also showed that ‘pupils’ views of primary school also predicted their cognitive and social/behavioural outcomes at age 10 and their progress from age 6 to age 10’ (Barreau, Grabbe, Hunt, Jelicic, Melhuish, Siraj-Blatchford, Smees, Sylva and Wellcome, 2008), and high quality primary school education was a defining feature of a positive, aspiration raising experience, and particularly with children from multiple disadvantaged backgrounds. Both familial engagement and excellent learning experiences are identified as contributing to this definition of ‘quality’.

Active Communities believe that this attitudinal and experiential area is the space in which community engagement and schools outreach should operate, working at the sharp end of disadvantage and disengagement and finding means of sharing the rich cultural and intellectual resource of the University at a local community level, and particularly in local primary schools.

In Active Communities, we use the definition of community and public engagement synonymously, as being about ‘radical social engagement’ (Watson, D, 2009), an aspiration towards creating equality of esteem for social and economic engagement. Watson describes community engagement as being primarily about knowledge application – the presentation

and extension of new knowledge, including in areas connected with social and community life. 'In terms of community it presents a challenge to universities to be of and not just in the community; not simply to engage in "knowledge-transfer" but to establish a dialogue across the boundary between the university and its community which is open-ended, fluid and experimental.' In his view, community engagement properly touches on critical areas of social life, including issues of citizenship, engagement with the Third Sector - as a partner and not just as a recipient of HE interventions - as well as embracing the public understanding of science, including social science, and supporting discussion of important ethical and diversity issues.

Typically, such a definition of community engagement embraces both knowledge transfer and knowledge exchange, and acknowledges, critically, that Universities can also be recipients of community knowledge. It is predicated upon a concept of collective knowledge, with tangible, tactical, pragmatic outcomes and is founded on the principle of mutual benefit. Instead of being about 'added value', it is a fundamental part of one of the core purposes of a university, civic engagement. It is about extending the view of who University is for, questioning the 50% participation target, and moving beyond monetary exchange and paid employment.

The Work of Active Communities

At the point of its inception in 2002, Active Communities undertook a staff survey to identify the kinds of areas in which staff within the University were interested in terms of offering their time and skills as volunteers. The three key areas identified were children, young people and education, reflecting the primary business of the University as an educational provider and also a drive amongst staff to offer their skills to children with fewer life chances in deprived communities surrounding the University's key campuses.

As stated above, a number of government initiatives relating to HE/schools links aim at widening participation for young people from lower socio-economic and disadvantaged backgrounds (for example, AimHigher), and the main target groups are pupils aged 13 to 19. Primary school children are outside the immediate purview of these initiatives, though initiatives such as SureStart and the extension of nursery and pre-school education are beginning to have a positive impact, particularly on the attainment of numeracy and literacy skills. The attainment and aspiration gap, however, remains a persistent problem from childhood and research demonstrates the value of working with very young children in terms of raising aspirations and creating inspiration and opportunity. According to Leon Feinstein (2003, p.73), this kind of intervention is necessary, to offset the negative effects of social class disparity, which appear to have a compounding effect on educational attainment throughout life, from as early as 22 months of age.

Therefore, a commitment to promoting social mobility is at the heart of this kind of schools outreach activity and it needs to be understood in the context of the educational statistics for Nottingham and Nottinghamshire, which are sobering. Parts of Nottinghamshire (40.8 % of its wards) fall into the bottom 10% of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2000, and 44% fall into the lowest 10% in terms of educational deprivation. According to POLAR data (POLAR - Participation Of Local Areas - is a series of maps showing the participation of young people in higher education for geographical areas ranging from regions to wards), in Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire young people's participation in Higher Education is the lowest in the East Midlands, at 15% and 27% respectively. Pre-16 educational attainment for Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire remains low and in Nottingham City in 2004 the LEA key stage 2 results (at age 11) were the fourth lowest in the country.

The Purpose of the Impact Research

Statistics from 2007 to 2008 show that Active Communities worked with 35 primary schools in this period, mainly from communities identified as disadvantaged on a range of indicators according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation. The team offered a wide range of activities through staff and students. This included multi-cultural activities, After school clubs in a range of subject areas, including Science and Engineering, access to the University campus through aspiration building visits for primary school children and their parents and numeracy and literacy support. During this period the team placed 236 volunteers and supported over a 1000 young people.

More detailed evaluation through focus groups with primary schools shows that such support is invaluable, in light of increased pressures on school staff around language needs, the need to continuously improve students' educational attainment, especially in areas of deprivation, and the extended schools agenda, amongst others.

Bearing in mind, however, the 5000 plus primary schools in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire and the educational statistics outlined above, this is a small – though important – contribution to developing sustainable primary school links.

The work of Active Communities has also been defined by the schools' proximity to the main University campuses, taking account of the nature of volunteering, which often takes place during work time and therefore needs to be easily accessible. This has had a strong bearing on the extent and reach of the Active Communities initiatives.

Another significant issue has been a lack of access to any longitudinal data demonstrating the potential impact of such quality interventions on the lives of young children longer-term. Therefore, we have been unable to demonstrate increased access to the University of Nottingham, or other HEIs, nor can we directly evidence wider aspiration raising in terms of future work and learning trajectories.

Therefore, in this short-term research programme, we chose to look at the social impact and benefit of our work in the immediate environment, examining some of the more subtle and less quantifiable social benefits, with a view to making a stronger case for the University's engagement both with primary schools and the wider communities within which they operate.

HEIs and community engagement - background

The HEFCE 'third stream' funding to support universities community engagement activities was made available through the Higher Education Active Community Fund (HEACF)¹ launched in 2002. It was part of the Government's wider initiative aimed to encourage greater involvement in voluntary and community activities and to help to build bridges between communities and local organisations, such as Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), thus promoting a fairer and more cohesive society in which individuals have a stake. The HEACF scheme, in particular, was intended to enhance the key role played by HEIs in their local community by encouraging staff and student volunteering, especially in disadvantaged sections of the community. It was also expected that volunteering would help both staff and

¹ There were two rounds of HEACF funding between 2002 and 2006. HEACF support for student (and staff) volunteering opportunities in HEIs is continuing under the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund.

students gain new perspectives, and enable students to develop their employment skills i.e. generic skills not necessarily linked directly to the course curriculum, while leading to recognisable benefits for both volunteers and the community.

Nevertheless, auditing and evaluating university community engagement activities is a challenge to most HEIs, especially in terms of assessing the impact of these activities. The choice of measurement tools allowing impact assessment is limited and it is difficult for such evaluation to be carried out in a systematic way. However, there is a growing interest in this area amongst HEIs, manifested by a body of literature and studies dedicated to various kinds of interaction and relationships between the universities and the wider community, referred to as public /community engagement. A simple and easy to use universal community engagement tool for measuring the impact of the university community/public engagement appears yet to be developed.

Community engagement and measuring impact

A comprehensive list of current approaches and models for auditing and evaluation of university community engagement activities, identifying the scope and relevance of each approach were discussed by Angie Hart in a briefing paper on auditing, benchmarking and evaluating university public engagement (Hart et al, 2008). The paper concluded that although many different organisations were producing indicators in developing auditing and benchmarking frameworks, 'incorporating community perspectives is almost entirely absent across the sector, both within the UK and beyond'. The paper also found that most evaluation frameworks measure the outputs, i.e. the changes resulting from the activities, rather than the impacts (their influence or effect).

The Higher Education Community Engagement Model², for example, applies a set of measures (number of beneficiary organisations supported, number of staff and students involved and hours committed to volunteering) to estimate the financial value of the activities. Although applying this model is a good starting point for data collection on community engagement activities across the whole institution, and as a tool it provides a comprehensive set of indicators for tracking and managing Third Stream activities, it does not go beyond measuring impact of volunteering activities in financial terms. However, due to the complex nature of community engagement activities, often involving a wide range of social interactions across different areas, some important aspects of community engagement in terms of social outcomes and impacts are left outside the picture.

Social impact measurement tools

The value of voluntary activities in the community has been recognised and tools and indicators for measuring their economic value are relatively well developed for Third Sector organisations. Putnam (1993) proved that there are significant indirect benefits which flow from voluntary activities that generate a wider social impact at both individual and community level. The social aspects of such interactions with others, emphasising the reciprocal nature of social relations, are referred to by scholars as 'social capital'.

² HECE model was developed by the Russell Group association of universities, in collaboration with The Corporate Citizenship Company

The wider economic value of social capital and volunteering were measured in an exploratory study by Peter Mayer (Mayer, 2003). The study measured the impact of social benefits in a few of the many possible areas where such impacts can be made by applying social capital measures.

Tools for measuring social impact were developed for Third sector organisations - the Volunteering Assessment toolkit, for example, was developed by the Institute for Volunteering research (IVR, 2004). Other tools include the SIMPLE model for assessing the social impact of social enterprise developed by the University of Brighton Business School (McLoughlin, 2008), a model which examines social enterprise in terms of a quadruple bottom line, based on its economic, social, environmental and financial impacts.

Another tool for measuring social and environmental outcomes that do not have market values is SROI (Social Return On Investment) tool. The tool was developed from traditional cost-benefit analysis by translating the social outcomes into financial measures and calculating the social return. Originally developed by SROI, it has been recently refined (and is still in the process of development) by NEF (New Economics Foundation) as an impact measurement framework designed to promote the inclusion of all stakeholders in the process.

Central to the concept of SROI is identifying important impacts from stakeholders' perspectives. An SROI analysis should not be restricted to one number, but seen as a framework for exploring an organisation's social impact, in which monetisation plays an important but not an exclusive role.

Despite the flexibility and value of this model, there still appear to be some crucial problems associated with monetising. Firstly, some outcomes cannot be monetised, especially the 'softer' outcomes such as raised self-esteem which are often an important development gained through volunteering or community engagement activities and the very areas research is trying to isolate and identify and secondly, a set of indicators using a variety of measures for community engagement need to be collected.

Community engagement impact study

This study applies the SROI principles in terms of exploring the benefits of the University community engagement activities from various stakeholders' perspectives, with the purpose of identifying important social benefits and outcomes arising from such activities. The focus was on qualitative outcomes rather than quantitative. Monetising these outcomes and calculating the social return ratio was not the primary purpose of the study.

The diversity of engagement activities undertaken by staff and students with a variety of external stakeholders meant that the development of a meaningful impact evaluation framework, incorporating these two perspectives, was a challenging task.

The proposed analytical framework used in this study is based on the social capital outcomes framework developed by Community Evaluation Northern Ireland. (CENI, Report, 2003).

The CENI framework describes three main domains in relation to social capital and communities:

- The Bonding capital – refers to cohesion and connectedness within a community
- The Bridging capital – refers to the levels and nature of contact and engagement between different communities
- The Linking capital – recognises the engagement and relations between community and voluntary organisations and resource agencies and policy makers. In the context of this study, the Linking capital dimension is explored in relation to any formal or informal links between the University and a community or voluntary organisation, or a school.

Social Capital Dimension	Core elements (adapted from the original CENI model)	Outcomes
Bonding	Empowerment	Increased confidence, skills development, personal satisfaction, improved leadership skills and team working capacity
	Connectedness	Building bridges between cultures, social inclusion and cohesion, citizenship
Bridging	Engagement	Improving the local neighbourhood
	Accessibility	Access to the University's physical and intellectual resources by representatives of less advantaged groups
	Innovation	New ways of engagement with the wider community
Linking	Resources	Links with external organisations and sharing the University's physical and intellectual resources
	Influence	Long term partnership links between the University and external organisations.

The proposed framework helps to explore various aspects of social outcomes arising from a range of interactions at individual, group or institutional level (e.g. staff/student volunteers and recipients, between the volunteers themselves, and between the University and any external organisations).

The social capital indicators applied within the CENI framework were derived from the World Bank indicators and were mainly devised to measure the community dimensions of social capital. As the study progressed, it became apparent that a new set of indicators had to be compiled to reflect the areas of impact identified in the context of the University's community engagement through staff and student volunteering. Such a complex task, however, could not be completed within the limited timescale and resources available for completing the study.

Another challenging task was data collection from such a broad spectrum of stakeholders' groups.

As stated, the study was initiated by Active Communities, in autumn 2008. The rationale was as follows:

- HEACF was for some institutions an open opportunity to put into place volunteering programmes that had not previously existed. At Nottingham, Active Communities focused on staff volunteering - most of the student volunteering activities remained within the remit of Student Community Action. Since its inception, however, AC has evolved and expanded the range and diversity of its activities, developing a wide range of volunteering opportunities for both staff and students. In the light of the diminishing HEFCE funding (originally the main source of funding for Active Communities) the question of sustainability of the existing community engagement activities or any expansion of such activities and the future of Active Communities became pertinent.
- In light of the above, the study also intended to explore the areas of student volunteering and also potential areas for future development, through consultation with staff, academics, students and external organisations.
- The aim was to apply a qualitative approach in identifying outcomes and impacts.

The first stage of the study was intended to capture the depth and breadth of community engagement activities taking place across the University over a 12 month period between 2007/8. A university-wide survey was designed and carried out by Active Communities.

The second stage of the study was to apply an evaluation framework for assessing the impact of these activities.

Methodology

Quantitative and qualitative data was collected by a number of means – a staff survey of community engagement activities undertaken over 2007/8 academic year, a series of internal and external focus groups, questionnaires and interviews with various stakeholders (staff, students, external third sector, public and private sector organisations). There was a relatively low response rate to the survey and the questionnaires. The variety of stakeholder groups represented in the study, however, was good overall.

Stakeholders involved in the study

The scope of the study internally was limited to University staff and students who have been participating in volunteering and community engagement activities organised exclusively by AC.

The following internal stakeholders groups and activities were included:

- i) Those activities supported through the Staff Volunteering Policy, or staff involved in organising academic related student volunteering, in collaboration with Active Communities.
- ii) Student academic enrichment programmes incorporating community based volunteering (*e.g. language support to bi-lingual/ethnic minority children, classroom support to children with special educational needs, business support to a community organisation/group*). Some staff are also included in these programmes.

The following external stakeholders were involved, as recipients of volunteering support:

- Primary schools (teachers, head teachers)
- Secondary school pupils involved in the Active Communities e-mentoring programme in collaboration with NEBA (Nottinghamshire Education Business Alliance)

Findings

The following outcomes, in each of the social capital domains, were identified:

Social Capital	Desired Outcomes	Findings
Empowerment	Increased confidence, skills development, personal satisfaction, improved leadership skills and team working capacity	Staff reported new skills, increased confidence and satisfaction gained through volunteering
Connectedness	Building bridges between cultures, social inclusion and cohesion, citizenship	Students valued being part of the local community, building trust and working towards common goals
Engagement	Improving the local neighbourhood	Projects for improving the local neighbourhood (The Lenton Centre, the Crocus Café, Ecoworks) – all valued
Accessibility	Access to the University’s physical and intellectual resources by less advantaged groups	Staff and student volunteers supporting primary school pupils results in raising aspirations amongst the pupils; the University is perceived as an accessible place, especially by young people from lower

		socio-economic backgrounds
Innovation	New ways of engagement with the wider community	The University is looking for new ways of engagement with the wider community; the Third Sector research network and external Third Sector meetings. Schools Focus group meetings
Resources	Links with external organisations and sharing the University physical and intellectual resources	The feedback from some local schools and community/voluntary organisations showed that access to the University's physical and intellectual resources can be improved
Influence	Long term partnership links between the University and any external organisations.	The Nottingham University Samworth Academy Community partners need to be involved and consulted in developing the University's community engagement strategy

The Bonding capital

Empowerment: Increased confidence, skills development, personal satisfaction, improved leadership skills and team work capacity

According to the Active Communities survey results, 156 members of University staff (academic and non-academic) were involved in various projects and activities with over 100 organisations, including 52 schools, in 2007/08 (AC survey results 2007/08). Given that the questionnaire response rate, however, was below 10%, this figure has to be viewed with caution and such activity is likely to be considerably higher.

As stated above, the majority of staff volunteering activities (78%) were of an educational nature and included staff providing direct support to primary school pupils with literacy, numeracy or English as a second language, or e-mentoring secondary school pupils.

Increased confidence, sense of achievement and fulfilment from helping someone else were found to be some of the major outcomes from staff volunteers' perspectives. This was linked to sharing their knowledge and experiences in a different setting and to actually being able to see the progress made by the pupils and the benefits arising from their help. Some staff

volunteers also stated that volunteering in schools helped them develop their own communication and teaching skills.

The volunteering activities in schools undertaken by students were similar to those performed by staff. There were three AC led projects targeting students in particular - MA Special Educational Needs (13 volunteers), MA Language support (12 volunteers), and 42 undergraduate students from the Business School who took part in the Lenton Centre (TLC) community project and Ecoworks project jointly run by Nottingham University Business School and Active Communities. Both MA programmes took place in primary school settings, providing a vital resource to hard-pushed schools in relation to the SEN agenda and language skills and an invaluable 'on the ground' experience for students in terms of applying their academic skills.

The areas of outcomes for students engaged in volunteering were related mostly to developing skills and capabilities through social interactions in a different setting, whilst working on a project with fellow students. In addition to having the opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge to a real life situation, all those interviewed pointed out that their volunteering helped them develop a range of other skills but especially the ability to interact and work as part of a team with their fellow students on a real life project. Most considered that improved communication skills were the major benefits they felt they gained through their involvement.

Connectedness: Building bridges between cultures, social inclusion and cohesion, citizenship

Important outcomes arising from student volunteering were found relating to aspects such as building bridges between cultures, a sense of being part of the local as well as the international student community, and an increased awareness and understanding of citizenship, expressed as:

'The ability to connect with people from all different kinds of backgrounds.'

'I do think that if it wasn't for the volunteering programme I would be completely focused on the university'.

NUBS international student volunteer

Although a range of positive benefits gained through community engagement and volunteering were reported by staff and students (such as increased confidence; developing communication, team working and leadership skills; a sense of fulfilment from making an active and positive contribution; being part of the community), a strong attitudinal trend towards the community engagement activities amongst both staff and students indicated that, in some instances, recognition, or even a reward, was expected by those engaging in such activity. For example, asked about their initial motivation for getting involved, the most common answer from students was that 'it would look good on my CV', though this instrumentalist approach seemed to soften and evolve over time. Some staff volunteers also expected that this activity should help advance their career and professional development, though many did not. Interestingly, most staff and students also appeared to continue to perceive volunteering as an additional activity. It remained secondary, rather than core to, their wider understanding of social responsibility.

The Bridging capital

Engagement: Projects for improving the local neighbourhood. The Lenton Centre (TLC), the Crocus Café, Ecoworks projects

Student engagement with TLC and Ecoworks are projects which were initiated and run jointly by Active Communities and Nottingham University Business School. The Crocus Cafe is a very successful student-led community cafe which has now been running for several years. The participants in these projects were undergraduate business/management studies students.

An important feature of the student volunteering placements organised through AC was that they were offered as an additional option to paid work placements for students, not replacing or competing with it.

Detailed feedback was obtained from one home student and three international student volunteers. The prevailing view from the student's perspective was that volunteering in the local neighbourhood was beneficial as it helped to improve the relationship with the residents of the local area and improve the way the student population was perceived in general. The Lenton Centre (and by association, Crocus Cafe, though this is supported by a range of student activity outside this project) in particular also brought a number of tangible benefits for the wider community living in the area and was actively frequented by them.

Accessibility: The University perceived as an accessible place, especially by young people from lower socio-economic backgrounds; raised aspirations.

The feedback from 5 schools (3 primary, 1 secondary and 1 special school) which took part in the AC Focus Group identified a number of benefits generated through staff and student interactions with primary school pupils. These were not solely related to improving the pupils' literacy and numeracy skills. The Focus Group participants confirmed that there were a number of positive benefits for the pupils who were supported by a University volunteer which extended beyond improving their skills in Maths and English, and attainment in general. The volunteers' support contributed to much more than the academic development of the pupils.

Benefits were reported in areas of social development, providing opportunities for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds to experience encounters with University staff and students. The University is generally seen as 'a special place' by the pupils. These are often children who will not have the opportunity or encouragement to apply to University and who may slip under the Widening Participation radar in terms of supporting people from non-traditional learner backgrounds, as well as perhaps not fitting into the 'gifted and talented' cohort also targeted by the WP programmes. Benefitting from the input of the University's staff and students was seen as crucial to raising the pupil's aspirations and offering something outside their normal range of life opportunities.

E-mentoring was also highly valued, though predominantly aimed at secondary schools at present. Amongst the main benefits reported by the e-mentees were positive motivation, empowerment to make their own decisions and advice and support from someone impartial

and non-judgemental. The annual visits to the University campus and meeting with their university mentors were in some cases a unique opportunity for some young people and this project has had the additional benefit of being non-location specific, so its reach has extended to schools in the North of Nottinghamshire.

Innovation: The University is looking for new ways of engagement with the wider community; The Third Sector research network; schools research and focus groups

Following on from the call from the Office of the Third Sector for the development of a national Third Sector Research Centre at the end of 2007, a group of academics within the University have now agreed to come together periodically to discuss work with the third sector and share best practice. The group has a diverse membership, across a range of discipline. It is as yet in its infancy but has started to create a forum for dialogue and for responding to funding/research calls in this area.

This structure is also beginning to create a space for

Active Communities convened two meetings last year with external Third Sector organisations – one in May and one in September. The first looked at the potential for research partnerships and areas of research need as identified by the sector and was a resounding success, also featuring presentations from key University researchers working in the community or third sector area. 50 people attended the event and feedback was very positive. The second Third sector event focused on student placements, internships and CASE studentships and was again well-attended. The next focus group will look at academic needs and engagement with the University, as well as focusing on mentoring and business development relationships.

The Linking capital

Resources: Access to the University's physical and intellectual resources

The feedback from some local schools and community/voluntary organisations showed that access to the University's physical and intellectual resources can be improved.

Development of a web portal has been suggested as a particularly helpful way forward, facilitating two-way dialogue and information exchange between communities and the University. This might take the form of identifying joint research interests or matching up skills required by community members with internal staff and student expertise.

A focus group held by AC with some of the primary schools identified a number of important 'aspirational' benefits for the pupils, especially those from lower socio-economic backgrounds, as stated above.

For specialist community groups, such as those from BME communities, access to resources was articulated in slightly different ways. They indicated in discussions that they would like mentoring/ skills sharing opportunities for both managers and trustees; appropriate academic courses – flexible, modular, and based on need; and research links, looking at impact and community research methods. There were also comments on the value of bursaries, grants and basic funding support to enable access to courses.

Influence: Long term partnership links between the University and external organisations.

One key overarching driver was a desire by community partners to be involved and consulted in developing the University's community engagement strategy. This was felt to be a vital way of both communicating and ensuring dialogue over the longer-term. This could also be supported by ongoing internal and external network development, outlined above, and the intention to undertake ongoing needs-analysis and focus groups with primary schools, to inform future collaboration and service provision.

Conclusions

There is a need for further research on appropriate measurement indicators. Any future indicators will require a level of sophistication in order to demonstrate mutual benefit in terms of generating social capital between the University, schools and communities. A shift in ethos is required towards engagement, as opposed to outreach, offering the opportunity for longer-term, ongoing dialogue and mutuality rather than short-term interventions. The move away from volunteering per se and towards community engagement and knowledge exchange will help support this shift and will enable sustainable, targeted activity across a wider geography. Schools engagement is a vital part of a wider community engagement strategy and needs to be intimately connected, not separate. In these ways, the University can maximise its impact and create opportunities for real, mutual schools engagement, as well as continuing to work with the wider communities within which schools operate, and by which they -and their pupils - are critically influenced.

References

Barreau, S, Grabbe, Y, Hunt, S, Jelacic, H, Melhish, E, Sammons, P, Siraj-Blatchford, I, Smees, R, Taggart, B '*Final Report from the Primary Phase:Pre-School, School and Family Influences on Children's Development During Key Stage 2 (age 7 to 11)*', DCSF – RB061, November 2008

CENI – Community Evaluation Northern Ireland (2003) *Measuring Up – A Review of Evaluation Practice in the Voluntary and Community Sector*, Belfast, Northern Ireland

Feinstein, L, 'Inequality in the Early Cognitive Development of British Children in the 1970 Cohort' *Economica*, New Series, Vol. 70, No. 277 (Feb., 2003), pp. 73-97, Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The London School of Economics and Political Science and The Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines;Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3548818>

Hart, A; Northmore, S; Gerhardt, C (2008) *Briefing Paper: Auditing, Benchmarking and Evaluating Public Engagement*, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement Watershed Media Centre, 1 Canons Road, Bristol BS1 5TX

Mayer, P (2003) *The Wider Economic Value of Social Capital and Volunteering in South Australia*, A Report by Dr Peter Mayer Politics Department University of Adelaide South Australia, Government of South Australia

McLoughlin, J. and Lewis, R. (2008) *Assessing Students with Special Needs*, 7th Edition, Pearson, London

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton

David Watson's paper – 2009 - 'Universities and civic engagement: a critique and a prospectus' – key note address for the 2nd biennial '*Inside Out*' conference on the civic role of Universities – “Charting Uncertainty – capital, community and citizenship”

Watson, D. (2007) *Managing civic and community engagement*. Maidenhead: Open University Press