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Executive Summary

Background
In partnership with the States of Jersey and Jersey Child Care Trust, and financed by UBS Optimus Foundation, the NCB has been funded to deliver an ambitious three year Early Childhood Development (ECD) Programme from 2016-2019 to build the capacity of the early years sector and to improve outcomes for young children and their families in Jersey. In Phase 1 of the programme the NCB has been engaging with Jersey stakeholders and providing tools, expertise and resources through three strands of programme delivery.

These headline findings are drawn from the main body of the evaluation report for Part 1 of the Evaluation of the Jersey ECD Programme, covering work conducted from April 2016 until December 2017. It should be noted that the ECD Programme has continued to develop since the data collection point in December 2017 which means progress against the recommendations may already have been made.

Headline Findings

The Part 1 evaluation of the ECD Programme has documented evidence to evaluate the impact each of the three strands of the programme has made against the programme aims and its’ identified outcomes, including:

1. Improve planning of services and collaborative working;
2. Improve early childhood development capacity;
3. Increase quality of early learning and childcare.

Reflecting on the Phase 1 evaluation evidence suggests that the three constituent strands of work in the ECD Programme are contributing significantly to the improvement of planning and collaborative working on the Island, with the OBA approach being particularly successful in relation to this aim. This may have been helped by the work already underway in Jersey in initiating the OBA approach which NCB has successfully built upon and accelerated to ensure it was seen as a key priority. The Making it REAL and KMC strands of work are also making good progress in relation to the aim of improving early childhood development capacity in the sector and also within families. However, there is, as yet, little evidence that the ECD Programme has led to an increase in the quality of early learning and childcare in Jersey other than in the settings that have participated in the Making it REAL Programme.

At the end of year 2 we can see clear evidence that all three strands of work that form the ECD Programme are well underway and are making good progress against their KPIs and the desired outcomes for the programme participants.
The evidence presented in this part 1 evaluation report reveals the following headline findings (more detail can be found in Section 3).

1. The ECD Programme is highly relevant to Jersey Policy priorities and vision.
2. There has been efficient delivery of Strand work plans and Programme KPI’s.
3. Positive engagement of target groups has been achieved.
4. Awareness of, and responsiveness to, enabling conditions and barriers is evident.
5. Good progress is being made in securing the ECD Programme Outcomes.

This evidence reveals that as an externally funded and led programme, with a Jersey constituted Steering Group, it has done well to steer a positive path and dispel any anxiety or suspicion about its motives and commitment to the long-term sustainability of services on the island. The climate around the Programme is largely positive, welcoming and acknowledging about the work it has undertaken and what it has achieved. This is a great tribute to the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the Programme.

**Recommendations for the Way Ahead**

The ECD Programme has a set of challenges in its final year if it is to fully achieve its aims and secure the outcomes it desires. The following recommendations are intended to support the development of the Programme in its final year and are presented as a list of 6 headline recommendations for action (more detailed action points for each are found in Section 4).

1. Enhancing Relevance of ECD Programme to Jersey Policy Priorities and Vision with More Active Engagement of Programme Steering Group with Emerging States Policy Agenda
2. Securing ECD Programme Sustainability by Seeking Additional Funding, Enhancing Links to States and EYCP Plans and Offering System Leadership Training and Support to OBA and REAL Champions
3. Greater Engagement of Target Groups
4. Further Embedding OBA Approach, particularly at Senior Lead and Front-Line Service Delivery Level
5. Widening and Strengthening Impact Data for Making it Real Programme, (to include Communication and Language Development, and Mathematical Development) Using More Rigorous Assessment Instruments
6. Encouraging Action Projects Linked to KMC Seminars to Secure Impact on Practice
Part One: ECD Programme Background and Evaluation Methodology

1. Introduction

1.1 ECD Programme Background
In partnership with the States of Jersey and Jersey Child Care Trust, and financed by UBS Optimus Foundation UK, the NCB has been funded to deliver an ambitious three-year programme from 2016-2019 to build the capacity of the early years sector and to improve outcomes for young children and their families in Jersey.

ECD Programme Aims
The ECD programme has three key aims:
1. Improve planning of services and collaborative working through the use of OBA;
2. Improve early childhood development capacity;
3. Increase the quality of early learning and childcare.

ECD Programme Delivery Strands
In Phase 1 of the programme the NCB has been engaging with Jersey stakeholders and providing tools, expertise and resources through three strands of programme delivery:
1. Developing an Early Years Outcomes Framework: developing an island-wide framework which identifies priority outcomes for improving the well-being of young children and families, with statistical indicator data to measure the extent to which the outcomes are being achieved and developing action plans to promote these outcomes through training and capacity building support to stakeholders in using the Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA) approach.
2. Making it REAL (Raising Early Achievement in Literacy): offering training and projects (literacy and math) to enable practitioners to reach out to parents and families, building their confidence and knowledge to support early home learning, with the aim of impacting on children’s outcomes and on family literacy practice.
3. Knowledge Makes Change: improving the knowledge of ‘what works’ to ensure the best possible outcomes for young children and families through a seminar series from leading experts on a range of early years topics, providing inspiration and ideas, as well as an opportunity for practitioners to build contacts and share good practice with one another. Monthly Knowledge Makes Changes newsletters also support the knowledge transfer process, profiling the latest research and practice from the UK along with International contexts.

In Year 3 of the programme (2018/19) there will be development of new strands of work, including the extension of REAL to include parent volunteers and further work to embed OBA across Jersey in a sustainable way.
**ECD Programme Target Outcomes**

The ECD Programme has six quantifiable outcomes to achieve by the end of the three-year programme delivery:

1. Early years settings and health practitioners have increased knowledge of how to support young children’s development.
2. Making it REAL project parents have increased knowledge and confidence to support young children’s early learning and literacy development.
3. Making it REAL project children show improvement in early literacy.
4. Policy makers and practitioners have improved understanding of outcomes-based approach and work more collaboratively across agencies.
5. Improvement in school readiness, particularly in early literacy for Making it REAL children.
6. Increased number of families from Polish and Portuguese speaking communities engaged with early years services before school.

The ECD Programme evaluation also set out to address the following five qualitative process questions:

1. How successful has the programme been in reaching and engaging key stakeholders across each strand of work?
2. How has the local context of Jersey influenced this impact?
3. What (if any) have been the key barriers and enablers to the achievement of the programme through each strand? How could these barriers be overcome?
4. How does the programme contribute to the Early Years and Childhood Partnership’s vision for ‘Jersey to be the best place for all children to grow up’ and other island wide policies and plans?
5. What might be next steps for key stakeholders in Jersey in terms of sustaining each programme strand of activity beyond the life of the programme?

### 1.2 Scope of Evaluation

As part of its commitment, UBS Optimus commissioned the Centre for Research in Early Childhood (CREC) to undertake Part 1 of a two-part evaluation of the progress made by the ECD Development Programme in achieving its target outcomes and addressing the Programme process questions in order to inform future planning and implementation. This report presents the findings of the Part 1 evaluation.

The aims of Part 1 of this quantitative and qualitative evaluation were to:

1. Assess the impact of the first two years of the programme which will end 31st March 2018;
2. Use this evaluation evidence to inform development for the remaining year/s of delivery.

Part 2 of the evaluation will aim to provide evidence to assess the success and impact of the entire programme.
2. Evaluation Methodology

2.1 Evaluation Focus
The evaluation was designed to explore how far the three strands of the ECD Programme had made progress in meeting the six quantifiable outcomes set out above and also to gather evidence on the five qualitative questions about the Programme implementation process, with a particular focus in Part 1 of the evaluation on outcomes 1, 2 and 4.

2.2 Methodological Approach and Design
The proposed evaluation design and methodology gathered a range of quantitative and qualitative information to address the evaluation brief. Data gathering was through a multi-method approach employing four research strategies including:

- Desk based analysis of existing monitoring data sets and reports;
- Focus groups with a purposeful sample of delivery partners, practitioners and parents/carers;
- Interviews (telephone or face to face) with representatives of the States of Jersey and Jersey Child Care Trust and Jersey delivery partners;
- Reflective discussions with NCB Programme team.

CREC worked closely with NCB to gain access to the required data and key stakeholders. These methods generated a complex and wide-ranging set of quantitative and qualitative data which has been rigorously analysed and systematically assessed against the six programme outcomes and five evaluation questions, providing an evaluative base line by which further progress towards the three key programme aims (see above) can be evaluated as the ECD Programme develops. To analyse the evaluation data we used two innovative methodological frameworks:

1: Benchmark Assessment Framework of Early Childhood Programmes
The first instrument is a Benchmark Assessment Framework of Early Childhood Programmes that facilitates an assessment of programme provision against a set of delivery outcomes. These outcomes encompass the six quantifiable programme outcomes as detailed above. The overall assessment in each outcome area will help policy makers and others understand existing resource gaps and where efforts might best be directed to drive improvement in the development and delivery of services for Jersey’s children and families. The quantitative and qualitative data needed to complete the framework assessment was gathered through a desk-based analysis of existing data sources and a series of focus groups and interviews. The results of this analysis are provided in Appendix 1.

2: Strand Case Study Framework
The second instrument is the Strand Case Study Framework which tracks the success and impact of each of the three programme strands (as detailed above) as they have progressed over the first year of the programme. These pathways map out the development journey of the three strands, identifying any gaps or issues in delivery and reach, exploring its impact and providing front line evidence of the adeptness of the strand to meet its objectives, thus illuminating the current capacity of the programme to deliver best practice to enable Jersey’s services to respond effectively to need. Qualitative and quantitative data were gathered for the strand case studies.
using focus groups and interviews with a range of stakeholders involved in each of the three programme strands and through detailed analysis of existing data sets and reports. The three completed Case Studies are set out in full in Appendix 2.

**Evaluation Methods**

To populate the data sets in each of the above two frameworks data was collected using:

**Documentary Analysis:** An analysis of existing NCB data for each strand of work, including monitoring data, children’s progress data, data analysis reports and recommendation reports.

**Focus Groups:** Two focus groups;
- One group of Making it REAL Champions and Practitioners;
- One group of Making it REAL Parents.

These focus groups were used to evaluate and obtain qualitative data primarily on the Making it REAL strand of work as well as the Knowledge Makes Change (KMC) strand.

**Interviews:** A series of nine interviews with key stakeholder leaders, including all eight members of the Project Steering Group as well as the Head of Health Improvement. These interviews (either face-to-face or via telephone) covered a set of semi-structured questions aiming to gather perceptions and evidence on performance of the strands against the six outcomes and five evaluation questions.

**Reflective Discussions:** A series of reflective conversations with the NCB Programme team.

**Research Participants**

Key stakeholders involved as participants in the evaluation included representatives of departments for the Chief Minister, Community and Constitutional Affairs and States Statistic Unit, representatives from a broad range of the children’s workforce who have participated in training, seminars, meetings and workshops, staff from NCB Programme team and the Jersey based delivery partners. Evaluation of Making it REAL also included REAL Champions, practitioners and families. Their participation and role in the evaluation process is set out above. We worked with NCB to obtain contact details for all required participants in accordance with the programme and NCB’s data protection and safeguarding standards.

**2.3 Ethical Protocols**

All CREC’s work is underpinned by strong ethical principles relating to the dignity and safety of participants and which is constructed round the following set of principles to ensure all actions should:
- Be done with, not to, participants;
- Be open and honest, and secure informed consent;
- Be collaborative and inclusive;
- Be empowering and developmental;
- Have utility;
- Be respectful;
- Protect all participants from harm;
• Keep confidentiality and anonymity;
• Provide feedback.

All participants in this evaluation provided their informed consent which guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity. Data was kept securely for the duration of the project in line with CREC’s data protection and security policy. We worked with the NCB team to raise awareness of the evaluation work being conducted with relevant partners and provide information for an information sheet which was distributed to relevant staff and partners, to ensure that there was awareness and understanding of the evaluation, its purpose and timescales. CREC believes that through this ethical approach we were able ensure the highest level of quality and integrity in the evaluation activity.
Part Two: Evidence and Analysis

3. Evaluation Findings

3.1 Early Childhood Development (ECD) Programme Context

3.1.1 Jersey Context
The evidence presented in this section comes from primary and secondary sources, including widely available published material, information drawn from island data bases, documents provided by participants and interview data.

Island Location and Political Structure
Jersey sits in the Bay of St Malo, 19 miles (or 30.5 km) from the French coast and 85 miles (137 km) south of the English coast. Jersey is the biggest of the Channel Islands. Jersey is only 5 miles (8 km) long and 9 miles (14.5 km) wide and is made up of 12 parishes. English is the main language spoken in Jersey. Other languages include Portuguese, Polish and Jèrriais (the Jersey language).

The States of Jersey (French: États de Jersey) is a parliamentary democracy that is a British Crown dependency. The States of Jersey refers to both the island’s executive and its administration, the public sector. The island’s parliament is called the States Assembly. The public sector is divided into 10 departments, each of which has a Minister. The departments deal with different aspects of island life, and include - Health, Treasury, Infrastructure, Social Security, Home Affairs, Education, Economic Development and Environment. The Assembly passes and amends laws and regulations; approves the annual budget and taxation; appoints and removes the Chief Minister, Ministers, presidents and members of committees; and debates matters proposed by the Council of Ministers, by Ministers or by individual members.

Jersey Population
Jersey’s resident population at the end of 2016 was estimated as 104,200. The latest report from gov.je shows that the Jersey resident population increased by 1500 people during 2016, with inward migration accounting for 1300 of this increase. From the 1970’s-1990’s most other Europeans arriving in Jersey were from Portugal/Madeira but in recent years there has been a notable change, with the proportion of arrivals from Portugal/Madeira falling and from Poland and Romania increasing. The new arrivals bring with them challenges around language and translation. Around 13% of people are non-locally qualified ie have not been resident for five years, which means they have no access to housing qualifications, health services or social support. These residents are also living away from their own extended family network. Some of the recently arrived families and children therefore go ‘under the radar’, with many young children having no development checks with a Health Visitor and are not registered with a GP.
Child and Family Demographics
There is a lack of data on child and family demographics in Jersey which was noted in recent reports and the evaluation evidence. We can say that currently in Jersey there is an average of 1,000 births per year and so approximately there are about 5,000 children under the age of five on the Island. However, this is the only profile information available and the NCB’s audit of data identified a lack of disaggregated data on young children. For example there are no published statistics on ethnicity or special educational needs and the NCB has recommended that processes be put in place to make this data available. See link to NCB webpages that have this information in the various project outputs https://www.ncb.org.uk/what-we-do/our-priorities/early-years/projects-programmes/our-work-jersey

Economy
Jersey’s economy is based largely on international financial services, agriculture and tourism. Other sectors include construction, retail and telecommunications. In 2016, the financial services sector accounted for about 41% of the island’s output. Light taxes and death duties make the island a popular offshore financial centre. Tourism also accounts for a significant portion of Jersey’s economy, with more than 700,000 total visitors in 2015. Living standards for most residents come close to those of the UK. In 2008 Jersey’s gross national income per capita was among the highest in the world. However, since the global economic downturn in 2008, the total Gross Value Added (GVA) of Jersey’s economy has decreased by a sixth (16%) in real terms. Over this period, the GVA of the Finance sector has decreased by a third (33%) in real terms, whilst that of the non-finance sectors, overall, has decreased by 5%.

Despite the relative wealth on the island, respondents pointed out that the economic situation for the significant minority group of non-qualified residents contrasts with other Jersey residents. They experience a high level of social inequality which is a major policy and service delivery challenge. Jersey is a very expensive place to live and although wages on the island can be good, many residents are on middle or low wages. Data reveals that income inequality has increased since 2009/10, with the distribution of household income becoming more unequal, particularly after housing costs are included. The average household income (after housing costs) of those in the lowest quintile has decreased by a sixth (17%) in nominal terms over the last five years. The decrease in household incomes for certain groups is driven by a reduction in employment income, particularly for those aged under 40 years and those in non-qualified accommodation, and an increase in housing costs for those in rental accommodation (particularly qualified and social renters). The supply of social housing is also very short, with an increasing number of low income families living in multi-occupancy housing. In such circumstances there has been a rise in domestic violence, substance and alcohol abuse which creates issues around child protection. As a respondent stated:

INT 2: There are key challenges for us. The wide range of incomes mean Jersey is a very unequal society with a high number (80%) of working mums so there is a great need for childcare which is affordable and flexible. Home visiting is difficult, and health is not free. There is a five-year residency requirement for eligibility of services for vulnerable families, and language barriers, we need to recruit more practitioners from migrant backgrounds.
While incomes can be low, it was reported that the rate of employment in Jersey is high, with a high rate of working women and families with two working parents, many of whom work long hours, and this impacts sharply on family life.

**Availability of ECEC Services**

Rights to maternity leave on the island are minimal, with only two weeks paid and twelve weeks unpaid leave, so many young babies are being cared for from six weeks old. The NCB audit of services in 2016 revealed there are a number of private, state and mixed funded programmes available for families which target a range of areas of child development, including Physical Development-24 programmes; Social/Emotional Development-26 programmes; Cognitive Development-10 programmes; Parent Capacity-20 programmes; Childcare Providers-11 programmes. Although there is a fairly good spread of home-based care (childminders and nannies) there is a need for more recruitment and costs are high relative to wages. Jersey also has a day care sector for 0 - 12 year olds offering out of school care but again accessing this care is not cheap. The NCB audit of services also identified 53 existing state / private sector funded services and programmes working to meets the needs of these young children and their families. Recent policy initiatives are beginning to address the need for more access to affordable services, with 23 ‘free’ early education hours, the Jersey ‘Premium Children’ programme, greater access to early years places and the development of some integrated Children’s Centres but it is acknowledged that creating services with viable business plans is hardest in areas of greatest need.

**ECEC Strategic Planning**

Respondents acknowledged that historically Jersey has lacked a culture of strategic planning, accountability and performance management in its public services, with a lack of clarity about goals. As one respondent stated:

**INT 5:** Key challenges are embedding strategic planning and a performance system in Jersey. We need clarity about achievement and then to start measuring ourselves against this. This needs to be comprehensive and provide outcomes across communities in Jersey and internationally. We need agreement on what we want to achieve and how to get there.

There was wide acknowledgement amongst respondents that the island lacks population level statistical data about children and family well-being, with no equivalence of an Office for National Statistics (ONS) and no central children’s data system. This meant that in the early stages of the ECD Programme a lot of work has had to go into preparing the ground for an outcomes approach (OBA) to strategic planning which is a central element of the ECD Programme. A major piece of early work for the ECD Programme focused on developing the outcomes framework for children and families, and this involved meeting with all the lead statisticians on the island to inform them of the project and explore what data they had. It remains the case that currently, obtaining accurate, comprehensive children’s data at population level which can be used for strategic planning and performance management is a real challenge.

**INT 2:** There is also a need to ensure quality of provision is benchmarked with international standards. The island needs to step up its data collection as it has not used data well to focus
development. There is a need to build in systems of accountability with moderation processes. The ECD Programme is making a shift in this direction.

There is also no information source for parents, to help them with choices or an OfSTED equivalent to help judge quality. However, several respondents felt that this situation was improving. As one respondent stated:

**INT 4:** Social policy data is immature in Jersey but improving. A reform agenda existed before the ECD Programme. The ECD OBA programme has highlighted and contributed to this development further. The language and performance metrics existed in health but we need to shift this across several departments. Child data was also there at a macro level but not micro data which helps explain and explore narratives. We have had score cards and have been using the language register of OBA before as it helps to simplify the picture and helps collaborative working eg in criminality, Home Affairs, giving population metrics for initiatives. The methodology should have an impact on long term strategy and the language speaks to policy makers but how this speaks to grassroots and can be used in performance management is more difficult to see.

It was pointed out by several respondents that introducing Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA) to Jersey was underway before the ECD Programme started, and this was stimulated by the attendance of key Jersey officers to an OBA international conference run by the NCB in Belfast. Since this conference the reach of OBA has extended beyond early years, including the Departments of Home Affairs and Health. However, there was an acknowledgement that silos still exist with each department continuing to have its own ways of doing things but it was felt that the ECD Programme had made a significant contribution to shifting and enhancing thinking around the vision for children and families in Jersey and consequent policy priorities.

The urgency and priorities of this wider change agenda, and the identified direction of travel for all public services on the island, was reflected in the evidence from several respondents:

**INT 5:** There have been some key developments and massive data collection eg Charlie Parker’s policy team and the ‘Future Jersey’ initiative working on the Jersey Indicator set. We have also developed a REAL Score Card so a corporate-wide system is developing through the OBA approach. 70+ people have been trained on OBA so I am confident the approach will stick. We can see the development of a common language, collaborative working and data development. We are developing headline indicators at level 3 for Future Jersey which includes Ready for School (school readiness), Health, Breastfeeding, Obesity, Wellbeing. This work feeds into the ECD Programme and vice versa, bits of NCB work have fed into this work. These Jersey specific headlines need to be in place within three years and we still have work to do on this to create the strategic plan with an evidence base.
History of ECD Programme

To understand the journey of the ECD Programme and its current status in relation to the wider policy agenda on the island, it is helpful to summarise the history and source of the Programme. The NCB had been delivering training to early childhood practitioners in Jersey for some years prior to the ECD Programme. Making it REAL had been of interest to settings in Jersey since 2014, building on delivery since 2009 of PEAL (Parents, Early Years and Learning) which supported working with parents. As Joyce Connor, the director of the NCB Early Childhood Unit, who led the work at the time, states:

Making it REAL has been of interest to settings in Jersey since 2014. Delivery of Making it REAL built upon the initial enthusiasm following delivery of PEAL (Parents, Early Years and Learning) which develops practitioners to work in partnership with parents to support children’s early learning. PEAL was rolled out from 2009.

The relationships built during the PEAL delivery enabled further support to settings. On 1st April 2014, eleven practitioners from ten settings were trained in Making it REAL. Follow up with these settings enabled us to identify potential settings and practitioners who would champion the approach and this informed the delivery plan for the new project, especially in the selection of the first cohorts selected for the project, and in communication and engagement in the set up meetings.

Delivery of these early REAL programmes in Jersey in this period had been on a small scale and commissioned as such, so the introduction of the ECD Programme in 2015 provided an ideal time to scale up the approach, to deliver it as a programme and evaluate the impact.

In 2014, Optimus (founded by UBS) had also commissioned Professor Philip Wilson and Dr Louise Marryat to examine opportunities for enhancing early childhood development. The report uncovered a range of issues including a lack of population and development data on children and families. The report recommendations included improving current service provision and access, securing better data collection and setting up robust evaluation systems for new services. In response to the recommendations, in late 2015 the Optimus Foundation appointed the NCB as the partner to develop a three-year strategy (2016-2019) for improving early childhood developmental outcomes across Jersey. NCB’s strategy has five key elements:

2. Securing the support of the States of Jersey Government for the Project.
3. Implementation of evidence-based approaches to improve the quality of early years settings and service provision (including extending the Making it REAL project).
4. High quality partnership working across the services and key organisations for early years improving communication and collaboration.
5. Up to date knowledge of ‘what works’, accessible to practitioners and parents and based on a belief that knowledge makes change, improving Early Childhood Development (ECD) capacity.

A key element of the ECD Programme involves supporting decision-makers in Jersey to use the Outcomes Based Accountability approach in relation to developing its children’s services, therefore taking a data and evidenced informed approach to collaborative decision-making in the planning and delivery of services to enable sustained improvements in children’s and young people’s lives. The ECD Programme is supported by the ECD Jersey Programme Steering Group.

It is also useful to note that Jersey has two relevant strategic documents which are relevant to this evaluation:

1. **Children and Young People: A Strategic Framework for Jersey (Nov 2011):** which sets out what is to be achieved for children and young people under six outcomes.

2. **1001 Critical Days Manifesto (Jan 2015):** which lays the foundation to give every child in Jersey the best start in life.

On a small island like Jersey understanding this history is important to inform how the work of the ECD Programme might become embedded and future proofed. With the appointment of a new Chief Executive, a significant change process is underway on the island and the success and long-term impact of the externally generated, led and funded ECD Programme will need to navigate alongside and within this wider programme of change if it is to succeed in its aims. The need to embed the programme, develop its connectivity with other Jersey-led early childhood initiatives, and encourage local ‘ownership’ of the various strands of work is an urgent challenge for the next phase of work. This agenda was acknowledged by a number of respondents:

**INT1:** Capacity-building is needed as the work is not yet sustainable, it needs to move to an approach of building it WITH you not doing it TO you.

**INT 2:** It takes time for wider trust to develop and the local Partnership to take ownership. They were wary at first, so we needed time to develop this trust, we were wary of where the initiative came from and who these external people and organisations were. Now it is time for us to develop our own island and sector-wide work.
In Summary

Progress to Date:

- Key policy priorities in Jersey are housing, social care and child protection, with better data collection and use in service planning, delivery and performance management underpinning all public service policy. The ECD Programme is feeding into this policy agenda in Jersey.
- A culture shift is underway to ensure better cooperation, more accountability and a transparent system of performance management across the public service agenda, including early childhood. The ECD Programme through its OBA work has influenced and fed into this wider culture shift.
- Key aspects of Jersey life that appear to affect less advantaged families with young children in Jersey are low income, poor and multi-occupancy housing, long working hours, lack of health and social care cover, high childcare costs, relatively high levels of domestic violence, drug and alcohol misuse, lack of English. The ECD Programme is contributing to the development of ECEC services that address these needs.
- Key needs of parents with children under the age of five in Jersey are access to social housing, health and social care, affordable childcare and early education, and parenting support. These needs are helping to shape the ECD Programme.
- Key targeted (neediest) families with children under the age of five are those working families on low incomes, those in multi-occupancy housing, and those at risk of domestic violence or drug/alcohol misuse. These families are key targets in the ECD Programme.
- Identified key outcomes for children from high need families are health and well-being, communication and language, early literacy, social and emotional development (school readiness). These child outcomes are being addressed in the three strands of the ECD Programme.

Recommendations for the Future:

- The ECD Programme needs to continue to take account of the above priorities in Jersey’s wider developing public service policy agenda to secure its sustainability and longer-term impact.
- The targeted outcomes for children and families set out in the above public policy statements should continue to be considered when developing the ECD Programme OBA framework.
- The ECD Programme should work to embed itself in the developing agendas and emerging priorities of the new Chief Executive over the next 12 months.
3.2 ECD Programme Strand Descriptions, Aims and Work Plans

The ECD Programme has three major strands of work, and the aims, activities, engagement and progress made against the KPI’s for each strand is described and evaluated below.

3.2.1 Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA) Strand

As part of the ECD Programme, NCB are supporting the development of an outcomes framework for Jersey, co-produced with key stakeholders. OBA is an evidence-based methodology for enabling change through a continued focus on outcomes. It begins with ‘ends’ i.e the outcomes which stakeholders would like to achieve, and it helps to make a clear distinction between two levels of accountability:

1. *Population accountability:* These are the outcomes or conditions of well-being that we want for citizens or communities. These outcomes are population outcomes as they refer to whole populations of a district or country. These outcomes will be quite broad and multi-faceted in nature, and cannot be achieved by a single organisation, service or programme working in isolation, but takes concerted action from many organisations, services and programmes and requires effective partnership working across key stakeholders.

2. *Performance accountability:* This relates to how well particular services or programmes perform. Each programme would have a set of performance measures which would relate to whether programme participants are any better off as a result of participating in the programme.

In summary, OBA aims to provide a clear link between how any service actions might lead to enhanced outcomes through:

1. Creating a common language;
2. Bringing together stakeholders for a common purpose;

OBA Strategy and Work Plan

There have been a range of strategies to take the OBA strand forward in the first two years of the ECD Programme including:

1. **Initial Meetings:** The first stage of work was a series of interviews with lead statisticians in each government department to assess what data currently exists on children and families.

2. **Introductory Workshops:** A series of introductory workshops have been delivered to introduce the basic concepts and principles of OBA. The workshops have been delivered five times (up to Sept 16) to secure stakeholder participation and to ensure local ownership and sustainability of the approach.

3. **Audit of Available Data:** An audit of existing data has been conducted for children aged 0-18 in Jersey, to specifically look at indicator data for children 0-5 to identify what statistical evidence exists to understand the extent of young children’s well-being in Jersey and identify gaps.

4. **Audit of Early Years Services:** An audit of early years services (conception to age 5) currently being delivered has been conducted to inform the discussions and to understand what services currently exists for 0-5s on the Island and identify gaps.

5. **Development of OBA Outcomes Framework and Indicators:** Work has been undertaken to develop an OBA Outcomes Framework and set of indicators for
The overall purpose of the Framework is to improve the lives of young children and their families growing up in Jersey. To do so, the Framework aims to: 1. Support a coordinated approach by States of Jersey departments, statutory, community and voluntary sector agencies, in service planning and delivery as they work to support children and families in the early years; 2. Help focus resources on activities that have been shown to have a positive impact on children and families; 3. Enable agencies to monitor progress and strengthen transparency and accountability in their work and the work of others; and 4. Inform actions taken to continue to improve services, ensuring the best possible services for children and families.

6. **Turning the Curve Workshops:** Two sets of Turning the Curve workshops with a wide range of stakeholders have been delivered. The aim of the workshops was to introduce people to the Turning the Curve process and its role in embedding OBA in strategic planning. The workshops used some of the health indicators which were prioritised by the Steering Group (Dec 16; Jan 17).

7. **OBA Intensive capacity building training:** Capacity building training to develop OBA Champions and strengthen stakeholder engagement has been undertaken to enable stakeholders to begin using OBA in the planning and delivery of children’s services. The first round was with those stakeholders leading on writing the new Children’s Plan in Jersey.

**Target Groups and Engagement**

The OBA work plan set out to reach key stakeholders from across a variety of different contexts in the Jersey early years community at strategic and operational level to engage them in discussions and actions about how to define and continually improve outcomes. The evaluation evidence set out to document who are the key target groups for the OBA programme; how successful the programme has been in reaching the target groups; and whether the coverage has been comprehensive and well distributed.

The monitoring evidence for the OBA strand reveals that this programme has been successful in achieving strong engagement from a range of stakeholders at both strategic and operational levels. The programme KPI target was to hold four workshops and reach 80 beneficiaries at this point in the work plan. In fact, this KPI target has been substantially met, as reflected in the data below.

- Four OBA workshops delivered;
- 77 attendees (representing statutory and voluntary/community organisations);
- Six workshops delivered on Health indicators and one closed workshop on child development indicators;
- 90.4% said the workshops met expectations; 96.2% said workshops were pitched at the right level and 76.9% would recommend the course to others;
- Produced data analysis report, mapping of services, health indicator reports and initial discussions on child development indicators.
3.2.2 Making it Real Strand

Making it REAL gives families ideas and practical ways to support children’s early literacy development, focusing on everyday opportunities at home as well as when families are out and about. REAL enables children and their families to explore key strands of literacy – books, early writing, environmental print and oral language and is underpinned by the ORIM framework. ORIM stands for: Opportunities; Recognition; Interaction; and Model. It is based on the idea developed by Cathy Nutbrown and Peter Hannon¹ that these are the four ways in which parents help their children’s learning.

REAL aims to:
- Engage parents in their children’s early literacy development;
- Build parent’s confidence and knowledge to support early home learning;
- Impact on children’s outcomes and family literacy practice.

Making it REAL Strategy and Work Plan

The aim of this work plan was to provide a replicable, scalable model of the Making it REAL approach and embed it in Jersey through two strands of work 1. Focused development projects involving all early years settings, delivering a prescribed programme phased over a two-year period (17 state settings and 28 private and voluntary settings). 2. A smaller number of settings in year two to commence A REAL approach to early maths, (approx. 20 settings), depending on readiness and capacity to take on additional training. The intention also was to devise an implementation plan for the period beyond the project funding and support four key practitioners (REAL Champions) to become familiar with the training so that Jersey can continue the roll out of A REAL approach to early maths and Making it REAL.

In December 2015 the NCB started the Making it REAL scale-up by working with the 15 settings that had already received training (see history). This cohort were engaged in the design of how to extend Making it REAL in Jersey in order to optimise their interest to generate local examples and case studies, inspiring other local practitioners and providing rich material for the Knowledge Makes Change dissemination. It was intended that this cohort of practitioners would take the delivery of Making it REAL to three families per setting, working with families and influencing the home learning environment. In summary, there have been a range of strategies to take the Making it REAL strand forward including:

**REAL Training**: A series of funded 2-day training programmes has been delivered to early years practitioners.

**REAL Projects**: Trained practitioners are provided with a bursary of £300 to support resourcing for activities. The project includes a minimum of two home visits per child and at least 3 literacy events, and submission of monitoring information which demonstrates they have enrolled a minimum of three targeted children and ten additional children and recruited and supported at least one volunteer. The local projects are also offered leadership and support through project support network meetings.

**REAL Home Visits**: A series of home visits to families have been completed.

**REAL Literacy Events**: A series of literacy events for families have been offered.

REAL Champion Training: Training for six REAL Champions to support REAL training and projects across Jersey and contribute to the delivery of other training courses for practitioners on the island has been completed.

Dissemination Activities: REAL Champions shared their experience of delivering the REAL programme at the second KMC seminar; provision of REAL Literacy leaflets for parents; and publication of a set of eight practice examples launched at Festival of Words island-wide event.

Maths REAL training: A one day extension training for REAL practitioners to support families in early mathematics and enable families to support early learning in a more holistic way;

Further Training: Offered for REAL Champions, training and briefing for other agencies, students from Highland College and REAL parents recruited to participate in parent volunteer workshops.

Target Groups and Engagement

The evaluation evidence set out to document who are the key target groups for the Making it REAL programme of work; how successful the programme has been in reaching the target groups; and whether the coverage has been comprehensive and well distributed. Making it REAL targets early years practitioners, parents, children and their siblings and wider family members. During the period April 2016 - March 2017 practitioners from a wide range of early years settings received the two-day training and engaged families in REAL home visits and literacy events as part of the ECD Programme. 6 REAL Champions additionally received a one-day training to support programme delivery and contribute to other training on the island.

The monitoring evidence for the Making it REAL strand reveals that this programme has been successful in achieving strong engagement. The KPIs for the first 12-18 months of the programme were:

- Min 60 REAL practitioners trained in early years settings
- 4 REAL Champions trained
- 47 settings engaged
- 135 individual children and 45 siblings or other children directly benefit (180 children total)
- 135 parents directly benefit
- 900 family members indirectly benefit eg other children and parents or carers via events

The Making it REAL Report Card for 2016/17 reveals that this strand has made good progress in reaching and engaging its target groups and reaching its end of Programme KPI’s in respect of this strand of work and has also had some success with engaging parents from Portuguese and Polish speaking communities, as shown in the evidence below.

Training: Making it REAL training has been delivered to 59 practitioners and 6 champions.

Quality of training: 100% of those trained stated it was either Excellent (88%) or Very Good (12%). 54 (of 59) rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge to support children with early literacy; 58 (of 59) rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge of engaging with parents to support child’s learning; 43 (of 58 rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge of engaging with bilingual families to support child’s learning;
40 (of 59) rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge of early identification of need and referral onwards.

**Delivery:** The Making it REAL programme has been offered to 47 settings; take up was 34. Within the settings that took up REAL, 124 families participated, 30 of which received home visits.

**Ongoing support:** 29% of those trained attended at least 2 network meetings.

**Reach of programme:** 72% of Early Years settings are delivering REAL (47 settings); 24% of children engaged in REAL home visits.

**Engagement:** 39% of children in Early Years settings across Jersey attended literacy events; 32% of eligible families attended literacy events; 84% speak English as their first language at home.

**Literacy events:** Literacy events have been held in 28 settings and attended by 735 (39%) children; and 611 (32%) parents. 31% of sample of participants were from bilingual families including Polish and Portuguese.

The interview and focus groups provide further evidence of a high level of engagement by practitioners and parents in the REAL programme across the island, and the success in engaging targeted families from Portuguese and Polish speaking communities is revealed in the respondent comment below:

**INT 6:** Parents attending the parental programme session are mostly Portuguese (currently 2), Polish (1), Irish (1), with relatively fewer self-identifying as ‘Islanders’. For the Portuguese parent, culturally, there was a lack of ‘educative interactions’ at home, especially literacy activities together.

### 3.2.3 Knowledge Makes Change Strand

The Knowledge Makes Change (KMC) strand of work aims to establish an effective model for improving knowledge of ‘what works’ in terms of early childhood development. The programme forms an integral part of a sustainable model for capacity building and continuous quality improvement in early childhood development in Jersey.

**KMC aims** are:

- To be an effective dissemination mechanism for local, national and international evidence-based research and practice to empower children’s workforce and pass on their child development and early learning messages to parents;
- To build on existing practice and provide a catalyst for inspiring continuous quality improvement and capacity building;
- To provide a platform for sharing learning across Jersey;
- To be informed by and easily accessible to the children’s workforce in Jersey.

**KMC objectives** are:

- To provide information about early years developments in Jersey;
- To provide up to date research and practice;
- To encourage dissemination of learning.

### KMC Strategy and Work Plan

There have been a range of strategies to take the KMC strand forward including:

1. **A series of 4 Seminars:** (over first 2 years of the project) Seminar 1: focus on what matters most for early years. Seminar 2: focus on language development.
Seminar 3: focus on home visiting to support children’s health, well-being and early development. Seminar 4: focus on supporting bilingual families

2. **Regular e-Newsletters and Newsflash Updates:** Published monthly to provide a balance of Jersey/international context. They are also a channel for supporting recruitment and engagement in REAL/OBA/KMC seminars.

**Target Groups and Engagement**

The evaluation evidence set out to document who are the key target groups for the KMC programme of work; how successful the programme has been in reaching the target groups; and whether the coverage has been comprehensive and well distributed. Key target audiences for this strand are:

- Children’s workforce multi-agency representatives including schools, speech and language, early years, health, family, social care and SENCOs;
- Parents;
- Policy makers, strategic leads and partner representatives from other departments.

The monitoring evidence for the KMC strand of work reveals that this programme has been successful in achieving strong engagement from a range of stakeholders at both strategic and operational levels. The programme KPI target was to hold four workshops/seminars and reach on average 80 beneficiaries and the evidence reveals that this KPI target has been substantially met, as reflected in the data below. The KPI target was for the seminars and newsletters to reach a total of 340 policy makers and practitioners at this stage in the ECD Programme.

**Seminars:**

- Seminar 1: 79 attendees; 98% rated seminar excellent or good
- Seminar 2: 72 attendees; 98% rated seminar excellent or good
- Seminar 3: 63 attendees; 94% rated seminar excellent or good

**Newsletters:**

- Monthly newsletter delivered with 616 recipients on mailing list, including early years, education, health and social care practitioners and strategic leaders.
In Summary

Progress to Date:
- All three strands of work are making timely progress towards achieving their KPIs by the end of the Programme and some aspects of the work in the OBA, Making it REAL and KMC strands of work have already exceeded some of their end of programme KPIs.
- Reach to the target groups for each strand of work has been largely achieved.
- The quality of training offered in all three strands of work has been rated very high and well received by delegates.

Recommendations for Future:
- More focused work to engage Portuguese and Polish speaking communities within the Making it REAL Programme would enable better reach to these targeted communities eg by exploring more flexible timing of sessions.
- Further consideration of the target groups for all three strands of work should take place eg a wider group of stakeholders for OBA training; more engagement of students in KMC seminars.

3.3 Process Evidence
The evaluation brief provided five key questions to explore in evaluating the progress of the ECD programme in implementing its work plans, the effectiveness of the process and its success in achieving its agreed objectives. The evidence for each of these five aspects of programme delivery in respect of the relevant strand of work is set out in the sections below.

3.3.1 How successful has the programme been in reaching and engaging key stakeholders across each strand of work?
All three strands of the ECD Programme had to reach and engage stakeholders at three levels in the system:
1. Strategic: senior and middle leadership in government departments and non-governmental programmes;
2. Operational: front line practitioners and service providers;
3. Client: recipients of services, including parents, children and extended families.
The Programme also had to reach across departmental, professional discipline and organisational boundaries to encourage dialogue, partnership working and collaborative action, including Education, Health, Social Security, Home Affairs departments. The intention was to bring together all parties to work collectively to address the major and shared challenges relating to children and families faced by the States of Jersey (as outlined earlier) to ensure all children and families can thrive and service quality can develop. As respondents stated:

INT1: Our priorities are the development of more services for parents, a one stop shop for families so that all young children can access services and all parents have support in parenting. We want to see all children thrive across
the board whatever their circumstances. The challenges for parents are for us to enable their earning capacity, health and good parenting.

**INT 2:** There is a need to empower practitioners to know what quality looks like, across sectors. We need collaboration on requirements and compliance to get beyond minimal standards and be aspirational. There is a need for the PVI sector especially towards a cultural shift of aspiring past the threshold of quality and being more professionally reflective.

To achieve the ambitious goals of the ECD Programme requires each of the three strands of the programme to reach and engage key stakeholders in their work plan. Analysis of the evaluation evidence reveals that sound progress has been made in this respect. All three strands of work have largely met or exceeded their KPIs on engaging stakeholders in their programme of work. The OBA strand has benefited from work already underway in some government departments at a strategic level, particularly Health and Home Affairs, and has skilfully linked the ECD work on early years outcome indicators with this wider work. The KMC strand has attracted a wide range of professional sectors and specialisms, including practitioners, providers, policy makers and trainers who have engaged in the knowledge transfer and reflection processes at the series of seminars. The E-Newsletter has also reached a high number of recipients in the field. The REAL strand has also successfully engaged an enthusiastic and committed group of leaders and practitioners who have successfully engaged an active group of parents and children in the work of the project. It is also working well with Portuguese and Polish communities.

However, in all three strands more work needs to be done at the three levels of engagement. Achieving buy-in to the work of the ECD Programme in this final year from the new Chief Executive and his team, and also from senior strategic leads in other departments is vital if the Programme is to become sustainable and ‘owned’ by the Jersey government. There is also a need for the ECD programme to extend its reach to a wider group of practitioners, and to ensure they see the overall goals of the programme, to which each strand of work contributes. At present, it seems many front-line practitioners have not yet engaged with the radical culture shift towards greater accountability and transparency of process and outcomes in public service delivery that is underway. The ECD Programme needs to engage more actively in promoting this culture shift to front-line early years providers and practitioners in its last year.
In Summary

Progress to Date:
- The ECD Programme has made sound progress in engaging a wide range of stakeholders at strategic, operational and client level in the system. All three strands of work have met their KPIs in respect of engaging target stakeholders.

Recommendations for the Future:
- There is more work to do to get buy in and traction for the goals of the ECD Programme at senior strategic and front line operational level.
- Work to engage a wider mix of participants from the sector and the local communities is needed.

3.3.2 How has the local context of Jersey influenced this impact?
The ECD Programme was shaped around the local context of Jersey and the sharp and urgent service needs to support vulnerable children and families on the island as set out in Section 3.1.

Analysis of the evaluation evidence reveals that all three strands of work are directed at achieving goals to enhance family life and learning and the health, well-being and attainment of the less advantaged families on the island, creating a world class system of support and accountability in the early years. However, as would be expected, the ability of an externally led and funded programme of work to achieve these ambitious goals and for the work to become fully embedded and owned by the island infrastructure is taking time. Building the required trust to ensure the work is sustainable is a key challenge for the ECD Programme in its final year of operation. The evidence indicates that this trust and mutual recognition is developing well, and the NCB is well respected across all stakeholder groups to undertake the critical role of leading the work.

To ensure sustainability and impact, there is a need over time to pass the ECD Programme work strands on to those working within the local infrastructure. It also needs to link with the other radical change initiatives that are underway and which will be further stimulated by the arrival of the new Chief Executive and the further development of the Jersey EYCP. This next year will be critical in establishing these relationships to secure the longer-term sustainability and impact of the ECD Programme. The evidence indicates that those leading the three strands of the Programme are aware of the challenges of the local context and its culture and are working hard to address key policy priorities on the Island. They are also aware of the challenge of the limited time available for securing the necessary Island buy-in.
In Summary

Progress to Date:
- The ECD Programme has been shaped around the local Jersey context and the urgent policy and practice agendas which require the early years sector to be transformed to meet need more effectively on the island.

Recommendations for the Future:
- There is more work to do to ensure the ECD Programme is responsive to the changing island culture and policy priorities of a new Chief Executive and the EYCP as these develop during the next year.
- The work of ECD Programme needs to focus effort in the final year to become more embedded in overarching Jersey policy initiatives rather than operating as a stand-alone initiative.

3.3.3 What have been the key barriers and enablers to the achievement of the programme through each strand?

The interview and focus group evidence reveals several enabling conditions and barriers to the work of the ECD Programme in making progress and achieving its aims. These are set out below in relation to each of the three strands of the Programme.

Enablers and Barriers to OBA

OBA Enablers:

Respondents pointed out that the Island has an ambition is to have buy-in to the OBA agenda across all government departments, so that everyone is using the same language. It was reported that a number of departments were already using an OBA approach before the ECD Programme was launched. Separately to the ECD programme the NCB had delivered an international OBA conference, attended by a delegation from States of Jersey. This previous input has been shown to have been a key enabler, as by the time the OBA workshops were delivered there was already work underway to create an open climate for this initiative. As one respondent stated:

**INT 4:** A reform agenda existed before the ECD Programme. A group from Public Health attended an OBA international conference in Belfast. The ECD OBA programme has highlighted and contributed to this development further. The language and performance metrics existed in Health but we need to shift this across several departments. Child data was also there at a macro level but not micro data which helps explain and explore narratives. We have had score cards and have been using the language register of OBA before as it helps to simplify the picture and helps collaborative working eg in criminality, Home Affairs, giving population metrics for initiatives.

The additional resources brought in by the NCB through the ECD Programme was also acknowledged as vital in the progress made, adding value and energy to what was already happening on the island. As one respondent stated:
INT 9: The OBA programme brought extra capacity - we didn’t have sufficient resources to cope with the initiatives the NCB have undertaken. Training and promotional materials. We just would not be here now if not for NCB impact. The funding runs out in a year, so there is a sustainability issue.

OBA Barriers:
However, despite the running start for this strand of the ECD Programme it is evident that while some departments have really embraced the approach, eg Public Health, others were outside the set of stakeholders relevant to the ECD Programme and are therefore currently less engaged, and the perspective of the new Chief Executive is not yet clear. The evidence seems to indicate that more engagement is needed at both a senior executive and grassroots level, perhaps through the work of the newly trained OBA Champions, as pointed out by several respondents:

INT 3: The big step for OBA is how you embed it as you bring it in. We all in government need to be using the same language and it is not centralised yet with ‘senior’ people. We have a new CEO coming. His language is close to OBA but different. Who might lead this?

INT 4: OBA is trying to establish data sets for benchmarking in Public Health. We have introduced OBA and been using it for enhancing Food Nutrition and Breastfeeding which have been early wins with the strategy. Health have embraced OBA more readily than Education but it is developing. There has been some difficulty in bringing people on board at the grassroots level and we need to get going on that. It also needs to inform commissioning. Momentum is a concern.

INT 7: There is caution in Jersey about taking on ‘fads’, about outsiders coming in, about what is just enough to avoid social dependency. Education is beginning to see the importance of data. It would be wrong to look at only one programme but OBA is seen by many (not all) as having universal possibilities and of proposing this to the new CE. Accountability in ECE has become wider. It needs strategic key players to take it on board and develop it. It needs time. There is work to do at Director’s level, Project Manager’s level and at grassroots. We also need champions and ambassadors.

INT 3: The challenge is how to get accurate data and how to make it meaningful and useful across the sector. The NCB is ‘outside’ so we need to get ‘ownership’ to give it a credible anchor. That’s the challenge. I understand its utility and value but other States people do not. We are one Government and we should say we don’t do silos. We all need to harness OBA.

INT 5: Demonstrably you can see the process has worked and is working. How far on we are with that journey I am not sure. The vision is in place, we have got the tent peg in. How to get it embedded and round the island is the next step.

The success in the reach of the OBA strand has in part been attributed to how it has been embedded in the larger Jersey wide policy agenda, providing a common framework for service delivery across several policy areas where it has been
recognised as a helpful approach by those at a senior strategic level. However, it is also clear in the evidence from many respondents that in some areas there has been less engagement, and it was suggested more effective targeting for the training and workshops could help to address this.

INT 1: The OBA Programme has been a useful tool for knowing and sharing, two years in policy making and now we are all talking OBA, it has become embedded in the Children and Young People Plan. Getting the right people to take it on and champion it at the beginning has been important, maybe others could have been included at the early stage and we are still learning. It is still in the process of becoming embedded. In the initial stage it was open to whoever and whatever and maybe we could have been more targeted in our approach but I feel now we have the ‘right’ people. We have the upper (strategic) layer of policy makers on board and now putting in place ‘Ambassadors’ to take it forward. Training will establish more confidence.

INT 2: The NCB had ownership of this programme to begin with and would have liked more partners but the data has been focused and it’s brilliant that we now know what we don’t have. However, the OBA data has not yet been embedded in Education as they didn’t target the right people, it needed a more targeted group especially at a senior level. There was a very open invitation for practitioners and politicians but maybe this could have been layered more carefully. I feel the Champion approach is the right way as we go forward, we are now nominating for this which is better, more strategic. Some data sets are in place while others are more culturally challenging to secure.

There is also an awareness that all participants are in a learning process and that this slows things down as taking on board the new approaches takes time. Deep cultural shifts in systems take time to embed and be shaped to local contexts. At this stage those involved are having to let go of previous practices and learn new ones, which involved the development of trust and confidence building, as pointed out by a respondent:

INT 7: We were novices. We had motivation but not skill application - 90 minutes for the Turning the Curve exercise – but it took us two and a half hours each time. 90 mins is a rush - maybe it feels too tick box with little time for complexities. Friedman is simple whereas reality is not but I really like the process. So maybe our challenges were about being novices. We needed outside facilitators like NCB. It was challenging, good engagement, lots of interest - but also there were organisation and personal agendas and a danger of those who shout the loudest. Voting on action is not always most effective as if yours is not taken up it can feel like exclusion and not many knew the process. NCB was focused on Education so I feel we needed more preparation. There were suspicions – there’s been lots of overview strategies – ‘here’s another one’ – so a new initiative needed a level of trust to succeed.
REAL Enablers and Barriers

REAL Enablers:
The significant funding and support offered as part of the ECD Programme has clearly been a key enabler for the REAL programme to be extended and embedded within practice.

INT 6: Its sustainability is an attraction, for me it’s a small cost with a high benefit; encouraging us to do things differently; the Jersey Premium helped too and the programme is now embedding into KS1.

NT1: ALL 3 programmes need funding beyond the 3 years if they are to be sustainable. It needs more work to develop a critical mass to become normalised and universalised. It also needs to be embedded with students.

It was widely acknowledged that Dr Cathy Hamer has been a key ambassador for the REAL stand of work, offering leadership, clarity of purpose and inspiration to practitioners and other stakeholders, giving confidence and encouraging competence in others to take the work forward. As stated by one respondent:

INT1: The REAL Programme is aimed at nursery practitioners and I have been surprised at the level of engagement, word of mouth has helped. Dr Cathy Hamer has been great and good at promoting the programme.

The flexible delivery of the programme has also enabled access for some parents as this respondent stated:

INT 2: The aim is to impact on home learning environment, especially for working families, so flexibility of Saturday and evening sessions are important.

REAL Barriers:
Barriers to engagement in the programme had been overcome through flexible programme delivery and funding which ensured all families could benefit. The working patterns of parents was, however, a barrier for participation for some parents, as this respondent indicates:

INT 6: Only one parent worked, at night, and had a young baby. All the others did not work. Non-working parents was a consistent theme. For the Portuguese parent culturally there was lack of ‘educative interactions’, especially literacy activities together.

KMC Enablers and Barriers

KMC Enablers:
The international reputation of the speakers has been a key draw to the seminar programme and the timing of the seminars has enabled attendance by a wide group of stakeholders. The open and inclusive nature of the events has also been appreciated, providing a forum for networking and information exchange, as stated below:
**INT 2:** The research has been good, cross sector and inclusive, with good attendance and quality speakers.

A feedback survey about the newsletter indicates that the content is useful, helping readers in their role as a practitioner, raising awareness of practice guidance and increasing practitioner knowledge. Feedback indicates the content is liked, with a good balance between Jersey and international news, and length, format and publication timing are at right level.

**INT1:** The KMC Programme has a bulletin with 600+ practitioners involved in the mailing network. There remain gaps, eg Highland students are not really penetrated yet though they are the future workforce. The NCB put information into the bulletin for us. We have a Jersey Childhood Practitioners webpage which helps knowledge exchange, I feel bottom up knowledge sharing is not as strong with the need to develop more practitioner research that goes beyond reflection. The mix of seminars that have been run has been very good and addressed issues across the workforce eg midwives, childminders.

**KMC Barriers:**
However, the evidence indicates a need to extend the reach of the programme and ensure the impact of the seminars on practice quality through better targeting to those in training, exploring different venues and timings for seminars. There is also a need to use practitioner research linked to the seminar content to take practitioners beyond reflection into action in their settings. This would ensure the KMC programme had more direct and better impact on the quality of service delivery and on outcomes for children and families.

**ECD Programme Enablers and Barriers**
Looked at as a whole, the evaluation evidence indicates that the ECD Programme has benefited from its ‘fit’ with wider policy initiatives in Jersey, particularly around the OBA approach, which is being enthusiastically promoted by senior leads in key government departments. The positive relationships between the ECD Programme Steering Group members, the NCB and other senior leaders has ensured the programme has made good progress in achieving its goals in the first two years. The additional funding brought by the Programme has been vital to enabling the work of all three strands to go ahead and for the NCB to have capacity and resources to lead this work through, ensuring a coherent and evidenced approach. The open climate, inclusive approach and careful planning and performance management for each strand of the Programme has also ensured transparency, pace and consistency with clarity of goals and outcomes.

Barriers which may limit the impact and sustainability of the programme include a lack of buy-in by some senior strategic leaders in the sector, the uncertainty surrounding the intentions of the new Chief Executive, the ability to engage a wider group of stakeholders at grassroots level who have yet to take on board the extent of culture shift that is underway and the need to secure additional funding (minimally two years) to allow more time to ensure the longer-term sustainability of the Programme. Key priorities in the final year for the Programme Steering Group are to secure greater buy-in to the work of the three Programme strands at senior strategic lead level and also at front-line grassroots level and securing additional funding for the Programme to give it more time to embed the work within Island infrastructures and processes.
In Summary

Progress to Date:
- The ECD Programme has benefited from a number of enabling conditions, including the Programmes ‘fit’ with wider policy impulses; funding; strategic commitment and its inclusive approach.
- Barriers to its longer-term sustainability include lack of buy-in at senior level; uncertainty around the new Chief Executive; reach to grassroots; a local culture of resistance to accountability.

Recommendations for the Future:
- There is a need for the ECD Programme to continue to be responsive to the wider priorities of the new Chief Executive.
- The ECD Programme Steering Group needs to work to secure greater buy-in to the Programme at senior strategic lead level and also at front-line grassroots level.
- Securing additional funding to give the ECD Programme more time (minimally 2 years) to secure its longer-term sustainability and embed it more securely within Island strategy is a priority for the Steering Group and the NCB.

3.3.4 How does the programme contribute to the Early Years and Childhood Partnership’s vision for ‘Jersey to be the best place for all children to grow up’?

The ECD Programme is congruent with local Jersey priorities and needs (as set out in Section 3.1) and achieving the stated vision for ‘Jersey to be the best place for all children to grow up’. There was acknowledgement from participants that the OBA strand of work, in particular, has the potential to make a significant contribution to the Jersey vision for its children but that this was still a work in progress. The main contribution of this strand of work is that it offers a clear and transparent framework, supported by robust data, which would enable clarity about goals to realise the vision and accountability for performance of service providers. As stated by one respondent:

**INT1**: I feel it’s worked and is working but we almost needed to be ‘pre-trained’. We will know where we are with more precise data, rather than making assumptions we will be able to baseline evidence against the indicators.

**INT 3**: I see the OBA Programme as helping us to develop priorities and from these outcomes for children. This approach is attractive because it provides clear outcomes which will help us to Turn the Curve on these. I think Public Health has embraced this and is using the language but it needs to spread – contagion. I feel OBA is a useful tool across the policy agendas but it needs to be mainstreamed with headline outcomes and embedded. As a strand in the ECD Programme it offers me something and it fits within the system I want to operate.

It also is helping to ensure the focus on the child does not get lost as policy and services develop, but more work needs to be done, as a respondent pointed out:
INT 2: The OBA programme has added to the dynamic of ensuring we are impacting on children. It has become ‘ours’, especially in education, and there is a consistency developing through all sectors and providers but it needs longer to embed.

However, a real challenge to the ECD Programme is that it remains at present an externally driven and funded programme. There was evidence from respondents that it should explore the development of a closer relationship with the Jersey Early Years and Childhood Partnership (EYCP) as this organisation develops its role and function within a changing landscape of public service provision in Jersey. It is a time of change and culture transformation in Jersey and potentially this provides the ideal context for the ECD Programme to secure its future. However, to do so will require sensitive and focused action with a clear commitment to, over time, explore the viability of handing over responsibility for taking forward the ECD Programme of work to an Island authority.

In Summary

Progress to Date:
- The ECD Programme sits well with local Jersey priorities and the EYCP’s stated vision and is making a significant contribution to this vision.

Recommendations for the Future:
- The ECD Programme Steering Group needs to work actively on future-proofing the Programme and explore how it can work towards handing over responsibility for the Programme work plans to the States and the EYCP.
- A first step would be for the NCB/UBS to explore how far the EYCP and other States structures are developing their role in relation to children and family services and have the resources, capacity and authority to take the work of the ECD Programme forward.

3.3.5 What might the next steps for stakeholders in Jersey in terms of sustaining each programme strand of activity beyond the life of the programme?

The evaluation evidence reveals that the ECD Programme has achieved significant outcomes and impact in its first two years of operation (see Section 3.3). Analysis of the evidence reveals a solid and evidenced base of achievements with significant shifts in culture and practice underway, with sector capacity building to ensure legacy and sustainability at the end of the Programme. However, as stated earlier, more focused and active work needs to be done in the last year of the Programme, including an attempt to secure additional funding to extend the life of the ECD Programme to give it more time to embed its work and develop sector capacity further to take its mission forward. This work will include a need to develop a profile and visibility with the new Chief Executive and his team, and to explore how it can contribute to and support the development of the work of the Jersey EYCP.
In Summary

Progress to Date:
- The ECD Programme has a solid and evidenced base of achievements in its first two years of operation with significant shift of culture and practice in some areas.

Recommendations for the Future:
- There is a need to continue the work to secure enhanced buy-in at senior and grassroots level.
- Exploration of the developing role of the EYCP and its potential to take on the work of the ECD Programme is needed.
- Securing funding to extend the life of the ECD Programme to allow it more time to embed its work and develop sector capacity to take the work forward and secure its legacy is needed.

3.4 Outcomes Evidence

The evaluation brief provided six outcomes to explore in assessing the effectiveness of the process and its success in achieving its agreed objectives. The evidence demonstrating progress against each of these outcomes is set out in the sections below.

3.4.1 Outcome 1: Early Years and Health practitioners have increased knowledge of how to support young children’s development

There was evidence from both the monitoring data and the process evaluation that the KMC and REAL programmes of work have significantly enhanced early years and health practitioners’ knowledge and understanding of how to support young children’s learning and development, particularly regarding early literacy. It should be noted that the evidence on impact was generated through participant feedback and monitoring data rather than a more rigorous impact research design such as RCT or Pre- and Post-Intervention designs.

Making it REAL Outcomes

The monitoring evidence reveals that the Making it REAL programme of work has made a real contribution to outcome 1. The REAL Report Card evidence for 2016/17 shows that:
- 98% trainees rated the training as excellent/very good in ‘increasing knowledge of engaging parents to support learning’.
- 92% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing their knowledge of ‘supporting children with early literacy.’
- 86% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing knowledge of ‘early identification of need and referral onwards’.
- 74% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing knowledge of ‘engaging with bilingual families to support child’s learning’.

These findings are self-rated perspectives of participants after training and show that the training was well received and pitched correctly to the practitioners’ level of expertise and competence, extending this appropriately to give them a sense of enhanced capacity in their practice. The interview and focus group evidence
supports this assessment of the impact of the programme on this outcome. A focus group agreed that the programme had encouraged them to signpost the library to parents, and given them confidence to model practice to parents, adapting the resources and materials to individual communities and families. It had also provided a vehicle for more home visiting which contributes to the safeguarding agenda, as one respondent pointed out:

**INT1:** The REAL Programme has resulted in an increase going into homes with more participation which I think has impacted on ‘safeguarding’. It’s been a vehicle to develop more trust with parents.

**KMC Outcomes**
The monitoring evidence reveals that the KMC seminars have been well attended and well received by policy makers and practitioners on the island, enhancing large numbers of practitioners understanding of ‘what works’ in practice and providing a coherent view of quality services in the areas covered by the seminars and the newsletters. The evaluation feedback reveals that:

- The topics covered have been popular and informative, relevant to a wide range of practitioners, service providers and policy makers.
- Newsletter content is useful and increases practitioner knowledge.

The interview and focus groups provide further evidence that the KMC seminar programme and newsletters are increasing early years and health practitioners’ knowledge, understanding and reflection on how to support young children’s development. As stated by one respondent, the excellent quality of the speakers has been well appreciated and they have succeeded in stimulating dialogue and reflection across sectors.

**INT1:** Implementation has been relatively simple and through the NCB has brought top people to Jersey and has led to increasing reflection and knowledge in the system. Also practitioners sharing knowledge to make change.

However, as yet there is little evidence of the impact of this work on the quality of service delivery, practice or child/parent outcomes in early literacy and school readiness (outcomes 2, 3, 4 and 5). The application of this new knowledge into practice, to secure transformation and quality improvement is harder to see at this stage, as highlighted by a number of respondents:

**INT 2:** I would say that the quality of the programme has been good and it has had an impact but I am not sure whether the knowledge is embedded. I think practitioner confidence is improved but there is no evidence on the impact on practice. The reach of the Bulletins is good and learning what is happening elsewhere as well as on the island is good but the impact on practice I am not so sure.

**INT 3:** How you achieve step change is hard to assess. There are eddies of reflection but how you get to the stage of transformational change and how you convert reflection to action is harder. There is knowledge and interaction but I am not sure about measurable change or impact on children’s learning outcomes yet. This can be one of the tools.
INT 7: The KMC newsletter has been driven by NCB seeking to improve the knowledge of ‘what works’ for families through newsletters that provide local updates, profile latest research and practice from the UK along with international contexts has raised awareness about Jersey and national and international data. Did it make a change? I’m not so sure. There was a wide audience for the seminars, well attended, but maybe we need to understand the Jersey context before we fly in specialist outsiders.

In Summary

Progress to Date:
• There is evidence that the Making it REAL and KMC work plans have enhanced early years and health practitioners’ knowledge and understanding of how to support young children’s development and learning.

Recommendations for the Future:
• Further engagement is required with a wider reach of the sector to ensure practice transformation can occur.
• The KMC programme of work would benefit from becoming more action focused with workplace-based action research projects being embedded in the programme of work linked to the seminar series and knowledge dissemination strategy.

3.4.2 Outcome 2: Making it REAL project parents have increased knowledge and confidence to support young children’s early learning and literacy development

It is evident that the Making it REAL programme has had a considerable impact on parents’ knowledge and confidence in their support for learning and literacy for those it has reached. The monitoring data reveals that in a sample of REAL core children (79 of 121), 52% parents had increased confidence in asking questions and starting conversations with practitioners about their child and 80% of parents reported increased confidence in being able to support their child’s early literacy. Evidence from the interviews and focus groups also supports a significant shift in REAL parents’ confidence and knowledge, particularly around literacy development. In many cases parents reported that home life and their interaction with their child and its siblings had been transformed by participating in the REAL project. As respondents stated:

Parent Focus Group: We’d never experienced these kinds of workshops with parents involved before and the home visits were important – the teacher left materials that changed how I interacted with my child and our range of activities. They showed us everyday activities which were also learning opportunities, for example when we were shopping. I now know why I am doing these activities. I have enjoyed it very much and I want to continue being involved. I’m much more confident in what I do with my boy and know what to do. I understand the real point of this school and what goes on

INT 6: I understand after programme why parents are important, what the child is learning from them and that the process is fun, enjoyable and
manageable. Home visits were informative both ways, the teacher was seen in a different light and in an accessible context and could show that practical and everyday experiences could be turned into opportunities to learn. A Jersey parent said she had much more awareness of her child’s development: ‘It has changed the kind of activities I do at home and I talk to them more’. There’s been lots of learning for me as a parent – ideas to support learning through fun activities. I wish I’d known this for my first son. It’s changed how we are at home for all of us. I’ve also built relationships and friendships with other parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is evidence that a substantial number of REAL parents have increased their knowledge and confidence to support young children’s early learning and literacy development at home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Recommendations for the Future:** |
| - Further engagement is required with a wider reach of parents would extend this outcome to more parents, particularly those from Portuguese and Polish speaking communities. |
| - More focus on supporting parents’ confidence in dialoguing with practitioners about their child’s learning and literacy development would further enhance the impact of the REAL programme. |

3.4.3 Outcome 3: Making it REAL project children show improvement in early literacy

There was evidence from both the monitoring data and the process evaluation that most of the REAL project children show an improvement in early literacy. The monitoring data reveals that:

- Sample of core children (79 of 121) evidence reveals 63% REAL project children have increased confidence in literacy;
- 76% REAL project children registered improvements in oral language;
- 72% REAL project children registered improvements in their awareness of environmental print;
- 67% REAL project children registered increased sharing of books;
- 61% REAL project children registered increased engagement in early writing;
- 71% REAL project parents reported their child’s literacy, language and communication had improved ‘a lot’;
- Library membership of REAL project children increased by 50% from 42% to 68%.

The achievements of the majority of the REAL participating children should be acknowledged as it is often in the area of language and literacy development that less advantaged children struggle, especially if their first language is not English. However, the evidence reveals that a significant minority of children are not making the same progress as reported in the monitoring evidence and the reasons for this should be explored. It may also be timely for the REAL programme team to develop their assessment instruments to capture more systematically and robustly the impact of the programme on early language and communication skills, as well as literacy, especially given the evidence of the primary importance of this aspect of early
development as the basis for literacy development and a many other areas of learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is evidence that significant progress in early literacy has been made with the majority of participating children but that 25% or more of REAL children are not assessed as improving their literacy skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Recommendations for the Future:** |
| - The reasons for the lack of progress in literacy skills for a significant minority of REAL children should be explored. |
| - The REAL programme team should develop the assessment instruments to capture more systematically and robustly the impact of the programme on early language and communication skills, as well as literacy. |

3.4.4 Outcome 4: Policy makers and practitioners have improved understanding of outcomes based approach (OBA) and work more collaboratively across agencies.

The monitoring evidence reveals that the OBA training has been well attended and well received by policy makers and practitioners on the island, enhancing attendees understanding of OBA and its potential to improve the performance of services. The data reveals that:

- 96.2% attendees rated the course good or excellent in improving their understanding of basic concepts and principles of OBA;
- 98.1% attendees rated course good or excellent in helping them understand how OBA can be used to improve performance of programmes or services.

The two-day intensive capacity building training delivered in January 2017 also reveals very high levels of satisfaction and its impact on participants’ confidence and capacity to disseminate the OBA approach.

The interview and focus groups provide evidence that the OBA methodology is impacting significantly on early years policy but has yet to make an impact on service delivery. It is also making a valuable contribution to the wider shift towards enhanced data-informed, service delivery and performance management across a wider range of public services. For example, Jersey’s Food and Nutrition Strategy and also Future Jersey, a public consultation to help shape Jersey’s long-term vision, as revealed by respondents:

**INT1:** We are using data more and OBA techniques. We have more champions emerging and it’s becoming more sustainable, leaving a legacy, though there are some uncertainties with new Chief Executive.
INT 8: OBA has been the key change mechanism and contributed to adopting a different perspective. With the money from Optimus, NCB has brought a specific focus on outcomes. OBA has been related not just to money based answers, not just handouts, but to a clear vision and an evidence based plan.

INT 4: Social policy data is immature in Jersey but improving. A reform agenda existed before the ECD Programme. The ECD OBA programme has highlighted and contributed to this development further. The methodology should have an impact on long term strategy and the language speaks to policy makers but how this speaks to grassroots and can be used in performance management is more difficult to see.

INT 7: We recognised that our top-down models were not effective. The OBA programme led to better performance management across the board. There is always a risk in innovation that the baby gets thrown out with the bath water. Now there is two years of history where it’s working well. OBA has driven collaborations. We can see it works and is sustainable and the reach is now across other policy areas, not just the Public Sector but also the PVI. We have a common language. ‘Turning the Curve’, is often heard in policy and political forums.

However, despite this real progress, respondents also indicated that there was still work to do to embed the OBA approach and understandings across the board, both within the early years sector, and more widely before it could be judged as sustainable and enabling for collaborative working across all agencies. It was also suggested that the ECD Programme’s work on OBA needed to take careful account of Jersey’s culture and ongoing work on data collection and performance management.

INT 3: It’s beginning to impact but it has got a bit to go yet. We have made a good start.

INT 4: I think after a year we are in a middle stage of development. We have achieved political awareness of this programme as a new way and perhaps with a new incoming CE there will be a grasping of OBA to use for commissioning and performance management.

INT 7: The programmes cannot merely be transposed from Northern Ireland and contextualised for and be cognisant of Jersey’s culture.

Despite these reservations, there was evidence from both the monitoring data and the process evaluation that policy makers and some practitioners have improved understanding of the OBA approach and are beginning to work more collaboratively across agencies. In many ways this strand of work has been the most successful in achieving shift and transformation across the sector, at least at strategic level. The approach sits well within the wider public service approach to OBA in Jersey but the evidence indicates that it needs to be further embedded across a wider range of sectors at government level to encourage collaborative working and needs to be extended to grassroots or front line practitioners more consistently, many of whom remain unaware of this new approach to service delivery and performance management.
In Summary

Progress to Date:
- There is evidence that considerable progress made in introducing and embedding the OBA approach.
- OBA training and capacity building has been well attended, received and has enhanced understanding of the OBA approach at both policy and practice levels.
- There remains a lack of awareness of the OBA approach to service delivery for some government departments whose activity is relevant to children and families, and also for many front line practitioners who deliver the services.

Recommendations for the Future:
- Further work is needed to extend the OBA approach to senior leads in other policy areas with relevance to children and families at government level and to front-line practitioners to better secure partnership working at all levels and the culture shift towards greater accountability for those delivering children and family services.

3.4.5 Outcome 5: Improvement in school readiness, particularly in early literacy for Making it REAL children
The 2016/17 REAL Report Card provides evidence of the impact of the Making it REAL programme on practitioners, parents and children as shown below:

**Impact on practitioners:** 98% (58 of 59) of attendees rated training as Excellent/Very Good in terms of “increasing knowledge of engaging with parents to support learning”.

**Impact on parents:** 80% (44 of 55) parents reported increased confidence in terms of them being able to support their child’s early literacy.

**Impact on children:** 71% (55 of 77) of parents reported their child’s literacy, language and communication had improved; 76% (31 of 41) of parents reported improvements in oral language; 72% (51 of 71) of parents reported the child’s increased awareness of environmental print; 67% (26 of 39) reported increased sharing of books; and 61% (33 of 54) reported improved engagement in early writing. Library membership also increased from 42% (34 of 81) at the baseline to 68% (55 of 81) at the endpoint of the Programme. (% of children reaching age related expectations at the end of Key Stage 1 – no data sourced yet).

The monitoring and evaluative evidence reveals that REAL children are reported as demonstrating improved confidence, creativity, curiosity, concentration, language and agency as well as the improved literacy skills suggested previously. These child and family outcomes provide a strong indication that most children who attend the Making it REAL programme do benefit from enhanced school readiness as shown in the comments below:

**Parent Focus Group:** You could see the difference it made to the children: they are more imaginative, focused. He likes to do different things, it’s given them and me more ideas.
INT 6: For my son, I see greater concentration and language. The kids are more confident, and the approachability of staff makes the kids more likely to approach and engage confidently and so learn more.

There is also evidence that participating practitioners feel more confident in supporting parents in enabling their children to be school ready. However, there were no formal child assessments to support school readiness as an achieved outcome of the programme. As indicated earlier, there is a need to consider how more rigorous evidence might be gathered on the impact of the making it REAL programme on school readiness, particularly in relation to children’s language and communication development.

In Summary

Progress to Date:
- There is evidence that most Making it REAL children benefit from an improvement in school readiness, particularly in early literacy.
- REAL children are reported as having improved confidence, creativity, curiosity, concentration, language and agency.
- There is also evidence that REAL practitioners feel more confident in supporting parents in enabling their child to be school ready.
- The assessment instruments used to evaluate the outcomes of the Making it REAL Programme are limited in scope, focusing primarily on Literacy Development.

Recommendations for the Future:
- The assessment instruments used to evaluate the impact of the Making it REAL need to be reviewed and a more rigorous tool to assess the impact of the programme on children’s Language and Communication development and their overall School Readiness should be considered alongside Literacy Development.

3.4.6 Outcome 6: Increased number of families from Polish and Portuguese speaking communities engaged.
Although this outcome was not planned to be assessed in the phase 1 evaluation, the monitoring and evaluation data from the Making it REAL programme did reveal that some progress was being made in relation to engaging increasing numbers of Polish and Portuguese speaking parents. Data from Nov 17 revealed that 44% of REAL families were Portuguese, 30% Polish, 11% French and 15% other, reflecting the inclusive approach of the project. This attraction for parents from a wide range of cultures and communities was borne out in the focus group evidence.

Parent Focus Group: An Irish parent spoke about ‘democratic encounters, having a voice, learning about other parenting cultures, intergenerational, civic, learning community – all of us learning together and about each other’. And a Jersey islander said ‘I’m more aware of possibilities, the day to day activities are different now at home – more talk, more awareness. I feel I understand the point of school’s approach but also I’m aware that home learning is critical and my boy is more aware, pointing things out
when we are out’. A Portuguese parent stated, ‘It is not work. It’s harder than work. I never really knew how to be with my child before – I’ve learnt lots about being a parent, ideas about how to interact with my child and to support learning through fun activities. I just wish I’d known about this with my first son. It’s helped their concentration, they focus for longer. It’s changed how we are at home for all of us parents, links, relationships and friendships – I wouldn’t change it – I would like to continue to be involved, it’s fun, sociable for parents. Learning, it is us, the parents, understanding why they do things. It’s not just play. I didn’t know that. All parents should do this programme so they can support their child. Older siblings have benefited too.

However, there is no evidence to show greater engagement of these communities with early years services other than the Making it REAL programme.

### In Summary

**Progress to Date:**
- There is evidence that the Making it REAL programme is engaging Portuguese and Polish speaking families where it is operating.
- There is, as yet, little evidence that the other strands of the ECD Programme are leading to increased engagement of these communities.

**Recommendations for the Future:**
- This aspect of the ECD Programme outcomes needs to be evaluated more carefully in the final year across all strands of the Programme, but especially in relation to the impact of the OBA and KMC strands of work where this outcome is less easily identified.
4. Reflections and Next Steps

4.1 Reflections on Progress

The Part 1 evaluation of the ECD Programme has documented evidence to evaluate the impact each of the three strands of the programme has made against the programme aims and its identified outcomes, including:

1. Improve planning of services and collaborative working;
2. Improve early childhood development capacity;
3. Increase quality of early learning and childcare.

Reflecting on the Phase 1 evaluation evidence suggests that the three constituent strands of work in the ECD Programme are contributing significantly to the improvement of planning and collaborative working on the Island, with the OBA approach being particularly successful in relation to this aim. The Making it REAL and KMC strands of work are also making good progress in relation to the aim of improving early childhood development capacity in the sector and also within families. However, there is, as yet, little evidence that the ECD Programme has led to an increase in the quality of early learning and childcare in Jersey other than in the settings that have participated in the Making it REAL Programme. This third aim could be enhanced and the impact of the ECD Programme extended by the development of the KMC seminar programme to include a strategy of linked action research projects, where enhancing the quality of practice was the prime aim.

At the end of year 2 we can see clear evidence that the three strands of work that form the ECD Programme are well underway and are making good progress against their KPIs and the desired outcomes for the programme participants. The evidence presented reveals that progress has been made in the following areas:

1. Relevance to Jersey Policy Priorities and Vision
   - The ECD Programme has been shaped around the local Jersey context and the urgent policy and practice agendas which require the early years sector to be transformed to meet need more effectively on the island.
   - Key policy priorities in Jersey are housing, social care and child protection, with better data collection and use in service planning, delivery and performance management underpinning all public service policy. The ECD Programme is feeding into this policy agenda in Jersey.
   - A culture shift is underway to ensure better cooperation, more accountability and a transparent system of performance management across the public service agenda, including early childhood. The ECD Programme through its OBA work has influenced and fed into this wider culture shift. The ECD Programme is acknowledged as having had a significant influence on policy thinking and priorities in relation to Jersey’s stated vision for supporting children and families.
   - Key aspects of Jersey life that appear to affect less advantaged families with young children in Jersey are low income, poor and multi-occupancy housing, long working hours, lack of health and social care cover, high childcare costs, relatively high levels of domestic violence, drug and alcohol misuse, lack of English. The ECD Programme is contributing to the development of ECEC services that address these needs.
Key needs of parents with children under the age of five in Jersey are access to social housing, health and social care, affordable childcare and early education, and parenting support. These needs are helping to shape the ECD Programme.

Key targeted (neediest) families with children under the age of five are those working families on low incomes, those in multi-occupancy housing, and those at risk of domestic violence or drug/alcohol misuse. These families are key targets in the ECD Programme.

Identified key outcomes for children from high need families are health and well-being, communication and language, early literacy, social and emotional development (school readiness). These child outcomes are being addressed in the three strands of the ECD Programme and directly shaping the OBA strand of work.

The ECD Programme sits well with local Jersey priorities and the EYCP’s stated vision and is making a significant contribution to this vision.

The NCB is recognised as being an effective partner by the States of Jersey government and the current EYCP in delivering an effective ECD Programme and contributing significantly to the Island’s policy priorities and vision.

2. Efficient Delivery of Strand Work Plans and Programme KPIs
   - All three strands of work are making timely progress towards achieving their KPIs by the end of the Programme and some aspects of the work in the OBA, Making it REAL and KMC strands of work have already exceeded some of their end of programme KPIs.
   - Reach to the identified target groups for each strand of work has been largely achieved.
   - The quality of training offered in all three strands of work has been rated very high and well received by delegates.

3. Positive Engagement of Target Groups
   - The ECD Programme has made sound progress in engaging a wide range of stakeholders at strategic, operational and client level in the system. All three strands of work have met their KPIs in respect of engaging target stakeholders.

4. Awareness of Enabling Conditions and Barriers
   - The ECD Programme has benefited from a number of enabling conditions, including the Programmes ‘fit’ with wider policy impulses; funding; strategic commitment and its inclusive approach.
   - Barriers to its longer-term sustainability have been identified and include lack of buy-in at senior level; uncertainty around the new Chief Executive; reach to grassroots; a local culture of resistance to accountability.
5. Successful ECD Programme Outcomes

- The ECD Programme has a solid and evidenced base of achievements in its first two years of operation with significant shift of culture and practice in some areas.

**OBA Strand Outcomes**

- There is evidence that considerable progress made in introducing and embedding the OBA approach.
- OBA training and capacity building has been well attended, received and has enhanced understanding of the OBA approach at both policy and practice levels.
- There remains a lack of awareness of the OBA approach to service delivery for some government departments whose activity is relevant to children and families, and also for many front line practitioners who deliver the services.

**Making it REAL Outcomes**

- There is evidence that the Making it REAL work plans have enhanced early years and health practitioners’ knowledge and understanding of how to support young children’s development and learning.
- There is evidence that a substantial number of REAL parents have increased their knowledge and confidence to support young children’s early learning and literacy development at home.
- There is evidence that significant progress in early literacy has been made with the majority of participating REAL children but that 25% or more of REAL children are not assessed as improving their literacy skills.
- There is evidence that most Making it REAL children benefit from an improvement in school readiness, particularly in early literacy.
- REAL children are reported as having improved confidence, creativity, curiosity, concentration, language and agency.
- There is also evidence that REAL practitioners feel more confident in supporting parents in enabling their child to be school ready.
- The assessment instruments used to evaluate the outcomes of the Making it REAL Programme are limited in scope, focusing primarily on Literacy Development.
- There is evidence that the Making it REAL programme is engaging Portuguese and Polish speaking families where it is operating.

**KMC Outcomes**

- There is evidence that the KMC work plans have enhanced early years and health practitioners’ knowledge and understanding of how to support young children’s development and learning.

This evidence reveals that collectively and individually the three strands of work in the ECD Programme have already begun to impact on the discourse and culture around service planning and delivery in Jersey. As an externally funded and led programme, with a Jersey constituted Steering Group, it has done well to steer a positive path and dispel any anxiety or suspicion about its motives and commitment to the long-term sustainability of services on the island. The climate around the Programme is largely positive, welcoming and acknowledging about the work it has undertaken and what it has achieved. This is a great tribute to the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the Programme. As respondents commented:
INT1: The NCB was the right organisation to take this forward. They could see it from a policy and practice perspective, mapping change simultaneously makes it real at different levels.

INT 8: Without the ECD Programme, we just wouldn’t be where we are now. ‘Making it REAL’ with NCB has really improved relationships; ‘Knowledge Makes Change’ has improved access; and OBA has been the key change mechanism and to adopting a different perspective. Right from the beginning and with a new Government in power, NCB/Jersey, it was a two-way street—this was a joint journey, focussed, facilitating contacts/ opening doors; creating forums for dialogue. NCB were absolutely instrumental in driving change and we were instrumental in connecting them into Jersey’s networks.

However, this success brings with it a further set of challenges regarding the future sustainability of the ECD Programme and its ability to transfer the leadership and management of the work back to Jersey institutions such as the EYCP in a way that will secure its legacy. Clearly, time is short and a three-year programme of work will only ever be able to achieve limited success in terms of deep level transformation of culture and services. The evaluation indicates that for this work to be properly embedded within the set of other Jersey initiatives, and the transformation of the quality of service planning, delivery and practice to be achieved so that all young children in Jersey have the best possible start in life, it is clear that more time and more funding is needed. Three years provides only a limited opportunity for the deep level, sustainable development within an under-developed and under-acknowledged sector that Jersey ECEC represents. As respondents stated:

INT 2: It has influenced strategic thinking, a tranche of people are embracing it and it is influencing practice but I am not sure there is a deep understanding or that it is embedded yet.

INT 7: In the constellation of initiatives, many could be said to be ‘still in development’. This programme sits within that nexus. We need to consider funding and who might take these initiatives forward and raise cross-departmental awareness of ECE. There should be more investment in the views of the Steering Group, they should be empowered. We are at a tipping point. Early Childhood Development should sit within the EYCP, be almost a subset.

The final year of this current programme of work has many challenges to face if it is to secure its legacy and build the capacity needed to take this work forward. However, the stage is set for the ECD Programme to succeed in its ambitions, as acknowledged by a number of respondents:

INT 8: This has potential to be a game changer, the timing is absolutely right for this to happen, there is a firm foundation and the Child Care Enquiry has awakened people but it does need significant investment.

INT 2: Next year I am aware there are lots of initiatives as we move from a project to a programme. The evaluation should feed into how we go
forward and embed the ECD Programme into other strategic developments. It will take time for wider the Trust to take ownership. They were wary at first so we needed time to develop this trust, we were wary of where the initiative came from and who these external people and organisations were. Now it is time for us to develop our own island and sector-wide work.

INT 5: Demonstrably you can see the process has worked and is working. How far on we are with that journey I am not sure. The vision is in place, we have got the tent peg in. How to get it embedded and round the island is the next step. Demonstrating that it is making a difference is the next step. The ECD Programme needs to get traction with Government. The challenge is sustainability, what to keep going. At present it’s not clear, what investment is needed, how to get this into the Children’s Plan? How to evidence its success? How far does the NCB go? We need to integrate and support their thinking into the new. There is a need to raise political awareness of Charlie Parker and his team and political members and this requires shared effort.

This evidence reveals that as an externally funded and led programme, with a Jersey constituted Steering Group, it has done well to steer a positive path and dispel any anxiety or suspicion about its motives and commitment to the long-term sustainability of services on the island. The climate around the Programme is largely positive, welcoming and acknowledging about the work it has undertaken and what it has achieved. This is a great tribute to the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the Programme.

4.2 Recommendations for the Way Ahead

The ECD Programme has a set of challenges in its final year if it is to fully achieve its aims and secure the outcomes it desires. Analysis of the evaluation evidence and reflection on the current Jersey context and policy drivers suggests some clear priorities for action over the final year of the ECD Programme which are intended to support the development of the Programme in its final year. These are presented as a list of recommendations for action under 6 broad headings but collectively stand together as a reinforcing circle of support to ensure the coherence and unity of the ECD Programme intentions and success in securing its desired outcomes.

1. Enhancing Relevance of ECD Programme to Jersey Policy Priorities and Vision with More Active Engagement of Programme Steering Group with Emerging States Policy Agenda
   - The ECD Programme needs to continue to take account of Jersey’s wider developing public service policy agenda and priorities to secure its sustainability and longer-term impact.
   - There is more work to do to ensure the ECD Programme is responsive to the changing island culture and policy priorities of a new Chief Executive and the EYCP as these develop during the next year.
   - The ECD Programme Steering Group needs to work to secure greater buy-in to the Programme at senior strategic lead level and also at front-line grassroots level.
• The targeted outcomes for children and families set out in the public policy statements should continue to be considered when developing the ECD Programme OBA framework.
• The work of ECD Programme needs to focus effort in the final year to become more embedded in overarching Jersey policy initiatives rather than operating as a stand-alone initiative.

2. Securing ECD Programme Sustainability by Seeking Additional Funding, Enhancing Links to States and EYCP Plans and Offering System Leadership Training and Support to OBA and REAL Champions

• Securing additional funding to extend the life of the ECD Programme to allow it more time (minimally 2 years) to secure its longer-term sustainability and embed it more securely within Island strategy is a priority for the Steering Group and the NCB.
• The ECD Programme Steering Group needs to work actively on future-proofing the Programme and explore how it can work towards handing over responsibility for the Programme work plans to the States and the EYCP.
• A first step would be for the NCB/UBS to explore how far the EYCP and other States structures are developing their role in relation to children and family services and have the resources, capacity and authority to take the work of the ECD Programme forward.
• Developing the role of OBA and Making it REAL Champions, and resourcing this by offering them training in system leadership and coaching/mentoring skills and time allowance to ensure they have the capacity and skills to operate as system leaders.

3. Greater Engagement of Target Groups

• There is more work to do to get buy-in and traction for the goals of the ECD Programme at senior strategic and front line operational level.
• Further consideration of the target groups for all three strands of work should take place eg a wider group of stakeholders for OBA training; more engagement of students in KMC seminars.
• More focused work to engage Portuguese and Polish speaking communities within the Making it REAL Programme would enable better reach to these targeted communities eg by exploring more flexible timing of sessions.
• The work to engage Portuguese and Polish speaking communities needs to be evaluated more carefully in the final year across all strands of the Programme, but especially in relation to the impact of the OBA and KMC strands of work where this outcome is less easily identified.

4. Further Embedding OBA Approach, particularly at Senior Lead and Front-Line Service Delivery Level

• Wider engagement in OBA training by opening opportunities to other groups such as students and Health Visitors.
• Further work is needed to extend the OBA approach to senior leads in other policy areas with relevance to children and families at government level and to front-line practitioners to better secure partnership working at all levels and the culture shift towards greater accountability for those delivering children and family services.
• Providing the Steering Group with responsibility for enhancing the knowledge and confidence at strategic level by targeting their input more carefully at stakeholders at a senior level in the various departments and programmes of work.

• The development of more understanding at grassroots or front-line level through better supporting and resourcing the role of OBA Champions as mentors and coaches (system leaders) for supporting front line workers including early years practitioners, health visitors, social workers.

• More dissemination and modelling of the value of the OBA approach, with better sharing of experience within and across public service sectors, and across different programmes of work e.g. Making it REAL. This could be achieved by including knowledge about the OBA approach in Making it REAL training and joint training of OBA and Making it REAL champions.

• More training, support and resources given to OBA Champions to ensure they can execute their mentoring and coaching role and act more effectively as system leaders. This would ensure they are trained and supported to work with a range of providers in the system and use established coaching and mentoring strategies in their OBA development work.

5. Widening and Strengthening Impact Data for Making it Real Programme, (to include Communication and Language Development, and Mathematical Development) Using More Rigorous Assessment Instruments

• Further engagement is required with a wider reach of parents and children to extend the REAL programme outcome to more parents, particularly those from Portuguese and Polish speaking communities and children with SEND.

• Ensuring the programme is culturally nuanced and reflects diversity of languages.

• Recruitment of REAL practitioners and volunteers from migrating communities.

• More focus on supporting parents’ confidence in dialogue with practitioners about their child’s learning and literacy development would further enhance the impact of the REAL programme.

• The reasons for the lack of progress in literacy skills for a significant minority of REAL children should be explored.

• The assessment instruments used to evaluate the impact of the Making it REAL need to be reviewed and a more rigorous assessment instruments to capture more systematically and robustly the impact of the programme on children’s early Language and Communication development and their overall School Readiness should be considered alongside Literacy Development.

• Extension of REAL maths programme.

• More training, support and resources given to Making it REAL Champions to ensure they can execute their mentoring and coaching role and act more effectively as system leaders. This would ensure they are trained and supported to work with a range of providers in the system and use established coaching and mentoring strategies in their OBA development work.
6. Encouraging Action Projects Linked to KMC Seminars to Secure Impact on Practice

- Better showcasing good Jersey practice where it exists.
- Targeting trainee practitioners for seminars and newsletters.
- Developing Action Learning Projects linked to the KMC seminar programme which would better support the linking of new knowledge and understanding on ‘what works’ to deeper and more critical reflection on current practice. Offering support for practitioner-led, workplace-based action research projects and embedding the implementation and evaluation of these projects into the programme of work so linking them to the knowledge dissemination strategy would ensure implementation of what works, with a clearer focus on enhancing child outcomes.

4.3 Reflections from Participants on Way Ahead

Respondents in the evaluation revealed that they were aware of the need for carefully planned and targeted work during the final year of the ECD Programme and were aware of where attention should now focus in relation to each strand of work within the programme. These reflective comments provide further support for the recommended actions detailed in section 4.2.

OBA Strand of Work

Respondents in the evaluation indicated where they felt attention should now focus in relation to the OBA strand of work.

**INT1:** More training and developing more confidence at upper strategic policy level about OBA.

**INT 2:** Identifying Champions has to be the way forward as someone has to own it and champion it, especially those in strategic roles. We have some way to go before it is recognised as the ‘go to’ process in Education. We can learn that it is not the indicators or data per se but rather what you are going to do with it and which indicators need to be changed. It needs to be more talked about and embedded.

**INT 3:** We have to nudge and influence. Through modelling we can show how. It’s the responsibility of those who have been touched by it to be part of the contagion. I am mindful that there is one year to go so it’s time to take stock.

**INT 4:** Using the data from OBA to commission new initiatives and programmes. KPI performance metrics should link to population measures and longer health outcomes. There should be an interconnection from top to bottom. We need to have milestones and markers which are concrete, hold fire and target, and be confident in the approach, looking for the ‘turn’ and knowing why it is happening, and when it is stagnating. It ensures accountability and evidence-based practice so the culture on the island begins to change. This is particularly important in the PVI sector. We need levers and carrots and to inform the population so we ‘deliver what the public want’. At this middle stage in the ECD programme I can see the stars aligning and there is buy in developing. Champions need to get an
understanding of the other ECD Programme Champions eg REAL. At the moment they are not connected. The Champions need training in support and mentoring – we need to invest in these people if we are to achieve real change.

**INT 7:** We should look for interaction between OBA, which many practitioners do not understand, and REAL. Culturally different paradigms exist. That’s where we need the ambassadors. It is vital that the EYC Partnership takes this on.

**INT 8:** But it hasn’t reached some parts lower down the system – Making it REAL practitioners are not using OBA terms. We need more impact there at the base. We need sensitivity. Priority for ‘final year’? Embedding of OBA across sectors – that’s not NCB’s role but ours.

**INT 9:** We have just touched the surface really. It needs someone, some strategy to embed this. It needs both outsider input and OBA Champions.

**Making it REAL Strand of Work**
Respondents in the evaluation indicated where they felt attention should now focus in relation to the Making it REAL strand of work.

**INT 1:** The programmes all need funding beyond the three years if they are to be sustainable. It needs more work to develop a critical mass to become normalised and universalised. It also needs to be embedded with students.

**INT 2:** It needs widening to include Highland students and Health Visitors to ensure greater visibility and sustainability. This is harder to do without funding. I am excited by idea of parents as REAL Champions, as an island-wide strategy and it could be part of our Quality Framework. I can see this beginning to happen.

**INT 3:** The focus must be on the key stakeholders in the system and targeting them. It needs more people and it needs to be wider than early years to include work force, health, social care and others.

**INT 8:** We need to be better at Portuguese translation. Make it REAL is all in English. We are not culturally sensitive enough. If we take on more Health Visitors, we need Portuguese speakers.

**Practitioners’ Focus Group:** The programme needs to target EAL families and do home visiting early morning and evening, even Sunday morning. Autistic children also need more recognition within system. Earlier is more effective so sign posting from Health Visitors is vital.

**Knowledge Makes Change Strand of Work**
Respondents in the evaluation indicated where they felt attention should now focus in relation to the Knowledge Makes Change strand of work.

**INT 4:** Maybe a ‘sandwich’ approach - input, research action in setting, then a follow up which looks at individual impact – then there’s the ‘so
what’s the impact, how is it evidence based and what are the indicators of progress? How do we change ideas into reality and make Jersey the best place to grow up for both the child of the Range Rover parent and the night shift worker? These are the more challenging questions.

**INT 7:** Look at time scales - three years, and one year to go. Will that be the whole programme? What can be realistically achieved in three years? This is more than just about sowing seeds, we need to win hearts and minds and we will need much more time to secure sustainable change.
## Appendix 1: Benchmark Assessment of Jersey Early Childhood Programmes February 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Questions</th>
<th>Evidence Source</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECD Programme Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Evidence that KMC and REAL programmes have significantly enhanced early years and health practitioners knowledge and understanding of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Early Years and Health practitioners have increased knowledge of how to support young children’s development</td>
<td>REAL report card REAL training feedback forms REAL training tracking sheet REAL setting record form REAL network meeting notes REAL progress updates KMC seminar feedback KMC Bulletin survey results REAL practitioner focus groups Interviews</td>
<td>&gt; 98% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in ‘increasing knowledge of engaging parents to support learning’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 92% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing their knowledge of ‘supporting children with early literacy’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 86% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing knowledge of ‘early identification of need and referral onwards’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 74% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing knowledge of ‘engaging with bilingual families to support child’s learning’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making it REAL project parents have increased knowledge and confidence to support young children’s early learning and literacy development</td>
<td>REAL report card REAL parent focus group Interviews</td>
<td>&gt; 80% REAL parents have increased confidence in being able to support their child’s early literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Evidence supports the significant shift in REAL parents confidence and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Making it REAL project children show improvement in early literacy.</td>
<td>REAL report card REAL Pre + Post Child observation form REAL parent focus group REAL practitioner focus groups Interviews</td>
<td>&gt; 63% REAL project children have increased confidence in literacy. &gt; 76% REAL project children registered improvements in oral language. &gt;72% REAL project children registered improvements in their awareness of environmental print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policy makers and practitioners have improved understanding of outcomes based approach (OBA) and work more collaboratively across agencies</td>
<td>OBA update reports</td>
<td>OBA Steering Group feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improvement in school readiness, particularly in early literacy for Making it REAL children</td>
<td>REAL report card</td>
<td>REAL Pre + Post Child observation form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increased number of families from Polish and Portuguese speaking communities engaged with early years services before school</td>
<td>REAL report card</td>
<td>REAL setting Record form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluative Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How successful has the programme been in reaching and engaging key stakeholders across each strand of work?</th>
<th>Interviews&lt;br&gt;REAL report card&lt;br&gt;OBA/KMC REAL training feedback forms&lt;br&gt;REAL training tracking sheet&lt;br&gt;REAL setting record form&lt;br&gt;REAL network meeting notes&lt;br&gt;OBA/REAL progress updates Interviews&lt;br&gt;REAL parent focus group&lt;br&gt;REAL practitioner focus groups</th>
<th>&gt; All 3 strands of work have exceeded their target KPIs in engaging stakeholders&lt;br&gt;Still work to do to get buy in and traction for work at strategic and operational level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How has the local context of Jersey influenced this impact?</td>
<td>REAL report card&lt;br&gt;Interviews&lt;br&gt;REAL parent focus group&lt;br&gt;REAL practitioner focus groups</td>
<td>&gt; Evidence indicates that all strands of the programme are aware of the challenges of the local context and its culture, and are working hard to address key policy priorities&lt;br&gt;Work of ECD Programme needs to become more embedded in overarching Jersey policy initiatives rather than a stand-alone initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What have been the key barriers and enablers to the achievement of the programme through each strand?</td>
<td>Interviews&lt;br&gt;REAL report card&lt;br&gt;REAL parent focus group&lt;br&gt;REAL practitioner focus groups</td>
<td>&gt; Enablers: ‘fit’ with wider policy impulses; funding; strategic commitment; inclusive approach;&lt;br&gt;Barriers: lack of buy-in at senior level; new Chief Exec; reach to grassroots; local culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How does the programme contribute to the Early Years and Childhood Partnership’s vision for ‘Jersey to be the best place for all children to grow up’?</td>
<td>Interviews&lt;br&gt;REAL report card&lt;br&gt;REAL parent focus group&lt;br&gt;REAL practitioner focus groups</td>
<td>&gt; Not yet embedded with EYC Partnership working and vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What might the next steps for stakeholders in Jersey in terms of sustaining each</td>
<td>REAL report card&lt;br&gt;Interviews&lt;br&gt;REAL parent focus group</td>
<td>&gt; Solid base of work achieved with significant shift of culture and practice in some areas&lt;br&gt;Enhanced buy in at senior and grassroots level needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| programme strand of activity beyond the life of the programme? | REAL practitioner focus groups | > Sustainability strategy needed  
> Link in directly needed with work of Chief Executive and the Jersey EYCP |
Appendix 2: Strand Case Studies

Case Study 1: Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA) Strand

Strand Description and Aims
As part of the Early Childhood Project, NCB are supporting the development of an outcomes framework for Jersey, co-produced with key stakeholders. OBA is an evidence-based methodology for enabling change through a continued focus on outcomes. It begins with ‘ends’ ie the outcomes which stakeholders would like to achieve, and it helps to make a clear distinction between two levels of accountability:

1. **Population accountability:** These are the outcomes or conditions of well-being that we want for citizens or communities. These outcomes are population outcomes as they refer to whole populations of a district or country. These outcomes will be quite broad and multi-faceted in nature, and cannot be achieved by a single organisation, service or programme working in isolation, but takes concerted action from many organisations, services and programmes and requires effective partnership working across key stakeholders.

2. **Performance accountability:** This relates to how well particular services or programmes perform. Each programme would have a set of performance measures which would relate to whether programme participants are any better off as a result of participating in the programme.

OBA aims to provide a clear link between how any service actions might lead to enhanced outcomes through:

1. Creating a common language
2. Bringing together stakeholders for a common purpose
3. Providing a framework for managing performance

OBA Strategy and Work Plan
There have been a range of strategies to take the OBA strand forward including:

1. **Initial Meetings:** The first stage of work was a series of interviews with lead statisticians in each government department to assess what data currently exists on children and families.

2. **Introductory Workshops:** A series of introductory workshops have been delivered to introduce the basic concepts and principles of OBA. The workshops have been delivered five times (up to Sept 17) to secure stakeholder participation and to ensure local ownership and sustainability of the approach.

3. **Audit of Available Data:** An audit of existing data has been conducted for children aged 0-18 in Jersey, to specifically look at indicator data for children 0-5 to identify what statistical evidence exists to understand the extent of young children’s well-being in Jersey and identify gaps.

4. **Audit of Early Years Services:** An audit of early years services (conception to age 5) currently being delivered has been conducted to inform the discussions and to understand what services currently exists for 0-5s on the Island and identify gaps.
5. Development of OBA Outcomes Framework and Indicators: Work has been undertaken to develop an OBA Outcomes Framework and set of indicators for early years services. The overall purpose of the Framework is to improve the lives of young children and their families growing up in Jersey. To do so, the Framework aims to:

1. Support a coordinated approach by States of Jersey departments, statutory, community and voluntary sector agencies, in service planning and delivery as they work to support children and families in the early years;
2. Help focus resources on activities that have been shown to have a positive impact on children and families;
3. Enable agencies to monitor progress and strengthen transparency and accountability in their work and the work of others; and
4. Inform actions taken to continue to improve services, ensuring the best possible services for children and families.

6. Turning the Curve Workshops: Two sets of Turning the Curve workshops with a wide range of stakeholders have been delivered. The aim of the workshops was to introduce people to the Turning the Curve process and its role in embedding OBA in strategic planning. The workshops used some of the health indicators which were prioritised by the Steering Group (Dec 16; Jan 17).

7. OBA intensive capacity building training: Capacity building training to develop OBA Champions and strengthen stakeholder engagement has been undertaken to enable stakeholders to begin using OBA in the planning and delivery of children’s services. The first round was with those stakeholders leading on writing the new Children’s Plan in Jersey.

Target Groups and Engagement

The OBA work plan set out to reach key stakeholders from across a variety of different contexts in the Jersey early years community at strategic and operational level to engage them in discussions and actions about how to define and continually improve outcomes. The evaluation evidence set out to document who are the key target groups for the OBA programme; how successful the programme has been in reaching the target groups; and whether the coverage has been comprehensive and well distributed.

The monitoring evidence for the OBA strand reveals that this programme has been successful in achieving strong engagement from a range of stakeholders at both strategic and operational levels. The programme KPI target was to hold 4 workshops and reach 80 beneficiaries at this point in the work plan. In fact, this KPI target has been largely exceeded, as reflected in the data below.

- 5 OBA workshops delivered
- 77 attendees (representing statutory and voluntary/community organisations)
- 6 workshops delivered on Health indicators and 1 closed workshop on child development indicators
- 90.4% said the workshops met expectations; 96.2% said workshops were pitched at the right level and 76.9% would recommend the course to others
- Produced data analysis report, mapping of services, health indicator reports and initial discussions on child development indicators
Enablers and Barriers to OBA

The evaluation evidence set out to document what have been the main enablers of, and barriers to, the OBA strand of work making progress and fully achieving its aims. The interview and focus group evidence indicates a more considered view of the progress of the OBA strand made to date and what has enabled or prevented this progress.

**Enablers:**
Respondents have pointed out that the ambition is to have buy in to this agenda across all government departments, so that everyone is using the same language. It was reported that a number of departments were already using an OBA approach before the ECD Programme was launched. Separately to the ECD programme NCB had delivered an international OBA conference, attended by a delegation from States of Jersey. This previous input has been shown to have been a key enabler, as by the time the OBA workshops were delivered there was already work underway to create an open climate for this initiative. As one respondent stated:

INT 4: A reform agenda existed before the ECD Programme. A group from Public Health attended an OBA international conference in Belfast. The ECD OBA programme has highlighted and contributed to this development further. The language and performance metrics existed in Health but we need to shift this across several departments. Child data was also there at a macro level but not micro data which helps explain and explore narratives. We have had score cards and have been using the language register of OBA before as it helps to simplify the picture and helps collaborative working eg in criminality, Home Affairs, giving population metrics for initiatives.

The additional resources brought in by the NCB through the ECD Programme was also acknowledged as vital in the progress made, adding value and energy to what was already happening on the island. As one respondent stated:

INT 9: The OBA programme brought extra capacity - we didn’t have sufficient resources to cope with the initiatives NCB have undertaken. Training and promotional materials. We just would not be here now if not for NCB impact. The funding runs out in a year, so there is a sustainability issue.

**Barriers:**
However, despite the running start for this strand of the ECD programme it is evident that while some departments have really embraced the approach, eg Public Health, others were outside the set of stakeholders relevant to the ECD Programme therefore are less engaged, and the perspective of the new Chief Executive is not yet clear. The evidence seems to indicate that more engagement is needed at both a senior executive and grassroots level, perhaps through the work of the newly trained OBA Champions, as pointed out by a number of respondents:

INT 3: The big step for OBA is how you embed it as you bring it in. We all in government need to be using the same language and it is not centralised yet with ‘senior’ people. We have a new CEO coming. His language is close to OBA but different. Who might lead this?
INT 4: OBA is trying to establish data sets for benchmarking in Public Health. We have introduced OBA and been using it for enhancing Food Nutrition and Breastfeeding which have been early wins with the strategy. Health have embraced OBA more readily than Education but it is developing. There has been some difficulty in bringing people on board at the grassroots level and we need to get going on that. It also needs to inform commissioning. Momentum is a concern.

INT 7: There is caution in Jersey about taking on ‘fads’, about outsiders coming in, about what is just enough to avoid social dependency. Education is beginning to see the importance of data. It would be wrong to look at only one programme but OAB is seen by many (not all) as having universal possibilities and of proposing this to the new CE. Accountability in ECE has become wider. It needs strategic key players to take it on board and develop it. It needs time. There is work to do at Director’s level, Project Manager’s level and at grassroots. We also need champions and ambassadors.

INT 3: The challenge is how to get accurate data and how to make it meaningful and useful across the sector. The NCB is ‘outside’ so we need to get ‘ownership’ to give it a credible anchor. That’s the challenge. I understand its utility and value but other States people do not. We are one Government and we should say we don’t do silos. We all need to harness OBA.

INT 5: Demonstrably you can see the process has worked and is working. How far on we are with that journey I am not sure. The vision is in place, we have got the tent peg in. How to get it embedded and round the island is the next step.

The success in the reach of the OBA strand has in part been attributed to how it has been embedded in the larger Jersey wide policy agenda, providing a common framework for service delivery across several policy areas where it has been recognised as a helpful approach by those at a senior strategic level. However, it is also clear in the evidence from many respondents that in some areas there has been less engagement, and it was suggested more effective targeting for the training and workshops could help to address this.

INT 1: The OBA Programme has been a useful tool for knowing and sharing, 2 years in policy making and now we are all talking OBA, it has become embedded in the Children and Young People Plan. Getting the right people to take it on and champion it at the beginning has been important, maybe others could have been included at the early stage and we are still learning. It is still in the process of becoming embedded. In the initial stage it was open to whoever and whatever and maybe we could have been more targeted in our approach but feel now we have the ‘right’ people. We have the upper (strategic) layer of policy makers on board and now putting in place ‘Ambassadors’ to take it forward. Training will establish more confidence.

INT 2: The NCB had ownership of this programme to begin with and would have liked more partners but the data has been focused and it’s brilliant that we now know what we don’t have. However, the OBA data has not
yet been embedded in Education as they didn’t target the right people, it needed a more targeted group especially at a senior level. There was a very open invitation for practitioners and politicians but maybe this could have been layered more carefully. I feel the Champion approach is the right way as we go forward, we are now nominating for this which is better, more strategic. Some data sets are in place while others are more culturally challenging to secure.

There is also an awareness that all participants are in a learning process and that this slows things down as taking on board the new approaches takes time. Deep cultural shifts in systems take time to embed and be shaped to local contexts. At this stage those involved are having to let go of previous practices and learn new ones, which involved the development of trust and confidence building, as pointed out by a respondent:

**INT 7:** We were novices. We had motivation but not skill application - 90 minutes for the Turning the Curve exercise – but it took us two and a half hours each time. 90 mins is a rush- maybe it feels too tick box with little time for complexities. Friedman is simple whereas reality is not but I really like the process. So maybe our challenges were about being novices. We needed outside facilitators like NCB. It was challenging, good engagement, lots of interest - but also there were organisation and personal agendas and a danger of those who shout the loudest. Voting on action is not always most effective as if yours is not taken up it can feel like exclusion and not many knew the process. NCB was focused on Education so I feel we needed more preparation. There were suspicions – there’s been lots of overview strategies – ‘here’s another one’ – so a new initiative needed a level of trust to succeed.

**Contribution of OBA to ‘Vision’**

The evaluation evidence explored how the OBA strand of work is contributing to the vision that ‘Jersey should be the best place for all children to grow up’ and what would help this vision to be realised. There was acknowledgement from participants that the OBA strand of work has potential to make a significant contribution to the Jersey vision for its children but that this was still a work in progress. The main contribution of this strand of work was seen as offering a clear and transparent framework, supported by robust data which would enable clarity about goals to realise the vision and accountability for performance of service providers. As stated by one respondent:

**INT1:** I feel it’s worked and is working but we almost needed to be ‘pre-trained’. We will know where we are with more precise data, rather than making assumptions we will be able to baseline evidence against the indicators.

**INT 3:** I see the OBA Programme as helping us to develop priorities and from these outcomes for children. This approach is attractive because it provides clear outcomes which will help us to Turn the Curve on these. I think Public Health has embraced this and is using the language but it needs to spread – contagion. I feel OBA is a useful tool across the policy agendas but it needs to be mainstreamed with headline outcomes and
embedded. As a strand in the ECD Programme it offers me something and it fits within the system I want to operate.

It also is helping to ensure the focus on the child does not get lost as policy and services develop, but more work needs to be done, as a respondent pointed out:

**INT 2:** The OBA programme has added to the dynamic of ensuring we are impacting on children. It has become ‘ours’, especially in education, and there is a consistency developing through all sectors and providers but it needs longer to embed.

**Impact of OBA**

The evaluation evidence examined how far, and in what ways, the OBA strand of work has impacted on service planning and delivery in Jersey and in particular has contributed to, and impacted on, the stated ECD Programme outcomes. The evaluation evidence below reveals that the OBA strand of work has made a significant impact on outcome 4 but there is little evidence of its impact on the other outcomes.

**Outcome 4: Policy makers and practitioners have improved understanding of outcomes based approach (OBA) and work more collaboratively across agencies**

The monitoring evidence reveals that the OBA training has been well attended and well received by policy makers and practitioners on the island enhancing attendees understanding of OBA and its potential to improve the performance of services. The data reveals that:

- 96.2% attendees rated the course good or excellent in improving their understanding of basic concepts and principles of OBA
- 98.1% attendees rated course good or excellent in helping them understand how OBA can be used to improve performance of programmes or services

The interview and focus groups provide evidence that OBA methodology is impacting significantly on early years policy but has yet to make an impact on service delivery. It is also making a valuable contribution to the wider shift towards enhanced data-informed, service delivery and performance management across a wider range of public services. For example, Jersey’s Food and Nutrition Strategy and also Future Jersey, a public consultation to help shape Jersey’s long term vision, as revealed by respondents:

**INT1:** We are using data more and OBA techniques. We have more champions emerging and it’s becoming more sustainable, leaving a legacy, though there are some uncertainties with new CE.

**INT 8:** OBA has been the key change mechanism and to adopting a different perspective. With the money from Optimus, NCB has brought a specific focus on outcomes. OBA has been related not just to money based answers, not just handouts, but to a clear vision and an evidence based plan.

**INT 4:** Social policy data is immature in Jersey but improving. A reform agenda existed before the ECD Programme. The ECD OBA programme has
highlighted and contributed to this development further. The methodology should have an impact on long term strategy and the language speaks to policy makers but how this speaks to grassroots and can be used in performance management is more difficult to see.

**INT 7**: We recognised that our top-down models were not effective. It led to better performance management across the board. There is always a risk in innovation that the baby gets thrown out with the bath water. Now there is two years of history where it’s working well. OBA has driven collaborations. We can see it works and is sustainable and the reach is now across other policy areas, not just the Public Sector but also the PVI. We have a common language. ‘Turning the Curve’, is often heard in policy and political forums.

However, despite this real progress, respondents also indicated that there was still work to do to embed the OBA approach and understandings across the board, both within the early years sector, and more widely before it could be judged as sustainable and enabling for collaborative working across all agencies. It was also suggested that the ECD Programme’s work on OBA needed to take careful account of Jersey’s culture and ongoing work on data collection and performance management.

**INT 3**: It’s beginning to impact but it has got a bit to go yet. We have made a good start.

**INT 4**: I think after a year we are in a middle stage of development. We have achieved political awareness of this programme as a new way and perhaps with a new incoming CE there will be a grasping of OBA to use for commissioning and performance management.

**INT 7**: The programmes cannot merely be transposed from Northern Ireland, it has to be contextualised for and cogniscent of Jersey’s culture.

**Next Steps and Improvements**

Finally, the evaluation set out to explore the sustainability of the OBA strand of work and what next steps should be as the ECD programme moves into its final year of operation. There are four suggested priorities which emerge from the evaluation for the final year of the OBA programme of work:

1. More training in the OBA approach and concepts to a wider group.

2. The development of more knowledge and confidence at the strategic level by targeting more carefully key stakeholders at a senior level in the various departments and programmes of work.

3. The development of more understanding at grassroots or front-line level through better supporting and resourcing the role of OBA Champions as mentors and coaches (system leaders).
4. More dissemination and modelling of the value of the OBA approach, with better sharing of experience within and across public service sectors, and across different programmes of work eg Making it REAL.

Respondents in the evaluation revealed that they were aware of the need for carefully planned and targeted work during the final year of the Programme and were aware of where attention should now focus, highlighting those action priorities identified above.

**INT1**: More training and developing more confidence at upper strategic policy level about OBA.

**INT 2**: Identifying Champions has to be the way forward as someone has to own it and champion it, especially those in strategic roles. We have some way to go before it is recognised as the ‘go to’ process in Education. We can learn that it is not the indicators or data per se but rather what you are going to do with it and which indicators need to be changed. It needs to be more talked about and embedded.

**INT 3**: We have to nudge and influence. Through modelling we can show how. It’s the responsibility of those who have been touched by it to be part of the contagion. I am mindful that there is one year to go so it’s time to take stock.

**INT 4**: Using the data from OBA to commission new initiatives and programmes. KPI performance metrics should link to population measures and longer health outcomes. There should be an interconnection from top to bottom. We need to have milestones and markers which are concrete, hold fire and target, and be confident in the approach, looking for the ‘turn’ and knowing why it is happening, and when it is stagnating. It ensures accountability and evidence based practice so the culture on the island begins to change. This is particularly important in the PVI sector. We need levers and carrots and to inform the population so we ‘deliver what the public want’. At this middle stage in the ECD programme I can see the stars aligning and there is buy in developing. Champions need to get an understanding of the other ECD Programme Champions eg REAL. At the moment they are not connected. The Champions need training in support and mentoring – we need to invest in these people if we are to achieve real change.

**INT 7**: We should look for interaction between OBA, which many practitioners do not understand, and REAL. Culturally different paradigms exist. That’s where we need the ambassadors. It is vital that the EYC Partnership takes this on.

**INT 8**: But it hasn’t reached some parts lower down the system – Making it REAL practitioners are not using OBA terms. We need more impact there at the base. We need sensitivity. Priority for ‘final year’? Embedding of OBA across sectors – that’s not NCB’s role but ours.
INT 9: We have just touched the surface really. It needs someone, some strategy to embed this. It needs both outsider input and OBA Champions.

Case Study 2: Making it REAL Strand

Strand Description and Aims
Making it REAL gives families ideas and practical ways to support children’s early literacy development, focusing on everyday opportunities at home as well as when families are out and about. REAL enables children and their families to explore key strands of literacy – books, early writing, environmental print and oral language and is underpinned by the ORIM framework. ORIM stands for: Opportunities; Recognition; Interaction; and Model. It is based on the idea developed by Cathy Nutbrown and Peter Hannon² that these are the four ways in which parents help their children’s learning.

REAL aims to:
- Engage parents in their children’s early literacy development;
- Build parent’s confidence and knowledge to support early home learning;
- Impact on children’s outcomes and family literacy practice.

REAL Strategy and Work Plan
There have been a range of strategies to take the Making it REAL strand forward including:

REAL Training: A series of funded 2-day training programmes has been delivered to early years practitioners.

REAL Projects: Trained practitioners are provided with a bursary of £300 to support resourcing for activities. The project includes a minimum of 2 home visits per child and at least 3 literacy events, and submission of monitoring information which demonstrates they have enrolled a minimum of 3 targeted children and 10 additional children and recruited and supported at least one volunteer. The local projects are also offered leadership and support through project support network meetings.

REAL Home Visits: A series of home visits to families have been completed.

REAL Literacy Events: A series of literacy events for families have been offered.

REAL Champion Training: Training for 6 REAL Champions to support REAL training and projects across Jersey and contribute to the delivery of other training courses for practitioners on the island has been completed.

Dissemination Activities: REAL Champions shared their experience of delivering the REAL programme at the second KMC seminar; provision of REAL Literacy leaflets for parents; and publication of a set of 8 practice examples launched at Festival of Words island-wide event.

Maths REAL training: A one day extension training for REAL practitioners to support families in early mathematics and enable families to support early learning in a more holistic way;

Further Training: Offered for REAL Champions, training and briefing for other agencies, students from Highland College and REAL parents recruited to participate in parent volunteer workshops.

---

Target Groups and Engagement

The evaluation evidence set out to document who are the key target groups for the Making it REAL programme of work; how successful the programme has been in reaching the target groups; and whether the coverage has been comprehensive and well distributed. Making it REAL targets early years practitioners, parents, children and their siblings and wider family members. During the period April 2016 - March 2017 practitioners from a wide range of early years settings received the two-day training and engaged families in REAL home visits and literacy events as part of the ECD Programme. 5 REAL Champions additionally received a one-day training to support programme delivery and contribute to other training on the island.

The monitoring evidence for the Making it REAL strand reveals that this programme has been successful in achieving strong engagement. The KPIs for the first 12-18 months of the programme were:

- Min 60 REAL practitioners trained in early years settings
- 4 REAL Champions trained
- 47 settings engaged
- 135 individual children and 45 siblings or other children directly benefit (180 children total)
- 135 parents directly benefit
- 900 family members indirectly benefit eg other children and parents or carers via events

The Making it REAL Report Card for 2016/17 reveals that this strand has made good progress in reaching and engaging its target groups and reaching its end of Programme KPI’s in respect of this strand of work and has also had some success with engaging parents from Portuguese and Polish speaking communities, as shown in the evidence below.

Training: Making it REAL training has been delivered to 59 practitioners and 6 champions.

Quality of training: 100% of those trained stated it was either Excellent (88%) or Very Good (12%). 54 (of 59) rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge to support children with early literacy; 58 (of 59) rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge of engaging with parents to support child’s learning; 43 (of 58 rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge of engaging with bilingual families to support child’s learning; 40 (of 59) rated training as good/excellent in increasing practitioner knowledge of early identification of need and referral onwards.

Delivery: The Making it REAL programme has been offered to 47 settings; take up was 34. Within the settings that took up REAL, 124 families participated, 30 of which received home visits.

Ongoing support: 29% of those trained attended at least 2 network meetings.

Reach of programme: 72% of Early Years settings are delivering REAL (47 settings); 24% of children engaged in REAL home visits.
**Engagement:** 39% of children in Early Years settings across Jersey attended literacy events; 32% of eligible families attended literacy events; 84% speak English as their first language at home.

**Literacy events:** Literacy events have been held in 28 settings and attended by 735 (39%) children; and 611 (32%) parents. 31% of sample of participants were from bilingual families including Polish and Portuguese.

The interview and focus groups provide further evidence of a high level of engagement by practitioners and parents in the REAL programme across the island, and the success in engaging targeted families from Portuguese and Polish speaking communities is revealed in the respondent comment below:

**INT 6:** Parents attending the parental programme session are mostly Portuguese (currently 2), Polish (1), Irish (1), with relatively fewer self-identifying as ‘Islanders’. For the Portuguese parent, culturally, there was a lack of ‘educative interactions’ at home, especially literacy activities together.

**Enablers and Barriers to Making it REAL**

The evaluation evidence set out to document what have been the main enablers of, and barriers to, the Making it REAL strand of work making progress and achieving its aims. The interview and focus group evidence indicates a more considered view of the progress of the making it REAL strand to date and what has enabled or prevented this progress.

**Enablers:**

The significant funding and support offered as part of the ECD Programme has clearly been a key enabler for the REAL programme to extend and embed the work within practice.

**INT 6:** Its sustainability is an attraction, for me it’s a small cost with a high benefit; encouraging us to do things differently; the Jersey Premium helped too and the programme is now embedding into KS1.

**NT1:** ALL 3 programmes need funding beyond the three years if they are to be sustainable. It needs more work to develop a critical mass to become normalised and universalised. It also needs to be embedded with students.

It was widely acknowledged that Dr Cathy Hamer has been a key ambassador for the REAL stand of work, offering leadership, clarity of purpose and inspiration to practitioners and other stakeholders, giving confidence and encouraging competence in others to take the work forward. As stated by one respondent:

**INT1:** The REAL Programme is aimed at nursery practitioners and I have been surprised at the level of engagement, word of mouth has helped. Dr Cathy Hamer has been great and good at promoting the programme.

The flexible delivery of the programme has also enabled access for some parents as this respondent stated:
**INT 2:** The aim is to impact on home learning environment, especially for working families, so flexibility of Saturday and evening sessions are important.

**Barriers:**
Barriers to engagement in the programme had been overcome through flexible programme delivery and funding which ensured all families could benefit. The working patterns of parents was, however, a barrier for participation for some parents, as this respondent indicates:

**INT 6:** Only one parent worked, at night, and had a young baby. All the others did not work. Non-working parents was a consistent theme. For the Portuguese parent culturally there was lack of ‘educative interactions’, especially literacy activities together.

**Impact of REAL Programme**
The evaluation evidence examined how far, and in what ways, the Making it REAL strand of work has met the stated ECD Programme outcomes. The evaluation evidence below reveals that this strand of work has made a significant impact on outcomes 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, showing a wide range of benefits in terms of outcomes for practitioners, parents and children.

**Outcome 1. Early Years and Health practitioners have increased knowledge of how to support young children’s development**
The monitoring evidence reveals that the Making it REAL programme of work has made a real contribution to outcome 1. The data shows that:

- 98% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in ‘increasing knowledge of engaging parents to support learning’.
- 92% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing their knowledge of ‘supporting children with early literacy’.
- 86% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing knowledge of ‘early identification of need and referral onwards’.
- 74% trainees rated training as excellent/very good in increasing knowledge of ‘engaging with bilingual families to support child’s learning’.

The interview and focus group evidence supports this assessment of the impact of the programme on this outcome. A focus group agreed that the programme had encouraged them to signpost the library to parents, and given them confidence to model practice to parents, adapting the resources and materials to individual communities and families. It had also provided a vehicle for more home visiting which contributes to the safeguarding agenda, as one respondent pointed out:

**INT1:** The REAL Programme has resulted in an increase going into homes with more participation which I think has impacted on ‘safeguarding’. It’s been a vehicle to develop more trust with parents.
Outcome 2: Making it REAL project parents have increased knowledge and confidence to support young children’s early learning and literacy development

It is evident that the REAL programme has had a considerable impact on parents’ knowledge and confidence in their support for learning and literacy. The monitoring data reveals that in a sample of REAL core children (79 of 121), 52% parents had increased confidence in asking questions and starting conversations with practitioners about their child, and 80% of parents reported increased confidence in being able to support their child’s early literacy. This evidence was strengthened by the interview and focus group data. As respondents stated:

**Parent Focus Group:** We’d never experienced these kinds of workshops with parents involved before and the home visits were important – the teacher left materials that changed how I interacted with my child and our range of activities. They showed us everyday activities which were also learning opportunities, for example when we were shopping. Also I now know why I am doing these activities. I have enjoyed it very much and I want to continue being involved. I’m much more confident in what I do with my boy and know what to do. I understand the real point of this school and what goes on.

**INT 6:** I understand after programme why parents are important, what the child is learning from them and that the process is fun, enjoyable and manageable. Home visits were informative both ways, the teacher was seen in a different light and in an accessible context and could show that practical and every day experiences could be turned into opportunities to learn. A Jersey parent said she had much more awareness of her child’s development: ‘it has changed the kind of activities I do at home and I talk to them more’. There’s been lots of learning for me as a parent - ideas to support their learning through fun activities. I wish I’d known this for my first son. It’s changed how we are at home for all of us. I’ve also built relationships and friendships with other parents.

Outcome 3: Making it REAL project children show improvement in early literacy

The monitoring data reveals that the REAL programme of work has begun improve children’s early literacy significantly.

- Sample of core children (79 of 121) evidence reveals 63% REAL project children have increased confidence in literacy.
- 76% REAL project children registered improvements in oral language.
- 72% REAL project children registered improvements in their awareness of environmental print.
- 67% REAL project children registered increased sharing of books.
- 61% REAL project children registered increased engagement in early writing.
- 71% REAL project parents reported their child’s literacy, language and communication had improved ‘a lot’.
- Library membership of REAL project children increased by 50% from 42% to 68%.
Outcome 5: Improvement in school readiness, particularly in early literacy for Making it REAL children

The evidence from the focus groups shows that the REAL project has enhanced children’s learning and development in range of areas of learning, as well as literacy. This includes greater confidence, creativity, curiosity, concentration, language and agency. All of which support school readiness as shown in the comments below:

**Parent Focus Group:** You could see the difference it made to the children: they are more imaginative, focused. He likes to do different things, it’s give them and me more ideas.

**INT 6:** For my son, I see greater concentration and language. The kids are more confident, and the approachability of staff makes the kids more likely to approach and engage confidently and so learn more.

Outcome 6: Increased number of families from Polish and Portuguese speaking communities engaged

The monitoring evidence and focus groups reveal that the REAL programme has successfully engaged families from Polish and Portuguese speaking communities. Data from Nov 17 revealed that 44% of REAL families were Portuguese, 30% Polish, 11% French and 15% other, reflecting the inclusive approach of the project. This attraction for parents from a wide range of cultures and communities is borne out in the focus group evidence.

**Parent Focus Group:** An Irish parent spoke about ‘democratic encounters, having a voice, learning about other parenting cultures, intergenerational, civic, learning community – all of us learning together and about each other’. And a Jersey islander said ‘I’m more aware of possibilities, the day to day activities are different now at home – more talk, more awareness. I feel I understand the point of school’s approach but also aware home learning is critical and my boy is more aware, pointing things out when we are out’. A Portuguese parent stated, ‘It is not work. It’s harder than work. I never really knew how to be with my child before – I’ve learnt lots about being a parent, ideas about how to interact with my child and to support learning through fun activities. I just wish I’d known about this with my first son. It’s helped their concentration, they focus for longer. It’s changed how we are at home for all of us parents, links, relationships and friendships – I wouldn’t change it- I would like to continue to be involved, it’s fun, sociable for parents. Learning, it is us, the parents, understanding why they do things. It’s not just play, I didn’t know that. All parents should do this programme so they can support their child. Older siblings have benefited too.

Next Steps and Improvements
Finally, the evaluation set out to explore the sustainability of the Making it REAL strand of work and what next steps should be as the ECD programme moves into its final year of operation. There are nine suggested priorities which emerge from the evaluation for the final year of the Making it REAL programme:

1. Securing sustainability of funding.
2. Extension of REAL maths programme.
3. Widening training to include students and other sectors eg Health Visitors.
4. Developing REAL Champions, including parents, and ensuring they have training and support to carry out this role.
5. Embedding this strand of work into wider island initiatives.
6. Ensuring buy in by senior strategic leaders on the island.
7. Ensuring it is culturally nuanced and reflects diversity of languages.
8. Recruitment of REAL practitioners and volunteers from newly arrived communities.
9. Explore how programme can better support bilingual children and children with SEND.

These priorities were also highlighted by the respondents in the interviews and focus groups.

**INT1:** The programmes all need funding beyond the 3 years if they are to be sustainable. It needs more work to develop a critical mass to become normalised and universalised. It also needs to be embedded with students.

**INT 2:** It needs widening to include Highland students and Health Visitors to ensure greater visibility and sustainability. This is harder to do without funding. I am excited by idea of parents as REAL Champions, as an island-wide strategy and it could be part of our Quality Framework. I can see this beginning to happen.

**INT 3:** The focus must be on the key stakeholders in the system and targeting them. It needs more people and it needs to be wider than early years to include work force, health, social care and others.

**INT 8:** We need to be better at Portuguese translation. Make it REAL is all in English. We are not culturally sensitive enough. If we take on more Health Visitors, we need Portuguese speakers.

**Practitioners’ Focus Group:** The programme needs to target EAL families and do home visiting early morning and evening, even Sunday morning. Autistic children also need more recognition within system. Earlier is more effective so sign posting from Health Visitors is vital.
**Case Study 3: Knowledge Makes Change (KMC) Strand**

**Strand Description and Aims**
Knowledge Makes Change (KMC) aims to establish an effective model for improving knowledge of ‘what works’ in terms of early childhood development. The programme forms an integral part of a sustainable model for capacity building and continuous quality improvement in early childhood development in Jersey.

**KMC aims are:**
- To be an effective dissemination mechanism for local, national and international evidence based research and practice to empower children’s workforce and pass on their child development and early learning messages to parents
- To build on existing practice and provide a catalyst for inspiring continuous quality improvement and capacity building
- To provide a platform for sharing learning across Jersey
- To be informed by and easily accessible to the children’s workforce in Jersey.

**KMC objectives are:**
- To provide information about early years developments in Jersey
- To provide up to date research and practice
- To encourage dissemination of learning

**KMC Strategy and Work Plan**
There have been a range of strategies to take the KMC strand forward including:

3. **A series of 4 Seminars:** (over first 2 years of the project) Seminar 1: focus on what matters most for early years. Seminar 2: focus on language development. Seminar 3: focus on home visiting to support children’s health, well-being and early development. Seminar 4: focus on supporting bilingual families

4. **Regular e-Newsletters and Newsflash Updates:** Published monthly to provide a balance of Jersey/international context. Channel for supporting recruitment and engagement in REAL/OBA/KMC seminars. Published monthly.

**Target Groups and Engagement**
The evaluation evidence set out to document who are the key target groups for the KMC programme of work; how successful the programme has been in reaching the target groups; and whether the coverage has been comprehensive and well distributed. Each seminar aimed for 80 delegates on average and key target audiences are:

- Children’s workforce multi-agency representatives including schools, speech and language, early years, health, family, social care and SENCOs
- Parents
- Policy makers, strategic leads and partner reps from other departments

The monitoring evidence for the KMC strand of work reveals that this programme has been successful in achieving strong engagement from a range of stakeholders at both strategic and operational levels. The programme KPI target was to hold 4
workshops and reach 80 beneficiaries at this point in the work plan. In fact, this KPI target has been largely exceeded, as reflected in the data below. The KPI target was for the seminars and newsletters to reach a total of 340 policy makers and practitioners at this stage in the ECD Programme.

**Seminars:**
Seminar 1: 79 attendees; 98% rated seminar excellent or good
Seminar 2: 72 attendees; 98% rated seminar excellent or good
Seminar 3: 63 attendees; 94% rated seminar excellent or good

**Newsletters:**
Monthly newsletter delivered with 616 recipients on mailing list, including early years, education, health and social care practitioners and strategic leaders.

**Enablers and Barriers to KMC Strand of Work**
The evaluation evidence set out to document what have been the main enablers of, and barriers to, the KMC strand of work making progress and achieving its aims. Evaluation feedback from the seminars indicates that the topics covered have been popular and informative, relevant to a wide range of practitioners, service providers and policy makers.

**Enablers:**
The international reputation of the speakers has been a key draw and the timing of the seminars has enabled attendance by a wide group of stakeholders. The open and inclusive nature of the events has also been appreciated, providing a forum for networking and information exchange, as stated below:

**INT 2:** The research has been good, cross sector and inclusive, with good attendance and quality speakers.

A feedback survey about the newsletter indicates that the content is useful, helping readers in their role as a practitioner, raising awareness of practice guidance and increasing practitioner knowledge. Feedback indicates the content is liked, with a good balance between Jersey and international news, and length, format and publication timing are at right level.

**INT1:** The KMC Programme has bulletin with 600+ practitioners involved in the mailing network. There remain gaps, eg Highland students not really penetrated yet though they are the future workforce. NCB put information into the bulletin for us. We have a Jersey Childhood Practitioners webpage which helps knowledge exchange. I feel bottom up knowledge sharing is not as strong with the need to develop more practitioner research that goes beyond reflection. The mix of seminars that have been run has been very good and addressed issues across the workforce eg midwives, childminders.

**Barriers:**
However, the evidence indicates a need to extend the reach of the programme and ensure the impact of the seminars on practice quality through better targeting to
those in training, exploring different venues and timings for seminars, and the need to use practitioner research linked to the seminar content to take practitioners beyond reflection into action in their settings.

**Contribution of Programme to ‘Vision’**
The evaluation evidence explored how the KMC strand of work is contributing to the vision that ‘Jersey should be the best place for all children to grow up’ and what would help this vision to be realised. The perceived contribution of the KMC programme in providing a clear, coherent and evidenced vision of what service quality is and what works best for children and families, is well articulated by this respondent:

**INT 2:** The beauty of this programme is that it is overarching and so bridges barriers, bringing us together, especially through the seminars.

**Impact of KMC**
The evaluation evidence examined how far, and in what ways, the KMC strand of work has contributed to the stated ECD Programme outcomes. The evaluation evidence reveals that the KMC strand of work has made a significant contribution to outcome 1 but at this stage there is little evidence of its impact on the other outcomes.

**Outcome 1: Early Years and Health practitioners have increased knowledge of how to support young children’s development**
The monitoring evidence reveals that the KMC seminars have been well attended and well received by policy makers and practitioners on the island, enhancing large numbers of practitioners understanding of ‘what works’ in practice and providing a coherent view of quality services in the areas covered by the seminars and the newsletters. The evaluation feedback reveals that:

- The topics covered have been popular and informative, relevant to a wide range of practitioners, service providers and policy makers.
- Newsletter content is useful and increases practitioner knowledge.

The interview and focus groups provide further evidence that the KMC seminar programme and newsletters are increasing early years and health practitioners’ knowledge, understanding and reflection on how to support young children’s development. As stated by one respondent, the excellent quality of the speakers has been well appreciated and they have succeeded in stimulating dialogue and reflection across sectors.

**INT 1:** Implementation has been relatively simple and through the NCB has brought top people to Jersey and has led to increasing reflection and knowledge in the system. Also practitioners sharing knowledge to make change.

However, as yet there is little evidence of the impact of this work on the quality of service delivery, practice or child/parent outcomes in early literacy and school readiness (outcomes 2, 3, 4 and 5). The application of this new knowledge into practice, to secure transformation and quality improvement is harder to see at this stage, as highlighted by a number of respondents:
**INT 2:** I would say that the quality of the programme has been good and it has had an impact but I am not sure whether the knowledge is embedded. I think practitioner confidence is improved but there is no evidence on the impact on practice. The reach of the Bulletins is good and learning what is happening elsewhere as well as on the island is good but the impact on practice I am not so sure.

**INT 3:** How you achieve step change is hard to assess. There are eddies of reflection but how you get to the stage of transformational change and how you convert reflection to action is harder. There is knowledge and interaction but I am not sure about measurable change or impact on children’s learning outcomes yet. This can be one of the tools.

**INT 7:** The KMC newsletter has been driven by NCB seeking to improve the knowledge of ‘what works’ for families through newsletters that provide local updates, profile latest research and practice from the UK along with International contexts has raised awareness about Jersey and national and international data. Did it make a change? I’m not so sure. There was a wide audience for the seminars, well attended, but maybe we need to understand the Jersey context before we fly in specialist outsiders.

**Next Steps and Improvements**

Finally, the evaluation set out to explore the sustainability of the KMC strand of work and what next steps should be as the ECD programme moves into its final year of operation. There are three suggested priorities which emerge from the evaluation for the final year of the KMC programme:

1. Better showcasing good Jersey practice where it exists.
2. Targeting trainee practitioners for seminars and newsletters.
3. Better support for the linking of new knowledge and understanding on ‘what works’ to deeper and more critical reflection on current practice, through practitioner research and action projects to ensure implementation of what works, with a clearer focus on enhancing child outcomes.

As a respondents pointed out, timescales are short to achieve such a shift in practice:

**INT 4:** Maybe a ‘sandwich’ approach input, research action in setting, then a follow up which looks at individual impact – then there’s the ‘so what’ question, what’s the impact, how is it evidence based and what are the indicators of progress? How do we change ideas into reality and make Jersey the best place to grow up for both the child of the Range Rover parent and the night shift worker? These are the more challenging questions.

**INT 7:** Look at time scales - three years, and one year to go. Will that be the whole programme? What can be realistically achieved in three years? This is more than just about sowing seeds, we need to win hearts and minds and we will need much more time to secure sustainable change.