



PREVENT's core structural indicators* across different system levels

– including municipality level and individual project level

Dr. Paul Downes, Thematic expert

Ulf Häggglund, Lead expert



Two kinds of indicators well known in all kinds of developmental work

Outcome Indicators

Outcome indicators measure the broader results achieved through the provision of goods and services. Outcome indicators will often be used in conjunction with benchmarks or targets to measure change over time. Area rates of early school leaving is an example of an outcome indicator.

There are a number of limitations to outcome indicators. They do not explain why phenomena occur nor how they could be changed, nor obstacles to their change.

Process Indicators

'Process indicators measure programme, activities and interventions. They measure, as it were, State effort', whereas 'outcome indicators will often be used in conjunction with benchmarks or targets to measure change over time'.

This offers a focus on change over time dimensions and is a focus on degree/intensity of effort/participation.

Process indicators address two limitations of outcome indicators. That is, process indicators provide a better picture of the quality of services and better information for programme improvement.

Introducing Structural indicators*

Structural indicators (SI's); yes and no-questions, something that can be changed (laws, spaces, roles and responsibilities, key guiding principles, potentially malleable dimensions to a school and/or community system). SI's can operate flexibly at different levels of a system and at different levels of concreteness and abstraction (i.e., physical spaces and designated jobs, guiding principles for action/strategy etc.)

Structural indicators could be set up as physical structures, roles as structures in an organisation or as enduring key principles structurally underpinning the intervention.

Using structural indicators will help PREVENT network cities to understand if necessary key structures and mechanisms are in place to really combat ESL, and more specific, to involve parents in the process. Whereas outcome indicators in the Prevent context could be 'reduced rates of ESL' and 'increased school attendance' (i.e., evidence of effects), structural indicators are key conditions and/or enablers for system success, enduring features of a system that are malleable, thus going beyond the traditional qualitative/quantitative distinction. The SI's will focus on aspects like the level of ESL prevention in a city (universal, selected or indicated), on the level of collaboration with core target groups (from information to real co-production), on level of systemic change (individual, school, family, community). Goal of structural indicators is firstly for comparison of the cities' own progress over time compared with itself, and secondly to compare with other cities.

***Core structural indicators (SI's) - shared by all cities in the PREVENT network**

A structural indicators approach is already used by the UN concerning its international right to health.

Key Questions for your Municipality

– Agreed core structural indicators as part of a strategic systemic approach to overcome gaps

Guiding principles as Structural Indicators:

- Active involvement of target groups in design YES OR NO
- Active involvement of target groups in delivery YES OR NO
- Building on strengths of target groups – not framing them simply in terms of deficits YES OR NO
- Cultural awareness of staff (including in schools) YES OR NO
- Empowerment, not dependency of parents YES OR NO
- Prevention and early intervention focus YES OR NO

Roles in organizational structures as Structural Indicators:

- Services provided are consistent with objectives YES OR NO
- Intervention of sufficient intensity to bring change YES OR NO
- System change focus and not simply individual change focus YES OR NO

- Clear focus on level of prevention – universal, selected and/or indicated YES OR NO
- Distinct age cohort focus YES OR NO
- Clear outreach strategy to reach marginalised groups YES OR NO
- -Strategy to develop community leaders from marginalised groups YES OR NO
- Employment of members of marginalised groups in the team YES OR NO
- Clear leadership responsibility with and between agencies for achieving YES OR NO
- Specific goal – not diffusion of responsibility YES OR NO
- Clear feedback paths from parents YES OR NO
- Clear feedback paths from students YES OR NO
- Continuum of supports across ages YES OR NO
- Bridging health and education YES OR NO
- Targeting malleable risk and protective factors YES OR NO
- Multiple domains YES OR NO
- Confidentiality/Privacy Protocols YES OR NO
- Alternatives to Suspension YES OR NO

Physical spaces as Structural Indicators

- Specific space in school building for parents to meet YES OR NO
- Clear representations of cultural identity of specific groups in shared physical spaces such as schools (and communities, such as through festivals) YES OR NO
- Common spaces for overcoming hierarchies (e.g., common eating spaces) YES OR NO

Optional indicators for municipalities

a) Specific/thematic structural indicators - local needs, peer/critical friends, strengths/weaknesses with a minimum of 2 cities though ideally a cluster

b) Holistic structural indicators – all relevant ones that cities recognise are important and will address in the future if successful case for additional funding is made. These allow for recognition of gaps in current services for parental engagement and early school leaving prevention

(see next page for examples)

Some Key Themes for Consideration as Local Cluster or Holistic Structural Indicator Levels:

- Preventing pupil hunger in school (frequently underestimated) through parent support: cooking classes, availability of food, school kitchens
- Preventing pupil/students loss of sleep affecting concentration, behaviour, motivation, academic performance etc. through parent support to address adequate structured sleep – 9 hours a night recommended by international research
- Preventing bullying in school leading to ESL – parental involvement to provide supports/feedback for both bullies and victims, as part of a wider bullying prevention strate
- Early intervention for language development – Parents’ reading classes for children, storytelling, musical beginnings
- Early intervention for attachment bonding processes – Family supports for bonding, feeding, relational parenting styles, sensory stimulation of children
- Bridge-Building A: Outreach supports to parents’ homes for their children’s school attendance as empowerment supports rather than social control
- Bridge-Building B: Education outreach supports for parents in community lifelong learning centres (Downes 2011a), other community sites (Parent cafes, shops, churches, mosques, pubs)
- Bridge-Building C: Parent peer support approaches – for young children’s language development, for mutual advice for their adolescents
- Bridge-Building D: Recognise social dimension to parents’ motivation to be involved – to meet new people etc. – a feature increasingly recognised in adults’ motivation to attend lifelong learning classes
- Building on strengths of communities – festivals approach