



Changing life stories

The development of the National Literacy Trust's place-based model

June 2020

The National Literacy Trust is the leader in the UK's place-based approach to tackling low literacy in deprived communities. This report firstly presents and analyses the evidence and theory that have positioned a place-based approach to social problems at the core of the policy agenda. Then, reflecting on our learning and expertise when developing 14 National Literacy Trust Hubs and regional campaigns, it updates our best practice model for place-based working, offering an eight-point framework for successful place-based interventions.

Executive summary

- Children's lives, from the earliest moments, are shaped by where they live. Research has shown that the characteristics of the neighbourhoods where children live and the systems they encounter shape their lives more than almost any other factor. Interventions to help children overcome the factors that impede their wellbeing and educational attainment need to be interventions in particular places.
- In the Civil Society Strategy published in 2018, the government committed to 'a more collaborative place-based approach' for public services, working with 'individuals and communities in a place'. This move towards place-based work is only increasing with the devolution of power to the combined authorities and the localism agenda. The National Literacy Trust welcomes this shift of power and money away from Whitehall as an opportunity for us to work more closely with authorities closer to localised problems of poor literacy. Place-based approaches appear to be the most likely to make an impact on social mobility and educational outcomes and should therefore be the basis on which organisations build future strategies.
- The National Literacy Trust sought out and have learned from a range of theories, evaluations and research into place-based approaches. From Bronfenbrenner's underlying theory to more innovative approaches incorporating collective impact and social capital, the charity has utilised a range of learning to develop the communities-based Literacy Hub model. The Hubs are now delivering holistic multi-strand interventions that seek to develop community assets in a response to the systemic literacy difficulties these areas see. They have begun to see success in tackling low literacy in some of the most deprived communities and improving the life chances of children there as a result.

© The National Literacy Trust 2020

T: 020 7587 1842 W: literacytrust.org.uk Twitter: @Literacy_Trust Facebook: [nationalliteracytrust](https://www.facebook.com/nationalliteracytrust)

The National Literacy Trust is a registered charity no. 1116260 and a company limited by guarantee no. 5836486 registered in England and Wales and a registered charity in Scotland no. SC042944. Registered address: 68 South Lambeth Road, London SW8 1RL.

- From the success of this local-areas development, in 2014, the National Literacy Trust initially developed five key characteristics of successful place-based interventions in conjunction with other charities as part of the Read On. Get On. (ROGO) campaign. These characteristics were:
 1. A coordinated multi-agency approach, encompassing government, voluntary and business sectors
 2. A medium-term commitment to the communities you're working in
 3. A 'tripartite' approach where partnerships are fostered and developed with the public, corporate and third sectors
 4. A strong and focused commitment to a comprehensive approach that doesn't locate the complete solution in a single intervention
 5. Strong and visible local leadership at a senior level

- Building from ongoing learning from the Literacy Hubs in relation to these five characteristics, and from the growing body of external evidence and literature including around collective impact approaches, we have updated and developed a more comprehensive eight-point framework that we believe sets a renewed standard for any place-based approach:
 - 1. A common agenda between partners, including a shared vision for change, a joint understanding of the problem and an agreed approach to solving it with planned and collaborative contributions**

 - 2. Joint use of data and a shared measurement system to understand the issue and track progress**

 - 3. A range of mutually reinforcing activities that create a comprehensive approach, with clearly defined roles for each partner organisation**

 - 4. Continuous communication between stakeholders and clear, consistent external messaging**

 - 5. A backbone organisation that provides strong and visible leadership to coordinate the collective effort and that of local partners**

 - 6. A medium-term commitment to the communities you're working in**

 - 7. Cross-sector partnerships that are mutually beneficial for each partners' long-term strategy and short-term goals**

 - 8. Engage communities in every stage of the project**

Introduction

Children's lives, from the earliest moments, are shaped by where they live. Research has shown that the characteristics of the neighbourhoods where children live, and the systems they encounter, "shaped children's educational outcomes over and above the effects of social class or the overall deprivation levels of the areas" and compound existing disadvantages.

Their lives are moulded in many places: in the classroom, the home, through friends, through culture and through the wider communities in which they live. The neighbourhoods they are from and the systems they encounter can shape educational outcomes more than even their socio-economic standing. In coastal communities with poor transport links and limited opportunities, and inner-city communities where 'urban blight' shapes life chances, the community impacts on children's education more than the inherent deprivation of the area.

Interventions to help children overcome the factors that impede their wellbeing and educational attainment, therefore, need to be interventions in particular places.

The National Literacy Trust was established 27 years ago to shine a light on the literacy troubles faced by children in some of the most deprived areas in the UK. Over that time, the services we offer, the research we have undertaken and the schools we have worked with have changed to offer children the best possible support and reflect up-to-date thinking. In 2012, we launched our Literacy Hub approach, where we work within deprived communities to raise awareness of the importance of literacy and support young people to develop the literacy skills they need to succeed in life. Today, we have 14 Hubs and regional campaigns across the UK, a testament to the success they have seen in every location.

This report will be divided in two parts. Firstly, it will look at the background research, theories and best practice reviews that have shaped the charity's Literacy Hub model. From the Harlem Children's Zone in the USA to the New Deals for Communities in the UK, prior learning shaped the development of the Hubs from launch. In 2014, we also shared the five characteristics for place-based approaches as part of the Read On. Get On. (ROGO) campaign with a number of charity partners, which built from our learning at the time.

The second part of the report will review our learning from six years of running place-based programmes across the country alongside our continuing review of the growing evidence in the field. From this, we will present our new eight-point framework for successful place-based working.

By sharing our best practice framework, we hope to help charities and policy makers learn from our successful work in this area. Our combination of evidence-based approaches, alongside our expertise in place-based working, allows us to deliver collective impact. We remain convinced that this approach tackles low literacy and improves the lives of people in some of the most deprived communities in the UK.

Part 1: Why the move towards place-based?

Underlying theory

A key reason for the shift in focus towards, and interest in, place-based working is the lack of clear success from overarching national top-down policies and strategies. As an example, the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategies launched in the late 1990s produced mixed results, and did not drive long-term sustainable educational improvement among the most disadvantaged pupils. This can be evidenced by the continuing link between where people are born and their literacy outcomes.

The thinking around the relationship between place and life outcomes dates from at least 1979 and the American developmental psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory. According to Bronfenbrenner, a child's development interacts with, and is influenced by, a number of ecological systems: the immediate home environment, the school, the community, wider society etc. Given the influence of all of these systems upon a child's development, and thus educational attainment, any intervention seeking to improve a child's results/skills/wellbeing cannot confine itself to improving schools' standards. It requires a holistic multi-agency approach to interact with, and improve, the 'systems' outside school that hamper a child's development of key skills, and it should also engage with barriers to educational attainment in the child's home environment and wider community (e.g. low literacy in the community, no books/educational materials at home). These systems are based in specific **places**.

The theory in real-world use

In government and across the charity sector, Bronfenbrenner's theory has been used to create a change in approach towards a place-based model. In reviews for new policy and in evaluations, language has shifted to recognise the significance of place in interventions. This had a knock-on effect on the types of interventions being suggested and created. Save the Children's 2013 report into the evidence base for setting up Children's Zones modelled on the Harlem Children's Zoneⁱ (detailed below) in England made several references:

“Where a child lives, and the neighbourhood systems they experience, are of particular importance for children... The emerging evidence suggests that such concentrations [of poor families] may create neighbourhood effects which compound the existing disadvantages... different areas create different dynamics... one study found that different neighbourhood characteristics shaped children's educational outcomes over and above the effects of social class or the overall deprivation levels of the areas” (p.3).

“Children's ecologies are grounded in particular places – and place matters... interventions in children's ecologies should also be interventions in particular places” (p.4).

“The rationale for children’s zones asserts that a doubly holistic approach, where interventions take place across the whole of the child’s ecology and throughout the childhood and adolescent years, is likely to prove particularly effective in improving outcomes” (p.7).

The Big Lottery Fund, which finances and oversees a large number of place-based projects through its work, had further interesting observations on communities from its report on place-based workingⁱⁱ:

“Making work relevant and useful is done best by connecting it to people, their lives and where they live” (p.4).

Quoting from a 2017 study:

“... previous place-based approaches have been hampered by the absence of a clearly articulated rationale for working in place – a theory of place – and/or a lack of clarity about the motivation or starting point for choosing to work in place” (p.5).

The Institute for Voluntary Action Research (IVAR)ⁱⁱⁱ has a briefing paper on place-based working. Many of its major points reflect the learning above:

“It is more than just a term to describe the target location of funding; it also describes a style and philosophy of funding” (p.1)

“The issues funders wish to address – especially in the most disadvantaged areas – are multi-faceted and require a holistic approach” (p.1).

In government

The Institute for Voluntary Action Research (IVAR) also describe place-based working as “a response to the interest of successive governments in localism and decentralisation”. Indeed, the past few years have seen an increase in the government’s interest in place-based working for public-service reform, and this interest spans multiple government departments.

The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), for example, has a £4.5m joint project with the Big Lottery Fund called the Place Based Social Action Programme (PBSA), which funds place-based partnerships in 20 communities across the country. DCMS commissioned Renaisi^{iv} to prepare a learning review on place-based social action. This learning review outlines the government’s approach to, and understanding of, the ‘theory of place’:

“There has... been a renewed focus on place as a site for public service delivery, investment and control, both from government and funders” (p.1).

“The last decade has seen a marked increase in the popularity of place-based approaches. Place is a popular, but problematic, concept in public policy:

while the phrase itself has grown in currency and usage, there is a lack of consensus on its precise meaning” (p.5).

“PBSA requires that local stakeholders themselves determine what makes – or could make – their place” (p.6).

“We can assume that a place is locally rooted and it has – or has the potential for – broad community impact. A place eligible for intervention and funding will define its own boundaries” (p.6).

“Place-based delivery is built up from questions about that place; its community, needs, assets, services and ‘what-makes-it-what-it-is’ are all considered before prescribing and intervention” (p.6).

DCMS also released its Civil Society Strategy^v in August 2018. Within it, the government embraced place-based working as being central to achieving its goals around public services and devolution of power and money to communities:

“A new model of public services, rooted in communities, is emerging” (p.51).

“The government’s vision is that in the future, the public sector will take a more collaborative place-based approach. By working with service providers and the private sector as well as individuals and communities in a place, we will make more sensitive and appropriate policy” (p.51).

The championing of place-based working by the voluntary sector and now the government is not simply based on its solid theoretical underpinnings. There is now growing evidence, from multiple projects in the UK and the US, that place-based interventions can produce significant impacts. Below are two examples from either side of the Atlantic, from which the National Literacy Trust has learnt in the development of its Literacy Hub approach.

Previous evaluations

The Harlem Children’s Zone

The Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) is often the casting-off point for any discussion around the efficacy of a place-based approach. It has existed in various forms since 1970, with the mantra that “the success of our children and the strength of our community go hand in hand. Their needs are inseparable and must be addressed together in order to break the cycle of generational poverty and give our kids a real shot at the American dream”¹.

The ‘whole community’ response to improving educational outcomes that they emphasise is truly reflective of the aims of a place-based approach, with a programme of multi-strand educational interventions covering the whole-life course. The Yale Education Studies assessment of HCZ^{vi} outlined some of them:

¹ <https://hcz.org/about-us/history/>

“In 2000, HCZ started “The Baby College”, a series of parenting workshops. In 2001, it introduced the “Harlem Gems” pre-school program and, by 2004, it opened Promise Academy, the zone’s first charter school [equivalent to UK academies]. Now, the project has expanded to about 100 blocks of Central Harlem and includes three extended-day charter schools, all-day pre-kindergarten, health clinics and community centers for adults and children, youth violence prevention programs, foster care social services, and college admissions and retention support. Spurred by the success of the zone, former president Obama launched the promise zone initiative in 2013.”

As well as the above programmes, the HCZ also operates the Three-Year-Old Journey project for children admitted to the charter schools. This project “places extra emphasis on language development and gives parents tips on how to provide their children with opportunities to expand their vocabulary. Engaging with the children on a weekly basis allows the staff to begin to identify any developmental delays and to provide English-language instruction to hundreds of children.”

The assessments of the achievements of HCZ and its impact on local students have been largely positive. The Center for Policy Innovation at The Heritage Foundation^{vii} had the following findings:

- 81% of parents participating in the Baby College programme, a nine-week parenting class for expecting parents and parents of children up to three, from 2001 through 2011 reported reading to their children five or more times a week by the end of the programme (p.2).
- “In the 10 years from 2002 to 2011, 97.3% of the four-year-olds at Harlem Gems scored average, advanced, or very advanced on the scale, exceeding the 84.1% expected to do so based on test norms” (p.2).
- “In the fiscal year 2011, 95% of seniors in HCZ after-school programs were accepted into further education” (pp. 3-4).
- By 2013, “over 900 students had been enrolled in HCZ’s College Success Office”, which keeps track of HCZ graduates in higher education. The vast majority of these were in their first to third years of post-secondary schooling, and “fewer than 10% of HCZ students had dropped out [of further education], which is significantly lower [than] the national average of 43.6%” (p.5).

The impact of the community-focused approach was put centrally in this report, saying “HCZ officials on the ground are convinced that the mutual reinforcement of social services and education is fundamental to achieving their goals for the entire neighbourhood.” And the quantitative data and evidence that does exist on these programmes, some of which has been cited in this report, seems to show a “dramatic impact on the lives of those children and their families” (p.9).

However, the success of the scheme is not without some caveats, and they have been taken as learning for the National Literacy Trust’s approach and the place-based work of other institutions. The Brookings Institute was cautious about the success of HCZ in a report and then a response that followed. Firstly, they claimed that the HCZ only achieved middling attainment results in comparison with other schools despite the large associated cost. Secondly, they argued that it is difficult to evaluate the impact of the wider community schemes on attainment and thus difficult to say that they were effective.

In developing the National Literacy Trust Hub model, attention was paid to both the successes and the perceived failings of the HCZ and is commented on below.

The New Deal for Communities

The New Deal for Communities (NDC) was one of the largest ever place-based regeneration schemes in the UK. It was a Department for Communities and Local Government² (DCLG) initiative working in 39 of England’s most deprived neighbourhoods across 10 years (1998-2008), with each NDC partnership receiving £50 million over the duration. This funded a range of interventions from health and education to crime. The final evaluation from the department^{viii} found:

“Between 2002 and 2008 NDC areas saw an improvement in 32 of 36 core indicators... for 26 out of the 27 indicators where significance testing is possible, this change was statistically significant... There has been considerable positive change in the 39 NDC areas: in many respects these neighbourhoods have been transformed in the last 10 years” (p.6).

“In general NDC areas have narrowed the gaps with the rest of the country... The Programme has provided good value for money” (p.6).

However, there were some significantly different findings for the educational indicators, including English results. While KS2 English results increased by 4 percentage points relative to national benchmarks, and by 2 percentage points relative to local authority benchmarks, **these results were actually 2 percentage points worse than in non-NDC comparator areas** [areas in the same local authority that had similar demographics and profile but no NDC intervention] (p.26; Table 3.2).

The fact that pupils in identical areas, but where there had been no NDC intervention/spending, scored better than the children in areas where had been an NDC intervention/spending was so surprising for the government that they commissioned a specific evaluation of the education programme of the NDC^{ix}. Some of the conclusions it came to as to why this occurred are key to understanding the importance of holistic multi-strand place-based interventions:

² Now called the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)

“For most NDC partnerships, the evidence presented in this report suggests that schools-based interventions are not necessarily the most efficient means of improving educational attainment for children who are residents of the area” (p.58).

“Parental involvement is most valuable for their children’s educational attainment when it takes place in the home. Developing parental awareness of the importance of this role (as well as the confidence to carry it out) may be a potentially critical task for NDC partnerships and similar area-based programmes that may follow them” (p.59).

“Finally, the review of evidence confirmed both the importance of out-of-school activity, and the fact that represents yet another area where the advantages enjoyed by children from least disadvantaged backgrounds are compounded” (p.59).

“The evidence appears to suggest that for many (and perhaps most) NDC partnerships, investing in activities outside the school system may be the most cost-effective way of improving the educational attainment of children from the area” (p.60).

The key finding from the evaluation as to why one of the government’s biggest place-based interventions in education did not produce a significant impact was that it was only a single-strand schools-focused intervention. Future place-based government interventions in education for the most disadvantaged pupils need to be holistic and focus resources on extracurricular activity and engaging parents on learning at home.

Part 2: National Literacy Trust Hubs – developing our model

The National Literacy Trust is the UK’s largest literacy charity. For 27 years, our mission has been to ensure that disadvantaged children and young people across the UK have the literacy skills needed for education and to lead a successful life. In the early 2010s, influenced by both the success and the learning from the Harlem Children’s Zone and the New Deal for Communities (among others), we developed our own place-based model to tackling low literacy. When doing so, the importance of two sociological theories about how to engage, and develop change in, a community were critical to their development: collective impact and social capital.

Collective impact

The theory of collective impact was first articulated in 2011 in the Stanford Social Innovation Review article of the same name^x. At its core, the theory is a push back against the idea that there is a single ‘silver bullet’ solution to complex social issues. These ‘isolated impact’ approaches are oriented towards attempting to find the solution in a single intervention “as

if there were a cure for failing schools that only needs to be discovered, in the way that medical cures are discovered in laboratories” (p.38). This leads to non-profits working to try and independently solve major social problems “often working at odds with each other and exponentially increasing the perceived resources required to make meaningful progress” (p.38), not to mention that many social problems also have roots in government or private-sector activities that need addressing first. Worse than this, any progress they make towards “addressing disadvantage in one area of child’s life, such as education, can be easily undermined by neglecting another, such as poverty, health or the family”^{xi} (p.12).

In combatting this attitude, the authors of the original article drew on the example of Strive, a ‘cradle-to-career’ programme in Kentucky aimed at improving education and increasing student achievement. As an institution, Strive did not create new programmes or invest money, rather they “focused the entire educational community on a single set of goals, measured in the same way” (p.36). In doing so, they saw improvement in 34 of the 55 success indicators they tracked, even against a background of recession and budget cuts.

In the same article, collective impact is shown to be made up of five central tenants that separate it from just being ‘collaboration’:

1. **A common agenda** – a shared vision for change, including a joint understanding of the problem and an agreed-upon approach to solving it
2. **Shared measurement systems** – agreement on how success will be measured and how to report on it
3. **Mutually reinforcing activities** – a diverse group of stakeholders who work separately, but on coordinated activities that support the actions of others
4. **Continuous communication** – to build trust between stakeholders and recognise and appreciate the common motivation behind efforts
5. **Backbone support organisation** – to organise and coordinate the collective effort

These are reflected in the five key characteristics the National Literacy Trust have developed, as outlined below. However, our characteristics go one step further by beginning to integrate wider theories around social capital consistently into our place-based work.

Social capital

“Social capital refers to the social relationships and patterns of reciprocal, enforceable trust that enable people and institutions to gain access to resources necessary to fulfil a particular need or solve a specific problem”^{xii} (p.3).

As a concept, social capital has developed in academia (mostly in the USA) in the past few decades as a response to what is seen as the individualisation of leisure time, that is the idea that the rise of individual leisure pursuits (e.g. watching TV or *Bowling Alone*^{xiii}) and increased prioritisation of work including increased and/or irregular working hours. The impact of this

shift has been to reduce the bonds between neighbours and reduce time dedicated to things like volunteering, community projects or even socialising with neighbours and friends. In deprived communities in the UK, the source of lower social capital comes from a slightly different place, even if the results are much the same. A 2008 study found that, in general, people living in deprived areas were less likely to feel attached to their neighbourhood^{xiv}.

Social capital has benefits for individuals and for the community. It is linked strongly to better health outcomes, lower crime rates and economic benefits. In the UK for example, a government survey found that more people found jobs through personal contacts than through advertisements^{xv}. Most importantly for the work we do, there is a growing body of research that indicates increasing social capital can create positive educational outcomes and boost child development.

The World Bank argued that by increasing social capital by getting parents more involved with children's education, and by embracing school as a community asset, "teachers are more committed, students achieve higher test scores, and better use is made of school facilities in those communities where parents and citizens take an active interest in children's educational well-being". Similarly, drawing on Robert D. Putnam's work, Infed^{xvi} argue that:

“Child development is powerfully shaped by social capital. Trust, networks, and norms of reciprocity within a child's family, school, peer group, and larger community have far-reaching effects on their opportunities and choices, educational achievement, and hence on their behaviour and development.”

Any work that takes 'the community' as its central unit, as the National Literacy Trust Hubs do, requires an understanding of how social impact affects the end result. The National Literacy Trust has taken this on board. By launching campaigns and interventions that target community activation, the Hubs aim to increase social capital as a fundamental part of improving literacy and life chances among these deprived communities.

The Literacy Hub model

All of the learning above has shaped the National Literacy Trust Hub model, which has developed around the principle of holistic multi-strand interventions that are reflective of a deep understanding of the communities they serve. They are long-term place-based responses to the literacy challenge in some of the most deprived places in the country. The Hubs represent a unique opportunity to bring together the collective resources and expertise of the National Literacy Trust along with local, regional and national partners to break the cycle of intergenerational low literacy. They are supported by national programmes that are developed centrally by the National Literacy Trust and tailored for the needs of each area.

There are currently 14 Literacy Hubs and local-area campaigns up and down the country. Each is embedded within its local community and run by locally based Hub (or campaign) managers who know the area and local partners well. As well as delivering the charity's

national programmes in schools, such as Early Words Together and Words for Work, Hubs are based around literacy campaigns in the area. These campaigns seek to engage parents, businesses, local community groups, sports teams, faith groups and more to get them involved with promoting literacy and partnering with us to deliver activities, events and training. Depending on the local landscape, Hubs will also seek to deliver specialised programmes and training for specific groups, such as: children in care, male role models and dads, or maternity ward nurses. We constantly evaluate and learn from our work across the Hubs to ensure we are offering the best-quality interventions and community campaigns.

When our first Hubs were launching in 2013 and 2014, the National Literacy Trust was also working in conjunction with our partners in the Read On. Get On. (ROGO) campaign. As part of this coalition, we released our five characteristics of place-based working. These characteristics have shaped the way our Hubs work over that period and acted as a touch stone for new activity in each area. However, as our experience has grown and the evidence available from elsewhere has increased, it has become evident that our advice for launching place-based approaches has evolved.

The following will outline our learning and experience of using these five characteristics alongside external evidence. Following that learning, and with input from our thorough new literature review^{xvii} and the Stanford collective impact model^{xviii}, the National Literacy Trust will present a new eight-point framework for successful place-based working.

Our original five characteristics for successful place-based approaches

- 1. A coordinated multi-agency approach, encompassing government, voluntary and business sectors – in which partners’ contributions are planned and where possible collaborative, helping evaluate the outcomes of the work and determining the future direction of travel**

Our learning

Every Literacy Hub ingrains this characteristic as part of its core governance model. By doing so, it guarantees ‘buy-in’ for the Hub from local authorities, businesses and other key stakeholders, which is crucial for any long-term planning for the Hub and its future goals, as well as any potential successor work. It’s also a key part in how Hubs find partners to work with and spread the message.

This was particularly demonstrated when the National Literacy Trust opened a new Hub in Swindon in February 2018. WHSmith is headquartered in Swindon and sits on the steering committee of the Swindon Hub. They provided the financing for the launch and have brought invaluable knowledge, reach and local assets. They have since directly provided books and stationery for Hub activities and have acted as a facilitator for other local businesses seeking to support literacy in Swindon.

Similarly, in Nottingham, we partnered with Nottingham City Transport as a result of local authority representation on the steering group. They provided a literacy-branded bus that

visited schools and Children’s Centres and handed out books for the Hub launch. Since then, they have continued to assist in spreading literacy messaging to bus passengers.

All of this is embedded within a system of ongoing evaluation of both individual programmes and of the wider Hub model. Our in-house evaluation is supplemented by extensive use of external evaluators across our range of programmes. The final reports are available on the National Literacy Trust’s website and are used to learn, adapt and shape future interventions.

External evidence

Cass Business School, City University London: *Making a difference: Final evaluation of the collaborative work of The Prince’s Charities 2008-2014*^{xi}:

“Extend the key stakeholders of the programme... to include significant national organisations from all three sectors” (p.6).

Evaluating Collective Impact: Five Simple Rules by Mark Cabaj^x:

“In order for evaluation to play a productive role in a Collective Impact initiative, it must be conceived and carried out in a way that enables – rather than limits – the participants to learn from their efforts and to make shifts to their strategy” (p.110).

Save the Children: *Place-based initiatives affecting outcomes for children and young people – a review for Save the Children*^{xi}:

“Tackling multiple and severe disadvantage requires collaboration and a whole systems approach. The key to success is to create and sustain a shared vision and set to priorities that agencies, and importantly people in target communities, agree upon” (p.2).

“Failure to achieve systemic and transformational change quickly may invite disillusionment and even cynicism. So it is important to manage expectations of funders, partner agencies and – critically – community groups about what initiatives can achieve” (p.22).

“Even in education, where there is a wealth of schools – and examination-based data, evaluations point to problems for initiatives in measuring progress” (p.15).

Lankelly Chase on behalf of the Institute of Voluntary Action Research: *Historical review of place-based approaches*^{xii}:

“The literature stresses the importance of clarity from the outset about the rationale behind place-based approaches, its purpose and what place-based means” (p.26)

Joseph Rowntree Foundation: *What makes effective place-based working?*^{xiii}:

“Involving stakeholders centrally in development and design could help ensure follow up and sustainability for the programme... ownership needs to be clear for all involved to avoid confusion” (p.15).

- 2. A medium-term commitment to build trust with the communities you’re working in - recognising that a deep approach needs to be embedded over several years as part of a broader plan to engage and build trust with communities, placing their interests and needs at the heart of planning**

Our learning

Engaging communities, especially targeting marginalised communities and those without a voice, is a key part of the Hubs work. At the core of our place-based work, we recognise that the amount a community values and supports literacy is a key factor that often determines how well children in that community read, write and communicate. As the research above has shown, improving children’s literacy requires holistic multi-strand interventions that engage the whole community as well as children. To engage effectively, a medium-term commitment is required to build trust in the sustainability of the intervention and, crucially, to build trust with hard-to-reach communities.

To mobilise the community, the Bradford Hub launched a new programme: Literacy Champions. This programme recruited parents, business owners, sports coaches and more to be Literacy Champions, championing the enjoyment and value of reading in their communities and with their families. Literacy Champions were trained and supported by us to deliver a range of literacy activities to engage their communities.

The Literacy Champions programme has received great praise from its participants and has helped engage a diverse set of people, including the large South-Asian community in Bradford. For example, three mothers recruited from this community helped set up a book club, and they have since gone on to organise literacy events for their extended families, read to their children at local libraries and replicate their storytelling training with ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) students. Other Literacy Champions included a skills tutor, a manager of a nursery, a community support worker and an early years practitioner – all of whom engaged people within their settings in literacy activities. The programme has been so successful that Literacy Champions has been replicated in a number of Hubs and has proved an invaluable tool in reaching diverse community groups in each setting.

External evidence

Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport: *Civil Society Strategy: building a future that works for everyone*^{xxiv}:

“A place-based approach calls on people to work differently. Rather than public servants working in silos accountable to Whitehall, they need to work together and with local communities to co-design services and pool budgets” (p.51).

“Key to successful place-based work is involving the voice of local people in the decisions that affect them. People, communities, and services operate in complex systems” (p.51).

Save the Children: *Place-based initiatives affecting outcomes for children and young people – a review for Save the Children:*

“Community involvement is critically important in ensuring success, but often hard to achieve in more disadvantaged communities” (p.2).

“Along with partnership working, engaging communities in activities to improve their lives is at the heart of all initiatives. Like partnership working, engaging communities meaningfully and effectively brings significant benefits for both individuals and agencies, but also some risks” (p.10).

Big Lottery Fund: *Putting good ingredients in the mix: Lessons and opportunities for place-based working and funding*^{xxv}:

“Working ‘with’ people and not doing things ‘to’ them is essential to build trust and meaningful engagement” (p.4).

What Works Scotland: *Insights from ‘Your Community’: a place-based approach to public service reform*^{xxvi}:

“Place-based approaches need flexibility in delivery and geographical targeting in recognition of both the considerable time it takes to build trusting relationships between local services and with communities, and the highly localised nature of disadvantage” (p.3).

3. A ‘tripartite’ approach fostering and developing partnerships with the public, corporate and third sectors – with the aim of identifying and agreeing with partners’ long-term strategic aims and specific short-term priorities, based on an agreed understanding of the needs of the area

Our learning

Working in partnership with other organisations – voluntary, private and public – is key to the Hubs delivering maximum impact for their programmes and campaigns. Frequently, Hubs and other organisations working in the community have similar goals/aims and partnership working helps avoid replication and maximises reach. It is also a useful way of pooling resources and expertise.

In the Middlesbrough Hub, the local authority was keen for health and education to work more closely together, and the aims of Public Health England and the National Literacy Trust aligned. A partnership was formed between the Hub and staff at James Cook University Hospital, with a particular focus on supporting the parents of premature babies in the neonatal ward to help with early communication and bonding.

This partnership has led to the provision of welcome packs for every new parent, which include picture books that encourage parents to read to and talk with their babies. Large colourful posters developed by the Hub were placed in the ward and in key public places across the community to encourage parents to talk to and read to their babies. The Hub manager and Director of Nursing met to plan training for all nurses, staff and health visitors on literacy and early language development, and to encourage nurses to model good behaviour for parents in reading to their babies. In the first three years of this partnership, 3,500 books have been given to families and 53 therapeutic care volunteers have been trained to highlight the importance of reading. The welcome packs have now been extended to other children's wards, co-funded with Public Health England.

External evidence

Cass Business School, City University London: *Making a difference: Final evaluation of the collaborative work of The Prince's Charities 2008-2014*:

“Strong leadership is needed from all three sectors to ensure that innovative partnerships are taken forward” (p.7).

Save the Children: *Place-based initiatives affecting outcomes for children and young people – a review for Save the Children*:

“Crucially, partnerships working has the potential to marshal resources from different people, places and organisations to make a greater impact on reducing disadvantage. Some evaluations suggest that collaborations have the greatest effect on reducing disadvantage among the most deprived groups” (p.5).

“Place-based and collaborative strategies will not succeed without clearly identifying the results to be achieved and the metrics to gauge progress” (p.14).

Improvement Service: *Place-based approaches to joint planning, resourcing and delivery: An overview of current practice in Scotland*^{xxvii}:

“A key learning point from the literature is that place-based approaches must be clear about their aims and strategy in order to deliver identified outcomes successfully” (p.22).

- 4. A strong and focused commitment to a comprehensive approach, which doesn't locate the complete solution in a single intervention but understands the importance of multi-strand interventions. This involves utilising the research skills and reach of the national organisation to support improvement and build long-term sustainability, as well as the sharing of national effective practice**

Our learning

The national reach and expertise of the National Literacy Trust has been a huge boost to the work of the Hubs. Firstly, our reputation brings with it a certain prestige that helps Hub managers form relationships with local authorities, businesses and voluntary organisations more easily. This, in turn, fosters national partners for support and investment in the Hubs. Indeed, the very location and design of the Hubs is dependent on our research, particularly the mapping of the communities with the greatest literacy vulnerability as developed with data experts Experian^{xxviii}.

For the Hubs, this is demonstrated through the integration of our national literacy programmes into our local work. Programmes including Early Words Together, Small Talk, Young Readers Programme and Words for Work are all national programmes that have been delivered in the Hubs, utilising local Hub knowledge to determine which communities would benefit the most. The Hubs have also sought to leverage national partners to deliver these programmes. For Words for Work, we have worked with HarperCollins to deliver the programme in the Stoke-on-Trent Hub, Paul Smith to deliver it in the Nottingham Hub, KPMG to deliver it in Manchester, and Lancôme deliver it in both the Nottingham Hub and Manchester.

Hubs are also useful vehicles for developing programmes which, if successful, can be expanded across the other Hubs, such as the Literacy Champions programme piloted and developed in Bradford which is now delivered in multiple Hubs across the country.

External evidence

Cass Business School, City University London: *Making a difference: Final evaluation of the collaborative work of The Prince's Charities 2008-2014*:

"In the social regeneration of specific geographical areas there is a benefit to communities to have both major, national programmes... to provide breadth of coverage and also tailored, geographically specific, interventions" (p.7).

Big Lottery Fund: *Putting good ingredients in the mix: Lessons and opportunities for place-based working and funding*:

"Differences in local context and history will affect the dynamics of change and the transferability of the lessons" (p.6).

Joseph Rowntree Foundation: *What makes effective place-based working?:*

"Clear agreements about what will be shared before wider dissemination. In place-based work, putting out findings often requires careful negotiation..."

organisations should consider whether they need to adapt their current ways of communicating to accommodate the sensitivities of place-based working” (p.16).

Institute for Voluntary Action Research: *Working in Place Case Study: The Rank Foundation’s place-based programme in Dundee*^{xxix}:

“Being responsive to local needs means that the Foundation is also thinking about what role it might play in supporting local infrastructure and how to support organisations to take up new opportunities” (p.4).

5. Strong and visible local leadership at a senior level, which understands local communities and can act as their advocate, and dedicated on-the-ground capacity to broker and manage partnerships

Our learning

Every Hub has a local Hub manager who lives in the area and has been recruited from that community. This is useful for a number of reasons: it’s vital for community buy-in/trust, the nature and intensity of the work requires a locally-based manager, and having a person based in the area who understands the community helps forge the right connections with diverse community groups.

In Bradford, the Hub manager helped design and innovate a new programme called Our Stories, aiming to inspire creative writing and poetry among pupils aged 10-13, especially boys. He had a past interest and involvement in creative writing and performance, and personally helped to develop a resource pack for teachers. He also had great knowledge of the Bradford poetry and performance scene, and was key to cultivating relationships with local poets and co-delivering workshops with them in schools.

The local experience of our Hub managers has proved instrumental on many more occasions. For example, the Nottingham Hub manager previously worked for Business in the Community and had a variety of local business contacts, which she leveraged when the Hub hosted a business breakfast. And the Middlesbrough Hub manager was invaluable when the National Literacy Trust began working in Redcar; through her contacts, she was able to secure a Public Health England secondee to work for us in delivering Early Words Together in the area.

External evidence

Institute for Voluntary Action Research: *Working in Place Case Study: The Rank Foundation’s place-based programme in Dundee*:

“Employ a local coordinator who is able to act as a conduit to get resources to the community... Someone who would be perceived as a worthy leader in the community” (p.4).

Cass Business School, City University London: *Making a difference: Final evaluation of the collaborative work of The Prince’s Charities 2008-2014*:

“In order to be sustainable projects must be led by local stakeholders” (p.6).

Save the Children: *Place-based initiatives affecting outcomes for children and young people – a review for Save the Children:*

“The pivotal role and skills of project coordinators were mentioned by several evaluations” (p.19).

Big Lottery Fund: *Putting good ingredients in the mix: Lessons and opportunities for place-based working and funding:*

“Base yourself in your chosen place. Local people don’t trust parachuting in from the outside” (p.4).

Updating the model

While the Hub model has been successful and has embodied the five key characteristics listed above, we continue to learn. These characteristics remain true but the National Literacy Trust is always receptive to new scholarship both internally and externally. As part of this, we have conducted a large-scale literature review into place-based approaches, which reviewed over 270 items from scholarship. The review, which has been released in tandem with this report, unpicks the scholarship to understand how the best place-based models should be run^{xxx}.

It identified key features in the literature that should be present in a place-based approach, which are:

- Shared vision and evaluation framework
- Clear and consistent message
- Clearly defined roles
- Use of data to understand the local area
- Use of local assets
- Realistic ambitions
- Medium-term commitment
- Engaging communities in design and delivery

The combination of our learning from six years of running place-based programmes in 14 locations, in addition to the growing literature and further input from the Stanford Collective Impact model, has led to a review of the National Literacy Trust’s best-practice model.

As a result, we can present the eight key features of a new best-practice approach below. By combining evidence-backed approaches with our own place-based experience, these features help the National Literacy Trust and our partners create collective impact in the places we work.

Appendix A shows how the literature review, the Stanford Collective Impact model and the learning from the five previous characteristics have been built into this new model.

1. A common agenda between partners, including a shared vision for change, a joint understanding of the problem and an agreed approach to solving it with planned and collaborative contributions

Key features

- Common understanding of the problem faced and the issues that cause it
- A shared vision for the change required to address it
- Agreement on an approach and the range of activity required, with planned and collaborative contributions

2. Joint use of data and a shared measurement system to understand the issue and track progress

Key features

- Agreement on how success will be measured and how this will be reported
- Shared key data metrics that can define and track the problem
- Cross-partner agreement on detailed method of evaluation, which is holistic and enables strategic learning

3. A range of mutually reinforcing activities that create a comprehensive approach, with clearly defined roles for each partner organisation

Key features

- A focus in strategies on the need to address multiple factors. For example, in the case of literacy: home learning environment, community/neighbourhood context, etc.
- A range of different solutions to tackle the varied causes (“silver buckshot, not silver bullet”), with each organisation contributing in the area that best suits their expertise
- Separate activities to reduce duplication of effort (if a charity is already working on an issue, support them rather than compete)

4. Continuous communication between stakeholders and clear, consistent external messaging

Key features

- Build trust with stakeholders by communicating honestly and clearly about objectives
- Campaign messaging should be clear about the purpose of the programme
- Partners should communicate honestly and openly, discussing any successes and setbacks as they arise

5. A backbone organisation that provides strong and visible leadership to coordinate the collective effort with the work of local partners

Key features

- A high level strategic steering group of key local stakeholders should meet regularly
- Creating effective links with the national organisation and bringing in, where relevant, its national programmes, research etc.
- A manager who both lives in, and was recruited from, the local area and an office/staff centred in the area

6. A medium-term commitment to the communities you are working in

Key features

- A publicly announced commitment for the minimum duration of your intervention before it launches – ideally at least 10 years
- A commitment to engaging and consulting with the community to secure buy-in over the course of the project

7. Cross-sector partnerships that are mutually beneficial for each partners' long-term strategy and short-term goals

Key features

- Identify, where applicable, the range of public benefits from the project to ensure the correct engagement with cross-sector services
- A detailed and realistic strategy for engaging stakeholders and partners across sectors
- Close collaboration with both local and national organisations working in the area, of all sectors, on the delivery of programmes of work and events that meet all partners' priorities and aims

8. Engage the whole community in every stage of the project

Key features

- A strategy for engaging and consulting with communities before any decision is taken to launch an intervention/project
- Different demographics
- Clear evidence that communities have 'bought in' to the intervention and feel a sense of ownership over it

Nearly seven years of place-based working in the literacy field in different locations, alongside a renowned research team, has ensured that the National Literacy Trust has a firm grasp on how to make place-based interventions work across the UK.

From the five characteristics developed in 2014, we have continued to learn and reflect on our experiences to understand what constitutes best practice. The eight points above, we believe, reflect the breadth of activity required to establish an effective place-based

campaign. Crucially, they reflect the acknowledgment that no single entity, whether public, private or charitable, will solve complex social problems with a single silver bullet. Social problems like low literacy are complex and require the united and combined efforts of each sector and the community to combat their causes. Our framework provides a blueprint for doing exactly that.

Conclusion

The complex systems that children and adults encounter, which largely determine their social mobility and life chances (such as levels of deprivation, employment, quality of schools and public services, transport connections, home learning environments, etc.), are not uniform across the country. They vary from place to place, neighbourhood to neighbourhood. This is why sweeping and well-intentioned national strategies and programmes to address poverty, poor educational attainment, social immobility and a whole host of other factors connected to deprivation have never fully succeeded: they're unable to target local factors effectively.

Any intervention or programme of work that seeks to break these cycles of social disadvantage and poverty need to be centred in and focused on the places where people live, their communities and neighbourhoods.

However, it is not sufficient to simply plan interventions in places to address a single factor holding back a child's attainment. The New Deal for Communities, one of the government's biggest place-based schemes, was evaluated to have not made a significant impact in education largely due to its singular focus on school standards and results, with no attention paid to extracurricular activities and, crucially, the home learning environment in the early years.

The National Literacy Trust Hubs have produced excellent results because they are multi-strand interventions engaging parents, the wider community, social services, employers, public and third sectors on a broad range of factors around parenting, the home learning environment, early years, employment support and more. This is in addition to the more traditional focus on teacher training, delivering programmes and building capacity in schools.

From our evolving experience of running place-based interventions across the UK, the National Literacy Trust has developed a guiding framework of eight key components for success, building from the learning in our Hubs and from external evidence. While recognising that every place-based intervention is unique, this offers a usable framework for the charity sector and government to follow when launching these often complex interventions. We will continue to adapt and update these principles from both our own experience and evaluation of other interventions to ensure they remain relevant.

The growth and success of the National Literacy Trust's place-based Hub model shows that we are leading the way in improving young people's literacy in some of the most deprived communities in the UK. Our comprehensive model, which combines our evidence-backed approach with our experience in place-based working, backs up a collective impact approach that has helped improve literacy in the communities facing the greatest challenges.

Appendix A

The National Literacy Trust’s combined eight-point framework

This approach aligns the five ROGO characteristics plus the recommendations of the Stanford Collective Impact report within the eight key features of place-based programmes identified in the place-based programme literature review:

1. **A common agenda between partners, including a shared vision for change, a joint understanding of the problem and an agreed approach to solving it with planned and collaborative contributions**

From Stanford Collective Impact	From the literature review	From the five characteristics
A Common agenda: a shared vision for change, including a joint understanding of the problem and an agreed-upon approach to solving it	Shared vision and evaluation framework: defining goals and identifying desired outcomes	A coordinated multi-agency approach, encompassing government, voluntary and business sectors – in which partners’ contributions are planned and where possible collaborative, helping evaluate the outcomes of the work and determining the future direction of travel

2. **Joint use of data and a shared measurement system to understand the issue and track progress**

From Stanford Collective Impact	From the literature review
Shared measurement systems: agreement on how success will be measured and how to report on it	Use of data to understand the local area: developing an understanding of neighbourhood context; analysing data and sharing key learning

3. **A range of mutually reinforcing activities that create a comprehensive approach with clearly defined roles for each partner organisation**

From Stanford Collective Impact	From the literature review	From the five characteristics

<p>Mutually reinforcing activities: a diverse group of stakeholders who work separately but on coordinated activities that support the actions of others</p>	<p>Clearly defined roles: being clear about responsibilities; co-ordinating activities and developing shared values</p>	<p>A strong and focused commitment to a comprehensive approach, which doesn't locate the complete solution in a single intervention – but understands the importance of multi-strand interventions. This involves utilising the research skills and reach of the national organisation to support improvement and build long-term sustainability, as well as the sharing of national effective practice</p>
---	--	--

4. Continuous communication between stakeholders and clear, consistent external messaging

From Stanford Collective Impact	From the literature review
<p>Continuous communication: to build trust between stakeholders and recognise and appreciate the common motivation behind efforts</p>	<p>Clear and consistent messaging: being clear about expectations, assumptions and interests; having a consistent message</p>

5. A backbone organisation that provides strong and visible leadership to coordinate the collective effort and that of local partners

From Stanford Collective Impact	From the literature review	From the five characteristics
<p>Backbone support organisation – to organise and coordinate the collective effort</p>	<p>Use of local assets: focusing on the strengths of a local area and how to maximise these, plus selecting the right partners</p>	<p>Strong and visible local leadership at a senior level to understand local communities and act as their advocate, and dedicated on-the-ground</p>

		capacity to broker and manage partnerships
--	--	--

6. A medium-term commitment to the communities you're working in

From the five characteristics	From the literature review
<p>A medium-term commitment to the communities you're working in, recognising that a deep approach needs to be embedded over several years as part of a broader plan to engage and build trust with communities, placing their interests and needs at the heart of planning</p>	<p>Medium-term commitment: thinking about sustainability, transferring power to the local community, and linking local activity to regional and national policy</p>

7. Cross-sector partnerships that are mutually beneficial for each partners' long-term strategy and short-term goals

From the five characteristics	From the literature review
<p>A 'tripartite' approach where partnerships are fostered and developed with the public, corporate and third sectors with the aim of identifying and agreeing with partners' long-term strategic aims and specific short-term priorities, based on an agreed understanding of the needs of the area</p>	<p>Realistic ambitions: managing expectations of partners, and creating ambitious goals combined with realistic strategies</p>

8. Engage communities in every stage of the project

From the literature review
<p>Engaging communities in design and delivery: building an understanding of the problem and tailoring programmes to the needs of local communities</p>

References

- ⁱ “Developing Children’s Zones for England: What’s the evidence?” Save the Children (2013) <http://www.childrencommunitynetwork.org.uk/file/1153/download?token=h9SDyPzL>
- ⁱⁱ “Putting good ingredients in the mix: Lessons and opportunities for place-based working and funding.” Big Lottery Fund (August 2018) https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/media/documents/BLF_KL18-11-Place-Based-Funding.pdf?mtime=20181018152135
- ⁱⁱⁱ “Place-based funding: A briefing paper.” Institute for Voluntary Action Research (June 2015) https://londonfunders.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/PlaceBasedFunding_briefingpaper_June2015.pdf
- ^{iv} “Place Based Social Action: Learning Review.” Renaisi on behalf of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (July 2018) https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/755473/PBSA_Learning_Review_-_Full-FINAL_1_.PDF
- ^v “Civil Society Strategy: building a future that works for everyone.” Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (August 2018) https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/732765/Civil_Society_Strategy_-_building_a_future_that_works_for_everyone.pdf
- ^{vi} “Is the Harlem Children’s Zone accomplishing its goal? Should HUD’s promise zone initiative be the future of American public education?” Yale Education Studies (May 2017) <http://debsedstudies.org/harlem-childrens-zone/>
- ^{vii} http://s3.amazonaws.com/thf_media/2013/pdf/CPI_DP_08.pdf
- ^{viii} <https://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/general/A%20final%20assessment.pdf>
- ^{ix} <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/604/1/1462891.pdf>
- ^x <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/16643>
- ^{xi} <https://childrensneighbourhoods.scot/resources/place-based-approaches-literature-review/>
- ^{xii} <http://chrysaliscollaborations.com/wp-content/uploads/Knight-Social-Capital-primer-final.pdf>
- ^{xiii} <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/16643>
- ^{xiv} <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/socialcapitalacrosstheuk/2011to2012>
- ^{xv} <https://www.oecd.org/insights/37966934.pdf>
- ^{xvi} <http://infed.org/mobi/social-capital/>
- ^{xvii} “The effectiveness of place-based programmes and campaigns in improving outcomes for children”. National Literacy Trust (2020)
- ^{xviii} https://ssir.org/articles/entry/collective_impact
- ^{xix} “Making a Difference: Final Evaluation of the collaborative work of the Prince’s Charities 2008-2014.” Sir John Cass Business School on behalf of the Prince’s Trust (November 2014) https://www.cass.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/266954/Princes-Charities-Evaluation-Report_PG_April15.pdf
- ^{xx} <https://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/hubfs/Resources/Publications/Evaluating%20Collective%20Impact%20Simple%20Rules.pdf>
- ^{xxi} “Place-based initiatives affecting outcomes for children and young people: A review for Save the Children.” Save the Children (undated) <http://www.childrencommunitynetwork.org.uk/file/place-based-initiatives-affecting-outcomes-children-and-young-peoplepdf>
- ^{xxii} “Historical review of place-based approaches.” Lankelly Chase on behalf of the Institute of Voluntary Action Research (October 2017) <https://lankellychase.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Historical-review-of-place-based-approaches.pdf>
- ^{xxiii} “What makes effective place-based working? Lessons from JRF’s Bradford Programme.” Joseph Rowntree Foundation (August 2013) <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/what-makes-effective-place-based-working>
- ^{xxiv} https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/732765/Civil_Society_Strategy_-_building_a_future_that_works_for_everyone.pdf

^{xxv} https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/media/documents/BLF_KL18-11-Place-Based-Funding.pdf?mtime=20181018152135

^{xxvi} “Insights from ‘Your Community’ – a place-based approach to public service reform.” What Works Scotland (December 2017) <http://whatworksscotland.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/InsightsFromYourCommunityAPlaceBasedApproachToPublicServiceReform.pdf>

^{xxvii} “Place-based Approaches to Joint Planning, Resourcing and Delivery An overview of current practice in Scotland.” Improvement Service (April 2016) https://www.improvementservice.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/10744/place-based-approaches-report.pdf

^{xxviii} “Literacy score – mapping literacy need across England.” National Literacy Trust and Experian (2017) <https://literacytrust.org.uk/policy-and-campaigns/all-party-parliamentary-group-literacy/literacy-score-mapping-literacy-need-across-england/>

^{xxix} “Working in Place Case Study: The Rank Foundation’s place-based programme in Dundee.” Institute for Voluntary Action Research (November 2016) <https://www.ivar.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/IVAR-Place-Based-Case-Study%E2%80%94Rank-Foundation-.pdf>

^{xxx} “The effectiveness of place-based programmes and campaigns in improving outcomes for children”. National Literacy Trust (2020)