Only A Matter of Time?

A framework for the most effective way to lengthen the school day in England

Annaliese Briggs and Jonathan Simons
August 2014
Executive summary

This report explores what we know about expanding the length of the school day. It draws from a wide field of international data, academic research and local case studies.

It also includes original YouGov polling, commissioned by Policy Exchange, about the attitude of parents, teachers and head teachers’ towards how best to use expanded time in schools.

The following slides set out a practical framework for most effectively introducing a longer school day for some or all schools, as is under consideration by both the Conservatives and the Labour party.
Effective design of a longer school day policy requires six key questions to be answered

- What is the purpose of a longer school day?
- What type of schools should this apply to?
- Should it be mandatory or voluntary for schools?
- Should it be mandatory or voluntary for pupils?
- What activities should take place?
- Who should staff it?

Based on studying other countries that have implemented variants of longer school days, such a policy typically seeks to solve two different policy problems: a) improving education, particularly for more deprived children, which could include wider cultural and social capital and b) providing reliable and low cost childcare for parents of primary and secondary-aged pupils.
2) International evidence demonstrates that there is huge variation in the amount of time children spend in school learning subjects, academic performance between countries and the levels of maternal employment

• PISA and TIMSS data shows that there is no automatic relationship between the total amount of intended instructional time and performance in core subjects – some countries who have longer school days perform better than England in PISA, some who have longer school days perform worse, and some with shorter days also do better. The question is about how to deliver effective use of this time
• England has around the OECD average for maternal employment rate for mothers with very young children (age under 3) or older children (age 6-14). The policy gap is in this area is in maternal employment with 3-5 year olds, which would not be directly impacted by a policy offering childcare for primary and secondary aged children
3) The relationship of time to learning is neither direct nor simple because not all time spent in school is equal. The international evidence, based on self evaluation, seems to suggest benefits occur most from high quality teacher led activities for sustained periods of time.

- Simply extending time spent in school does not necessarily increase either engaged time (when pupils are focussed on the task in a lesson) or academic learning time (when learning is happening). Longer time itself is not a proxy for more learning.
- None of the studies reviewed as part of this report were reliably able to evaluate the impact of additional time on all pupils’ achievement. In the absence of a reliable measure and control groups, conclusions about the impact of longer school days are limited to self evaluation.
- Efficiencies in how to use time – including extended time – seems to generate good results according to self evaluation.
- The evidence of benefit from the international examples suggests that sustained engagement (from pupils) and teacher led activities are what generates the benefit, with one case study showing benefit for the more deprived.
4) There are a number of current and previous programmes and individual case studies in England from which to draw. There is also uncertainty around the capacity of the school estate to manage an extended day

• The schools running longer days reviewed here are united by a clear end goal and purpose which drives the implementation of their programmes. They have all bought in their local community (even in some cases against some initial opposition) and they have strong support right from the leadership down. They can run programmes without any additional funding and sometimes pay their staff a (small) additional stipend

• In 2010, 98% of schools offered access to Extended Services, at a total cost to government of £2.2bn. However, in reality, the offer and quality of this provision for schools and parents was extremely variable. In particular, issues of transport, and the cost model were crucial weaknesses in effective extended school roll out and would need to be addressed

• There is no national data on schools’ physical capacity to deliver extended services. An FOI for this research suggests at least 11% of primary schools – or almost 1,900 schools – will definitely struggle to run large scale activities without significant capital expenditure
5) New polling for this research from YouGov provides the first evidence for the reach, popularity and issues of concern around extending a school day

- Somewhere between a third and a half of schools already offer some form of longer school day
- Around 40% of all parents support the idea but a similar number are opposed. Parents much prefer the idea of a longer school day for secondary schools (51%) to primary schools (33%), possibly because of concerns about perceived academic demands on younger children. There is a strong preference in favour of such an initiative being voluntary (3 to 1 in favour for primary)
- A proposal for chargeable childcare is viewed slightly more favourably than a proposal which funds schools to offer a broader extended day
- Most staff and parents prefer any form of extended day to include enrichment activities or childcare not just academic lessons
- 75% of teachers will not work a longer school day under current terms and conditions but 64% of teachers would for a proportional pay increase
6) An effective policy design for a longer school day will require additional funding and be based on a clear set of answers to the six questions set out in our framework

- Schools may be expected to manage certain additional costs from extending the school day themselves. But there is no credible scenario in which government would not need to allocate additional resources. Depending on the model chosen, the additional costs to government could be significant – from several hundred million up to potentially almost £7bn
- Certain models of extending schools to provide childcare would be chargeable to parents but the example of extended schools suggests that extending the day at scale may well still require some form of subsidy for schools that are unwilling or unable to do it within their existing budgets
- The evidence in this report suggests that a successful extension of the school day should
  - Have a focus on broad educational outcomes, rather than childcare
  - Allow all schools to run a longer day, but recognise that the more schools that participate, the greater the cost
  - Provide some form of opt in for schools but compulsion for pupils within those schools
  - Staff a longer school day with teachers rather than teaching assistants or third parties
7) This pack sets out Policy Exchange’s preferred model should policymakers seek to systematically extend the school day

- **Have a focus on broad educational outcomes, rather than childcare**
  - Although the benefits are not guaranteed, the stronger evidence seems to be around the wider educational benefit to the pupil – both some growth in core subjects (from one study) and general social and cultural capital gains from high quality activity (largely self perceived and from polling)
  - Although there would clearly be a childcare benefit for pupils (who will be at school for a longer period), this would also carry deadweight costs amongst parents already paying for that provision, and as identified the biggest gap in existing provision (and for maternal employment) is actually for pre-primary aged children

- **Allow all schools to run a longer day, but recognise that the more schools that participate, the greater the cost**
  - A targeted scheme would reduce the costs – this could for example focus just on secondaries, or just on schools in deprived areas, or some other sort of criteria
  - The polling suggests secondary aged parents and secondary staff (and heads) are more positive about the benefits than their primary counterparts
  - Space constraints and rurality may make it difficult for a minority of primary schools to offer activities and transport
7) This pack sets out Policy Exchange’s preferred model should policymakers seek to systematically extend the school day

- **Provide some form of opt in for schools but compulsion for pupils within those schools**
  - There is insufficient evidence for a justification for mandatory longer days that would overrule school’s autonomy. The polling also suggests a move would be unpopular.
  - A system where both schools, and pupils within those schools, opted in to a longer day would maximise autonomy but potentially cause significant logistical difficulties for schools in terms of funding and organising activities if demand was entirely flexible.
  - Schools that opted in, at the decision of the Headteacher / Governors in consultation with the school community, could require all pupils to participate in the extended day. This would make investment / staffing decisions easier, and allow schools (if they wished) to remodel their timetable, rather than simply add extra curricular activities to the end of a normal day. Such schools would be eligible to access an ‘extended day premium’, modelled and designed like the pupil premium, to cover the costs of running a longer school day.

- **Staff a longer school day with teachers rather than teaching assistants or third parties**
  - Evidence presented here suggests that in most of the UK and US examples, teachers staff the longer school day rather than volunteers or TAs. Previous evidence on workforce suggests that teachers as opposed to other staff are needed to demonstrate academic gains.
  - The polling suggests that this is also an option favoured by secondary staff.
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1. Framework of policy and case for change

Thinking through how and whether to introduce a longer school day requires policymakers to have a view on six key questions – including around the purpose of the longer school day; its key design principles; and the way in which it can be implemented. Government has differing levels of legitimacy and control over the answers to some of these questions.

Based on studying other countries who have implemented variants of longer school days, such a policy typically seeks to solve one or both of two policy problems: a) improving education particularly for more deprived children, which could include wider cultural and social capital and b) providing reliable and low cost childcare for parents of primary and secondary-aged pupils. There may also be second order potential benefits including in areas such as reduced crime, reduced teenage pregnancy etc.

2. Evidence
   a. International comparisons
   b. Academic research
   c. Case studies

3. Polling

4. Policy Design
The design of a longer school day policy requires policymakers to have answers to a series of six key questions, all of which have different implications for government intervention.

1. **What is the purpose of a longer school day?**
   - This question is about the policy goal and relates to the desired and expected outcomes of the policy.
   - All funding, policy and implementation issues flow from an agreed end goal or purpose of a longer school day.

2. **What type of schools should this apply to?**
   - These cover the design of the policy and relate to any legislative requirements or incentives to implement the policy. A longer school day can apply to a subset of schools or for all schools. This subset could include primary only / secondary only, or schools in certain circumstances (e.g. of deprivation).

3. **Should it be mandatory or voluntary for schools?**
   - These relate to the implementation of the policy. As the specificity of longer school day arrangements increase, the Government’s capacity (and legitimacy) to intervene decreases.
   - Options include enrichment activities, academic catch up, or a redesigned timetable with greater academic teaching delivered by more or existing teachers, support staff and third party organisations.

4. **Should it be mandatory or voluntary for pupils?**

5. **What activities should take place?**

6. **Who should staff it?**

---

(1) In all of this work, when we consider a 'longer school day' we mean some form of extension of the main school day during term time, in order to provide a range of activities – academic, extra curricular, childcare, access to other state funded or charged for services or any combination of these. We specifically have excluded from this work any focus on supplementary schooling – i.e. school type activities carried out at the weekends. We have also excluded any consideration of extending the school year, which – particularly in the US – often takes place alongside an extension of the school day.
Longer school day typically seeks to solve one or both of two problems: a) improving education, particularly for more deprived children and b) providing reliable and low cost childcare for parents. There may also be second order spillover benefits.

- In terms of GCSE performance, the FSM – non FSM gap has only closed by 1.2% over five years in spite of numerous initiatives targeting the poorest children in schools, such as the Pupil Premium and Ofsted’s increased focus on data relating to the gap.
- Students from poorer backgrounds are underrepresented at university. In 2010/11, of the total number of students going to a Russell Group university, only 4% had been in receipt of FSM.
- The recent Education Select Committee report called for a longer school day “to provide space and time for students from lower socio-economic backgrounds to complete homework”.

There also may be some second order spillover benefits in areas such as reduced crime, reduced teenage pregnancy etc – though claiming causation as to these from a longer school day would be tentative and hugely dependent on local policy design and circumstances.

---

1. GCSE and equivalent attainment by pupil characteristics in England: 2011-12, DfE, January 2014
2. Impact indicator 13: percentage of children on free school meals progressing to a Russell Group university, DfE, March 2014
3. Childcare Costs Survey 2014, Family and Childcare Trust, 2014 and previous years
4. Education Select Committee Underachievement in Education by White Working Class Children June 2014
5. See for example the results – albeit largely self reported – in terms of crime reduction from the National Evaluation of the Positive Activities for Young People scheme which ran from 2003-2006, at a total cost of £124.5m.
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• OECD PISA 2012, and TIMSS 2011 data, shows that there is no relationship between the total amount of intended instructional time and performance in mathematics, reading and science, neither is there a relationship between teaching time in core subjects and performance in those subjects

• On childcare, England performs around the OECD average for maternal employment rate for mothers with very young children (age under 3) or older children (age 6-14). The policy gap is in maternal employment with 3-5 year olds, which would not be directly impacted by a policy offering childcare for primary and secondary aged children

3. Polling

4. Policy Design
OECD PISA data shows that there is no relationship between the total amount of intended instructional time for a typical programme for a 15 year old and performance in mathematics, reading and science.
A similarly weak relationship can be seen in the TIMSS results for mathematics of 9-10 and 13-14 year olds.

Relationship between total instruction time in mathematics and mean average performance score for a selection of countries in TIMSS¹

---

¹ Instructional Time Spent on mathematics, TIMSS 2011 International Results in Mathematics, TIMSS 2011
Presenting the PISA data another way shows that some countries that perform less well than England (Chile) have longer instruction time; some who do better (Korea) also are taught for longer, and some who do better (Finland) are taught for less.
PISA also shows whilst students in some high-performing jurisdictions spend more time on core subjects, so too do those in some poor performing jurisdictions. Increasing the amount of time spent learning core subjects does not reliably produce gains.
On childcare, OECD data shows the UK performs relatively well in childcare for 6-14 year olds and under 3s; the biggest gap is for 3-5 year olds which would not be directly impacted by this policy (as it would provide childcare for school aged children).

- It is estimated that a 5% boost to maternal employment will lead to an economic boom of £750m via increased tax receipts and wider private spending.

- However, the maternal employment ‘gap’ occurs amongst mothers of younger children. The UK has an above average employment rate for mothers of school-aged children, suggesting that, by international standards, provision of childcare for this group is relatively well established. However, the maternal employment rate for mothers with children aged three to five lags behind the OECD average which is where action is needed.

- A longer school day policy that offered childcare to mothers of school aged children would have benefits in reducing cost of childcare and allowing greater labour flexibility. However, it would likely have limited benefit in encouraging significant numbers of mothers with school aged children back into the labour market.

- There are a number of policy options available to governments to improve childcare cost, access and quality but they are out of scope for this pack.

(1) OECD Family Database, 2009  (2) ippr, Childmind the gap: reforming childcare to support mothers into work  (3) See for example recent Policy Exchange reports Quality Childcare and Centres of Excellence
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• The relationship of time to learning is neither direct nor simple because not all time spent in school is equal. Increasing the total amount of time spent in school does not necessarily produce increases in engaged time, which is a closer proxy for learning.

• None of the studies reviewed as part of this pack were reliably able to evaluate the impact of additional time on all pupils’ achievement because of the ways in which the systems were set up or who they were targeted at. The international evidence, based on self evaluation, seems to suggest benefits occur most from high quality teacher led activities for sustained periods of time:

  • The Massachusetts reforms found no increase in grade levels 5 years after rolling out the programme; however this is perhaps not surprising as there was no consistency of approach, no measure of fidelity to a reform programme, and no consistent studied group or control group of schools.

  • Germany’s all day schools showed some benefits (self reported) if students attended at least three days a week and if the students perceived the teaching support was high quality.

  • There is a group of high-performing charter schools in the US that have an expanded school day and achieve good results, although these are ‘opt in’ schools, often new, and there was no control group.

  • In KIPP schools, a one hour increase in instructional time in core subjects is positively and significantly related to higher achievement in reading and maths. In contrast, a one hour increase in non-core subjects is associated with lower achievement. This only applies to a subset of pupils that are typically present in KIPP schools and does not control for the longer school year which KIPP also runs, nor any form of teacher quality.

• The Education Endowment Foundation, having reviewed the evidence, conclude that “the amount of improved learning appears to depend heavily on how the time is used and which aspects of teaching and learning are increased…it is likely to be cheaper and more efficient to focus on using existing school time more effectively” (1) However, they note the evidence from KIPP that extending school time can be an effective means of improving learning for pupils who are most disadvantaged and at risk of failure.

The relationship of time to learning is neither direct nor simple because not all time spent in school is equal. Increasing the total amount of time spent in school does not necessarily produce increases in engaged time, which is a closer proxy for learning.

**Allocated Time**
This broadest measure of time (‘the school day’ or year) is easily measured and mandated.

**Instructional and Non-Instructional Time**
These two components make up allocated time. The time dedicated to time spent in lessons (instructional time) and the parts of the day when children are not (non-instructional time), which includes assemblies, breaks and lunch, moving between classrooms, etc. The allocation of time between these two is normally at the discretion of the school.

**Engaged Time**
A subset of instructional time, this measures ‘time on task’. It excludes time in lessons that is spent on non-subject-related tasks, including taking the register and interruptions from visitors and disruptive pupils. Teachers’ ability to manage their classroom will impact on the proportion of engaged time to that which is ‘wasted’.

**Academic Learning Time**
A subset of engaged time, academic learning time is when students are learning. It is the narrowest measure of time, difficult to measure and can only indirectly be addressed by policymakers. For example, via high quality ITT and professional development.

---

(1) ’Improving Student Achievement by Extending School: Is It Just a Matter of Time?’ J Aronson, J Zimmerman, and L Carlos, WestEd, 1998
Massachusetts study on a longer school day cannot evaluate the impact of additional time on achievement because of the ways in which the programme was set up

**Case Study: Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time (ELT) Initiative**

Established in 2005, a group of elementary and middle schools participated in a state-funded programme to **increase their allocated time by 300 hours per academic year**

The purposes of the programme were to: improve student outcomes in **core academic subjects**; broaden **enrichment** opportunities; and, **improve instruction** by adding more planning and professional development time for teachers

Between 2006-2009 29 participating schools received implementation grants of **nearly £800 per pupil**

After five years achievement levels across multiple subject areas and grade levels **does not appear to have changed between pre-implementation and the final year of the evaluation**

Furthermore, there was **no consistent pattern or meaningful relationship between the extent to which schools stayed faithful to the design of the programme and pupil achievement**.

There was no attempt to make the Massachusetts schools representative, nor keep to a common group consistent The schools who opted into the ELT initiative were largely self selecting, and the programme ran for five years, during which time some schools left the initiative

There was no attempt to ensure consistency across what the ELT schools did with their expanded time. All the state required was an expansion of allocated time, with which schools chose to implement in a variety of different ways

...And this variety did not become apparent until part way through the study. An Implementation Index was designed and fitted retrospectively, after discovering significant variation between schools, to try and establish fidelity to a programme

There was no reliable control group. Over the course of the ELT programme, some comparison schools increasingly implemented ELT-like components, for example before and after school clubs

---

Primary and secondary schools in Germany received funding to increase hours following poor results in OECD PISA 2000. The evaluation reports self identified benefits for high quality activities that take place intensively.

In Germany, schools typically offered an academic curriculum taught between 8am-noon/1pm. Lunch was not provided and there were no extra curricular activities on offer in the afternoons.

Between 2003-09, schools were financially supported to expand their day to seven hours per day at least three days per week. The main motivation was to improve maternal employment but, after PISA 2000 results ranked Germany well below average, the debate shifted to the educational benefits. Schools are required to ensure that extra-curricular activities in the afternoons have a ‘conceptual relationship’ with the academic content in the morning’s lessons.

Extended school time was rolled out alongside the Government investing in teaching quality improvements. Each Lander had flexibility in how it chosen to roll out its reforms, so again precise lessons are difficult to draw.

There is variation between schools in requirement for pupils to attend. In 2009, whilst 45 per cent of schools offered all day provision, only about 25 per cent of pupils participated.

Extra-curricular activities include help with homework and remedial lessons to support children who have fallen or are at risk of falling behind. Despite an explicit requirement, extra-curricular activities were often missing conceptual relationships with the academic curriculum studied in the morning.

In primary schools, children from disadvantaged backgrounds showed considerably lower participation rates when compared to their wealthier peers. There was no difference at secondary level.

Results suggest that school grades are influenced when the longer extra curriculum participation took place intensively (at least three days per week. Individual effects of extracurricular participation in all-day schools depend mostly on the quality of the activities; where individuals reported high quality teacher activity the effects were felt to be greatest.

Much of the evidence of benefits are of the self reported variety eg parents reporting fewer disciplinary problems at home, student perceived benefits of extra curricular activities and homework support.

---

(1) Quality and effectiveness of German all-day schools: Results of the study on the development of all-day schools, German Institute of Educational Research, 2013
There is a group of high-performing schools in the US that have an expanded school day and achieve good results. Although they credit the longer school day, it is not clear how much this has driven improvement.

Evidence

2. In May 2014, the NCTL published a further report on using additional time to develop teachers, including collaborative lesson planning, embedded professional development, summer training, data analysis, individualised coaching and peer observation. ‘Time for Teachers’, National Center on Time and Learning, 2014

Case Study: The National Center on Time and Learning (NCTL) studied 30 expanded time schools and found eight common practices that, delivered within a longer school day, teaching and senior staff believe have played a role in driving up standards

- Dedicate Time to Improve Teacher Effectiveness
  - Continuously strengthen instruction
  - Relentlessly assess, analysed and respond to data

- Use Time to Help Students Thrive in School and Beyond
  - Build high expectations and mutual accountability
  - Provide a well-rounded education
  - Prepare students for college and career

- Optimise Time for Student Learning
  - Make every minute count
  - Prioritise time according to focused learning goals
  - Individualise learning time and instruction based on student needs

- Time
- People
- Data
- Culture

• The NCTL’s case studies are based on surveys and observations of participating ‘opt-in’ schools, rather than formal evaluation of benefits against a control group
• Many of the schools, including three KIPP charter schools, were brand new schools, so no comparison can be drawn between ‘before’ and ‘after’ expanding the school day from these schools
In KIPP schools, a one hour increase in instructional time in core subjects is positively and significantly related to higher achievement in reading and maths. In contrast, a one hour increase in non-core subjects is associated with lower achievement.

**Case Study: KIPP schools**

KIPP (Knowledge is Power Program) runs a national network of elementary, middle and high schools in the US. Set up in educationally underserved communities, their schools serve disproportionately large communities of eligible for free lunch. Their mission is to equip these children with the knowledge, skills, character and habits needed to succeed in college and the workplace.

In order to realise these shared core principles, KIPP schools have a longer-than-normal school day; however, there is variation in the length of the school day between KIPP schools. This renders a comparison of KIPP’s longer school days collectively, with a traditional school days impossible.

KIPP schools have, however, compared the effect of time within their group of schools.

**Profile: KIPP Infinity Middle School, Harlem, New York City**

This high-performing middle school operates a school day that begins at 7.25am and formally finishes at 4pm, with after school activities – which are mandatory for some – following until 5pm. Teachers, who are typically NQT+3/4 years, are paid 20% above the union scale for public school teachers in NYC. There is no subsidy from KIPP HQ. Funding is found within school budgets, through increasing class sizes, small administrative teams and by not employing teaching assistants.

Research from Mathematica Policy Research found that an increase of an hour in instructional time dedicated to core subjects (English, maths, science, and history) was positively and significantly related to impacts in both reading and maths.

They also found that an hour increase in non core subjects is associated with a decrease in maths and reading achievement. One possible conclusion from this research is that children from disadvantaged backgrounds, such as the majority of pupils at KIPP schools, are likely to be the greatest beneficiaries of initiatives that expand time in school. This renders the application of KIPP’s ‘lessons learnt’ to schools with similar demographics.

It should also be noted that KIPP run expansive summer schools to counteract the phenomenon of ‘summer learning loss’. The research does not disentangle the effect of a longer school day from that of a longer school year.

---

(1) www.kipp.org (2) KIPP Middle Schools: Impacts on Achievement and Other Outcomes Final Report, Mathematica Policy Research, 2013 (3) Setbacks to academic skills experienced over the summer holiday months is well-documented and consistently shows that disadvantaged children suffer disproportionately from this ‘summer slide’, (Cooper, Nye, Charlton, & Greathouse, 1996) (4) According to the 2011-12 New York City Progress Reports, among Middle Schools, KIPP Infinity Middle School was ranked third in Manhattan and fourteenth in New York City.
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- Some academies and free schools are using their freedoms to lengthen the school day and year. These case studies are all informed by a very clear understanding of the overall purpose of the scheme and the way in which it needs to be implemented. None of the case studies receive additional funding and all manage it within their existing budget (and most pay their teachers a small additional stipend)

- In 2010, 98% of schools offered access to Extended Services, at a total cost to government of £2.2bn. However, in reality the offer and quality of this provision for schools and parents was extremely variable. In particular, issues of transport, and accessibility to a school actually offering extended days, is critical to success

- Conclusions – or ‘lessons learnt’ – from the DfE’s review of the Extended Schools policy should inform the design of future expanded time policy

- The size of school halls may determine longer school day staffing arrangements and activities, particularly in primary schools. Due to the autonomy of the school system, there is no national data which can be used to assess schools’ capacity to deliver this. New research for this pack suggests at least 11% of primary schools – or almost 1,900 schools – will definitely struggle without additional capital investment
Some schools in England are using their freedoms to lengthen the school day and year; their motivations differ, but all are clear about their aims and design their school policies with these specific ends in sight.

**Ark Primary Schools**

- Clear case for expanded time: to improve academic achievement by spending more time securing a high level of deep understanding in core subjects English and maths
- Ark Primary Schools admit a higher than average number of pupils eligible for FSM
- New schools run from 8.30pm-4pm, four days per week; ideally converter schools transition to this over a three year period, incrementally extending their day year by year
- 8.30pm-4.00pm is dedicated to instruction in subjects (i.e. it is not extra-curricular time). Pupils receive approximately 12 hours of English instruction and seven hours of maths instruction. Allocation of time to subjects is driven by teachers’ and senior leaders’ scrutiny of pupil performance data
- Pupils are released early (2.00pm) one day per week. The remaining school day (2.30pm-5.00pm) is dedicated to planning, data scrutiny and professional development
- Teaching Assistants supervise daily Breakfast Clubs and deliver optional after school activities until 5pm. Parents are required to give a small contribution to cover some costs and demonstrate commitment to the programme
- Some schools offer childcare until 6pm. This is only established if there is sufficient parental demand
- Teachers are paid 2.5% above the national pay scale and are expected to be available between 8am-5pm five days a week. Funding for this is found in existing school budgets by employing fewer operations staff and forgoing some ‘nice to haves’
- New staff that join converter schools are hired under these terms and conditions. Existing staff, when appropriate, are encouraged to TUPE over to new contracts. This process, which includes the flexibility to expand the school day, can take approximately three years. Ark is in a position to change contracts and expand the school day as trust between them and existing teachers increases

**David Young Community Academy (Secondary)**

- The school’s longer school day is designed to mitigate the effects of poor or absent parenting, which hinders academic performance. The content of the longer school is designed with these ends in sight
- Senior leaders were inspired by independent boarding schools and have forged close links to share support and ideas
- The school operates a seven term year, starting in June. The school day runs from 8.25am-3pm and comprises of three lessons each 1.5 hours. Years 7 and 8 are required to participate in the longer school day (until 4.35pm) on a part time basis (two days per week). As pupils get older, mandatory participation increases. The school site is available for all pupils to use until senior leaders leave (sometimes as late as 10pm)
- Pupils choose from a range of activities including arts and crafts, sports, drama, Latin, etc., and must commit for at least one term (6 weeks). Some pupils are identified for academic catch-up and are strongly encouraged to attend
- Participation in enrichment activities beyond a pupil’s mandatory longer school day is variable and often seasonal, with higher attendance in the summer when evenings are lighter and more sports activities are on offer
- Buses for travel home are available at 3pm and again at 4.35pm, though most pupils live within walking distance
- Teachers are on non-STCPD contracts and are required to deliver one longer school day activity per week. Teachers are not paid more for the extra time. Teachers are on new contracts, but the national pay scale is used.
- Teachers are not required to cover lessons and the school does not use supply agencies, employ teaching or behaviour support assistants. A small group of graduates with aspirations to train as teachers – para-teachers – cover absent teachers. Many of these go on to complete the GTP or School Direct with DYCA
- Teaching staff are allocated 10% PPA time. Tea and coffee is free, as is lunch provided it is eaten with pupils
### The Free School Norwich (Primary)

- Clear case for expanded time: to increase the time parents have available to work.
- School operates a six term year with two week breaks between each term and a four week summer holiday. The Club is open for 51 weeks of the year. It is closed for one week only between Christmas and New Year and on Bank Holidays.
- School day runs from 8.45am-3.30pm. A daily, optional breakfast club starts at 8.15am and costs £1 per day.
- Squirrels Club runs every day after school until 5.45pm and costs £3.20 per session.
- At 3.30pm a snack and drinks is provided. Half an hour of outdoor, structured group activity follows, after which pupils can choose activities (craft, TV, role play, etc.) until 5pm, when a hot two-course meal is served. Pupils are collected by parents between 5.25pm-5.45pm.
- During the holidays an extended Squirrels Club service runs all day, 8.15am-5.45pm and costs £16.50 (full day) or £11 (5 hours). The school does not offer subsidised places. Parents are happy with the costs.
- Parents are encouraged to book in advance where possible, but the programme can accommodate last minute on the day admissions. There are online, telephone and paper booking methods.
- Qualified childcare staff supervise Squirrels Club.
- Squirrels Club currently pays for itself and makes a surplus, which is used to purchase additional play equipment and resources. Some of the surplus is also used to contribute to the cost of school trips. The school’s annual budget is not used for the Club.
- Approximately 35% of pupils at the school attend Squirrels Club regularly and two thirds of these pupils are in Reception or Key Stage 1.
- The main challenge the school faces is expanding the provision to welcome younger pre-school siblings in the holidays. School insurance contracts do not permit this.

### Great Yarmouth Primary Academy

- Longer school day to give children opportunities that many middle class children have.
- Differentiated longer school day: 8.55am-3.30pm for Reception – 2, 5pm for Y3-4, 6pm for Y5-6. Earlier finish on Fridays: 3.30pm for Y3-4 and 4.15pm for Y5-6. Children choose from range of activities, including sports, horse riding, karate, cookery. Children in Y 5-6 complete an hour of prep – set by class teachers and supervised and marked by Teaching Assistants – between 5-6pm.
- Longer school day enables exclusive focus on academic curriculum during 9-3.30pm.
- After high level of resistance from parents, school began ‘soft launch’ implementation of longer school days for Y5-6 from September 2012 and for Y3-4 after the October half term.
- Teachers do not deliver longer school day activities/study support. Existing TAs deliver some activities (sometimes based on their expertise/interests). TAs are paid commensurately more for this extra time. Some third party organisations deliver activities that TAs cannot offer (e.g. karate, horse riding, ballet).
- Free childcare, supervised by TAs, for siblings in younger year groups.
- Estimated cost of programme per year is £100k. £50k contribution from Sponsor per year for first five years to support longer school day. Pupil Premium funding.
- Parents and teachers had concerns about pupils’ time to complete homework. Y3-4 receive homework at the weekends only. Y5-6 receive homework during the holidays.
- Activity groupings are vertically integrated, which has relieved early discipline issues due to the absence of teachers.
- Space to host activities was a problem in the early days, so the school hired additional space. With time the school improved timetabling of activities to avoid this.

---

**Evidence**

Some schools in England are using their freedoms to lengthen the school day and year; their motivations differ, but all are clear about their aims and design their school policies with these specific ends in sight.
The outcomes of the Extended School policy - at a total cost to government of £2.2bn – showed that without a smart design, the offer and quality for schools and parents was extremely variable.

In 2003, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) launched a national Full Service Extended Schools initiative. The intention was to have one or more schools in every LA which provided intense coverage of services for the local community. Each FSES was funded between £93k and £162k per year plus £26k a year for childcare, and there were 148 schools in total by the end of the scheme in 2006.

In 2005, the DfES made a commitment that by 2010 all children should have access to a variety of activities beyond the school day, called ‘Extended Schools’. Government spent a total £840m from 2003 to 2008, and DCSF then allocated a further £1.3bn to schools and Local Authorities through to 2011. By 2010, 98% of all schools were ‘Extended Schools’ although what that meant in practice was extremely variable.

**Case Study: Extended Schools in England**

In 2003, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) launched a national Full Service Extended Schools initiative. The intention was to have one or more schools in every LA which provided intense coverage of services for the local community. Each FSES was funded between £93k and £162k per year plus £26k a year for childcare, and there were 148 schools in total by the end of the scheme in 2006.

In 2005, the DfES made a commitment that by 2010 all children should have access to a variety of activities beyond the school day, called ‘Extended Schools’. Government spent a total £840m from 2003 to 2008, and DCSF then allocated a further £1.3bn to schools and Local Authorities through to 2011. By 2010, 98% of all schools were ‘Extended Schools’ although what that meant in practice was extremely variable.

**Benefits of participation in Extended Schools activities as perceived by all parents**

The benefits were deemed to be wider educative benefits rather than direct academics or even supporting work / childcare.

---

Conclusions – or ‘lessons learnt’ – from the DfE’s review of the Extended Schools policy should inform the design of future extended time policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary schemes can be difficult to market to parents, especially if there is variation between local offers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 per cent of parents felt they knew a little about the services on offer and nine per cent knew nothing. Just over half of parents were aware of their child’s school having consulted parents. Given the relatively low knowledge base and variety of offers, this can be a challenge to take-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If schools are not legally required to offer a service on their site, they will likely cluster services together. Whilst this avoids unnecessary local duplication and reduces costs, it can create transport issues, and therefore accessibility issues, which are passed on to parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where schools signposted activities and childcare that were not provided on the school site, 53 per cent of cases were within walking distance of the schools. This varied significantly by area (61 per cent of urban schools and 22 per cent of rural schools). Only 15 per cent of primary schools signposting childcare and activities offsite that were not within walking distance provided transport for these activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chargeable provision is an obstacle for disadvantaged pupils and families and, despite subsidies, participation remains a problem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68 per cent of pupils had taken part in at least one kind of activity in the previous term. Pupils from wealthier households could attend more activities, suggesting that the costs of activities are a barrier for some families. Whilst schools used funding from a range of different sources, 41 per cent of schools contributed to cost of providing childcare services and 59 per cent contributed to the cost of providing activities. 73 per cent of schools charged a lower fee or waived the fee for payment for families who struggle to pay the full fee for childcare or activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary schools, particularly urban ones, have greater capacity to offer a range of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82 per cent of secondary schools and 65 per cent of primary schools were offering full core offer and larger schools were more likely to be doing so than smaller ones. There was also variation between locations, with around 52 per cent of rural schools offering the full core offer compared with 71 per cent of urban schools. Two-thirds of schools offered extended services as part of a cluster or group of schools, with most clusters being made up of ten schools or less. 23 per cent of schools cited a lack of available space or places.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools find expanded time programmes create additional human resources and administrative burdens and funding is the most common challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66 per cent of schools had responsibility for the day to day delivery of childcare or activities used as childcare. 89 per cent of schools had responsibility for the day to day running of activities. The funding of services is the most common barrier to expansion; 63 per cent of schools cited as a challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All stats from Ipsos MORI, “Extended schools: testing the delivery of the core offer in and around extended schools” and Cummings et al, “Evaluation of the Full Service Extended Schools Initiative: Final report”
Space constraints may determine arrangements for a longer day, particularly in primary schools. In a recent FOI, 23% of primaries meet best practice rules on space, and 11% definitely don’t. There is nothing known about two thirds of the primary estate.

Building Bulletin 99 (BB99) is issued as best practice advice for school building projects.

This non-statutory guidance provides some insight into potential space-related challenges that may arise from a longer school day policy.

BB99 guidance on building halls states that:

‘In any primary school, the total area for halls should include a main hall of at least 120m² for infants or 140m² for juniors, sufficient for PE and dance (ideally with a sprung floor and some wall mounted PE apparatus), assemblies of the whole school at one time, public performances, parents’ evenings and community events.’

Polling undertaken for this project reveals that nearly half of head teachers (47%) have concerns about space and facilities to deliver a longer school day and that this is predominantly a problem in primary schools.

Policy Exchange therefore submitted a Freedom of Information request to the Department for Education and 152 Local Authorities in England requesting information about the proportion of primary schools that comply with this requirement.

(1) Policy Exchange submitted a Freedom of Information request to the Department for Education and 152 Local Authorities in April 2014.

---

Request for information relating to level of compliance with BB99 for schools in the LA

- 82% of LAs responded
- 18% did not
- 42% provided data
- 58% had no data
- 67% of primaries were compliant
- 33% were not

This data shows 23% of primaries in total are definitely compliant with BB99, and 11% are definitely not. We received no data on almost two thirds of schools. DfE, in response to an FOI holds no data nationally on this.
1. Framework and case for change

2. Evidence
   a. International comparisons
   b. Academic research
   c. Case studies

3. Polling
   - Policy Exchange commissioned YouGov to survey parents, teachers and head teachers of English schools about their use, attitudes and plans for longer school days
   - 10 major conclusions can be drawn from the polling (slide 40). These steer policymakers through deciding for who, with what and how a longer school day should operate and foreseeable challenges

4. Policy Design
Our polling suggests around 38%-50% of state schools (and 70%-80% of private schools) offer some form of longer day.

This is similar to a recent DfE report which found 53% of primary schools offer wrap around care in term time.

All data from YouGov. Fieldwork completed in April-May 2014. 1558 parents and 1010 teachers polled. All charts include state parents and teachers only, unless specified. Full data tables available at www.policyexchange.org.uk. DfE report referenced here is from TNS BMRB “primary schools providing access to out of school care” June 2014.
Around a third of parents have children in a longer school day, and about a quarter of parents use it. A further quarter of parents would like to use it, but it is not offered.
Parents split about 50-50 on their feelings around a longer day. They are significantly more keen on the idea for secondary-aged pupils. Parents of pre-primary-aged children are the most keen on the idea of longer school days for primary-aged children. See appendix for further details.
More middle class parents want longer school days in both primary and secondary schools than working class parents.

- Proportion of parents in favour of longer primary school days by social grade:
  - ABC1: 20% Like, 13% Like a lot
  - C2DE: 16% Like, 14% Like a lot

- Proportion of parents in favour of longer secondary school days by social grade:
  - ABC1: 29% Like, 25% Like a lot
  - C2DE: 26% Like, 22% Like a lot
There is a very strong preference – over 3 to 1 – in favour of longer primary school days being voluntary. Preferences for longer secondary school days are more mixed.

30% more parents with pre-primary-aged children believe longer primary school days should be mandatory, against parents of children aged 5-11 and 12-18 years old. See appendix for details.
72% of parents with primary-aged children support or could be amenable to a chargeable childcare model, whilst only half of parents feel the same about more integrated longer school days.
A greater proportion of middle class parents prefer the idea of chargeable childcare (44%) than working class parents (30%).

Distribution of parents’ attitudes towards chargeable childcare for primary-aged pupils amongst different social grades:

- **ABC1**:
  - Don't know: 4%
  - Strongly dislike: 13%
  - Dislike: 26%
  - No strong feelings either way: 31%
  - Like: 14%
  - Like a lot: 9%

- **C2DE**:
  - Don't know: 6%
  - Strongly dislike: 17%
  - Dislike: 17%
  - No strong feelings either way: 30%
  - Like: 21%
  - Like a lot: 9%
Primary parents believe the biggest benefit is on their purses, secondary parents on children’s knowledge and skills. Both groups want schools to focus on extra curricular activities and time for homework.

### Perceived impact of a longer school day amongst parents

- Reduced childcare costs for parents: 59% (5-11 year olds), 46% (12-18 year olds)
- Parents able to work longer hours: 54% (5-11 year olds), 42% (12-18 year olds)
- Improving academic knowledge and skills: 49% (5-11 year olds), 51% (12-18 year olds)
- Improving social skills: 35% (5-11 year olds), 37% (12-18 year olds)
- Improving overall well-being: 22% (5-11 year olds), 25% (12-18 year olds)
- Not applicable – no benefits: 15% (5-11 year olds), 21% (12-18 year olds)

### Preferences for longer school day activities amongst parents

- Time for enrichment opportunities: 73% (5-11 year olds), 69% (12-18 year olds)
- Time for 'homework': 73% (5-11 year olds), 75% (12-18 year olds)
- Time for sport: 70% (5-11 year olds), 59% (12-18 year olds)
- More time for teaching academic subjects: 37% (5-11 year olds), 39% (12-18 year olds)
- Other: 4% (5-11 year olds), 3% (12-18 year olds)
The vast majority – around 8 out of 10 - of primary and secondary school staff believe a longer school day should be voluntary for all pupils.

The difference between primary and secondary school staff attitudes for mandatory longer school days for identified groups may be indicative of the high stakes testing and accountability measures at GCSE.

3 times as many head teachers favour a mandatory longer school day for all than classroom teachers, which may be indicative of accountability pressures, or logistical concerns around managing uncertain demand.

Polling
Primary staff believe the biggest benefit of longer school day is to reduce childcare costs; secondary staff believe the biggest benefit is for pupils’ academic knowledge and skills.

Primary and secondary school staff are sharply divided on their attitude towards the academic benefits of a longer school day.

Secondary school staff, who believe the biggest benefit is on pupils’ academic knowledge and skills, may envisage enrichment opportunities related to the school curriculum.
Three quarters of school staff are unwilling to work a longer school day under their current pay, terms and conditions.

Polling

Proportion of primary and secondary school staff willing to work a longer school day under their current pay, terms and conditions

School staff already implementing a mandatory longer school day are five times more willing to work a longer school day under their current pay, terms and conditions as those who work in schools with no longer school day provision – though of course they may already be on pay scales, terms and conditions that differ from national ones.
But around two thirds of primary and secondary school staff would work a longer school day if their pay increased proportionately.

### Proportion of primary and secondary school staff choosing named incentives to work a longer school day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Primary School Staff</th>
<th>Secondary School Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased pay</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer teaching hours</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marking</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller class size</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More professional development</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing would encourage me</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breaking down responses by age shows that younger teachers are especially likely to see increased pay as an incentive to work a longer school day. This pay incentive is less attractive as teachers get older.

"Flexible working hours"
" Longer holidays”
"If they paid for my childcare”
"More PPA time so time spent after school marking and planning would be given back.”
"Less paperwork, planning, marking and preparation which all take place outside normal school hours."
"Same teaching hours but spread out more widely, so as to include after-school periods."
"I work 11 hours a day everyday, and a few at the weekend too. I don’t think I could work any more.”
Primary school staff would prefer to have a longer school day delivered via third party organisations; secondary staff would prefer to use more teachers

Preferences for staffing a longer school day expressed by primary and secondary school staff

Secondary school staff, who follow a specific schedule of lessons, may envisage larger teaching depts offering more subject time per pupil over a longer school day

Preferences for staffing a longer school day expressed by classroom teachers and head teachers

Head teachers favour non-teaching staff. They are cheaper and would not impact on current teaching arrangements
Head teachers are predominantly concerned about funding a longer school day; classroom teachers are concerned about increases to their workload, stress and tiredness.

Concerns about space amongst primary staff may be because they anticipate third parties delivering childcare to large groups of pupils.
10 major conclusions can be drawn from Policy Exchange’s polling. These steer policymakers through deciding for who, with what and how a longer school day should operate and foreseeable challenges.

**What are people’s views on a longer school day?**

1. Somewhere between a third and a half of parents and teachers are in schools that already offer some form of longer school day (which may be voluntary or mandatory for pupils).
2. Around 40% of all parents like the idea but a similar number dislike it. Parents much prefer the idea of a longer school day for secondary schools (51% like) to primary schools (33% like).
3. Middle class parents prefer the idea of longer school days to working class parents. This difference is more pronounced if you include parents who send their children to private schools.
4. There is a very strong preference – over 3 to 1 - amongst all parents for longer primary school days to be voluntary. Views on longer secondary school days are more mixed.
5. Teachers strongly want a longer school day to be voluntary for all pupils (80%), though head teachers are marginally more in favour of a mandatory longer school day for all pupils than classroom teachers.
6. Primary school staff think the biggest benefit of a longer school day is for parents. They do not believe there are any benefits for pupils’ education. Secondary school teachers think the biggest benefit is for their pupils’ education. By and large parents agree with teachers; however, parents of primary-aged pupils see far more value of a longer school day on their children’s academic achievement than their primary school teachers.

**What should a longer school day involve and who should deliver it?**

7. Staffing a longer school day with third party organisations is preferred amongst primary school staff. Their colleagues in secondary schools would prefer more teachers.
8. Time for enrichment activities is the most popular activity for a longer school day amongst school staff.

**What challenges need to be overcome in order to implement a longer school day?**

9. 75% of school staff will not work a longer school day under their current pay, terms and conditions...but a majority will for an commensurate increase in their salary.
10. The main challenges to implementing a longer school day are related to funding, workload, stress and pupil and staff tiredness levels.
1. Framework and case for change

2. Evidence
   a. International comparisons
   b. Academic research
   c. Case studies

3. Polling

4. Policy Design
   - On the question of mandatory vs voluntary, policy options for government at a national level can take one of three directions, all of which differ in their costs, challenges and outcomes
   - Depending on the model chosen, additional costs to government could be significant – from several hundred million up to potentially almost £7bn. A model of extending schools via childcare would be chargeable to parents but the example of extended schools suggests may well still require some form of subsidy
   - In answer to the six questions in the framework, the evidence presented in the pack suggests
     - a focus on broad educational outcomes, rather than childcare
     - a focus on secondary, rather than primary schools
     - a model of opt in for schools but compulsion for pupils within those schools
     - a longer school day staffed by teachers rather than TAs or third parties
A key question is the extent to which a longer school day is optional or mandatory for schools and pupils. The most effective option may be to allow schools to opt in to a longer day and for it to be mandatory for those pupils.

**Policy Design**

**Voluntary for schools / Voluntary for pupils**
- This is the current position for schools in England.
- Maximum autonomy for schools.
- This position does not require additional funding or changes to teachers’ contracts.
- There is an argument for remaining here, should the cost of a longer school day policy be considered too high.

**Mandatory for schools / Voluntary for pupils**
- This is the space presently occupied by Labour’s wraparound childcare proposal.
- This is similar to the Extended Schools policy.
- It is the simplest parental demand-led direction and likely – as the polling from YouGov shows – to have strong parental support and buy in.
- However, variation in pupil attendance may render this policy direction expensive and potentially wasteful for schools.
- This proposal does not necessarily equip schools with the stability to offer a targeted and coherent longer school day programme that boosts attainment.

**Voluntary for schools / Mandatory for pupils**
- It retains autonomy for schools, whilst enabling some input from parents.
- It guarantees pupil attendance, which enables schools to build a coherent programme, stable staffing structures and budgeting.
- Schools will likely require cash incentives to expand their day.
- Schools may need to retrospectively amend Funding Agreements and teachers’ contracts.
- This is Policy Exchange’s preferred model for most effective implementation of a longer school day systematically.

**Mandatory for schools / Mandatory for pupils**
- This is the most extreme policy direction and is most prescriptive for schools and parents, undermining autonomy in schools and choice for parents.
- There is scant rationale – from research and polling - for this direction.
- It is the most expensive form of the policy and schools, though schools could be expected to find funding from within their budgets.
- The STCPD would require changing, as would existing and new Funding Agreements.
The key issue for making a chargeable childcare model work is around its implementation in primary schools.

1. Will all primary schools be required to provide childcare within their own site, or will they be able to signpost parents to childcare offers further afield?

2. If schools must offer childcare services within their own site, how will issues around a lack of space be addressed?

3. If schools signpost childcare elsewhere, will schools be required to provide transport to the alternative site?

4. To what extent will schools be required to subsidise chargeable childcare for parents and will schools be required to address costs - which may be highly variable – from within their existing budgets?

5. Who will deliver the chargeable childcare on a day-to-day basis?
A longer school day will require additional revenue (and possibly capital) expenditure. For government to meet all the additional costs would be extremely expensive, even using TAs. It may be possible to ask schools to absorb some, but not all, of these costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost to government – approx £6.9bn</th>
<th>Cost to government – approx £4.9bn</th>
<th>Cost to government – approx £2.2bn</th>
<th>Cost to government – approx £465m</th>
<th>Cost to government – zero (cost to schools - ?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This scenario makes the following assumptions</td>
<td>Same assumptions as £6.9bn scenario, but modelled on a flat £800 per student increase to schools, as in Massachusetts, with schools absorbing any further costs</td>
<td>15 hours a week for all pupils staffed by TAs and with a bigger pupil-adult ratio</td>
<td>This scenario makes the following assumptions</td>
<td>Six hypothetical modelled scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schools are open for an extra 3 hours per day, 5 days a week, 39 weeks a year</td>
<td>• Schools can negotiate their own terms with teachers that are typically a 10% increase in average salary (including on costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any form of longer school day is optional and therefore not a legal requirement on pupils (by government or potentially by the school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schools are offering a longer school day for 5-10 year olds in primary and 11-16 year olds in secondary</td>
<td>• Schools have various other staff cost pressures from 2015 onwards – including annual (small) teacher and support staff pay increases, and increased pension contribution uplifts</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools make a charge to parents which covers the cost of additional staff, premises costs, insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100% participation rate (i.e. mandatory for both schools and pupils)</td>
<td>• Schools receive flat real budgets from 2016-2020 (at least flat cash per pupil)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Government does not provide any subsidy to schools to run this. Schools likely to have to find a sum of money to subsidise it themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staffed by additional teachers on an average teacher salary and using standard PTR for both primary and secondary schools</td>
<td>• Schools are asked to absorb 80% of this paybill increase through efficiency savings and staff remodelling and government meets the remaining 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All additional cost to schools met by government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs include:
- Childcare – 15 hours a week only for 5-7yos (target group for UIFSM), staffed by TAs on 20:1 ratio
- Staffed by additional teachers on an average teacher salary and using standard PTR for both primary and secondary schools
- All additional cost to schools met by government

(1) Hypothetical and illustrative examples only – different models would be possible under different scenarios and cost bases. All costings based on Policy Exchange modelling using publicly available data and assuming 100% uptake by schools. We have assumed a traditional definition of a longer school day – especially if mandatory - falls within the definition of education provided during school hours and therefore cannot be charged for under the Education Act 1996. Obviously any available options for user charging (as for childcare) would defray costs to government and schools.
Making a longer school day mandatory would likely require significant legal changes and/or funding changes, particularly as relate to Academies.

**Legislative issues**

- A longer school day could be legislated for – as, for example, Labour is committed to do with a “primary childcare guarantee”. This is intended to apply to all primary schools, both LA schools and Academies.

- Clause 2.1 of the model Funding Agreement for Academies is explicit that “the length of the school day and year is the responsibility of the Academy Trust”. Similarly, since 2011 the Governing Bodies of maintained schools have also had the right to revise the length of the school day as they see fit.

- It would be possible for a government to reintroduce regulations (secondary legislation) to reintroduce central control over a school day – the 2011 reforms simply abolished the previous regulations from 1999 which mandated the overall length of the day. Similarly, there is a precedent for legislation that affects Academies and supersedes Funding Agreements – for example, the recent Children and Families Bill places a legal duty on all state funded schools in England, including Academies and free schools, to offer a free school lunch to all pupils in Reception and Y1-2. Any government action which mandated schools to extend school days would require primary or secondary legislation.

**Funding issues**

- An alternative approach to legislating for an extended day would be to strongly incentivise all mainstream schools (Academies and LA schools, primary and secondary) to ‘convert’ to a longer school day with additional funding, much like the original Academy converter programme. This could take two approaches:
  - Assuming that a government post 2015 made progress towards a full National Funding Formula, this formula could include a new element that allocated more funding towards schools which offered a longer school day. Depending on the overall resources available, this may need to be funded by schools that do not extend their hours receiving cash cuts.
  - A future government could allocate a separate stream of money for schools that move to an extended day – an Extended Day Premium (along the lines of the Pupil Premium). The value of that would be based on assumptions as to additional cost pressures faced by schools extending their hours.
The evidence and polling presented here offers some – not always conclusive – direction towards answering the six questions set out in our framework.

1. What is the purpose of a longer school day?
   - The primary goal is to improve academic outcomes, especially of disadvantaged pupils.
   - This pack suggests that the case for change is stronger around improving broad educational outcomes (both standards and wider educational opportunities) than on childcare / employment.

2. What type of schools should this apply to?
   - The evidence in this pack suggests secondary staff and parents are more positive about longer school days than primary school staff. Such academic evidence as there is marginally favours secondary schools in deprived circumstances.

3. Should it be mandatory or voluntary for schools? *
   - Questions three and four are key areas for government (see slide 42). Overall, mandatory attendance for pupils is not popular amongst school staff and parents apart from certain groups and there is relatively little evidence on the educational (and childcare) benefits to justify the expense. Voluntary attendance, however, may create logistical challenges.

4. Should it be mandatory or voluntary for pupils?
   - The evidence in this pack suggests a focus on academic, especially core subjects (English, maths and science) – which can be delivered through extra-curricular activities as well. An academic focus is favoured by secondary teachers and all parents (who want it delivered via extra-curricular rather than more lessons).

5. What activities should take place?
   - The evidence from UK and US case studies is that teachers normally staff a longer school day as opposed to teaching assistants or third party providers, in particular when any benefits are subsequently seen.
   - This is favoured by secondary teachers but not primaries.
   - Teachers are strongly opposed to longer hours without a commensurate increase in pay, which has normally happened in the US and UK examples.

6. Who should staff it?

* For the purposes of this question ‘mandatory’ includes ‘strongly incentivised’ e.g. through sharply differential funding levels.