

The Contribution that Alternate, Pull-out and Externally-Provided Programs within Schools Make towards Student Learning, Well-Being and Pathways

Research Report for

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development,

Frankston Mornington Peninsula Youth Partnerships & Frankston Mornington Peninsula Local Learning Employment Network

Final Report

April 2014

Dr David Zyngier, Dr Rosalyn Black, Dr Nathan Brubaker & Dr Marc Pruyn

Faculty of Education

Monash University

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND, METHOD AND DEFINITIONS	4
Research Statement:.....	4
Background:	4
Policy Framework.....	5
METHODOLOGY	8
DEFINITIONS.....	9
Defining alternate programs.....	10
Defining vulnerability in relation to learning, wellbeing and pathways	11
What Is an Exemplary Program?.....	12
Alternate programs provided by external agencies.....	14
WHAT WORKS IN ALTERNATE PROGRAM PROVISION.....	17
A SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVE ALTERNATE PROGRAMS BEING CONDUCTED IN AUSTRALIA: The Dusseldorp Skills Forum.....	17
INTERNATIONAL CASE STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE IN ALTERNATE PROGRAM PROVISION	19
Studying the Project.....	19
Theoretical Framework Behind the Project	19
The Methods and Data Sources of the Project	20
Project Findings.....	20
Literacy & Literate Abilities	21
‘Push-out’	22
Project Conclusions.....	23
CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: WHAT THE LITERATURE SAYS ABOUT EFFECTIVE PRACTICE AND PROVISION.....	24
How Sustainable Alternate Programs Are – Their <i>Stickability</i>	24
How Effective Alternative Programs Are – Their Transformability	26
Transforming schools.....	28
Transforming communities.....	29
How Alternate Programs May be Used Successfully in Other Locations – Their Transmittability	30
RECOMMENDATIONS	32
REFERENCES.....	35
Appendix A: Effective Alternate Programs Being Conducted in Australia	42
Appendix B: Major Reports.....	43
National Research	43
International research	44
Appendix C: Learning Choices Analysis	46

THE CONTRIBUTION THAT ALTERNATE, PULL-OUT AND EXTERNALLY-PROVIDED PROGRAMS WITHIN SCHOOLS MAKE TOWARDS STUDENT LEARNING, WELL-BEING AND PATHWAYS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The focus of this review is on programs organised for schools by providers external to the education system for students who are at risk of not completing both compulsory and the non-compulsory years of schooling and/or who are at risk of low academic achievement. The nature of such risks faced by students and the responses of education institutions to them—and the efficacy of such programs—are also considered.

The review is guided by the Victorian DEECD policy and research environment, in particular the *Effective Strategies to Increase School Completion Report* (Lamb & Rice, 2008) and *A Guide to Help Schools Increase School Completion* (Rice & Lamb, 2008) and the subsequent policy advice contained within *Pathways to Re-Engagement through Flexible Learning Options: A Policy Direction for Consultation* (DEECD, 2010).

Alternate, pull-out, and externally provided programs within schools are developed in response to the identified needs of individuals and groups of young people. Some programs are of a more general nature, and are concerned with ‘preventative’ approaches, addressing issues of education structures, curriculum and pedagogy in ways that seek to make schooling more inclusive of the needs of all students, particularly those who are currently marginalised. Such ‘preventative’ approaches can also be seen to include programs inclusive of all students as well as those specifically targeted towards keeping ‘at-risk’ youth engaged in school.

In conducting this review of the academic and research literature, we consulted a number of major reports and literature reviews, which we summarise and discuss with regards to how their findings contribute to our understanding of programs designed to assist ‘at-risk’ students.

Almost all programs are targeted at students ‘at risk of not completing education.’ Such programs include students within ‘at-risk’ categories, either focusing on potential risk (e.g., ‘at risk of not completing education’), or responding to the needs of students who have already experienced some exclusion such as ‘early school leavers.’

There is a long history of schools working flexibly with other agencies to meet the learning, well-being and pathway needs of their students. Such history includes the development of numerous initiatives and individual sites of practice, but also a pervasive lack of clarity and a troubling lack of consensus about the definition, purposes, best practice implementation and even the terminology of such practice.

Faced with such limited consensus, government officials have generated policies and reports expecting schools to be the agents responsible for addressing the education needs of disadvantaged youth. A growing number of external agencies or providers have also entered the market, developing and offering a burgeoning range of programs to address the needs of such young people, often in competition with one another in contexts where school resources may be limited.

This report focuses on *pull-out programs*, especially those that are developed outside of the school and/or outside of the education system by external providers, that withdraw students from the mainstream curriculum of school or that are conducted parallel to or outside of that curriculum.

There is very limited research literature that focusses on the impact of external agencies on students' educational outcomes. Education systems, however, have become increasingly dependent on external funding to support new projects and have acquired an increasingly external focus. "Just as manufacturers look for new customers, educators seek benefactors—providing education assistance has become a big business" (Samoff, 1999, p. 10).

Moreover, the provision of externally-provided programs are supported by government policy driving localised policy initiatives, including the promotion of partnerships as part of the notion of 'neo-liberal localism' (Robertson & Dale, 2002, p. 470) directed at young people at risk. Australian research suggests that it is important not to overstate partnership achievements as these initiatives are usually too short-lived to address entrenched inequality—perhaps even exacerbating systematic disadvantage by using alternate programs to serve as 'dumping grounds' for students whom the school has identified as problematic. Programs that remove students from mainstream activities also remove them from important sources of knowledge, including their peers, and from the kinds of authorised knowledge that is most valued, and rewarded, by education systems. Alternate education programs, too often, do not lead to recognised and credentialed outcomes, or allow movement or substantial entry qualifications to further education and training. If schools are to use external agencies then the integration of services provided by local support agencies into the curriculum is critical.

Schools seem to turn to external providers who offer 'quick fix' and 'off-the-shelf' solutions that have little or no impact on the deeper and substantive school-based issues that may contribute to young peoples' vulnerability.

Exemplary programs must be robust, significantly increase learning, and continue to do so over time. No programs are universally successful as local context is critical and the inclusion of thorough monitoring, evaluation and assessment of alternate programs is an important step in understanding their efficacy. Our review of both local and international case studies found that the overwhelming majority of exemplary programs in schools are locally developed and internally implemented.

In this report, we synthesise the findings from relevant research on alternate programs and their contribution to student outcomes using three main conceptual headings: how sustainable these programs are – their *stickability*; how effective these programs are in actually achieving their stated purpose of improving and enhancing vulnerable student's learning, wellbeing and pathways - their *transformability*; and how these programs may be used successfully in other locations - their *transmitability*.

We believe that schools and systems must take account of students' own reasons for why they are disengaged from schooling. What changes schools and teachers themselves should consider is likewise a pertinent consideration for alternate education provision. The organisation, curriculum, and teaching practices of schools should create an environment in which all young people feel secure and valued and where their individual needs and points of view are taken into account. Schools should develop different and supportive structures to meet student need by implementing intensive and individually-targeted alternate programs while changing the nature of pedagogical

practice within the regular classroom.

Successful programs should be designed to meet the specific needs and reflect the specific context of the school and its local community. They should be socially supportive, intellectually challenging, and respond to students' needs both in the short- and long-term. The selection and training of teachers for participating in such programs is crucial, and should be supported by a leadership environment that promotes a professional learning community within the workplace. Successful programs actively involve and connect to the students' world and to the communities of which they are a part.

The greatest outcomes are achieved when specific interventions such as alternate programs are provided within the context of a supportive school culture and by strategies designed to ensure the best possible classroom practice at the mainstream level. The continued emphasis in some schools on alternate programs that are poorly connected to the mainstream curriculum and pedagogical approaches can be seen as running counter to the direction and priorities of the education system.

A large number of programs are 'stand-alone' in another sense: they don't integrate with other education, work or training commitments, though this is not the majority pattern. Many programs range between one day (or less) and four days a week, possibly maintaining young people in 'mainstream' education, with some alternate programs for a shorter time each week. The importance of such programs has been noted; they may provide 'hands-on' activities in parallel with 'mainstream' schools and these are directed towards holding students within schooling, and hence preventing the need for full-time 'responsive' programs at some future stage. To an extent, they also operate as 'preventative' approaches that model structural, curriculum and learning changes.

In summary, the research literature suggests the following key points in relation to the provision of any alternate programs offered for students at risk of early school leaving:

1. Alternate programs should be both mainstream and relevant, with a clear relation to the wider community or the adult world reflecting real-world problems. They should not be focussing on remediation or basic skills, nor should they be based on withdrawal or separate programs for the few chosen to participate.
2. Alternate programs must be socially supportive, intellectually challenging and respond to student needs both currently and in the long term.
3. The selection and training of the participating teachers is crucial, while it can be inferred that leadership "from above" is less vital.
4. Alternate programs must actively involve and be connected to the students' world and to the communities of which they are part.

Dr David Zyngier, Dr Rosalyn Black, Dr Nathan Brubaker & Dr Marc Pruyn

BACKGROUND, METHOD AND DEFINITIONS

This report is the product of a commissioned project undertaken by the Faculty of Education at Monash University on behalf of the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) Frankston Mornington Peninsula Youth Partnerships and the Frankston-Mornington Peninsular Local Learning Employment Network (FMPLLEN). The project is designed to identify the contribution that alternate, pull-out and externally-provided programs (“alternate programs”) within schools make towards student learning, wellbeing and pathways, with school-based flexible learning models defining a best practice approach to engaging our most vulnerable learners. The research brief is also designed to make recommendations regarding the efficacy of such programs as part of future policy and practice.

RESEARCH STATEMENT:

One of the enduring goals of Australian social policy is to improve the educational outcomes of students from lower socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds. The relationship between individual socioeconomic disadvantage and academic outcomes is well established, and current data confirm that underprivileged students have lower rates of Year 12 completion and university uptake than those of higher socioeconomic status (Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations 2011; Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision 2011). There is also substantial evidence that the quality and socioeconomic profile of schools matters with respect to academic outcomes (Gonski et al. 2011; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] 2010; Perry & McConney 2010; Watson & Ryan 2010; Gemici, Lim & Karmel 2013).

The research reported in this document examines whether *Flexible Learning* in the form of alternate programs that pull-out students from the mainstream, supports student learning, well-being and pathways to employment and further study for students from low SES backgrounds. It assesses the potential of these alternate, pull-out and externally provided programs within schools catering for low socio-economic students to contribute to enhanced student learning, well-being and pathways to employment or further study with school-based flexible learning models. As a result of such research, we make recommendations in relation to best practice approaches to engaging our most vulnerable learners.

BACKGROUND:

Flexible Learning is defined by the Frankston Mornington Peninsula Youth Partnerships, DEECD as the opportunity for students to participate in a varied school-based curriculum which embraces a flexible time table to support varied curriculum options allowing for the development of individual learning plans (ILPs)¹. Each ILP should address the educational needs (e.g., literacy, numeracy), pathways, transitions, social and emotional needs of each student in line with the Student Support Services best practice guidelines and to (where appropriate) AusVELS and VELS (Victorian Essential Learning Standards) requirements in a holistic education continuum model. The report by Gemici,

¹ The definition of School Based Flexible Learning has subsequently been further refined by FMP Youth Partnerships as “the opportunity for students to participate in a varied school based curriculum which embraces a flexible time table that can support and engage students in specific placed based outreach teaching settings allowing for the development of individual learning plans (ILP). Each ILP should address the educational needs (literacy, numeracy), pathways, transition, and the therapeutic social and emotional needs of each student in line with Student Support Services best practice guidelines and (where appropriate) address VELS requirements as part of a holistic education continuum model”.

Lim & Karmel (2013) concluded that:

- Academic school quality has a considerable differential effect on school completion for those who come from the lowest socioeconomic band. It also has a differential effect for those with low academic achievement at age 15 years.
- A differential effect is also seen in relation to the impact of academic school quality on tertiary entrance rank and the probability of going to university.
- Coming from a high socioeconomic background insulates students from early school leaving, even if they are weak performers and attend non-academic schools.
- Students from low socioeconomic backgrounds benefit even more from attending schools of high academic quality. (Gemici, Lim & Karmel, 2013).

POLICY FRAMEWORK

This review is also guided by the Victorian DEECD policy and research environment – in particular, the *Effective Strategies to Increase School Completion Report* (Lamb & Rice, 2008) and *A Guide to Help Schools Increase School Completion* (Rice & Lamb, 2008). The *Report* and *Guide* were commissioned by the DEECD and outlined successful strategies to improve student engagement and increase school completion rates. The *Report* identified effective strategies currently being used in Victorian schools and also strategies identified from the national and international research literature. The *Guide* detailed how schools can plan and implement various strategies in schools, including those suggested in the *Report*, to improve student engagement and increase retention regardless of location or socio-economic circumstances. These two research documents were then used as the basis for the subsequent policy advice contained within *Pathways to Re-Engagement through Flexible Learning Options: A Policy Direction for Consultation* (DEECD, 2010).

The *Report* identified that “a series of targeted interventions and programs underpinned by a supportive school culture or climate” was critical to improve student engagement, retention and completion for at-risk students. Further, it recommends that a school culture needs to be developed that puts student engagement and retention at the very centre of the school’s culture, which includes a shared vision across the school community, high expectations of staff and students, flexibility and responsiveness to student needs, a commitment to success for all students, and a drive for continuous improvement. It is worth quoting directly and at length, as follows:

The targeted initiatives include student focused strategies such as:

- mentoring,
- early and more intensive pathways and careers planning,
- careers guidance managed by appropriately qualified staff,
- fine-grained co-ordination of welfare needs,
- family outreach, programs to improve students’ social skills,
- tutoring and peer tutoring,
- targeted financial support,
- case management, and
- targeted assistance for skill development among low achievers.

They also include school-wide strategies:

- familial-based forms of organisation such as mini-schools,
- team-based approaches to teaching, learning and pastoral care,

- early intervention to support literacy and numeracy skill growth,
- project-based and applied approaches to learning,
- pathways planning and quality careers guidance and counselling, such as outlined in the MIPS Good Practice Framework,
- smaller class sizes,
- strategic use of teachers and teaching resources,
- initiatives to improve connections with parents,
- priority professional development,
- broad curriculum provision with strong VET options, and
- high expectations on attendance and behaviour.

The research found that there were several common strands running through the most effective programs and strategies. The **most effective programs** appear to do the following:

- foster connectedness between students, parents, the school and the community,
- increase the trust placed in students,
- provide tasks for students with immediate, tangible benefits,
- make spaces within schools and curricula for diverse student needs,
- address poor achievement, and
- address students' practical personal obstacles to staying at school.

In addition, the schools most successful at increasing school completion adopted the following principles, which are also supported by the international literature:

- Early intervention is best: Schools that had increased student engagement and retention identified student problems such as weak achievement or welfare needs at an early stage, and were proactive in addressing them.
- Schools need to ensure interventions are sustained: Schools that provided program continuity and long-term supports for students were most successful in addressing achievement and engagement issues. Research participants stressed the importance of allowing time and funding for initiatives to be embedded within the school culture.
- Schools need to adopt multifaceted approaches: It is usually the case that no single strategy works alone to increase student engagement and retention. Rather, successful schools used a range of strategies to address a variety of student needs.

Context sensitivity is essential:

- Numerous research participants noted the importance of selecting and adjusting strategies according to the needs of the local students and parents.
- Supportive school culture greatly improves effectiveness: The schools most successful in engaging and retaining students had an integrated approach, underpinned by a well-articulated philosophy that drove all aspects of provision and a culture of continuous improvement. (Lamb & Rice, 2008, pp. 3-4)

Similarly the Policy document *Pathways to Re-Engagement through Flexible Learning Options: A Policy Direction for Consultation* (DEECD, 2010) highlights a number of "good Practice" programs – all are school developed and school managed. The advice is very clear that the schools are responsible for:

- Meeting the learning needs of all enrolled students
- Implementing a range of whole-of-school engagement strategies

- Identifying students at risk within the school, and work in conjunction with the network to address these needs
- Referring students to support services, where appropriate
- Providing Tier 1–3 programs where applicable and refer students to Tier 4 programs where appropriate
- Developing and maintaining effective partnerships with families to support children and young people’s learning and development. (DEECD, 2010, p.19).

The same policy highlights the three following areas for schools to address the issue of student disengagement from learning that were “introduced or enhanced to provide a platform for improved engagement and increased school completion” (DEECD, 2010, p. 11). This was to be achieved through focus on the following areas:

Curriculum and pedagogy

- Ultranet
- e5 Instructional Model
- Principles of Learning and Teaching
- Victorian Certificate of Applied Learning (VCAL)

Services

- Student Support Services
- Primary Welfare Officers
- Student Welfare Coordinators
- Secondary School Nurses
- School Focused Youth Services
- Local Learning and Employment Networks
- Youth Transition Support Initiative Coordinators
- Youth Connections

Programs

- Alternative Education Settings
- Community VCAL
- Adult and Community Education programs
- TAFE
- Distance education provision
- Schools and programs delivered within other sectors i.e. Catholic, Independent and Community
- Services Organisations. (DEECD, 2010, p. 11)

From such documents, it is evident that all recommendations and strategies are focussed on schools themselves providing programs and resources – not outsourcing them to external agencies. Such a recommendation is reinforced by the *Guide* (Rice & Lamb, 2008) which provided concrete examples of programs within this “framework for thinking about provision” (p. 12) that will better meet the needs of students to increase their retention, building on one or more of the six effective strategies above. Of all the examples provided from the various schools reviewed in the *Guide*, none were provided by external agencies. On the contrary, the programs that are highlighted were developed internally and provided internally.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach used for this systematic review of the empirical research literature on alternate programs comprised several interrelated and complementary steps, as follows:

Step 1: Initial search of the research literature. First, the principal investigators conducted an extensive search of the extant research literature using a variety of strategies. The search strategies included:

Extensive Search of Electronic Databases: We first identified key words and/or phrases for the topic (*alternate programs, pull-out or pullout programs, "at-risk" programs, pathways programs, student well-being programs, student engagement programs, external provision, external providers, external agencies*) and searched a variety of well-established electronic databases for relevant empirical research studies (see below).

It was not within the research brief to conduct an evaluation of any particular program or programs currently being offered and implemented in the Southern Region of the DEECD. Such an evaluation would be highly recommended and useful for any further research into these issues. A locally developed and increasingly popular pull-out program *Hands on Learning*² has now been government funded and is gaining further support in the Southern Region of the DEECD. The program was evaluated on behalf of HOL by in 2012 Deloitte Access Economics *The socio-economic benefits of investing in the prevention of early school leaving*. The review concluded that:

Hands On Learning (HOL) is an established approach to reengaging students who are disengaging from formal schooling. HOL has demonstrated over 10 years of operation that it is effective in increasing retention rates among program participants and, more broadly, in the schools which these students attend. This approach is also associated with positive post-schooling outcomes, as demonstrated through surveys of former program participants. (Deloitte, 2012, p. i)

Other keywords used in combination with the main search phrases identified above included *research, effectiveness* (and its variants, such as *effects* or *effective*) and *outcomes*. In the main, for the initial electronic search, major education-related research databases were accessed via Monash University's library portal. The education databases included:

- *A+ Education*, a database built on the Australian Education Index produced by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) that provides indexes and abstracts of published and unpublished material on all levels of education and related fields, and that includes information published in Australia and Australian content published internationally.
- *British Education Index*, which provides access to all of the Index's records for education-related texts, freely available internet resources, and the most recently indexed journal articles not yet included in the full BEI subscription database.
- *ERIC*, the US-based Education Resources Information Center sponsored by the US Department of Education that is arguably the largest electronic database globally that indexes and abstracts international documents and journal articles on all levels of education, education research and related subjects.

² The program and its evaluation can be found online <http://handsonlearning.org.au/> and http://handsonlearning.org.au/DAE_investing_in_preventing_ESL_via_HOL_September_2012.pdf

- *ProQuest*, a multidisciplinary collection of journals, magazines and theses, including many business, management and economics resources that includes ABI/INFORM Global and Dissertations and Theses.
- *SAGE Journals Online*, a multidisciplinary collection of journals, including many education, humanities, social sciences, science, and technology titles.

In addition, other databases—perhaps less uniquely focused on education issues—such as *JSTOR* and *Web of Knowledge*, were also included in the initial and subsequent electronic searches. In addition to searching established academic databases, commonly used internet search engines such as *Google Scholar* (<http://scholar.google.com>) were also utilized, particularly as a means of comparing search results generated from academic databases accessible via the Monash University library portal versus those generated outside of that portal.

Website Searches: We searched the websites of relevant organizations whose work or research encompasses the topic area.

In the initial search of the research literature, we endeavoured to maintain focus on the *primary research* literature related to the topic at hand. We did also recognize, however, that the studies that we located varied in their relevance to the central focus of this review, the contribution that alternate, pull-out and externally provided programs (“alternate programs”) within schools make towards student learning, wellbeing and pathways to employment with school-based flexible learning models defining a best practice approach to engaging our most vulnerable learners, and to making recommendations in regards to the efficacy of such programs as part of future policy and practice.

Step 2: Additional gathering of relevant research

- We prepared an international case study based on the experience of one member of the team having previously worked in the area of alternate programs in New Mexico, USA.
- We conducted a review of the multitude of programs highlighted as “good practice” on the Learning Choices website of the Dusseldorp Skills Forum (<http://www.dsf.org.au>). Such programs offer pathways to enable young people to remain in school or to return to complete their education in safe, inclusive, innovative and flexible settings. The Learning Choices website (<http://www.learningchoices.org.au/programs/index.php>), contains over 800 flexible and alternative learning programs from across the country, which were filtered using the following parameters:
 - **Relevant age:** 13-19;
 - **Program Duration:** 20 weeks or less, 21-40 weeks and Full Year;
 - **Credential:** Year 9 to Year 12
 - **Program Target Group:** Early School Leaver, At risk of non-completion
 - **Activities of Program:** Literacy/numeracy; Homework Support

Step 3: Draft and final reports. The review findings were then synthesized to form a coherent framework for the report, with the literature review structured around the questions posed to the research team in the research brief. Upon receiving feedback on the draft report from the DEECD and FMPLLN, a final version of the report was delivered on 17 April 2104 in both electronic and paper formats.

DEFINITIONS

First, it is useful to define some key terms. This is particularly important in a field where there is both a proliferation of terminology and a great deal of controversy and contestability about that terminology.

DEFINING ALTERNATE PROGRAMS

Schools have become the main sites for the early identification, tracking and providing of services for young people who are considered vulnerable in relation to their learning, wellbeing and transitions from school ('pathways'). There is a long history of schools working flexibly with other agencies to meet the learning, wellbeing and pathway needs of their students (Black et al, 2010). This has seen the development of numerous initiatives and individual sites of practice, but it has also seen a pervasive lack of clarity and a troubling lack of consensus about the definition, purposes, best practice implementation and even the terminology of this kind of practice. In her extensive analysis of alternate education provision in Australia, te Riele described "a bewildering array of projects," a "multitude of programs [that] has led to confusion and inefficiency" (2007, p. 54).

Recent government targets in Australia aimed at increasing student participation, retention and achievement have meant that more young people are staying on into the post-compulsory years. Much of this retention is the result of alternate programs developed to meet the identified needs of vulnerable individuals and groups of young people. Some of these programs are developed by schools themselves while others are developed by external providers and implemented in schools by such providers, usually at a cost. It is this latter category of provision that is the focus of this report.

Alternate programs may operate under a range of organisational arrangements. They may be stand-alone programs that operate parallel to the mainstream curriculum, affiliated programs that intersect with the curriculum or fully integrated programs (te Riele, 2012). This report focuses primarily on 'pullout' programs, especially those that are developed outside of the school and/or outside of the education system by external providers, that withdraw students from the mainstream curriculum or that are conducted parallel to or outside that curriculum.

In a large survey of Australian programs (respondents N=410), Holdsworth (2011) found that almost all programs provided 'literacy/numeracy' (80%) and 'life' skills (79%). About two-thirds provided 'formal or accredited vocational training' (67%) while slightly fewer provided 'ICT skills' (62%), 'mentoring' (60%) and 'job seeking skills' (58%). Less than half the programs provided each of 'non-accredited vocational training' (44%), 'visual arts' (37%), 'outdoor education' (35%), and 'digital/media skills' (31%). Other pathway options were provided by 30% or less of the programs.

Such program elements may consist of specifically-focused skills training, or may be identified as the sorts of skills developed through other means. For example, 'literacy/numeracy activities' could involve specific instructional classes or, more likely, could be identified as being developed through a range of other activities. 'Life skills' in particular implies a broader individual and social approach to learning, based in practical and hands-on activities, which may also be strongly linked to literacy and numeracy.

Similarly, literacy and numeracy activities may include 'job seeking skills' as a specific program component. It is interesting to note that two-thirds of the programs reviewed by Holdsworth say at this stage that they include 'formal/accredited vocational training,' while in the next question 80% of programs indicate that students have a chance to complete some form of credential. Less than half the programs indicated that they offered 'non-accredited vocational training' and it is recognised

that the two categories may overlap, with some programs offering both accredited and non-accredited training.

Again, a large number of programs (29%) indicate that other activities are offered. It would be useful to determine if there are any recognisable groupings of activities across such areas/programs. A quick scan at the information provided (Holdsworth, 2011) seems to show that many are more specific statements of activities coded elsewhere, but that there is a subset (of about 23 programs in various areas) that are described as 'whole school programs of change' and these need further investigation.

Specifying that activities such as 'literacy/numeracy' are included in many programs also raises the question of teaching approaches being used – it would be useful to examine a sub-set of programs in more detail to gain greater insight into such practices.

DEFINING VULNERABILITY IN RELATION TO LEARNING, WELLBEING AND PATHWAYS

Young people who are considered vulnerable to a range of factors likely to limit their successful transition to adult life are often described as being 'at-risk.' Notions of vulnerability and risk may be used to refer to particular problematic outcomes such as delinquency, pregnancy, homelessness, or substance misuse. Within an educational context, however, the notion of being vulnerable or at-risk specifically refers to those young people considered unlikely to complete school to Year 12. The literature recognises that this risk is frequently the product or outcome of a series of risk factors that may relate to the attributes of the individual, the family, the school, the community, and/or to broader societal circumstances. It also recognises that there may be a continuum of risk for young people which may begin by being minimally at-risk but become more vulnerable with time without successful intervention. The risk continuum can also be usefully conceptualised in terms of developmental pathways which highlight the changing, contingent and sometimes cumulative nature of risk for young people.

While such terms as *vulnerability* and *at-risk* are used interchangeably within the literature, both can denote a 'deficit' approach to young people. There is a strong tradition in the literature that attributes reasons for student 'failure' to the deficits and/or disadvantages of students themselves. In this report, we acknowledge this inference of deficit but intend not to contribute to it. Instead, our intention is to highlight the generative potentialities of young people to positively transform their own lives through supportive learning environments that productively engage with their diversity, connect to their socio-cultural backgrounds and provide intellectually stimulating learning. It is also to highlight those school, community and system level factors that contribute to young people's learning, wellbeing and pathways and that need to be addressed by any strategies seeking to improve them.

Young people dislike, disengage from, or leave school for a variety of reasons, at different stages of their schooling, with different attitudes towards education and different prospects for future careers (Dwyer, 1996: 47, cited in Dwyer et al, 1998: 16). However, lack of interest, boredom and negative experiences with teachers have been found to be the most common reasons for leaving school. Young people are much more likely to leave because of a negative experience of school rather than a positive sense of what exists outside school (Maas and Hartley, 1988). Australian findings on young people's reasons for leaving school are broadly similar to the results from international studies of school leavers and at-risk youth (Strategic Partners, 2001).

There is no dominant typification of an early school leaver (DETYA, 2001, p. 15). Dwyer et al. (1998) suggest that there are three sorts of early school leavers: those who *elect out*, those who *drift out* and those who are *driven out*. For the first group of young people, early school departure can be a positive and affirming decision (Teese, 2003). For the second and third groups, however, it may be associated with a range of outcomes that include workforce precarity and reduced lifelong earning capacity (Teese, 2003).

The three main contributors to young people's educational disengagement and early leaving are as follows: a non-stimulating environment with no clear relation to the wider community or the adult world; lack of support and referral to appropriate agencies for young people who are experiencing problems in their personal and academic lives; and negative teacher/student relationships which are propped up by rules and regulations which disallow young people from expressing themselves as adult and responsible members of the school community.

Nevertheless, many programs appear in a context of continuing barriers to students' improved education outcomes (The Allen Consulting Group, 2003, p. 4). Some even suggest that the current emphasis on increasing student retention has meant that students who require more assistance miss out in favour of those already likely to be successful (Prime Minister's Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce, 2001b, p. 23). As Kirby (2000, p. 7) puts it, many young people continue to 'fall through the cracks.' Indeed, the Dusseldorp Skills Forum (DSF, 2002) suggests that at least 15% of 15-24 year olds are not in any work or in any education. OECD figures estimate somewhere between 15-20% of young people leave school without a 'worthwhile' qualification and that 15-30% are classed as 'at-risk' of failure in school. According to these figures, a total of 30%-50% are at educational risk (Budge, 2000).

Further support for this view can be found in a recent OECD (2002) report, which suggests that among OECD countries, Australia has one of the largest gaps (up to 4 years of schooling) between the highest and lowest achievers in the same age group. Other reports on the education of Australian young people (Connors, 2000; Kirby, 2000) also identify the persistent inequality in students' educational outcomes and opportunities, in particular for the marginalised and most vulnerable.

Faced with these poor outcomes and diminished opportunities, government policies and reports often place expectations on schools to be the responsible agents for addressing the education needs of disadvantaged youth. A growing number of external agencies or providers have also 'entered the market,' (Thomson, 2002) developing and offering a burgeoning range of programs to address the needs of such young people, often in competition with one another in contexts where school resources may be limited. Thomson (2002) has described what she calls the operation of an 'at-risk industry', especially in schools characterised by socioeconomic disadvantage.

DEFINING AN EXEMPLARY PROGRAM

The issue is not whether students in a program do a bit better than some other group not in that program, but that those students actually achieve substantial gains over those not included in any such intervention. The term "exemplary" is preferred over "effective" because an exemplary program is one that increases learning to what Pogrow (1998) called a surprising extent together with a great deal of consistency. "Surprising" means that a program can exceed some typical standard, such as a national average, preferably by a substantial amount.

Pogrow (1998), moreover, argued that:

Consistency of gains should be the goal of every program designer and the key criterion for designating a program 'exemplary.' Without consistency, a program is too unreliable to be of value in the large-scale context. (p. 23)

Consistency does not mean that the program will work in all cases but that it is highly robust and will work powerfully in the vast majority of cases with a variety of measures. Further, Pogrow (1998) asserted that such programs must further research knowledge on the specific conditions of effectiveness and disseminate those conditions. His research found that:

There is no such thing as a program that is universally successful. Vague assertions that the program did not work because the site did not implement it properly or did not have sufficient commitment without very specific details are of little value to researchers or practitioners. (p. 23)

Finally, he concluded that such programs, to be exemplary (not just effective), they must initially set standards for expected gains, to define consistency of effects, and to examine claims of program effectiveness.

The *Centre on Organization and Restructuring of Schools* based at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995) found that school effectiveness and student learning were enhanced when schools took on the qualities of "professional communities" (Louis & Kruse, 1995; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Such communities had three basic features: "Teachers pursue a clear shared purpose for all students' learning. Teachers engage in collaborative activity to achieve the purpose. Teachers take collective responsibility for student learning" (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995, p. 30). Summarizing the Center's findings, Newmann and Wehlage (1995, p. 51) stated that:

The recent education reform movement gives too much attention to changes in school organization that do not directly address the quality of student learning. New administrative arrangements and teaching techniques contribute to improved learning only if they are carried out within a framework that focuses on learning of high intellectual quality. Student learning can meet these high standards if educators and the public give students three kinds of support:

- Teachers who practice authentic pedagogy.
- Schools that build organizational capacity by strengthening professional community.
- External agencies and parents that support schools to achieve the high quality student learning we have described.

Reflecting on decades of school reform research in the USA, Teddlie and Stringfield (2006) made the following seven conclusions:

1. While stability or status quo in both processes and outcomes tend to be the rule, meaningful improvement is tantalizingly possible. Clearly, individual schools can and do improve measurably. Equally clearly, the national norm has tended toward stability to stasis or the status quo.
2. The importance of a clearly defined intervention or set of interventions. Consistently, researchers have found that vague philosophical goals, however laudable in the abstract, tend to be lost when it comes to the classroom.
3. Context matters: Teachers, schools, school districts vary tremendously. There is not one 'right' reform for all schools. Material resources, human capacities, prior experiences with change and belief systems all vary across schools, and within schools, over time.

4. Collaboration between providers and school is vital. Successful programs involve local teachers and administrators adapting external research and development efforts so that it will work well in the local context.
5. The importance of strong focused leadership at the school site. Whether the studies have been of 'school effects' or 'promising programs' or 'school restructuring,' a very nearly-universal finding in change efforts has been the need for strong, academically-focused principal leadership.
6. The importance of ongoing teacher support. Students learn in a classroom, under the direct supervision of a teacher. If the teacher is not provided with ongoing professional development on topics relevant to the intersection of the intervention program's goals and the teacher's areas of needed growth, the teacher is unlikely to grow to the disadvantage of the students and impacting on future sustainability.
7. The need to focus on processes as well as outcomes when assessing the success of the program. Desired outcomes do not 'just happen,' or happen because someone focuses attention on them. Effective practices and processes produce outcomes. A focus just on process tends to produce more processes, but not higher outcomes. A focus on outcomes that ignores processes tends to produce few generalizable results in either.

ALTERNATE PROGRAMS PROVIDED BY EXTERNAL AGENCIES

There is very limited research literature that focusses on the impact of external agencies (i.e., non-school or education system groups providing programs within schools for students at risk). Of the available literature, Aeby, Manning, Thyer, and Carpenter-Aeby (1999) compared the outcomes of an in-school control group of at-risk students to an externally provided and pull-out group. They concluded that "the overall levels of change within each group for self-esteem, depression, locus of control, grades, and attendance were low for both cohorts, so low as to perhaps make it difficult to justify the appreciable resources which went into providing the ... services" (p. 28). However, the researchers emphasise the importance of including family support in any alternate programs provided for such students. They concluded that:

The complexities of educating disruptive students are formidable. These are encouraging findings as one considers the realization that problems of disruptive youth, left untreated, result in a significant personal, emotional, and financial burden to the student, family, and society. Any improvement however slight suggest that [alternate programs] with strong parental involvements was an effective strategy for intervening with students at risk for psychosocial barriers and academic failure, and/or drop out as a result of their behaviors. (p.29)

Brown, & Beckett (2007) made similar conclusions about the importance of including families in any alternate programs. Their study shows how middle-class teachers and parents overcame barriers associated with socioeconomic class and ethnicity and became partners in building a home-school learning community that helped at-risk students prepare themselves for a more promising future.

Zavela (2002) concluded in relation to drug prevention programs that what is most important is that effective partnerships are created that support both the goals of the outside agency and the mission of a school.

Webb & Vulliamy (2001) identified that inter-agency cooperation is recognised as problematic with clashes between professional cultures, competition between departments for local government

funding, reductions in overall budgets and low morale being commonly cited as the main contributory factors. Their research in England Local Education Authorities described how external agencies often have a history of separate development and funding, worked to different sets of legislation, were subject to different lines of accountability and had strong distinctive professional cultures based on their training and specialist knowledge. Consequently, their values, priorities and ways of working were often different from, and sometimes viewed as in conflict with, those of the schools and school communities. External providers had different pressures and priorities from schools and others in education which often can cause professional disagreements and put up barriers to joint working. In particular, differences in values and priorities between the culture of the support workers as derived from their social work background and those of teachers often generated tensions (Webb & Vulliamy, 2001).

Samoff (1999) described how education systems have become increasingly dependent on external funding to support new projects and how education planning has acquired an increasingly external focus. "Just as manufacturers look for new customers, educators seek benefactors. Providing education assistance has become a big business" (p. 10). Such research also found that external agencies can have a major direct and indirect influence on education policy. Although external resources are often a very small portion of total education spending, their direct and indirect influence on policy and programs is substantial (Samoff, 1999).

Seddon, Billett, and Clemans (2005), however, showed how social partnerships involving significant horizontal relationships based in localised networks can provide contexts for unexpected, sometimes remarkable, achievements. They argued that "while partnerships are contested, they are places where individuals and agencies commonly set aside immediate interests in order to generate possibilities, particularly for young people" (p. 568). Seddon et al. (2005) explained that these partnerships form as a consequence of government-directed action or through localised community agency. Their ways of working are shaped by the need to build and sustain some level of trust between participants, in the absence of formalised rules or contracts, and to coordinate the disparate elements. Further, such partnerships are comprised of distinct agencies with different traditions and cultures that are anchored in different organisational logics. These local initiatives that support the provision of externally provided programs are supported by government policy driving localised policy initiatives, including the promotion of partnerships as part of the notion of 'neo-liberal localism' (Robertson & Dale, 2002, p. 470) directed at young people at risk and directed at regional development.

Seddon et al. (2005) warn:

It is important not to overstate these partnership achievements. Their initiatives are usually too patchy and often too short-lived to address entrenched inequality. Indeed, they can exacerbate systematic disadvantage by focusing resources on specific included or recognised groups while further remaindering others who are excluded or unacknowledged. (p. 568)

Providing Education and Training for At-Risk and Unemployed Young People documents the variety of programs and resources already available and analyses the characteristics of programs that work. St. Leger, Beckett, and Harper (1998) reviewed 19 intervention programs in schools from disadvantaged communities. They recommended that constructive, clear, caring and connected learning was essential. If schools were to use external agencies then the integration of services provided by local support agencies into the curriculum was critical. Schools, the authors suggested,

would have to:

Change a good deal to meaningfully address the learning needs of young, but experientially-rich, adults who are seeking to return to study. Indeed, there is a strong case that schools need to change into more adult learning environments just to better address their current continuing students, many of whom are 'at risk' because of the dominance of the tertiary-focussed curriculum in Years 11 and 12. (p. 7)

While the vast majority of intervention programs the authors described were developed and implemented by the schools themselves, they also described how schools and local agencies worked together to source funding and write submissions for tenders. This proved to be mutually beneficial in terms of enabling everyone involved to develop strategies to address local social issues that affected students on a range of fronts, including working with families. Part of this strategy was to build relationships between students and the agencies so students could develop support networks that extended beyond the school. In order to manage the range of student service programs that are supported by agency staff, the school developed a set of operational guidelines. This sets out the desired learning outcomes and issues to be addressed as well as protocols for conducting sessions, counselling students and reporting. This level of coordination was essential to ensure accountability so that the school maintained control of who was working with particular students. The coordination role also endeavoured to keep the agencies in touch with one another and the general school program to avoid duplication and maintain effective strategies.

St Leger et. al. (1999) argued that successful learning for young adults who are 'at risk' of poor achievement in Victorian secondary schools, or who are returning to study, depends upon a range of support. They made the following recommendations:

- That an adult learning environment is required for all Service Learning programs
- That programs identify an individual's entry level and articulate an agreed series of involvements with an outcome that leads somewhere personally significant.
- That Service Learning programs should explicitly show how they connect with each other and with wider related agencies, in a way that best meets local needs and resources.

Louden (2000) reviewed Australian programs dealing with students at educational risk and found that external agencies were significant in providing teachers with school-based professional development. In these schools, key teachers had participated in externally run programs and returned to the schools to lead other teachers in program implementation.

Kramer, Laumann & Brunson (2000) in a study that focussed on programs assisting school children to deal with parental death or divorce, suggested that it was not enough to develop good programs for children; they must be adopted and maintained over time. According to Durlak (1995), the diffusion of a school-based program can be divided into four phases: *Dissemination*, in which schools are informed about the existence and operation of a new program; *Adoption*, in which a school decides to try a new program; *Implementation*, in which the school conducts the program; and *Maintenance*, in which the program is incorporated into the routine operations of the school. Kramer, Laumann & Brunson (2000) recommended that preventive intervention programs offered through schools have the potential to help large numbers of children but that a school's ability to implement prevention programs was also seen to depend on family and community support.

WHAT WORKS IN ALTERNATE PROGRAM PROVISION

THIS SECTION OF THE REPORT INCLUDES THREE PARTS: A SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVE ALTERNATE PROGRAMS BEING CONDUCTED IN AUSTRALIA; AN INTERNATIONAL CASE STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE IN ALTERNATE PROGRAM PROVISION; AND A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AS IT DESCRIBES THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE AND PROVISION.

A SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVE ALTERNATE PROGRAMS BEING CONDUCTED IN AUSTRALIA: THE DUSSELDORP SKILLS FORUM

For over 20 years the Dusseldorp Skills Forum has focused on innovative educational pathways to engage young people in learning (te Riele, 2012). The Dusseldorp Skills Forum (<http://www.dsf.org.au>) has identified a multitude of programs they have identified as representing “good practice” in the areas of flexible and alternative learning programs. More than 800 flexible and alternative learning programs from across the country are highlighted on the Learning Choices website (<http://www.learningchoices.org.au/programs/index.php>). Such programs offer pathways to enable young people to remain in school or to return to complete their education in safe, inclusive, innovative and flexible settings. An evaluation of the *Learning Choices* programs by te Riele (2012) concluded that:

Program reports provide data in relation to attendance, academic achievement, destinations, non-academic achievement and stakeholder satisfaction. Overall programs outline improvements for these types of outcomes based on young people’s previous achievements and experiences, if not relative to state averages. However, the quality of outcomes data varies. Research points to limitations on the ability of programs to achieve positive outcomes as well as limitations related to the measurement of outcomes.

The vast majority of Learning Choices programs are relatively small, which research suggests enables successful provision. A small majority are full time and a small majority run over a full year or longer. Results from the Learning Choices National Scan show almost all programs are part of a local, state or national network. It is likely non-networked programs are underrepresented in the Scan.

Learning Choices programs are organised in a variety of different ways, especially in terms of their relation to conventional schooling. Cross-sectoral and interagency collaborations are considered valuable in the research reports. Funding problems are reported to be a barrier to the quality and sustainability of programs both in program and in research reports. (te Riele, 2012, p.3).

For purposes of this report, the programs listed on the Learning Choices website were filtered using the following parameters:

- **Relevant age:** 13-19;
- **Program Duration:** 20 weeks or less, 21-40 weeks and Full Year;
- **Credential:** Year 9 to Year 12;
- **Program Target Group:** Early School Leaver, At risk of non-completion
- **Activities of Program:** Literacy/numeracy; Homework Support.

Such criteria resulted in approximately 450 programs, which were further filtered according to how

the programs were provided (internally or externally), and whether they were TAFE or stand-alone schools. Programs identified as TAFE and stand-alone schools were excluded from the results. The final list of programs was then tabulated and presented under the following headings: Program Name; Pull-out from mainstream; Internally provided; Externally provided; Learning; Well-being; and Pathways.

While many of the programs had multiple foci on Learning (e.g., literacy, numeracy, overall academic engagement) and Well-being (e.g., drugs, health, sexuality), some also involved attention to Pathways (e.g., programs focused on transition to work or further study). In this case, multiple checks were made against such programs. Overall:

- 107 programs of those selected were identified as pull-out from mainstream
- 91 programs were identified as internally provided (including 33 from the Big Picture Program and 6 from the Clontarf Football Program for Indigenous boys)
- 16 programs were identified as externally provided (including 4 from Anglicare, 5 from CentaCare Catholic, and 3 from Mission Australia)
- The full details of the 107 programs, as duplicated from the Learning Choices website, are presented in [Appendix C](#).

In summary, of the 107 programs identified as meeting the criteria of pull-out from the mainstream, only 16 were provided by agencies external to the state or territory education authority. Of these, 13 were provided by different religious organisations through funding by social welfare organisations and local school funds.

Forty four (44) of the 91 programs provided internally through the school were adopted from externally developed programs but are being implemented locally onsite by the schools themselves. For example, there were 33 Big Picture Schools and 6 Clontarf Football Academy Programs. The remaining 27 programs were developed by schools themselves – sometimes in partnership with local agencies or TAFE providers. While these programs may not have not been externally evaluated it is indicative that good or best practice featured by Dusseldorp Skills Forum fewer than 20% of pull-out programs are provided externally from schools themselves.

INTERNATIONAL CASE STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE IN ALTERNATE PROGRAM PROVISION

The case study reported in this section involves a project from the USA for which one of the authors of this report, Marc Pruyn, served as External Evaluator from 2002-2004—namely, the Drop-out Prevention Demonstration Project (DPDP). The DPDP was a US Department of Education project that met the parameters of the projects at the centre of this report, and was funded for \$500,000 USD. We have included it in this report due to its relevance to the types of alternate programs being considered in Australia.

The DPDP was initiated in a rural, low-SES community along the US/Mexico border. The project took place in five primary schools and two secondary schools, involved 450 students and 46 teachers, and sought – through additional in-class and after-school support and literacy tutoring – to both understand the ‘drop-out’ problem of children ‘placed at-risk’ in this school district (close to 50% of children in the district routinely did not graduate) and to uncover strategies for ‘drop-out’ prevention.

STUDYING THE PROJECT

Ethnographic, qualitative data were gathered and analysed to understand the perspectives of student and teacher participants toward the phenomena of ‘push-out’ (often referred to in the literature – and drawing on a deficit model of viewing learners – as ‘drop-out’) and literacy practices within one school district in the US Southwest. The researchers sought to understand these participants’ views and attitudes toward the described phenomena within the larger webbing of hierarchies of power and control exerted (explicitly or implicitly) by the more powerful over the less powerful.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK BEHIND THE PROJECT

The following is from the Drop-out Prevention Demonstration Project Literature Review, and helps to contextualise both the Project, and its approach to understanding children ‘placed at-risk’:

Why and how socialized selves are inculcated into acting upon the socially constructed schooling enterprise begs for theoretical and applied clarification on many levels. How do we as a schooling/education/teaching/learning culture, and in societies, systematically construct the experience (i.e., cultural capital) of push-outs, drop-outs or students placed-at-risk? Bourdieu (1977) speaks of ‘an’ experience that could be like the one addressed above as doxa. This ‘doxic mode’, Bourdieu (1977) explains, adheres ‘to the world of tradition experienced as a “natural world” and taken for granted’ (p. 164). Distinguishing doxa from orthodox, or heterodox, beliefs implies ‘awareness and recognition of the possibility of different or antagonistic beliefs’ (p. 164). This study’s research findings suggest that the so-named ‘doxic modes’, that are the social realities of the concept ‘push out’, are not only varied and deeply embedded along a complex multi-tiered construction, but are already well formulated in the minds of Latina/Latino students’ and teachers’ construction of their schooling and social realities. The concepts ‘drop-out’, ‘push-out’ or ‘at-risk’ are, in the Gramscian (1971) sense, hegemonically part of the everyday of the teaching and learning enterprise. That is, all actors have been, in Gramsci’s (1971) words, ‘deputized’ to ‘exercise the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government’ (p. 12). Our understandings of the drop-out/push-out phenomenon are grounded in melding our discernment of orthodoxy (Bourdieu, 1977) and hegemony (Gramsci, 1971). The theoretical juncture comes to apogee when the relational interactions

within/between all actors is understood in the 'natural' or 'common sense' everyday of teaching and learning, which our data tend to suggest.

If we are to collaborate with the next generations of Latina/Latino youngsters, we believe we need to reinvent our understandings about what both Gramsci and Bourdieu have addressed. Today, most youngsters come from humble beginnings, be they rural, suburban or urban. And a majority of this youth has been placed 'at-risk' by and within the context of hegemonic/orthodox systems; i.e., social and schooling mechanisms of control and oppression (Cohen & Tyree, 1988; Davison-Avilés, Guerrero, Howarth, & Thomas, 1999; Fine, 1995; García, 2000; Heath, 1995; Latinas in School, 2001; Margonis, 1992; Mehan, 1997; Meier & Stewart, 1991; Ogbu, 1978; Oakes, 1995; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Rumberger, 1991, 1995, Secada et al, 1998; Valenzuela, 1999; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999).

There are as well scores of studies about communities, teachers and students that have created relational understandings about such social and schooling mechanisms and who, very much to their credit, have made remarkable headway to what continues to be a constant denial that an elephant is indeed in the cafeteria in regards to drop-outs, push-outs, and/or students placed at-risk (Barrera & Jimenez, 2000; Bartolomé, 1996; Chávez Chávez, 1997; Clandinin, 1993; Delgado-Gaitán, 1991, 1992; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990; LeCompte & Preissel, 1992; Mondragon, Kitchen & Velasquez, 1999; Olsen & Mullen, 1990; Rios, 1994; Soto, 1997; Trueba, 1999; Valdés, 1996, 1999; Valencia, 1997; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999).

This alone is not what makes the push-out phenomenon/experience so devastating. What makes this phenomenon/experience for all actors within an educational enterprise with its orthodoxy and seemingly, unconscious hegemony so devastating is how such concepts are conceptually constructed and, through this study, exposed as the inner and outer workings of 'deficit thinking'. This is a thinking that is deeply embedded and well-constructed over time within those already holding lesser positions of power and/or cultural capital and who have absorbed and been socialized through an insidious discourse that is thick with the theoretical characteristics so addressed (see also, Foley, 1997; Giroux, 1998; Heath, 1995; Valencia, 1997; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997).

THE METHODS AND DATA SOURCES OF THE PROJECT

This study of student and teacher perceptions and understandings toward the experience of push-out within the Drop-out Prevention Demonstration Project – and the literacy practices that informed (either negatively or positively) that experience – used a qualitative/ethnographic approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman 1984; Oakes, Gamoran & Page 1992). The consistent intent of this research was to study participants' insights around push-out and literacy practices in a non-intrusive way as they naturally occurred within the school district. This research study was part of a collaborative project between a medium-sized university and a local rural school district in the US Southwest (with approximately 11,000 students). The stakeholders involved in this project were attempting to: (1) try to understand why the push-out rate is as high as it is for the working-class, Latina/Latino youth who attend this school district; and, (2) reduce this push-out rate through the implementation of a during- and after-school literacy tutoring project.

This research focused on trying to understand the phenomena/experiences from the point of view of the students (approximately 450) and teachers (approximately 46) within the program. This larger program and study began in 2002 and concluded in 2004. The data collected for this study from participants (students and teachers) included open-ended surveys; one-on-one interviews; focus group interviews; and, observational field notes of pedagogical sessions.

PROJECT FINDINGS

In general, and overall, the student participants in the Drop-out Prevention Demonstration Project:

- Felt that they benefited from and enjoyed the tutoring program (by a measure of 78%);
- Engaged with the curriculum/activities (by a measure of 89%);
- Believed that *students themselves* were responsible for the drop-out phenomena (by a measure of 46%);
- Believed that *teachers and schools* are responsible for the drop-out phenomena (by a measure of 54%);
- Believed that positive, supportive, well-funded and supplied teachers are crucial in preventing drop-out and in helping children to perform better in literacy activities, and school more generally (by a measure of 82%);
- Believed that a constructivist/connected approach is more beneficial for learning (by a measure of 93%); and,
- Reported that students who resist authoritarian pedagogy do so by non-engagement (by a measure of 73%).

Following is an example from an ethnographic field note about how 'Stevie' felt regarding the engaging and student-centered approach of the DPDP in his classroom:

I asked a few of the students what they think of the program. The boys say they like it. I asked why. Stevie said the program is good because it is getting his grades up from Ds to As, Bs and Cs. Stevie quit basketball because he will have no days to rest. He said that he had to manage his time better because he is too busy, and the program was helping him do that.

Stevie said this is fun because we are doing interviews with our family, and because we get to talk a lot. We also do campfires in the middle of the room and talk about family traditions and what makes a tradition, which is enjoyable. For example, every year my family has the same cake for our birthdays, and so that's a tradition.

Best thing was drawing the painting on the family traditions and background because we get to talk about our family, which is good because I respect and like my family. I also liked the activity at the beginning of the year because we got ice cream with strawberries, which was VERY GOOD, YUM! It was good because we had two days when we didn't have real snacks; so two teachers went to the store to buy strawberries. Another time they went to get popcorn.

In general, and overall, the teacher participants in the Drop-out Prevention Demonstration Project:

- Thought that the 'Celebration of Knowledge' meetings – regularly held to allow teacher tutors to share what they were using pedagogically – were effective in allowing them to gain new pedagogical knowledge and become inspired (by a measure of 87%);
- Appeared to be doing similar types of units and activities across the different schools guided by student-centered, constructivist approaches (by a measure of 84%);
- Claimed to 'believe' in the Project (by a measure of 93%); and,
- Felt they had more pedagogical liberty within the Project than they did in their regular classrooms before the Project began (by a measure of 87%)

Analyses of the larger corpus of data revealed the following findings specifically around 'Literacy & Literate Ability' and the phenomena of 'push-out'.

LITERACY & LITERATE ABILITIES

The following is from the findings section of this research; specifically, around participants' views toward 'literacy' and 'literate abilities', two specific markers that often determine when and why students 'placed at risk' 'drop-out' or are 'pushed-out':

A majority of the participant students self-reported a positive self-image/self-concept as readers and writers (by measure of 74%). A minority of students self-reported a negative or deficit self-image/self-concept as readers and writers (by a measure of 18%).

While some teacher respondents had a more politically radical/non-deficit view of literacy and the participant students' literate abilities (see Freire & Macedo, 1987; Macedo, 1994); other teachers typically had a politically conservative/traditional/deficit view of literacy and the participant students' literate abilities (see, for example, Bennett, 1992). A strong majority of teacher respondents fell in the middle (25% non-deficit, 21% deficit/traditional, and 47% in the middle). Analyses of their self-reported views on literacy abilities and student cultural capital, as well as data collected via observational field notes of literacy tutoring sessions, revealed that they held both a more typically liberal position; that is, they saw students' literate/cultural capital as an asset (Guillory, 1993). Yet teachers still revealed semi-deficit positions toward students, their abilities and their cultural capital (Valencia, 1997; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997); that is, understanding that capital as a bridge (Gramsci, 1971) and tool to transition students into orthodox ways (Bourdieu, 1977) of understanding and doing literacy (Macedo, 1994).

Given the strength and insidious stamina of hegemonically normalized ways of understanding our literate selves as constructed within the early 21st Century United States – that we are largely 'empty vessels' that need to be 'filled-up' with the privileged cultural capital of the mainstream educational system – we were surprised and heartened by the fact that some, but not all, of the participant students saw themselves and their literate abilities in a positive, affirmed light; and this from youngsters who live under extremely oppressive conditions along the US/Mexico border; especially given that these were Students of Colour and from the working-class.

In regards to participant teachers, we agree with Freire (1970) and find the majority paternalistic, deficit, and (neo)liberal in practice troubling. This 'banking pedagogy' in a velvet glove was a position consistently exhibited by the project teachers toward their learners and the views of and toward literacy held by these youth.

'PUSH-OUT'

The following is from the findings section of this research; specifically, around participants' views toward 'push-out':

Counter-posed against the surprisingly positive views of participant students toward their literate abilities, a vast majority of reporting youngsters took a deficit view towards reasons why learners stop going to school. Well above 70% believed that kids 'drop-out' of school because of something that is wrong with them, not something that is wrong with the educational system. Students labelled their peers that had been pushed-out as: 'lazy', 'not smart' and/or involved in 'gangs'/'drugs', demonstrating, we believe, an internalisation of their 'deficits'.

But, according to this participant, students, a pedagogy that focused on them, and their real lives, could improve children's' interest to stay in school. These were examples from student survey responses:

- 'Teachers should focus on the kids' problem and help them out.'
- 'They should let kids know that school is fun and that that they can use their imagination.'
- 'If school activities would be more fun, kids would get more into them and learn more.'
- 'In school we should learn in a way that is fun, but educational. That way kids could see that learning is fun, in a way.'
- 'Teacher should focus on the kids' problems.'
- '*Debemos hacer bastante trabajo, pero trabajo diferente* (we should do a lot of work, but different work)

A majority of respondent teachers believed that when a push-out/drop-out occurred, it was the 'fault' and 'responsibility' of the teacher, the school, the school district, the state, and even the nation, not the youngster. Although a notable 21% of respondent teachers held neoliberal/deficit perspectives on student literacy development, these views did not translate into their views on push-out/drop-out. A strong majority of all teacher (87%) clearly felt that schools were to blame, not youngsters, thus moving considerably away from the hegemonic/orthodox traditional understandings of children and why they stay in or leave school. These analyses appear to indicate that students have a strong hegemonic/orthodox/deficit notion that can be best described as 'student emptiness'. Here, hegemony and orthodoxy have clearly succeeded and achieved a stronghold. At the same time, however, it is hopeful that a majority of teachers – although not as strong a majority as the students – believed just the opposite.

PROJECT CONCLUSIONS

Following, and in bringing this section of the larger report to a close, are the concluding thoughts around the conclusions of the Drop-out Prevention Demonstration Project:

Why are oppressive/disempowering/'blame-the-victim' views regarding the causes for student push-out so strongly entrenched in the minds of this group of youngsters who also hold very positive literate self-images as capable and valorized readers and writers? Why do respondent teachers both see students as being pushed-out by the school system and in need of receiving the liberal/mainstream literacy/language arts/reading curriculum that they are best suited to deliver? In response to these two questions is the unraveling of the many hopeful and liberatory teaching and learning experiences enmeshed within this group of learners/pedagogues who can develop, change and become mutually influential as the project continues. To what end will deficit thinking be uncovered, understood, reconstructed with hope rather than despair (Freire, 1998)? We hope that answers to these questions and concerns will be uncovered within the socialized mindsets of all participant stakeholders, including ourselves, as we participate within the larger webbing of hierarchies of power and control exerted (explicitly or implicitly) by the more powerful over the less powerful.

CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: WHAT THE LITERATURE SAYS ABOUT EFFECTIVE PRACTICE AND PROVISION

In this section, we synthesise the findings from relevant research ([Appendix B](#)) on alternate programs and their contribution to student outcomes using three main conceptual headings: how sustainable these programs are – their *stickability*; how effective these programs are in actually achieving their stated purpose of improving and enhancing vulnerable student’s learning, wellbeing and pathways - their *transformability*; and how these programs may be used successfully in other locations - their *transmitability*.

HOW SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATE PROGRAMS ARE – THEIR *STICKABILITY*

MEASURING THE EFFICACY OF ALTERNATE PROGRAMS

The landscape of alternate programs is characterised by ambitious aims and purposes. On the one hand, they provide a strong vision and purpose for the particular services they offer. At the same time, it must be asked how realistic the aims of such programs are. Tyler and Stokes (1997) proposed that three questions should be satisfactorily answered before the decision is made to base an alternate service in schools: is it in the best interests of the young people; is it in the best interests of the service; and is it in the best interests of the school? These questions could be usefully applied to all alternate programs.

One significant criticism of alternate programs that emerges from the literature relates to the lack of consistency, coherence and consensus that characterise alternate program provision overall. This lack of orchestrated provision represents a challenge for systems, especially at the regional or local level. It also represents an issue for individual schools. The lack of agreement about what constitutes the effective provision of alternate programs, and how this provision should be accessed and coordinated within any one given school, makes it almost impossible to determine what the successful outcomes of such provision would look like (Aron & Zweig 2003). The development of mechanisms for the evaluation and assessment of alternate programs would be an important step in understanding the efficacy, and coordinating the most effective provision of such programs, as well as documenting and sharing successful approaches, yet rigorous evaluation and assessment is relatively uncommon (Brown & Holdsworth, 2001).

Black and colleagues (2010) noted that any effective practice should include “the thorough monitoring and measurement of its actions and outcomes and the capacity to respond to the evidence that [such measurement] yields” (Black et al., 2010, p. 11), yet the consensus from the literature on alternate programs is that there is a consistent lack of measurement or analysis in relation to either provision or outcomes. In her overview of alternate education programs in Australia, for example, te Riele noted that while most programs are informed by clear objectives, “they do not necessarily gather or provide strong evidence on the extent to which these objectives are achieved” (2012, p. 23).

This is not to underestimate the complexities that may attend the measurement of alternate programs. Some such programs are interventions with multiple variables that do not immediately lend themselves to orderly analyses. They often involve complex ‘real world’ settings (Mortimore & Mortimore 1999, p. 114). Many of the outcomes that they aim to achieve require time to change and to accurately assess (Kenny et al., 2002). As te Riele observed, even a fairly fundamental measure such as attendance within alternate programs may be complex to assess. Alternate

programs have a “chequered attendance history” (te Riele, 2012, p. 19). Student attendance within alternate programs may be better than their attendance within mainstream classes, but the base level of attendance may still be low, or vary from term to term or week to week as a function of the complexity of students’ lives, circumstances and relationship to schooling. Smyth and his colleagues have captured some of the challenges of measuring alternate education provision:

Keeping an eye on the longer-term goals is also crucial. The initial indicators are likely to be improvements in attendance and participation or it may be as simple as students having a go in group activities or handling frustrations and anger in a more mature manner. These may not hold the same currency as attainment in standardised testing regimes but they are crucial to the personal development of young people placed at social and economic disadvantage. (2013, p. 309)

Other challenges to the effective measurement of alternate programs may include the nature or the expertise of the agency undertaking the measurement. The evaluations of many alternate programs are conducted or commissioned by the agencies that are responsible for funding or conducting them and that are eager to justify their provision and success (Black et al., 2010; Cole, 2004). Such self-monitoring is an important mechanism for the ongoing development and improvement of individual programs and agencies (Aron & Zweigh, 2003), but it is unlikely to provide answers to more rigorous questions about the efficacy of alternate program provision, especially given that many of these self-evaluations have been found to be methodologically flawed (Raffo & Dyson, 2007).

Self-monitoring is also unlikely to provide the longitudinal data that is essential in understanding the efficacy of such programs for the young people they target. The lack of coherent and orchestrated provision of alternate programs already represents a significant challenge for such young people. Stokes (2000) has noted that some young people end by moving disjointedly from one program to another. Especially where the programmatic intention is to ensure better pathways to training or employment, such lack of coherence within program provision reduces the likelihood that the young people concerned will be able to utilise their experiences within various programs to craft a coherent pathway. Longitudinal analyses are needed to better demonstrate the long-term outcomes of such programs for participating young people. In the absence of such mechanisms for measurement, the sustainability and stickability of individual programs are at risk. Effective alternate programs have clear and realistic expectations of student achievement (Cole, 2004; Slavin & Madden, 1989), but the sustainability of student achievement beyond the life of these programs requires shared and agreed expectations amongst all stakeholders, of whom the students themselves, and their regular classroom teachers, are arguably the most important.

Borman, Hewes-Overman and Brown (2008, p. 169), in an extensive meta-analysis, concluded that the most successful of such programs “have been well researched and have shown that they are effective in improving achievement across reasonably diverse contexts.” Such insight reinforced an earlier study that concluded: “students in schools working with whole school reform tended to achieve greater gains than did students in schools attempting various pull-out programs” (Stringfield, Millsap, & Herman, 1997, p. 1).

ADDING TO THE DEFICIT VIEW

Another criticism of alternate programs relates to their effects on the perception and identity of the students targeted for inclusion. There is a persistent association between young people, vulnerability, risk and deficit. As Wright et al. (2000) note, vulnerable students may be stereotyped

not only as 'deficit' but as 'deviant.' They may be seen as capable of 'contaminating' the school culture.

Schools that adopt a deficit approach to young people's learning, wellbeing or pathways typically focus on individualised, de-contextualised understandings of student vulnerability that take little account of the wider forces and factors that influence young people's experience of education, including school, community and system level factors. From such a view, programs are designed to "reinforce structures that have broken down" (Wright et al., 2000, p. 35) rather than question the structures themselves. While programs to address students' vulnerability may be either preventative (operating as part of an early intervention strategy) (DETYA, 2001), or ameliorative (remedial), the most common approach by schools, according to the OECD (1986b), is to offer remediation rather than preventative programs. There is no conclusive evidence in the literature that suggests students have experienced improved achievement or altered patterns of learning through the development or implementation of such remediation programs (Mortimore & Mortimore, 1999).

There is also a concern expressed in the literature that alternate programs serve as 'dumping grounds' for students whom the school has identified as problematic (De Jong & Griffiths, 2006). The removal of students from the mainstream classroom to participate in alternate programs is often associated with reduced opportunities for normal social interaction between targeted students and others, with the negative labelling or stigmatisation of targeted low-achieving students (Teddlie & Stringfield, 2006) and with the formation or reinforcement in these students of a sense of self as 'other' or as delinquent (Hawkins et al., 1998; Slavin & Madden, 1989; Zyngier & Gale, 2003).

This last claim would benefit from greater investigation. Anecdotally, effective alternate programs are associated with a greater sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy amongst students whose experience of the normative classroom is negative, alienating and demoralising. It may also be that some young people derive an increase in self-esteem from the development of an identity as a noncompliant student, as one who resists, refuses or evades the expectations of the normative classroom (Black, 2012). Putting such questions aside for the time-being, however, the literature consistently emphasises the importance of schools "focusing on changing conditions rather than on the perceived problems of young people or their families" (te Riele, 2012, p. 32). Zyngier and Gale's suggestion that schools and systems must "take account of students' own reasons for why they are disengaged from schooling and what changes schools and teachers themselves might need to consider" (2003, p. 1) continues to be a pertinent one for any alternate education provision.

HOW EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS ARE – THEIR TRANSFORMABILITY

A consistent theme that emerges from the literature is in relation to the efficacy of alternate programs, as researchers highlight whether such programs have the capacity, or the potential, to effect lasting or widespread transformations at the student, school, or community levels.

TRANSFORMING STUDENT OUTCOMES

One of the most controversial questions that arises from the research literature is whether programs that remove students from mainstream activities also remove them from important sources of knowledge, including their peers, and from the kinds of authorised knowledge that is most valued, and rewarded, by education systems. The literature suggests that significant numbers of vulnerable students are suspended or excluded from school, or develop chronic absenteeism (truanting), and that, too often, school practices do not encourage the retention of such students. Practices

associated with such concerns expressed in the literature include maintaining environments that do not engage students, insisting on curriculum content that is too difficult or irrelevant, or alienating students through poor teacher-student relations (Young, 2000, p. 150). Other commentators (e.g. Apte, 2001; Dwyer, et al., 1998; Teese & Polesel, 2003) are more forceful in their analysis, suggesting that many vulnerable students are 'driven out' of school. Such studies deplore the labelling or stigmatisation of vulnerable students, but they also recognise some of the forces that may impel educators to isolate such students within the school, including the need within a competitive educational market to show improvement by moving under-performing students on to other schools, or to improve the educational profile of specific classes or year level groups by moving such students into diversionary or alternate programs. There is a clear warning from the literature that the needs of vulnerable students may be given less consideration in a market-driven education system.

The research also warns that students who are identified as being most at-risk of educational failure are the least likely to be exposed to intellectually challenging and relevant learning material and opportunities, causing them to fall progressively further behind their peers and making it even harder to alter the pattern of inequality of outcomes (Lingard et al., 2001). Such literature cautions that the redistribution of vulnerable students into alternate programs will not address the root cause of educational underachievement.

Such a point raises the central question of what good practice looks like in relation to alternate program provision. Our review of the literature has highlighted at least 178 differently named characteristics of good practice in such programs (Appendix A: Effective Alternate Programs Being Conducted in Australia). We suggest that there is some agreement within the research on the following:

- Successful programs are socially supportive, intellectually challenging, and respond to students' needs both in the short- and long-term.
- The selection and training of participating teachers is crucial, and should be supported by a leadership environment that promotes a professional learning community within the workplace.
- Successful programs actively involve and connect to the students' world and to the communities of which they are a part.

Major reviews of teaching and learning (e.g., Batten & Russell, 1995) suggest that even the most vulnerable students are capable of quality educational outcomes if they have access to a supportive educational environment that: builds on their strengths, responds to their needs, and monitors their progress; promotes their social and personal as well as their academic and vocational development; has a focus on practical learning related to their own life experience; encourages them to share responsibility for their own learning and to be involved in decisions about that learning; sets high expectations of their achievement and challenges and extends them; gives them the opportunity to work cooperatively with others, both inside and outside the classroom; and involves parents, the community and relevant agencies in a collaborative endeavour to support them.

Other reviews (e.g., Brown & Holdsworth, 2001) add to such recommendations, suggesting that effective alternate programs should accomplish the following: link learning to real life and work applications; provide opportunities to learn outside the classroom and the school; have flexible

spacing and allow young people to learn at their own rate; include opportunities and assistance for students to talk with staff about their future aspirations and goal-setting; and maximise student autonomy and decision-making. The authors of such reviews recommend that the organisation, curriculum, and teaching practices of schools be arranged in ways that create an environment in which all young people feel secure and valued and where their individual needs and points of view are taken into account. They also recommend that schools develop different and supportive structures to meet student need.

Such recommendations are borne out by other studies that have identified the barriers that prevent vulnerable students from achieving their potential. Such barriers include inflexible curriculum pathways; a lack of curricular relevance to students' own experience and context; inadequate or inappropriate teacher pedagogy, skills and training; and a school environment that doesn't value students' backgrounds, families or communities (School Focussed Youth Service, 2001).

Two strategies are strongly suggested in the research literature for promoting the most significant improvements in the learning, wellbeing and pathways of vulnerable students: implementing an intensive and individually targeted alternate program, and changing the nature of pedagogical practice within the regular classroom in line with the kind of measures described above (Slavin & Madden, 1989). While different organisational arrangements may suit different programs, settings or student needs, the general consensus of the relevant research literature is that where alternate programs are poorly integrated with regular classroom pedagogy and fail to influence that pedagogy, they fail to make a significant or sustainable difference to student outcomes.

Lamb and Rice (2008) have shown that the greatest outcomes are achieved when specific interventions such as alternate programs are provided within the context of a supportive school culture and by strategies designed to ensure the best possible classroom practice at the mainstream level. Such sentiment is echoed by other researchers (e.g., Druian & Butler, 1987; te Riele, 2006) who conclude that the factors that are most predictive of educational success for at-risk students include effective school leadership, coherent classroom management across all curricular areas and year levels, and the regular and coordinated monitoring of student progress. Less integrated models of alternate provision are less likely to substantially build the capacity of the school and its community to meet young people's needs, let alone to inform or support systemic change.

TRANSFORMING SCHOOLS

While Slavin and Madden's review (1989) is now more than two decades old, its themes continue to have currency within more recent studies. Their primary recommendation is that a comprehensive and whole-school approach is the only strategy that will have significant outcomes for the learning, wellbeing and future transitions of students at risk. By contrast, the scattergun or sporadic provision of alternate programs is unlikely to achieve these aims. In particular, the uncoordinated provision or proliferation of disparate programs within any one school runs counter to the conclusions of the research. As the authors note, "it is not enough to take a little of Program A and a little of Program B and hope for the best" (p. 10). Moreover Stringfield, Millsap and Herman (2005) concluded that students in schools using externally developed pull-out programs tended to achieve less than did students in schools that attempted whole school reform programs.

Particularly in highly disadvantaged contexts, alternate program provision has been criticised for targeting a cohort of students without changing the culture of the school, focusing on superficial problems rather than addressing root causes, and of implementing educational reform without the

social and economic reforms needed to change the circumstances of such communities (Dyson & Raffo, 2007; Muijs, 2007). Such programs are *supplemental* rather than *fundamental* or *mainstream*: they are directed at specific 'sub-populations' of students and remain isolated alternatives to the mainstream (DETYA, 2001). It has been suggested that such programs work against sustained student improvement because they are poorly linked and articulated to the mainstream curriculum (Luke et al., 2003). As Slavin and Madden have argued (1989), such programs fail to emphasise the responsibility of the whole school, and of all teachers, for the educational success of all students. They fail to enable the kind of change at the level of the mainstream classroom that would reduce educational failure and disengagement for all students and ensure that students who do need additional support experience a consistent pedagogical approach regardless of which classroom or learning context they occupy. They also fail to capture the full potential of effective alternate programs to serve as "laboratories of teaching and learning reform" (Teese, 2006). As Aron notes (2005), alternate education programs can be far more than 'dumping grounds' for 'problem' youth; because they represent a departure from the standard approach to schooling, they may also represent a valuable source of educational innovation and creativity.

In some ways, the continued emphasis in some schools on alternate programs that are poorly connected to the mainstream curriculum and pedagogical approaches can be seen as running counter to the direction and priorities of their systems. National and state-based initiatives such as extended service schooling, school regeneration projects and the integration of early childhood and schooling services are driven by a desire to achieve more integrated service provision for children and young people in high-need contexts (Black et al., 2010). They are also driven by the recognition of education systems that the achievement of positive learning, wellbeing and pathways for all students requires not just "a proliferation of new practices ... but also whole of school change ... backed up and mandated by systemic guidelines, policies and appropriate resource allocations" (DETYA, 2001, p. 26).

Such motivation can also be seen at the level of the individual school, where a growing number appear to have been making the commitment to more integrated and ambitious forms of service provision in order to improve student outcomes (McLeod & Stokes, 1999). Such approaches depend on a high degree of commitment from the top of the school, however, as Black and her colleagues note: "more integrated approaches require greater resources and facilities and a higher level of leadership and support" (2010, p. 7). They may require significant whole school change processes, including changes to school structures, school culture and resource allocations. We return to this issue when we consider the transmissibility – how such programs may be used successfully in other locations – of alternate program provision in schools.

TRANSFORMING COMMUNITIES

A major review of innovation and best practice in relation to the education of vulnerable young people (Strategic Partners, 2001) found that schools that engaged the local community and participated directly in community capacity building had the greatest impact on the young people involved. Such schools provided options and strategies that attempted to address the factors which rendered young people vulnerable in the first instance. They took a leading role in the rebuilding of "human communities" at the local level, especially in communities where disadvantage is an issue (School Focused Youth Service, 2001).

There is a view, expressed strongly within the wider literature, that any alternate education service

provision should be designed to meet the specific needs and reflect the specific context of the school and its local community (Black et al., 2010). Researchers recommend that the most successful provision for vulnerable young people is that which is developed locally and in response to local need. Doing so may require schools and brokers to establish strong links with other local agencies. It may also require the development and provision of culturally appropriate alternate programs and services, especially in contexts where Indigenous young people are involved (Brown & Holdsworth, 2001).

In relation to extended service schooling, the policy trend is to set no single blueprint for practice. An example comes from the largest centralised initiative to date, the Full Service Extended Schools program in the United Kingdom. Within this model, schools are expected to decide what constitutes their local community, what the needs of that community are, whether interventions are best directed at the level of the young person, the family or the community, and which interventions should be employed (Success Works, 2001).

Researchers express caution, however, about how far such variability should extend. A dissenting view from the literature is that the absence of a single, coherent vision or mandate from educational systems represents a significant challenge to the efficacy of alternate service provision in schools. An authoritative evaluation of the United Kingdom Full Service Extended Schools initiative suggests that good practice should rely less on what it calls “entrepreneurship at the school level” and more on “policy coherence and stability” (Cummings et al., 2007, p. 4). The inference for alternate programs is that they may prove most effective when supported by a policy plan that establishes minimum standards for practice and considers long-term sustainability (RPR Consulting, 2002).

HOW ALTERNATE PROGRAMS MAY BE USED SUCCESSFULLY IN OTHER LOCATIONS – THEIR TRANSMITABILITY

The research literature acknowledges that schools play a critical role in the prevention and early intervention programs for vulnerable youth. However, the research also suggests that much of this work appears to be fragmented with individualistic approaches that contribute little to the capacity of the system overall. There is a view within the research literature that it is easier to change the education system than the student. At the same time, the literature cautions that proposals to change the system through a bits and pieces approach will not deliver long term sustainable change (School Focused Youth Service, 2001; The Allen Consulting Group, 2003). Such conflicting assessments raise the question of the extent to which alternate programs conducted in individual schools have the capacity, or the potential, to effect lasting or widespread transformations at the level of the school system: that is, whether they have the potential to be scaled up across a greater number of schools, or to inform and serve as models of practice in other schools.

We have suggested earlier in this report that young people do not disconnect from education because of the failure of any one system, and that reconnecting them requires collaboration and coordination among multiple systems. In this vein, one criticism of alternate education programs is that they are, on the whole, ‘dead-end’ programs: they do not lead to recognised and credentialed outcomes, or allow movement or substantial entry qualifications to further education and training (Holdsworth, 2011). From such a view, the delivery of alternate programs within individual schools is considered to also overlook the consensus amongst researchers that “the problem of youth disconnecting from mainstream schools is largely a systemic problem” (Aron & Zweig, 2003, p. 42). Indeed, a consistent recommendation that emerges from the literature concerns the need for the

better systemic overview and coordination of alternate provision (e.g., Mills & McGregor, 2010; te Riele, 2012).

In particular, researchers recommend a better systemic overview and coordination of the cost of provision of alternate programs. While the proliferation of alternate programs in individual schools represents a groundswell of commitment to meeting the needs of vulnerable young people, previous government reports have acknowledged that “[a] lot of money can be spent in pursuit of limited benefits without some commitment to systemic change” (DETYA, 2001, p. 2). The same reports have noted that “without system change, effective practice that serve marginalised or ‘at-risk’ young people will either remain localised, and/or dissipate as resources shrink and creative energy is exhausted” (DETYA, 2001, p. 102).

Researchers, including the latest recommendations from the *Review of Funding for Schooling* (Gonski et al., 2011), urge school systems to better recognise that meeting the needs of vulnerable young people requires significant investment, including greater staffing resources and facilities and a higher level of leadership and support. Based on long-term research by the OECD, Mortimore (1999) concluded that improving outcomes for vulnerable students requires a move away from narrow or instrumentalist views of what educational success means as well as greater support and recognition of the role of educators in planning and implementing change. He also warns that no such outcomes can be achieved without adequate resources. Such a view is echoed by Teese, who argues that improved outcomes for vulnerable students “must be supported by an intensity of effort, high expectations and solidarity in sharing resources” (2006, p. 3). Such studies, however, are not simply a call for additional resources, as echoed by Luke and colleagues (2003). In a significant review of provision for students in the middle years of schooling, Luke et al. (2003) argued that dedicated funding tied to specific groups of vulnerable young people, including Indigenous young people, appears to encourage piecemeal and pull-out approaches that are not supportive of whole school change.

The findings of such studies, and others (e.g., Black, 2007; Brown & Holdsworth, 2001; Luke et al., 2003), provide a reminder that educational change and innovation works best if it is both ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up.’ The authors suggest that investment should be particularly targeted towards teacher learning and the creation of new and supportive mechanisms and strategies for teachers to work together and with other staff and agencies to meet all students’ needs. These may include strategies to improve the professional knowledge and learning of all educators—not just those who are directly involved in the delivery of alternate programs—as well as strategies to deliver smaller student-staff ratios, strategies to provide time within the timetable for staff to provide pastoral care, and strategies to improve the quality and capacity of student welfare and mentoring programs. Investment in such strategies shifts the locus of expertise from the agencies or individuals delivering alternate programs to all teachers within the school. Doing so recognises that, with adequate support, all teachers can act as internal change agents within their own school contexts.

Before investment of resources can be more effectively directed, however, systems need to know the scale and extent of the provision of alternate programs in school. A necessary first step is a comprehensive environmental scan or mapping of existing provision. Cole noted in 2004 that “there is no overall strategy that considers the location and placement of alternate settings within the community” (p. 11). The findings from this review of literature likewise suggest that little has changed in this regard. Such mapping should go beyond a simple analysis of what kind of programs

and agencies are operating in specific schools and regions to include an analysis of what funds are being expended in the provision of alternate programs. Such analysis should address the following questions:

- What is the cost of alternate programs in schools? What resources are required to access externally provided programs and agencies, and where do schools obtain such resources?
- What are the sources and security of funding for such programs? (te Riele, 2012)
- What are the cost-benefits, cost-effectiveness and opportunity costs of such programs?

Such analysis should also enable systems to answer the following questions:

- How do schools access externally provided programs and agencies? What issues of equity apply to such access? Do all schools have equal access to externally provided programs and agencies?
- What is the longevity of externally provided programs within any one school, and what factors contribute to this longevity? Te Riele notes the consensus of a large research literature that “there is a sense of wastage when effective programs are discontinued due to lack of funding” (2012, p. 28). There is also a serious drain on school resources, both capital and human, when alternate programs are discontinued or exchanged for other programs after only a short period (Black, 2008).
- What opportunities exist to coordinate the provision of programs across schools within the same geographic area? What collaboration exists between schools accessing the same externally provided programs and agencies (Myconos, 2011)?
- What is the nature of the young people being targeted for participation in alternate programs? What other services are these young people accessing, and what are the opportunities for better coordination of this provision? Te Riele (2012) recommends the analysis of such young people in relation to such factors as gender, age, and conditions of disadvantage. It would also be useful to know what proportion of young people is being targeted by alternate programs within any one school and within any one area.
- What are the short- and long-term outcomes for the young people who participate in alternate programs? What pathways or positive destinations exist for such young people, both within the school and beyond it, and how long does it take for such youth to achieve such positive destinations? What is the impact for students of time spent in any one program as well as of the duration of the program (te Riele, 2012)?

RECOMMENDATIONS

Teese has concluded that “in the end, the quality of a school system can be judged by the experience of the most vulnerable children in it” (2006, p. 3). Overseas research (OECD, 1998) as well as Australian research (Applied Economics & Dusseldorp Skills Forum, 2002; Fiona Macdonald, Eleanor Marsh & Access Training & Employment Centre, 2002; The Allen Consulting Group, 2003b, 2003c, 2003a) indicates that if we do not purposefully address student and school failure we risk paying a considerable economic and social penalty.

The findings from this literature review suggest that school systems must prioritise prevention and early intervention in the provision of support to vulnerable students. Remedial programs and interventions, however, should be used as a last resort, not as the first or preferred strategy.

Alternate pathways to educational success are needed at every stage of schooling, beginning with prevention and early intervention strategies in the early years, progressing to a range of high-quality alternate options within mainstream K-12 systems, and, finally, offering 'second chance' opportunities for those who have been unable to learn and thrive in the general education system (Aron, 2005). It is essential that our teachers are active participants in change as this may require considerable changes to their practices, habits and beliefs.

We therefore conclude that one of the critical strategies that all schools can use in an effort to improve outcomes for "at-risk" (and all) students is to recognise that there are failings in the school system, but that such failings offer considerable professional opportunities. Initiatives against school and system failure are likely to raise teacher skills and professionalism. Central to such efforts is the need for teachers to 'stop and reconsider assumptions about their classroom practices' (OECD, 1998, p. 51). We call for a revitalised pedagogy that is productive and connected, intellectually challenging and connected to the real world of students and that engages with student background and difference.

Further research is required to establish a more definitive inventory of international best practice principles and exemplars in order to ensure

that those students who currently derive the least benefit from their middle schooling years are provided with enhanced opportunities to attain academic and social outcomes from their learning that are of value in the difficult transitions and pathways that many need to negotiate in the years ahead. (Luke et al., 2003, p. 9)

As Teddlie and Stringfield (2006) concluded regarding the importance of school-level leadership and high quality professional development of staff:

- whole-school change efforts were more effective than 'pull-out' or otherwise targeted programmes
- early-elementary reforms tended to produce greater measured change than reforms focused on later grades, and
- externally developed designs were both more likely to obtain coherent implementation and to produce measurable positive results.

Building on the various studies of 'promising reforms' of the past 20 years, Borman et al. (2003) conducted a large-scale meta-analysis of the effects of specific whole-school reform designs. The authors' analyses included over 300 studies based on 29 different school reform programs, ranging from reforms focused on primary grades through high school. Their analyses suggested that more rigorous research is needed and echoed earlier research in indicating a great deal of within-design outcome variance, hence suggesting the importance of local co-construction (Teddlie & Stringfield, 2006). We also believe that further studies will make similarly strong cases for other, research-based reform designs.

It seems from the literature that schools have not always taken up the challenge or had the resources or capacity to address such issues. As a result, many may turn to external providers who offer 'quick fix' and 'off-the-shelf' solutions that have little or no impact on the deeper and substantive school-based issues that may contribute to the creation of young people's vulnerability. Such solutions may also overlook the finding that no single or overarching explanation can account

for young people's vulnerability in relation to education and that any simple or universally applicable measure can address it. Overcoming risk for young learners, however, requires a sustained and long term effort to meet the needs of all students, especially of the low achievers (OECD, 1998, p. 56). As Mortimore and Mortimore (1999, p. 113) observed, the maintenance of improvement requires considerable and sustained effort: "schools cannot either rest on their laurels or switch to auto-pilot!"

In summary the research literature and the programs highlighted on the *Learning Choices Appendix* suggests the following key points in relation to the provision of any alternate programs offered for students at risk of early school leaving:

1. Alternate programs should be both mainstream and relevant, with a clear relation to the wider community or the adult world reflecting real-world problems.
2. Alternate programs must be socially supportive, intellectually challenging and respond to student needs both currently and in the long term.
3. The selection and training of the participating teachers is crucial, while it can be inferred that leadership "from above" is less vital.
4. Alternate programs must actively involve and be connected to the students' world and to the communities of which they are part.

REFERENCES

- Aeby, V. G., Manning, B. H., Thyer, B. A., & Carpenter-Aeby, T. (1999). Comparing outcomes of an alternative school program offered with and without intensive family involvement. *School Community Journal*, 9(1), 17-32.
- Angwin, J., Blackmore, J., Harrison, L., & Shacklock, G. (2001). 'Pathway planning and "becoming somebody": Exploring the tensions between wellbeing and credentialism with students at (educational) risk.' Paper presented to the AARE Annual Conference, Perth, 2-6 December.
- Applied Economics & Dusseldorp Skills Forum (2002). *Realising Australia's Commitment to Young People - scope, benefits, cost, evaluation and implementation*, Dusseldorp Skills Forum.
- Apte, J. (2001). *Successful outcomes for youth at risk: A Resource Kit*. Australian National Training Authority.
- Aron, L.Y. "The Alternate Education Landscape in the Mid-2000s: Working Paper." Washington: The Urban Institute, 2005.
- Aron, L. & Zweig, J. (2003). Educational Alternatives for vulnerable youth: Student needs, program types and research directions. The Urban Institute, Washington DC.
- Australian Centre for Equity through Education & the Australian Youth Research Centre (2001). *Building Relationships - Making Education Work: A Report on the Perspectives of Young People*. Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Barrera, R. & Jimenez, R. (2000). *Literacy practices for Latino students*. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education homepage. <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/reports/literacy/>
- Bartolomé, L. (1996). *Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy*. In P. Leistyna & A. Woodrum & S. A. Sherblom (Eds.), *Breaking free: The transformative power of critical pedagogy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Bennett, W. J. (1992). *The de-valuing of America: The fight for our culture and children*. New York: Summit Books.
- Black, R. (2007). *Crossing the Bridge: Overcoming Entrenched Disadvantage through Student-Centred Learning*. Melbourne: Education Foundation.
- Black, R. (2008). *Beyond the Classroom: Building new school networks*. Melbourne: ACER Press.
- Black, R. (2012). *Educating the Reflexive Citizen: Making a Difference or Entrenching Difference?* The University of Melbourne.
- Black, R., Lemon, B., & Walsh, L. (2010). "Literature Review and Background Research for the National Collaboration Project: Extended Service School Model. Report for Department of Education, Western Australia." Melbourne Foundation for Young Australians, 2010.
- Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research*, 73(2), 125-230.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyd, W. L., & Shouse, R. C. (1997). The problems and promise of urban schools. *Issues in Childrens and Families Lives*, 7, 141-165. <http://www.ed.psu.edu/edadm/Shouse/pandpurb.html>
- Brown, J. & Holdsworth, R. (2001). *Building Relationships - Making Education Work: A Report on the Perspectives of Young People*, Australian Centre for Equity through Education, the Australian Youth Research Centre for Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Brown, L. H., & Beckett, K. S. (2007). Parent involvement in an alternative school for students at risk of educational failure. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(4), 498-523.

- Chávez Chávez, R. (1997). A curriculum discourse for achieving equity: Implications for teachers when engaged with Latina and Latina/o Students. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education homepage. <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/hdp/3/index.htm>.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1993). Teacher education as narrative inquiry. In D. J. Clandinin, A. Dacies, P. Hogan & B. Kennard (Eds.), *Learning to teach, teaching to learn*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, Y., & Tyree, A. (1988). Escape from poverty: Determinants of intergenerational mobility of sons and daughters of the poor. *Social Sciences Quarterly*, 67, 803-813.
- Cole, P. (2004). 'Learning in Alternate Settings: What makes a sustainable program?' Paper delivered at the Learning for Choices Expo, Sydney.
- Cummings, C., Todd, L. & Dyson, A. (2007). 'Towards Extended Schools? How Education and Other Professionals Understand Community-Oriented Schooling'. *Children and Society*, 21, 189-200.
- Datnow, A., Hubbard, L., & Mehan, B. (2002). *Extending Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Davison-Avilés, R. M., Guerrero, M. P., Howarth, H. B., & Thomas, G. (1999). Perceptions of Chicano/Latino students who have dropped out of school. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77 (4), 465-473.
- De Jong, T. & Griffiths, C. (2006). The role of alternate education programs in meeting the needs of adolescent students with challenging behaviour: Characteristics of best practice. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 16(1), 29-40
- Delgado-Gaitán, C. (1991). Involving parents in the schools: A process of empowerment. *American Journal of Education*, Nov. 91, 20-46.
- Delgado-Gaitán, C. (1992). School matters in the Mexican-American home: Socializing children to education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29:3, 495-513.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (1998). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. New York: Sage.
- Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (2010). Pathways to re-engagement through flexible learning options. A policy direction for consultation Melbourne: Student Wellbeing Division Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.
- DETYA (2001a). *'Doing it Well' Case Studies of Innovation and Best Practice in working with At Risk Young People*. DETYA, Canberra.
- (2001b). *Innovation and Best Practice in Schools: Review of Literature and Practice*. DETYA, Canberra.
- Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (2011). *Student 2010 full year: selected higher education statistics publication*. DEEWR, Canberra.
- Druian, G., & Butler, J.A. (1987). Effective Schooling Practices and at-Risk Youth: What the Research Shows. School Improvement Research Series. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Lab.
- Durlak, J. A. (1995). *School-based prevention programs for children and adolescents*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dyson, A. & Raffo, C. (2007). Education and disadvantage: The role of community-oriented schools. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(3), 297-314.
- Dwyer, P, Stokes, H., Tyler, D., & Holdsworth, R. (1998). *Negotiating staying and returning: Young peoples' perspectives on schooling and the Youth Allowance*. Victorian Department of Education, East Melbourne, Vic.
- Fine, M. (1995). The politics of who's "at risk." In, B. B. Swadener and S. Lubeck (Eds.), *Children and families "at promise": Deconstructing the discourse of risk* (pp. 76-94). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Foley, D. E. (1997). Deficit thinking models based on culture. In R. R. Valencia, (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp.113-131). London, UK: Flamer Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. With notes by Ana Mari Araújo Freire. Translated by Rober R. Barr. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder: Westview.
- García, E. E. (1992). Analysis of literacy enhancement for middle school Hispanic students through curriculum integration. *The Journal of Education Issues of Language Minority Students*, 10,31-145.
- García, G. (2000). The factors that place Latino children and youth at risk of educational failure. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Gemici, S., Lim, P., & Karmel, T. (2013). *The impact of schools on young people's transition to university*. NCVET, Adelaide.
- Giroux, H. A. (1996). *Fugitive cultures: Race, violence and youth*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1998). *Channel surfing: Racism, the media, and the destruction of today's youth*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Gonski, D., Boston, K., Greiner, K., Lawrence, C., Scales, B. & Tannock, P. (2011). *Review of funding for schooling — final report*. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Canberra.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Medea, Q. and Smith, N., (Eds. and Trans.) London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Guillory, J. (1993). *Cultural capital: The problem of literary cannon formation*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hawkins, J.D., Doueck, H.J., & Lishner, D.M. (1988). Changing Teaching Practices in Mainstream Classrooms to Improve Bonding and Behavior of Low Achievers *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 31-50.
- Heath, S. B. (1995). Ethnography in communities: Learning the everyday life of America's subordinated youth. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 114-128). New York: Macmillan.
- Holdsworth, R. (2011) LEARNING CHOICES NATIONAL SCAN: Results & Analysis. Dusseldorp Skills Forum: Sydney
- Kenny, M.E., Waldo, M., Warter, E.H., & Barton, C. (2002). 'School-Linked Prevention: Theory, Science, and Practice for Enhancing the Lives of Children and Youth'. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 30(5), 726-748.
- Kramer, L., Laumann, G., & Brunson, L. (2000). Implementation and diffusion of the Rainbows Program in rural communities: Implications for school-based prevention programming. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 11(1), 37-64.
- Lamb, S. and Rice, S. (2008). *Effective Strategies to Increase School Completion Report*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.
- Latinas in school*. [Research abstract] Washington, DC: American Association of University Women. Retrieved May 2, 2001, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aauw.org/2000/latina.html>.
- LeCompte, M. D. & Preissel, J. (1992). Toward an ethnography of student life in schools and classrooms: Synthesizing the qualitative research tradition. In LeCompt, M., Millroy, W. L., and Preissle, J. (Eds.), *The*

Handbook of Qualitative Research In Education (pp. 815-859). San Diego: Academic Press.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Lingard, R., Ladwig, J., Mills, M., Bahr, M., Chant, D., Warry, M., . . . Luke, A. (2001). Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study: Final report, vol.1 (Vol. 1). Brisbane: Report prepared for Education Queensland by the School of Education, The University of Queensland.

Lingard, R., Ladwig, J., Mills, M., Bahr, M., Chant, D., Warry, M., . . . Luke, A. (2001). Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study: Supplementary Materials (Vol. 2). Brisbane: Report prepared for Education Queensland by the School of Education, The University of Queensland.

Louden, W. (2000). Mapping the territory: Overview. *Mapping the territory: Primary students with learning difficulties: Literacy and numeracy*, 1-28.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 315-340.

Luke, A., Elkins, J., Weir, K., Land, R., Carrington, V., Dole, S., Pendergast, D., Kapitzke, C., Kraayenoord, C., Moni, K., McIntosh, A., Mayer, D., Bahr, M., Hunter, L., Chadbourne, R., Bean, T., Alverman, D. & Stevens, L. (2003). *BEYOND THE MIDDLE: A Report about Literacy and Numeracy Development of Target Group Students in the Middle Years of Schooling*. Vol 1, Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training under the Grants for National Literacy and Numeracy. Strategies and Projects Programme. School of Cognition Language and Special Education Griffith University and The University of Queensland, Mt Gravatt Campus

Macdonald, F., Marsh, E., & Access Training & Employment Centre (2002). *Youth Focus Groups - in regard to Realising Australia's Commitment to Young People*. Dusseldop Skills Forum, Sydney.

Macedo, D. (1994). *Literacies of power: What Americans are not allowed to know*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Margonis, F. (1992). The cooption of "at-risk": Paradoxes of policy criticism. *Teachers College Record*, 94, 343-64.

McKeown, A. (2011). Young People Speak: Experiences of Alternate Education. *Developing Practice*, 29, 69-75.

McLeod, J. & Stokes, H. (1999). *Linking Schools and Communities Project: An evaluation*. Erskinville: Australian Centre for Equity through Education

Mehan, H. (1997, January 8). *Contextual factors surrounding Hispanic dropouts*. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education homepage. <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/hdp/1/index.html>.

Meier, K. J., & Stewart, J. (1991). *The politics of Hispanic education : Un paso pa'lante y dos pa'tras*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Miles, M. and Huberman, M. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

Mills, M. & McGregor, G. (2010). *Re-Engaging Students in Education: Success Factors in Alternate Schools*. Brisbane: Youth Affairs Network Queensland.

Mondragon, J., Kitchen, R., & Velasquez, D., (1999). Dropout intervention/prevention in New Mexico schools with special emphasis on Hispanics and Native Americans. *Catalyst for Change*, 29 (1), 9-6.

Mortimore, P. & Mortimore, J. (1999). 'Improving educational performance of at-risk youth.' Paper presented to Preparing youth for the 21st Century: the transition from education to labour market, Washington DC.

Muijs, D. (2007). 'Leadership in full-service extended schools: Communicating across cultures'. *School Leadership and Management*, 27(4), 347-362

Myconos, G. (2011). *A path to re-engagement. Evaluating the first year of a Community VCAL education*

program for young people. Fitzroy (Vic): Brotherhood of St Laurence

National Center for educational Statistics. (2001). Dropout rates in the United States: 1999. Executive summary.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperatives for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Oakes, J. (1995). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. Gamoran, A., and Page, R. (1992). "Curriculum differentiation: Opportunities, outcomes, and meaning." In Jackson, P., (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York: McMillan.

OECD (1998). *Overcoming Failure at School*, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2010). *PISA 2009 results: what makes a school successful? Resources, policies and practices*, OECD, Paris.

Ogbu, J. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Olsen, L., & Mullen, N. A. (1990). *Embracing diversity: Teacher's voices from California's classrooms*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Perry, L & McConney, A (2010). 'School socioeconomic composition and student outcomes in Australia: Implications for educational policy.' *Australian Journal of Education*, 54, 72—85

Pogrow, S. (1998). What is an exemplary program, and why should anyone care? A reaction to Slavin & Klein. *Educational Researcher*, 27(7), 22-29.

Raffo, C. & Dyson, A. (2007). 'Full service extended schools and educational inequality in urban contexts—new opportunities for progress?' *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(3), 263–282.

Rice, S., & Lamb, S. (2008). *A Guide to Help Schools Increase School Completion*. Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development

Rios, F. (1994) (Ed). *Teachers thinking in multicultural context*. New York: SUNY.

Robertson, S. & Dale, R. (2002). Local states of emergency: The contradictions of neo-liberal governance in education in New Zealand. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23, 464-482.

Romo, H. D. (1998). Latina high school leaving: Some practical solutions. Eric Digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EDO-RC-97-8)

Romo, H. D. & Falbo, T. (1996). *Latina/o high school graduation: Defying the odds*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Rumberger, R. (1995). Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools. *American Educational Research Journal*. 32, (3), pp. 583-625.

Rumberger, R. (1991). Chicano dropouts: A review of research and policy issues. In, R. R. Valencia, (Ed.). *Chicano school failure and success*. (pp. 64-89). London: The Falmer Press.

Samoff, J. (1999). *When research becomes consulting*. ERIC Clearinghouse

School Focused Youth Service (2001). *SFYS Literature Review*, DEET, DHS, CEO and AISV, Melbourne

Secada, W. G., Chávez, R. C., Garcia, E., Muñoz, C., Oakes, J., Santiago, I. S., and Slavin, R. (1998). *No more excuses: The final report of the Hispanic dropout project*. U.S. Department of Education.

Seddon, T. & BilRPR Consulting (2002). *Turning Lives Around: Effective service responses for young people with intensive support needs. Final report*. Retrieved November 15, 2013 from http://www.dhcs.act.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/5728/turnlivesaround_iys_report.pdf

- Seddon, T., Billett, S., & Clemans, A. (2005). Navigating Social Partnerships: Central Agencies-Local Networks. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(5), 567-584. doi: 10.2307/30036098
- Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1989). "What Works for Students at Risk: A Research Synthesis." *Educational Leadership* 46(5), 4-13.
- Smyth, J., McInerney, P., & Fish, T. (2013). "Blurring the Boundaries: From Relational Learning Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Engagement for Disengaged Disadvantaged Young People." *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 21(2), 299-320.
- Soto, L. D. (1997). *Language, culture, and power: Bilingual families and the struggle for quality education*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision (2011). *Report on government services 2011*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.
- St Leger, P., Beckett, D., & Harper, G. (1998). *Providing education and training for at risk and unemployed young people*. Department of Education.
- Stokes, H. (2000) Out of Education. A report for the Victorian Full Service Schools Program, Department of Education, Employment and Training, Melbourne.
- Stringfield, S., Millsap, M. A., & Herman, R. (2005). Using "promising programs" to improve educational processes and student outcomes. In D. Hopkins (Ed.), *The Practice and Theory of School Improvement* (pp. 280-304). Springer Netherlands.
- Success Works (2001). *Evaluation of the School Focused Youth Service*. Melbourne: School Focused Youth Service
- Teddlie, C. B., & Stringfield, S. (2006). A Brief History of School Improvement Research. In A. Harris & J. H. Chrispeels (Eds.), *Improving schools and educational systems: International perspectives* (pp. 23-38). Oxon: Taylor & Francis..
- Te Riele, K. (2006). Schooling practices for marginalized students – practice-with-hope. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(1), 59-74
- Te Riele, K. (2007). 'Educational Alternates for Marginalised Youth'. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 34(3), page numbers???
- Teese, R.V. & Polesel, J. (2003). *Undemocratic schooling: Equity and quality in mass secondary education in Australia*. Melbourne University Publishing, Carlton, Vic.
- Teese, R. (2006). "Condemned to Innovate." *Griffith Review*, 11, page numbers???
- The Allen Consulting Group (2003a). *Overview of transition programs - policies and programs*, Business Council of Australia.
- (2003b). *The Cost of Dropping Out: The Economic Impact of Early School Leaving*, Business Council of Australia, Melbourne.
- (2003c). *The Economy Wide Benefits of Increasing the Proportion of Students Achieving Year 12 Equivalent Education: Modelling Results*, Business Council of Australia, Melbourne.
- Thomson, P. (2002). *Schooling the rustbelt kids: Making the difference in changing times*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, N.S.W.
- Trueba, H., & Goldman, S. (1987). Organizing classroom instruction in a sociocultural context: Teaching Mexican youth to write in English. In S. Goldman & H. Trueba (Eds.), *Becoming literate in English as a second language: Advanced in research and theory* (pp. 235-252). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Trueba, E. T. (1999). *Latinos unidos : From cultural diversity to the politics of solidarity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman

& Littlefield

Tyler, D. & Stokes, H. (1997). *Rethinking Inter-Agency Collaboration and Young People*. Melbourne: Language Australia and Youth Research Centre.

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Valdes, G. (1999). Incipient bilingualism and the development of English language writing abilities in the secondary school. In C. Faltis and P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism and ESL*, (pp. 138-175). New York: Teacher's College Press.

Valencia, R. (Ed.) (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York: Falmer.

Valencia, R. R. (1997). *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990s*. London, England: Falmer Press.

Valencia, R. R., & Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Contemporary deficit thinking. In, R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The Evolution of Deficit Thinking: Educational Thought and Practice* (pp. 160-210). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Villenas, S., & Deyhle, D. (1999). Critical race theory and ethnographies challenging the stereotypes: Latina/o families, schooling, resilience and resistance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(4) (winter 1999). 415-45.

Watson, L & Ryan, C (2010). 'Choosers and losers: the impact of government subsidies on Australian secondary schools.' *Australian Journal of Education*, 54, 86—107.

Webb, R., & Vulliamy, G. (2001). Joining up the solutions: The rhetoric and practice of inter-agency cooperation. *Children & Society*, 15(5), 315-332.

Werner, E. (1996). How children become resilient: Observations and cautions. *Resiliency in Action*, 1(1). 18-24.

Willis, S. (1999), *I am a true believer - so why do I feel so uneasy*. Western Australian Teachers Union State Executive, Perth.

Young, K. (2000). *Identifying good practice in supporting youth transitions to independence*. DETYA Commonwealth of Australia, ACT.

Zavela, K. J. (2002). Developing effective school-based drug abuse prevention programs. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 26(4), 252-265.

Zyngier, D. & Gale, T. (2003). *Non-Traditional and Non-systemic Educational Programs in Frankston Mornington Peninsula Secondary Schools*. Melbourne: Faculty of Education, Monash University.

APPENDIX A: EFFECTIVE ALTERNATE PROGRAMS BEING CONDUCTED IN AUSTRALIA

The following review of literature is based on having highlighted, from relevant literature, at least 178 differently-named characteristics of good practice in relation to students at risk of early school leaving or of non-completion and/or dis-engagement from school. Such characteristics are grouped, as follows, on the basis of their focus (e.g., program, student, teacher, and community). The numbers after each statement indicate how many different characteristics were “bundled” together under each particular heading. Note that some characteristics were placed into more than one category.

Program Focus

- real life issues of immediate relevance (13)
- integration into mainstream (10)
- use integrated approach across many subject areas (7)
- separate streaming - withdrawal (2)
- emphasis on basic skills and remediation (1)

Student Focus

- student wellbeing (20)
- responding to student needs (17)
- students having control of their lives - student empowerment (12)
- high expectations and challenge (10)
- long term training and future needs(9)
- student involvement in planning (7)
- students as active learners (5)

Teacher Focus

- importance of positive student teacher relationships (17)
- selection of quality teachers and continuous teacher training (14)
- school leadership and vision (2)

Community Focus

- community connectedness – involvement of and engagement with students’ world (21)
- collaboration with community organisations and groups (8)

APPENDIX B: MAJOR REPORTS

The following major reports and meta-reviews were analysed. The brief summaries that follow are based on materials from the reports' own publicity material. All were sourced from the internet.

NATIONAL RESEARCH

Successful outcomes for youth "at-risk": A Resource Kit: Australian National Training Authority. <http://www.det.nsw.edu.au/youth> A resource kit for educators in post compulsory school environment containing information, effective approaches and strategies for providing programs for "at-risk" youth. (PDF 85 pages)

Innovation And Best Practice In Schools: Review Of Literature And Practice Strategic Partners in association with the Centre for Youth Affairs and Development A Research Report prepared for the Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, February 2001 Department Of Education, Training And Youth Affairs (DETYA 2001b) <http://www.dest.gov.au/schools/publications/2001/fss/index.htm>

Full Service Schools Programme 1999 and 2000 National Evaluation Report (117 pages) <http://www.dest.gov.au/schools/publications/2001/fss/evaluation.pdf>

The National Evaluation examined which Full Service School Programme activities worked and what outcomes were achieved. It outlines possible future policy directions in addressing the needs of "at-risk" young people.

Doing It Well: Case Studies of Innovation and Best Practice in Working with "at-risk" Young People (PDF 87 pages) <http://www.dest.gov.au/schools/publications/2001/fss/doing.pdf>

Nineteen examples of innovative and best practice case studies, many from schools that participated in the Full Service Schools Programme, are contained in this report. Participating schools demonstrated their capacity and willingness to meet the needs of students "at-risk" in ways that greatly enhance a student's potential to succeed. The activities cover approaches taken at the systemic, community, school and student level. (DETYA 2001a)

Innovation and Best Practice in Schools: Review of Literature and Practice (PDF 139 pages) <http://www.dest.gov.au/schools/publications/2001/fss/bestpractice.pdf>

This report provides an overview of effective intervention strategies, both nationally and internationally, designed to assist "at-risk" students and reduce early school leaving. The literature review demonstrated that schools are being asked to respond to a complex and changing environment from which many young people are becoming disengaged. The case studies illustrate the considerable activity in schools and the broader community to address the needs of these young people.

Building Relationships: Making Education Work. A Report on the Perspectives of Young People (PDF 145 pages) (Australian Centre for Equity through Education & the Australian Youth Research Centre 2001) <http://www.dest.gov.au/schools/publications/2001/fss/buildingrelationships.pdf>

This report outlines the views of young people on school, further education, training and employment opportunities. It found they view education as a major pathway to achieving their goals, but that good relationships with teachers and the wider school community are vital if they are to remain at school. Students "at-risk" share similar dreams and aspirations to other young people. Their difficulty lies in realising their ambitions. Approximately 1400 young people throughout Australia who were identified, by their schools or communities, as being "at-risk" of not completing secondary education. The conclusions are not based on any 'objective' assessment of 'what works' for these young people or on an attempt to document 'best practice': such program documentation or evaluation was not within the scope of this research. Neither are these conclusions and recommendations based on agency, school, worker or teacher perceptions. Rather, the synthesis and analysis of these young people's responses and perspectives presented in this report leads to these proposals.

Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (Lingard, Ladwig & et al. 2001a, 2001b) was a three-year intensive observation of 24 representative state primary and secondary schools undertaken by some of Australia's pre-eminent educational thinkers. Almost 1000 separate lessons were carefully observed and analysed according to international methodology across a variety of subjects and years levels. The final report is in two volumes. Together they represent the largest and most detailed school reform study, almost 500 pages of the most exhaustive and important education research undertaken in Australia.

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

OECD Proceedings Preparing Youth for the 21st Century: The Transition from Education to the Labour Market: Proceedings of the Washington D.C. Conference -- 23-24 February 1999.

<http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/pub/oezd/youth.pdf> OECD, August 1999. (Mortimore & Mortimore 1999)

This publication points the way to future initiatives to improve youth labour market and educational outcomes as identified by policy-makers and experts of OECD countries brought together at the Washington Conference "Preparing Youth for the 21st Century: The Policy Lessons from the Past Two Decades", held on 23-24 February 1999. It first puts today's challenges into a historical perspective by taking stock of two decades of policies for youth employment. But more substantially, this book provides insight into experiences and policy issues in the United States, as well as in Europe and Japan, with a stress on the special needs of disadvantaged youth.

Innovating Schools. OECD, April 1999. <http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/pub/oezd/inovating.pdf>

It is now widely agreed that learning is pivotal in the "knowledge societies" of today and, still more, of tomorrow. It is also widely agreed that schools have a key role to play in laying the foundations for lifelong learning for all, not just the at-risk". But, how well are these aims being met? How innovative are schools as institutions? And what are some of the most promising examples across OECD countries from which we can learn? This volume addresses these questions, drawing on a major OECD/Japan conference which was held in Hiroshima and attended by experts from 24 countries and a "virtual" conference conducted in parallel. It presents key trends and policy challenges regarding schools for today and tomorrow, from European traditions across to the different perspectives of the Asia-Pacific region, with a particular focus on Japan. Alongside expert chapters are the innovative schools themselves, with examples taken and synthesised from many of the countries that attended the Hiroshima conference. The volume addresses issues of curriculum, innovation and the achievement of lifelong learning in the schools of tomorrow.

What Works in Innovation in Education: Motivating Students for Lifelong Learning. OECD, 2000. <http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/pub/oezd/lifemot.pdf>

How to engage and maintain teenagers' interest in school "work"? Young children rarely lack curiosity, but as they enter the teenage years their appetite for learning often appears to shrink. Many eventually drop out before the end of compulsory schooling. Others continue to turn up for school but make the minimum effort. They are present in body, but not in mind. Such problems are generally associated with Western countries but even Japan and Korea, two of the most academically successful Pacific Rim nations, are not immune. These figures take on new significance in an era when one of the essential survival tools for individuals -- and nations -- is a willingness to learn and re-learn. What can governments and education systems do to inculcate the "zest for learning" that young people will need if they are to thrive in 21st-century post-industrial societies? This is one of the key questions which is addressed in this review of eight countries offering innovative schemes that appear to be developing the skills and attitudes necessary for lifelong learning. (135 pages)

Making the Curriculum Work. OECD, November 1998. <http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/pub/oezd/kurikulum.pdf>

How can curriculum content be adjusted to tomorrow's needs? Can student assessment help make curricula more relevant? How can further training for teachers make their teaching more effective? These questions lie at the heart of curriculum reform, which is unanimously ranked among the top priorities in education, but often approached too narrowly. To be truly effective, curricula must be fully consistent with both teaching

practice and education policy. They must also equip students for the challenge of lifelong learning. Making the Curriculum Work approaches these interlinked imperatives via detailed analysis of the most recent experience and innovation in a number of countries, throwing new light on the curriculum issue. (128 pages)

Overcoming Failure at School. OECD, November 1998. <http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/pub/oecd/failure.pdf>

Failure at school: an old problem in a new context? In most OECD countries, there is some reluctance to acknowledge the problem of failure at school. And when the problem is acknowledged, it is not always easy to find effective means for combating it or, even, to agree on indicators of failure that would demonstrate its scale. What are the different manifestations of educational failure today? And what are the policies needed to address them? This book aims to develop a deeper understanding of the nature of failure at school in OECD countries. It restates the problem as it confronts policy-makers today and presents new findings. It proposes a set of national and international indicators of failure and compares various forms of intervention aimed at improving student achievement in Australia, Belgium, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Spain and the United Kingdom.

APPENDIX C: LEARNING CHOICES ANALYSIS

Details of 107 selected programs highlighted by the Dusseldorp Skills Forum, as duplicated from the Learning Choices website (<http://www.learningchoices.org.au/programs/index.php>)

Learning	Well-being	Pathways	Pullout from Mainstream	Externally provided	Internally provided	Program/Provider with link/overview
X			X		X	<p>Aldridge Secondary High School Alternative Education Program</p> <p>Boys Ave, Maryborough, QLD, 4650 Telephone: (07) 4120 8444</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Alternate Class is an individual program offered to our identified male students focusing on social, behavioural, and academic needs. This class has been developed and fosters the principals of boys' education by Dr Ian Lillyco and the Boys Forward Institute. This class focuses on the four core subject areas of Maths, English, Science and Social Studies.</p>
x	x	x	x	x		<p>Anglicare Y Connect Program Flexible Learning Options</p> <p>18 King William Rd, North Adelaide, SA, 5006 Telephone: (08) 8305 9200</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Y Connect is an Anglicare SA program that partners with high school students in order to provide '\Flexible Learning Options\' (FLO) - alternative education options due to their disengagement from main stream school. Y Connect aims to re-engage young people through one-on-one support, provision of life skills, social development, and accredited learning. The Y Connect program assists young people to develop the skills needed to</p>

						make good life choices for furthering their education and future career pathways.
x		x	x		x	<p><u>Australind SHS Senior School Engagement Program (SSEP)</u></p> <p>Break O\`Day Dr, Australind, WA, 6233 Telephone: (08) 9797 4400</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Senior School Engagement Programs are designed to support young people in Years 11 and 12. Engagement Programs assist students to develop awareness, skills, knowledge and personal attributes that will enable them to better access further education, training and / or employment.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Ballajura Community College ACCESS Senior Schooling Engagement Program</u></p> <p>Illawarra Cres, Ballajura, WA, 6066 Telephone: (08) 9262 7928</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>This is a full time course for students not intending to sit university entry exams at the end of Year 12, but who instead will complete Year 11 and/or Year 12 before entering TAFE WA, Apprenticeships or the workforce.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Belmont High School</u></p> <p>424 Pacific Hwy, Belmont, NSW, 2280 Telephone: (02) 4945 0600</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its</p>

						philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Birdwood High School</p> <p>Shannon St, Birdwood, SA, 5234 Telephone: (08) 8568 5100</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Blue Gum Community College</p> <p>114 Maitland St, Hackett, ACT, 2602 Telephone: (02) 6230 6776</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia aims to stimulate vital changes in Australian education by</p>

						generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work in partnership with their greater communities. Our philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time." We promote and create personalised education programs that are unique for each student. We believe that true learning takes place when each student is an active participant in his or her education, when his or her course of study is personalised by teachers, parents and mentors who know him or her well, and when school-based learning is blended with outside experiences that heighten the student's interest.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Canberra College</p> <p>Fremantle Drv, Stirling, ACT, 2611 Telephone: (02) 6205 5777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Students who enrol in the Big Picture Program can be disconnected from education and their performance has generally been held back due to a lack of motivation towards their schooling. Most students are capable of high levels of achievement and therefore need to have a more goal oriented approach to their work. Coaching, mentoring and real world learning or training all assist students to "catch up" with their cohort. The program is deliberately kept to 30 students in total for Years 11 and 12.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Caroline Chisolm School Senior Campus</p> <p>108 Hambidge Cres, Chisholm, ACT, 2905 Telephone: (02) 6205 7277</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia aims to stimulate vital changes in Australian education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work in partnership with their greater communities. Our philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time." We promote and create personalised education programs that are unique for each student. We believe that true learning takes place when each student is an active</p>

						participant in his or her education, when his or her course of study is personalised by teachers, parents and mentors who know him or her well, and when school-based learning is blended with outside experiences that heighten the student's interest.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Child Side High School</p> <p>32 Armstrong Rd, Boyanup, WA, 6237 Telephone: (08) 9731 5232</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Clarence High School</p> <p>Wentworth Street, Bellerive, TAS, 7018 Telephone: (03) 6244-2544</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes</p>

						that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Corinda State High School</u></p> <p>46 Pratten St, Corinda, QLD, 4075 Telephone: (07) 3379 0222</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Corinda State High School develops young people who can participate in a dynamic society, take responsibility for themselves, engage in life-long learning and contribute to the stewardship of the Earth.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Croydon Community School</u></p> <p>177-181 Mt Dandenong Rd (Cnr. Anzac St), Croydon, VIC, 3136 Telephone: (03) 9724 2900</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Croydon Community School is a small government secondary school located in Croydon. The school has a current enrolment of 110 students in Years 7-12 and attracts young people from across a wide area. The school provides an alternate secondary education to students who for various reasons have experienced difficulty in their previous schools, or who are returning to study in order to prepare for work or further study. Croydon Community School provides a learning environment which is supportive and safe. It promotes close and constructive relationships between parents, students and staff and individualises programs to effectively meet the needs of each student.</p>

x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Erindale College</p> <p>McBryde Cres, Wanniasa, ACT, 2903 Telephone: (02) 6205 8111</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Big Picture inspired Academy has been designed to meet the needs of a diverse range of students in both Year 11 and 12. ... The key to achievement in a Big Picture school lies in fostering students individual interests, encouraging their active participation in the learning process, and developing their ability to apply knowledge and skills to real life experience and challenges. Erindale College students ... have been recommended for the program, or ... have self-identified.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Glebe High Sydney Secondary College</p> <p>Blackwattle Bay Campus Taylor St, Glebe, NSW, 2037 Telephone: (02) 9399 1000</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Glebe Pathway</p>

						<p>Pathways Campus 84 Glebe Point Rd, Glebe, NSW, 2037 Telephone: (02) 9660 5688</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Hunter Sports High School</u></p> <p>Pacific Hwy, Gateshead, NSW, 2290 Telephone: (02) 49435755</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>

x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Jordan River Learning Federation</p> <p>55 Eddington Street, Bridgewater, TAS, 7030 Telephone: (03) 62625500</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Through the Big Picture program in Years 9 and 10 and an emphasis on Individual Learning Plans in Year 8 we take care to help students learn at the individual level (School website/About us/General)</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Lake Tuggeranong College</p> <p>Cowlishaw St, Tuggeranong, ACT, 2901 Telephone: (02) 6205 6222</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia aims to stimulate vital changes in Australian education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work in partnership with their greater communities. Our philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time." We promote and create personalised education programs that are unique for each student. We believe that true learning takes place when each student is an active participant in his or her education, when his or her course of study is personalised by teachers, parents and mentors who know him or her well, and when school-based learning is blended with outside experiences that heighten the student's interest.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Launceston City Campus</p> <p>Invermay Road, Launceston, TAS, 7250 Telephone: (03) 6262 5500</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and</p>

						changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Manjimup Senior High School</u></p> <p>Rutherford St, Manjimup, WA, 6258 Telephone: (08) 9777 0500</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Montrose Bay High School</u></p> <p>Elmsleigh Road, Moonah, TAS, 7010 Telephone: (03) 6272-2493</p> <p>Program Description</p>

						<p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Ogilvie High School</p> <p>228 New Town Road, New Town, TAS, 7008 Telephone: (03) 62288800</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Prospect High School</p>

						<p>Ralph Street, Prospect, TAS, 7250 Telephone: (03) 6344-4744</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Big Picture Education Reece High School</u></p> <p>Middle Road, Devonport, TAS, 7310 Telephone: (03) 6420-8100</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>

x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Scottsdale High School</p> <p>20 Coplestone Street, Scottsdale, TAS, 7260 Telephone: (03) 6352 2477</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>"Scottsdale High School is a Big Picture Inspired schoolThere are two advisories in the program each with 15 students (One grade 9 and one grade 10) and are called the Think BIG class Students involved participate in option subjects, community service, tutorials, internships and are required to conduct two learning exhibitions per yearThe Think BIG class appeals to students with a wide range of academic ability and interests" (School website/ Subjects/ Think Big)</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Silkwood School</p> <p>39 Shepherd Hill Lne, Mount Nathan, QLD, 4211 Telephone: (07) 5596 2266</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>We are an independent school offering a unique developmental and student-centred approach to education. We have a professional and talented team dedicated to our vision of providing an education that encourages young people to realise their potential and discover pathways for their future. We invite you to come on a journey to discover more about our school◆ the "Silkwood Educational Experience" is like no other!</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education SMYL Community College CARE school</p> <p>32 Tesla Rd, Rockingham, WA, 6168 Telephone: (08) 9550 9400</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital</p>

						changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education South Lake Ottey Family and Neighbourhood Centre</p> <p>2A South Lake Drv, South Lake, WA, 6164 Telephone: (08) 9417 2372</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education St Johns Park High School</p> <p>Mimosa Rd, St Johns Park, NSW, 2176 Telephone: (02) 9610-8035</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Thornlie Senior High Big Picture Academy</p> <p>319-323 Spencer Rd, Thornlie, WA, 6108 Telephone: (08) 9459 2544</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>

x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Toronto High School</p> <p>Field Ave, Toronto, NSW, 2283 Telephone: (02) 4959 1788</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Tranby College</p> <p>17 Tranby Drv, Baldivis, WA, 6171 Telephone: (08) 9524 2424</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater</p>

						communities.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Valley View Secondary School</p> <p>240 Wright Rd, Para Vista, SA, 5093 Telephone: 08 8360 6111</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Wanniasa School Senior Campus</p> <p>Wheeler Cres, Wanniasa, ACT, 2903 Telephone: (02) 6205 6178</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>A Big Picture program is currently offered to interested students in Years 9 and 10. Students who choose this pathway have the opportunity to design their learning around their areas of interest, using the Big Picture Education Australia design principles. This program is open to all students and meets the Year 10 Certificate requirements. ... Students design and complete four individual learning plans in a year, incorporating the Big Picture Learning Goals Empirical Reasoning, Quantitative Reasoning, Communication, Social Reasoning and Personal Qualities, with the close individual</p>

						involvement of their AG teacher/s.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Education Yule Brook College</p> <p>61 Dellar Rd, Maddington, WA, 6109 Telephone: (08) 9251 8333</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The college has adopted Big Picture Education Australia (BP) principles which have led us to rethink and redesign curriculum delivery; it was a bold step forward which has transformed how we operate and it could not have happened if we did not have the support of all stakeholders. BP principles set the priorities for our program which includes pedagogy (how we teach and learn) and community (how we relate to one another). BP engages significant family/community involvement which grows a strong effective culture. It enables our staff to personalise learning and support the personal development of our students with an intimate knowledge of our students and their families. Big Picture Education Australia (BPEA) is a non-profit company aiming to stimulate vital changes to Australian education by starting innovative and successful schools and changing the conversation around education. It wants to make schools better. Its philosophy is grounded in educating "one student at a time". We promote the creation of personalised education programs that are unique for each student. BPEA believes that too many of our young people are failing in our schools. This is because for too many young people school is not relevant to lives and needs and they do not become engaged in learning. We want to make vital changes in education by generating and sustaining innovative, personalised schools that work with the real world of their greater communities.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Big Picture Yea High School</p> <p>Racecourse Rd, Yea, VIC, 3717 Telephone: (03) 5797 2207</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>Yea High School is a co-educational secondary college with an enrolment of 320 students situated 100 kilometres from Melbourne. The school runs an outreach program for students who were previously not connected with education - the Access Yea Community Education (AYCE) Program. The school is a vibrant learning institution with a progressive attitude to curriculum programs and education provision. Yea High School is a Big Picture Inspired school which currently runs a Big Picture academy in Year 9 for two classes of students. Students apply to join these classes and the teacher student ratio in advisory classes is 1:12. Students spend 10 periods a week in advisory groups and come together as one class for 5 periods of English and 5 periods of mathematics. In addition all students undertake a community connections project for 6 periods and sport for 4 periods.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Broome Senior High School Senior School Engagement Program (SSEP)</p> <p>69 Frederick St, Broome, WA, 6725 Telephone: (08) 9192 2502</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Senior School Engagement Programs are designed to support young people in Years 11 and 12. Engagement Programs assist students to develop awareness, skills, knowledge and personal attributes that will enable them to better access further education, training and / or employment.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Canberra College Futures Program</p> <p>Launceston St, Phillip, ACT, 2606 Telephone: (02) 6205 5782</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>A highly respected college disability education/student engagement program ... that builds on the individual strengths and interests of all students. This is embodied in the Program's philosophy of supporting students to become the best they can be, encouraging students to develop a strong platform to support their transition to life after college and celebrating their achievements as young individuals.</p>
x	x	x	x	x		<p>Centacare Catholic Flexible Learning Options</p> <p>38 Cudmore Terrace, Whyalla, SA, 5600 Telephone: (08) 8645 8233</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>FLO is a program that enables schools to flexibly engage individual students in school/community learning. Centacare Catholic Country SA staff work within the FLO program to provide individual case management to young people for the purpose of addressing the barriers (personal and learning) that prevent successful engagement and retention. FLO utilises a community partnership approach with the purpose of value-adding to current supports. Case Management is provided to each student for one hour per week and can be provided at the young person's home, school and community agencies.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Christies Beach High School - Centacare Coolock House Program</p> <p>Coolock House Elizabeth Rd, Christie Downs, SA, 5164 Telephone: 08 8329 9777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Christies Beach High School has a range of off-campus programs to support students that do not fit into the mainstream schooling environment. These programs are funded through ICAN FLO funding. Students must be FLO eligible to access these programs</p>

						unless otherwise negotiated.
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Christies Beach High School - Centacare Louise Place Program</u></p> <p>Fullarton Road, Christie Downs, SA, 5164 Telephone: 08 8329 9777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Christies Beach High School has a range of off-campus programs to support students that do not fit into the mainstream schooling environment. These programs are funded through ICAN FLO funding. Students must be FLO eligible to access these programs unless otherwise negotiated.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Christies Beach High School - Flexible and Accredited Meaningful Education Program</u></p> <p>Southern Life Church, 280 Beach Rd, Christie Downs, SA, 5164 Telephone: 08 8329 9777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Christies Beach High School has a range of off-campus programs to support students that do not fit into the mainstream schooling environment. These programs are funded through ICAN FLO funding. Students must be FLO eligible to access these programs unless otherwise negotiated.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Christies Beach High School - Hallett Cove Youth Project Youth Choices Program</u></p> <p>O'Hallarin Hill TAFE Campus, Majors Rd, Hallett Cove, SA, 5158 Telephone: 08 8329 9777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Christies Beach High School has a range of off-campus programs to support students that do not fit into the mainstream schooling environment. These programs are funded</p>

						through ICAN FLO funding. Students must be FLO eligible to access these programs unless otherwise negotiated.
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Christies Beach High School - Learning Together Program</u></p> <p>Christie Downs Primary School, Elizabeth Rd, Christie Downs, SA, 5164 Telephone: 08 8329 9777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Christies Beach High School has a range of off-campus programs to support students that do not fit into the mainstream schooling environment. These programs are funded through ICAN FLO funding. Students must be FLO eligible to access these programs unless otherwise negotiated.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Christies Beach High School - Southern Offcampus Learning Experience</u></p> <p>Southern Youth Xchange, 13 McKinna Rd, Christie Downs, SA, 5164 Telephone: 08 8329 9777</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Christies Beach High School has a range of off-campus programs to support students that do not fit into the mainstream schooling environment. These programs are funded through ICAN FLO funding. Students must be FLO eligible to access these programs unless otherwise negotiated.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Clontarf Football Academy Esperance Senior High School</u></p> <p>Pink Lake Rd, Esperance, WA, 6450 Telephone: (08) 9071 9555</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>The Clontarf Foundation exists to improve the education, discipline, self esteem, life skills and employment prospects of young Aboriginal men and by doing so, equip them to participate more meaningfully in society. Using the passion that Aboriginal boys have for football allows Clontarf to attract the boys to school. But it is not a sporting program. Each Clontarf Academy, formed in partnership with the local school, is focussed on encouraging behavioural change, developing positive attitudes, assisting students to complete school and secure employment. Fundamental to this, is the development of values, skills and abilities that will assist the boys to achieve better life outcomes. Through a diverse mix of activities, the full-time, local Clontarf staff mentor and counsel students while the school caters for the educational needs of each student.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Clontarf Football Academy Mildura Academy Chaffey Secondary College</u></p> <p>Deakin Ave, Mildura, VIC, 3500 Telephone: (03) 5021 2911</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Clontarf Foundation exists to improve the education, discipline, self esteem, life skills and employment prospects of young Aboriginal men and by doing so, equip them to participate more meaningfully in society. Using the passion that Aboriginal boys have for football allows Clontarf to attract the boys to school. But it is not a sporting program. Each Clontarf Academy, formed in partnership with the local school, is focussed on encouraging behavioural change, developing positive attitudes, assisting students to complete school and secure employment. Fundamental to this, is the development of values, skills and abilities that will assist the boys to achieve better life outcomes. Through a diverse mix of activities, the full-time, local Clontarf staff mentor and counsel students while the school caters for the educational needs of each student.</p>

x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Clontarf Football Academy Robinvale Academy Robinvale Secondary College</u></p> <p>Latje Rd, Robinvale, VIC, 3549 Telephone: (03) 5026 3704</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Clontarf Foundation exists to improve the education, discipline, self esteem, life skills and employment prospects of young Aboriginal men and by doing so, equip them to participate more meaningfully in society. Using the passion that Aboriginal boys have for football allows Clontarf to attract the boys to school. But it is not a sporting program. Each Clontarf Academy, formed in partnership with the local school, is focussed on encouraging behavioural change, developing positive attitudes, assisting students to complete school and secure employment. Fundamental to this, is the development of values, skills and abilities that will assist the boys to achieve better life outcomes. Through a diverse mix of activities, the full-time, local Clontarf staff mentor and counsel students while the school caters for the educational needs of each student.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Clontarf Football Academy Swan Hill Academy Swan Hill College</u></p> <p>Pye St, Swan Hill, VIC, 3585 Telephone: (03) 5032 9360</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Clontarf Foundation exists to improve the education, discipline, self esteem, life skills and employment prospects of young Aboriginal men and by doing so, equip them to participate more meaningfully in society. Using the passion that Aboriginal boys have for football allows Clontarf to attract the boys to school. But it is not a sporting program. Each Clontarf Academy, formed in partnership with the local school, is focussed on encouraging behavioural change, developing positive attitudes, assisting students to complete school and secure employment. Fundamental to this, is the development of values, skills and abilities that will assist the boys to achieve better life outcomes. Through a diverse mix of activities, the full-time, local Clontarf staff mentor and counsel</p>

						students while the school caters for the educational needs of each student.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Clontarf Football Academy Warrnambool Academy Brauer College</p> <p>Grafton Rd, Warrnambool, VIC, 3280 Telephone: (03) 5564 4444</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Clontarf Foundation exists to improve the education, discipline, self esteem, life skills and employment prospects of young Aboriginal men and by doing so, equip them to participate more meaningfully in society. Using the passion that Aboriginal boys have for football allows Clontarf to attract the boys to school. But it is not a sporting program. Each Clontarf Academy, formed in partnership with the local school, is focussed on encouraging behavioural change, developing positive attitudes, assisting students to complete school and secure employment. Fundamental to this, is the development of values, skills and abilities that will assist the boys to achieve better life outcomes. Through a diverse mix of activities, the full-time, local Clontarf staff mentor and counsel students while the school caters for the educational needs of each student.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Coodanup Community College Focus Program</p> <p>Coodanup Community College, Mandurah, WA, 6210 Telephone: (08) 9581 0900</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Coodanup Community College is a school for all students and provides opportunities for every student to experience success within a fair, nurturing and caring environment which will enable all students to develop a pathway that is useful, productive and ultimately lead to a satisfying future. At Coodanup a range of pathways and learning experiences for students are provided to cater for individual needs and interests.</p>

x		x	x		x	<p><u>Coorparoo Secondary College Adult Secondary Education</u></p> <p>Cnr Stanley St East & Cavendish Rd, COORPAROO DC, QLD, 4151 Telephone: (07) 3394 8830</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Welcome to Coorparoo Secondary College where we pride ourselves on working with each student, his/her parents and the community to deliver a world class secondary education. We believe this will empower our students to confidently and competently seek future opportunities and positively manage the challenges they are bound to face in both their future personal and professional lives.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Denison College School within a School (SWAS)</u></p> <p>Denison College, Bathurst High Campus, Hope St, Bathurst, NSW, 2795 Telephone: (02) 6331 3755</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>School Within a School targets a small group of students in Year 10 and provides an alternate pathway for those who might otherwise find it difficult to engage with mainstream curriculum. In partnership with a number of agencies, including TAFE and Central West Community College, this program has proven successful in helping young people to achieve a number of very worthwhile credentials and go on to either continue their studies in Year 11, or transition into the workforce.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Dickson College Connect 10</u></p> <p>Phillip Ave, Dickson, ACT, 2602 Telephone: (02) 6205 6455</p> <p>Program Description</p>

						This program provides you with flexible learning opportunities to achieve an adult year 10 equivalent relevant to your intended learning and/or training pathways.
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Duncraig Senior High School ACCESS Senior Schooling Engagement Program (SSEP)</u></p> <p>27 Readshaw Rd, Duncraig, WA, 6023 Telephone: (08) 6241 5000</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The ACCESS Program is a course designed for Senior School students who are aiming to pursue post school options such as employment, apprenticeships, traineeships or TAFE studies. The goal of the program is to provide these young adults with the necessary transferable skills and experience to achieve their greatest potential whilst maximising their competitiveness in the post school options of training and employment. ACCESS will present students with the opportunity to participate in a flexible learning program designed to meet the requirements of WACE (Western Australian Certificate of Education). The added advantages of a high level of individual tuition (a maximum of 18 students in the course), ongoing academic monitoring and specifically tailored vocational courses to suit student aspirations, all enhance student success.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Eaglehawk Secondary College Outreach Education Program</u></p> <p>Reserve St, Eaglehawk, VIC, 3556 Telephone: 03 5446 8099</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Eaglehawk Secondary College identified a need within the School to better cater for the needs of Students who had severe learning barriers, and hence had become disengaged in the conventional School setting for a number of reasons. It was deemed that the program would need to be held off campus with smaller groups of students, but apart from that, the program was a 'blank slate' from which to set up the programs, structures</p>

						and supports to facilitate improved learning outcomes for these at-risk students.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Edward John Eyre High School - Young Mums Program YMs</p> <p>Grundel St, Whyalla Norrie, SA, 5608 Telephone: 08 86457677</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Edward John Eyre High School's Young Mums (YMs) program has been established to provide educational opportunities for girls who have had, or are about to have, children. Students in this program are supported with a range of subjects which will increase their skills and knowledge of parenting. This may include nutrition, cooking skills, clothing and textiles, as well as numeracy and literacy. Students in this course have the opportunity to complete their SACE and proceed to Tertiary study.</p>
x			x		x	<p>Epping Secondary College Pathways VCAL Career Development</p> <p>McDonalds Rd, Epping, VIC, 3076 Telephone: (03) 9401 2599</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Victorian Certificate of Applied Learning (VCAL) is a hands-on application for students in Years 11 and 12. It gives students practical work related skills, as well as the literacy, numeracy and personal skills they need to take them into further training or their ideal job. And like the VCE, it is an accredited senior secondary qualification. Applied (hands-on) learning is an integral part of the VCAL curriculum. It provides students with real life experiences and direct exposure to industry.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Erina High School TRADESTART</p> <p>Green Central, Kangoo Rd, Kariong, NSW, 2251 Telephone: (02) 4367 7353</p>

					<p>Program Description</p> <p>Trade Start is a DEC alternative learning program which provides an innovative and enterprising educational solution for students designed to offer an opportunity to work towards a qualification, receive accredited training, participate in employment generating activities and to have a pathway to further education, training or employment. Students will also study Preliminary HSC units with a focus on work skills. To be part of the Trade Start program students need to be enrolled in a NSW DET school. Students in this program will be enrolled at Erina High School but will only attend the Green Central facility for lessons.</p>
x	x	x	x	x	<p>Eyre Futures - Flexible Learning Options</p> <p>37 East Tce, Ceduna, SA, 5690 Telephone: (08) 86 252 475</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>What is FLO about? Most young people successfully stay at school and complete year 12. Some young people struggle with staying on for many different reasons. For some young people, they don't see school as relevant, or they have relationship difficulties, or there are health issues that make it difficult for them to learn at school. Flexible Learning Options (FLO) ensure ALL young people have the chance to successfully complete school and get the qualifications they need for a job.</p>
x	x	x	x	x	<p>Eyre Futures - Flexible Learning Options</p> <p>Unit 2/80 Tasman Tce, Port Lincoln, SA, 5606 Telephone: (08)86824177</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>What is FLO about? Most young people successfully stay at school and complete year 12. Some young people struggle with staying on for many different reasons. For some</p>

						<p>young people, they dont see school as relevant, or they have relationship difficulties, or there are health issues that make it difficult for them to learn at school. Flexible Learning Options (FLO) ensure ALL young people have the chance to successfully complete school and get the qualifications they need for a job.</p>
x		x	x	x		<p><u>Fresh Learning for Youth (FLY) Program</u></p> <p>88 Fitzgerald St, Northam, WA, 6401 Telephone: (08) 9621 1999</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The FLY program helps students from Northam, Moora, Merredin and across the Wheatbelt become work-ready by giving them the confidence, discipline and skills they need to enter a workplace - while also gaining practical qualifications such as first aid certificates. FLY students can learn trade skills through practical work as they renovate buildings and undertake tangible projects, or they can participate in activities including sport, cooking, computer skills, art, music, media and horticulture.</p>
x	x		x	x		<p><u>Gateway Community Health Highwater Theatre Program</u></p> <p>97 Ashworth St, Albert Park, VIC, 3206 Telephone: (03) 9699 5961</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The program is an arts based program for high risk young people, aged 12-15 years of age (out of school; involved with Juvenile Justice, Child Protection; Youth Welfare Agency) in the Wodonga area. HighWater Theatre is a joint initiative between Somebody's Daughter Theatre, Gateway Community Health Service and the Department of Education and Training (Vic). The young people along with professional artists will constitute a local theatre team aimed at drug prevention and improving teenage emotional and physical wellbeing. It will also provide education and training for those</p>

						who work with individuals experiencing drug, alcohol and emotional health issues.
x	x		x	x		<p><u>Gateway Community Health Highwater Theatre Program</u></p> <p>Gateway Is, Wodonga, VIC, 3690 Telephone: (02) 60212811</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The program is an arts based program for high risk young people, aged 12-15 years of age (out of school; involved with Juvenile Justice, Child Protection; Youth Welfare Agency) in the Wodonga area. HighWater Theatre is a joint initiative between Somebody's Daughter Theatre, Gateway Community Health Service and the Department of Education and Training (Vic). The young people along with professional artists will constitute a local theatre team aimed at drug prevention and improving teenage emotional and physical wellbeing. It will also provide education and training for those who work with individuals experiencing drug, alcohol and emotional health issues.</p>
x			x		x	<p><u>Gateway Program</u></p> <p>Pau St, Lithgow, NSW, 2790 Telephone: (02) 6352 1422</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Governor Stirling Senior High School Bassendean Accessing Careers and Employment (ACE) (SSEP)</u></p> <p>Reid St, Bassendean, WA, 6054 Telephone: (08) 9379 5166</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>ACE is a Senior School Engagement Program (SSEP) offering an alternative for Years 11 and 12 in a vocational education and training environment. The ACE Program provides</p>

						opportunities for students to successfully complete secondary graduation or to transition successfully to training or employment through alternative programs that focus on skill acquisition and life skills. Senior School Engagement Programs are designed to support young people in Years 11 and 12. Engagement Programs assist students to develop awareness, skills, knowledge and personal attributes that will enable them to better access further education, training and / or employment.
x	x	x	x	x		<p>Grampians Community Health (with Stawell Secondary College) Tribal Youth Central Connect</p> <p>Patrick St, Stawell, VIC, 3380 Telephone: (03) 5358 1700</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>A program run in conjunction with the Stawell Secondary College, Tribal Youth, Lenzone (CGLLEN) and Ballarat Group Training (Youth Pathways) to provide an alternative education for disengaged youth in the area. Students will build skills in literacy, numeracy, living skills, personal development, work related skills, SOSE and vocational pathways. Contact Stawell Secondary College on 5358 1700</p>
x			x		x	<p>Halls Creek District High School Pathways Program</p> <p>Thomas St, Halls Creek, WA, 6770 Telephone: (08) 9168 6082</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Huonville Highschool Future Boost</p> <p>82 Wilmot Road, Huonville, TAS, 7109 Telephone: (03) 6264 8800</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>John XXIII College Vocational Program</p>

						<p>Mooro Drv, Mt Claremont, WA, 6010 Telephone: (08) 9383 0400</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Innovative Skills Training and Education Program (INSTEP) is a program enabling students to undertake workplace learning and VET Courses ... as part of their Western Australian Certificate of Education. John XXIII College students apply for entry into INSTEP West by a selection interview.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Kalamunda Senior High School Work Links Program</p> <p>12 Cotherstone Rd, Kalamunda, WA, 6076 Telephone: (08) 9293 6457</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Work Links program gives ... students the ability to consider upper school training for the workplace without needing to complete TEE or WSA subject selection. However, Work Links also gives students the ability to graduate at year twelve and obtain WACE. A maximum of approximately 20/25 students will be considered and preference, upon application, will be given to students to whom this program may benefit most.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Karratha Senior High School Bridging Course</p> <p>Searipple Rd, Karratha, WA, 6714 Telephone: (08) 9185 2155</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Katanning Senior High School Senior School Engagement Program (SSEP)</p> <p>Golf Links Rod, Katanning, WA, 6317 Telephone: (08) 98219800</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Senior School Engagement Programs are designed to support young people in Years 11</p>

						and 12. Engagement Programs assist students to develop awareness, skills, knowledge and personal attributes that will enable them to better access further education, training and / or employment.
x	x	x	x		x	Kempsey High School The Enterprise Centre 13 Broughton St, Kempsey, NSW, 2440 Telephone: (02) 65626166
x	x	x	x		x	Lake Tuggeranong College Connect 10 123 Cowlshaw St, Tuggeranong, ACT, 2900 Telephone: (02) 6205 6222 Program Description This program provides you with flexible learning opportunities to achieve an adult year 10 equivalent relevant to your intended learning and/or training pathways.
x			x		x	Lilydale Heights College VCAL Lilydale Heights College, Nelson Rd, Lilydale, VIC, 3140 Telephone: (03) 9735 1133 Program Description The delivery of VCAL is based on adult learning and youth development principles. These principles have been found to be relevant in providing successful programs for students seeking pathways to further vocational education and training and/or employment. Key features of the VCAL program are: Curriculum that focuses on the nature of work, Commitment to negotiated learning, Opportunities for learning new work and life skills, Valuing and recognising achievements in all areas, Raising self esteem in student, Encouragement of active citizenship, personal development and growth, Partnership approaches to program planning and delivery that link students to the broader

						community.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Lynwood Senior High School LEAF Senior School Engagement Program (SSEP)</p> <p>Metcalfe Rd, Parkwood, WA, 6147 Telephone: (08) 9354 0600</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Senior School Engagement Programs are designed to support young people in Years 11 and 12. Engagement Programs assist students to develop awareness, skills, knowledge and personal attributes that will enable them to better access further education, training and / or employment.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Magone</p> <p>204 Tolosa St, Glenorchy, TAS, 7010 Telephone: (03) 62746087</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Magone Program is a goal oriented, individual intervention designed to re-engage students for mainstream education. The program has an academic focus with all core subjects covered. Students are continually provided with individual support for their academic program in order to assist them make dramatic improvements in their learning. Students are also provided with rich practical learning activities in the manual and visual arts areas. Students are given the opportunity to explore a weekly recreational activity which is both fun and a positive learning experience.</p>
x			x		x	<p>Merredin Senior High School Alternative Pathways Program</p> <p>Woolgar Ave, Merredin, WA, 6415 Telephone: (08) 9041 0900</p>

x	x		x	x	<p><u>Mission Australia Aim'n High Program</u></p> <p>21-25 Liquidamber St, Doveton, VIC, 3177 Telephone: 1800 335 106</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Aim'n High program is a collaboration between Mission Australia, Hallam Senior Secondary College and South East Local Learning and Employment Network. It aims to assist young mothers in the Greater Dandenong region to complete their mainstream education in a supportive learning environment. This program enables young mothers aged 16 to 19 to focus on their school studies off-campus at the Mission Australia Early Learning Service centre in Doveton, while their children receive high-quality care. Aim'n High also provides intensive case management and parenting education to help the young women meet the demands of parenthood and study.</p>
x		x	x	x	<p><u>Mission Australia Language, Literacy & Numeracy Program Hobart</u></p> <p>Suite 3, Level 1, 175 Collins Street, Hobart, TAS, 7112 Telephone: (03) 62346800, 1300 676 937</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Mission Australia's Language, Literacy and Numeracy Program provides training to increase skills in speaking, listening, reading, writing and maths. Our aim is to help remove one of the major barriers to employment and to make life easier for your client. All our courses are available at no cost and are supplied by Mission Australia.</p>
x	x	x	x	x	<p><u>Mission Australia Learning Unlimited - Pathways / WAVE Program</u></p> <p>60 Halifax St, Adelaide, SA, 5000 Telephone: 08 8218 2800</p> <p>Program Description</p>

						<p>Learning Unlimited is a suite of services in South Australia with a focus on working in partnership with schools to meet the needs of young people who are at risk of leaving school or home. Pathways and WAVE engage, empower and inspire young people to rediscover the value of learning. They focus on the needs of young people who are at risk of becoming, or who have become, disengaged from mainstream education. The programs provide practical activities and a 'learning by doing' methodology, which challenge young people and focus on the experience of success through achievement and offers accreditation through Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA). They provide a structured workplace learning environment, offer an awareness and development of local support networks and provide the opportunity to explore and develop transition pathway plans to assist young people with re-entry into mainstream education, employment or enterprise initiatives. Case management is also provided, which addresses the social or emotional issues that have prevented the young person from continuing their education.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Moruya High School Partners in Industry and Education (PIE) Program</u> 97 Albert St, Moruya, NSW, 2537 Telephone: (02) 4474 2155</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Mount Gambier High School - Applied Learning Pathway Programme</u> Brownes Road, Mount Gambier, SA, 5290 Telephone: 08 87256244</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Newman College Churchlands Jean Baptiste Montagne (JBM) Program</u> 216 Empire Ave, Churchlands, WA, 6018 Telephone: (08) 9204 9417</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The JBM Program is an innovative approach ... to meet the specific needs of those students at the College who wish to fast track their career, who may lack interest in the</p>

						school curriculum and/or who may be lacking in motivation, direction or success. ... 3 days per week in school and 2 days out of school on School Apprenticeship Link (SAL) Program ? includes TAFEWA component & on the job training. ? possibility to undertake a school based traineeship or school based apprenticeship instead of the SAL Program.
x	x	x	x		x	North Albany Senior High School Lead to Succeed Program Anson Rd, Albany, WA, 6330 Telephone: (08) 9892 0707
x	x	x	x		x	Notschool Australia Education Services Australia 182 Fullarton Rd, Dulwich, SA, 5065 Telephone: 08 83343210 Program Description Notschool.net is an ICAN-led project offering a flexible and innovative virtual learning space for young people who have disengaged with their learning. Notschool (e-worx@openaccess) is primarily an individualized learning re-engagement program. The program offers full time, home-based learning for young people, including a Local Project Team, consisting of a Team Leader, Virtual Learning Engagement coordinator and Technician, who are available to Researchers to discuss progress and problems. The aim of the program is to re-engage young people in learning, through an individualized service that supports them to actively and purposely address the social and emotional issues that act as a barrier to them engaging in meaningful learning and earning pathways by rebuilding their confidence, self esteem and social skills.
x	x	x	x		x	Notschool Australia Payneham Rd, Payneham, SA, 5070 Telephone:

					<p>Program Description</p> <p>Notschool.net is an ICAN-led project offering a flexible and innovative virtual learning space for young people who have disengaged with their learning. Notschool (e-worx@openaccess) is primarily an individualized learning re-engagement program. The program offers full time, home-based learning for young people, including a Local Project Team, consisting of a Team Leader, Virtual Learning Engagement coordinator and Technician, who are available to Researchers to discuss progress and problems. The aim of the program is to re-engage young people in learning, through an individualized service that supports them to actively and purposely address the social and emotional issues that act as a barrier to them engaging in meaningful learning and earning pathways by rebuilding their confidence, self esteem and social skills.</p>
x	x	x	x	x	<p><u>Ohana for Youth Coolamon Program</u></p> <p>Level 2, Jandream Plaza23 Nind St, Southport, QLD, 4215 Telephone: 1800 244 744</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Ohana For Youth's Southport location features a purpose-designed training suite that includes child care facilities, aptly named The Baby Academy. The program offers a flexible curriculum provided through accredited training or the School of Distance Education; and we value every individual and strive to provide individualised quality education to meet their needs. Small class sizes, low teacher/student ratio and support provided by volunteer mentors allows our young mums to build trusting relationships with staff and feel fully supported in their learning pursuits. These relationships are critical to the success of Coolamon. This program assists our mums to continue their education through the use of technology, expert tuition and mentoring. Each student will have an individualised learning plan which is developed with Yvette's support. Coolamon aims to change the lives of these young people through care, support, and education. The program will provide many opportunities for personal improvement. We will offer daily sessions and workshops which will provide information and education on</p>

						parenting and life skills.
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Redcliffe Youth Space Checkpoint Peninsula Schools Flexible Learning Program</p> <p>Cnr Anzac and Oxley Ave, Redcliffe, QLD, 4020 Telephone: (07) 3283 8769</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Checkpoint is a vitally important program. Basically it's a flexi-school, which means young people who are having trouble staying in a mainstream school can join Checkpoint and finish their year 10! Checkpoint aims to do a lot of different things; re-engage young people with their educational institution (usually a high school); stop truancy; re-invigorate a young person's desire to learn; support young people who are disengaging from education because they are encountering complex life issues; advocate for young people to schools; support local schools and their behavioural units; support young people to complete their year 10 at the Youth Space or transition into Access 10 at TAFE if they don't want to return to their school.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Rosemount Good Shepherd Study Support Centre</p> <p>440 Marrickville Road, Marrickville, NSW, 2204 Telephone: (02) 8571 7800</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Alternative education program for young people 14 - 18 years offering Years 9 - 12 through Sydney Distance Education High School and various vocational courses.</p>
x			x		x	<p>Scoresby Secondary College VCAL</p> <p>2 Cavell St, Scoresby, VIC, 3179 Telephone: (03) 9765 4199</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>VCAL ? the Victorian Certificate of Applied Learning ? is a separate certificate offered in Years 11 and 12. VCAL should be considered by students who want to develop skills for the workplace. Many VCAL students continue their education at TAFE or as part of Traineeships or Apprenticeships that are started through the VCAL course. Successful outcomes after VCAL could include further study at TAFE, Employment, an Apprenticeship or a Traineeship.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>South Coast Workplace Learning Partners Industry Education (PIE) Program</u></p> <p>Shop 5/73 Vulcan St, Moruya, NSW, 2537 Telephone: (02) 4474 5134</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Partners: Industry and Education Program has been developed to provide selected students at Eurobodalla High Schools with an opportunity to combine in-school learning with a vocational course and structured on-the-job training. The Program will be coordinated by South Coast Workplace Learning in conjunction with the Eurobodalla Shire Council, Schools and several key local business partners. The Program runs from one to three years and targets selected students from the High Schools in the Eurobodalla across years 10 to 12; though may include some year 9 students. Students are enrolled at High School and a local Registered Training Organisation and follow a program that will lead to the completion of a Certificate II level qualification</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Southern River College Work Readiness Program</u></p> <p>Southern River Rd, Gosnells, WA, 6110 Telephone: (08) 9495 3200</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Work Readiness Program at Southern River College is a flexible, inclusive and</p>

						responsive education program for students in Year 10/11 who have become disengaged with school or who would struggle academically with current Senior School requirements. The program is a combination of 3-4 days within school subjects and the off-site program consists of Hillside Farm and/or Workplace Learning opportunities. A small number of students undertake TAFE courses with a possibility of a School Based Traineeship or Apprenticeship
x	x		x		x	<p><u>Spinifex Senior College Alternative Program</u></p> <p>6 -12 Fifth Ave, Mount Isa, QLD, 4825 Telephone: (07) 4740 1111</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Spinifex State College is a three-campus co-educational school, with a Junior, Senior and Residential campus. The school is based on a 'school within a school' concept with a Deputy and Head of Department assigned to, and managing each year level. In addition to this there is also a Pathways Program that caters for students who are not achieving success in the mainstream program. Some of the pathway students attend at the junior campus, some attend a class at senior campus and others attend a class based at Mount Isa Special School.</p>
x	x	x	x	x		<p><u>St Kilda Youth Services SKYS Young Parents</u></p> <p>62 Pickles St, Port Melb., VIC, 3205 Telephone: (03) 96965340</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>We offer a Certificate of General Education for Adults to young mothers and pregnant teenagers; this program allows young parents to attend class with their children. Young parents and pregnant teenagers engage in activities, which centre around parenting and raising children, through this they also engage all the standard aspects of secondary education. Young parents bring their children to class at the Pickles Street education</p>

						centre, which has a dedicated space for the young parents and their children
x	x	x	x	x		<p><u>St Luke's Specialist Teaching Unit</u></p> <p>St Luke's Anglicare, 175-187 Hargreaves St, Bendigo, VIC, 3550 Telephone: (03) 5440 1100</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The focus of the Unit is supporting young people (particularly those in Out of Home Care) to re-engage in education and/or continue their education in situations where they are unable to remain at a mainstream school. The Unit is based on a deemed enrolment scheme where young people are enrolled at surrounding mainstream schools and engage in education programs off campus. The Unit employs five teachers and works with up to 50 young people.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Students With A Goal (SWAG) Flexible Learning Program</u></p> <p>Sunshine Coast PCYC Youth Ave, Nambour, QLD, 4560 Telephone: (07) 5476 4172</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Students with a goal (SWAG) is a crime prevention program which has been conducted by the Sunshine Coast PCYC since January 2004. SWAG is funded by Education Queensland and runs in partnership with Integrated Family and Youth Services (IFYS). The program targets high school aged youth at risk of disengaging from their education and involves the employment of a teacher and teacher aid to provide intensive educational support to these youth. SWAG runs as an annex to Burnside SHS and Nambour SHS.</p>

x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Tom Price Secondary High School Traineeship Program (SSEP)</u></p> <p>Milpera St, Tom Price, WA, 6751 Telephone: (08) 9143 8100</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Traineeship Program is offered onsite at Tom Price Senior High School and is a collaboration of a Senior School Engagement Program and an Aboriginal School Based Training (ASBT) & School Based Training (SBT) preparation program. The major aim of the program is to ensure that students have an alternative option to reduce the chance of disengaging in school, education and training. The program can also provide those who have already disengaged with the system an opportunity to reengage and to develop skills that will allow smooth transition into an ASBT or SBT. Senior School Engagement Programs are designed to support young people in Years 11 and 12. Engagement Programs assist students to develop awareness, skills, knowledge and personal attributes that will enable them to better access further education, training and / or employment.</p>
x	x	x	x	x		<p><u>Uniting Care Wesley Country SA Flexible Learning Options</u></p> <p>60 Florence Street, Port Pirie, SA, 5540 Telephone: 08 8633 8600</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>FLO (Flexible Learning Option) - Partnership between UCWCSA and John Pirie Secondary School. Work in collaboration to engage and retain young people between 12 and 19 that are at risk of leaving school early or have left school without completing year 12</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>University of Canberra Senior Secondary College (UCSSC) Connect 10</u></p> <p>2 Emu Bank, Belconnen, ACT, 2617 Telephone: (02) 62057370</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>This program provides you with flexible learning opportunities to achieve an adult year 10 equivalent relevant to your intended learning and/or training pathways.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Wanneroo Secondary High School (Joondalup Campus)</u></p> <p>McLarty Ave, Joondalup, WA, 6028 Telephone:</p>
x	x		x		x	<p><u>Western Youth Space Flexible Learning Options</u></p> <p>2 Webster Street / Baker Street, Port Adelaide, SA, 5015 Telephone: 08 73244900</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>The Western Youth Space program is a specialist program offered to Western region schools for students that are part of the ICAN/ FLO program. The young people that attend the program are referred from their home school for a diverse range of reasons. Whatever the reason, the one factor that is common to those young people is that they have a very practical way of learning; they don't sit around for too long, they like variety, and it must be hands on doing stuff ! The Youth Space program, is an alternative education space using experiential education methodology, we have a workshop area and a small learning centre/ IT area. The program offers young people the opportunity to re engage in learning through their participation in the workshop/ learning modules that are linked to a very practical hands on approach.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p><u>Wirreanda High School Adaptive Vocational Education (WAVE) and Flexible Learning Options</u></p> <p>105 Richards Drive, Morphett Vale, SA, 5162 Telephone: 08 8329 7253</p>

						<p>Program Description</p> <p>The WAVE program is an alternative pathways program for students that are disengaged with mainstream schooling options. The WAVE program actively engages students through a specialised case management approach that identifies student's individual barriers and tailor makes a program that allows meaningful and accredited/recognised learning and earning pathways throughout the school year. Students that are part of the school WAVE program are classified as Flexible Learning Options (FLO) students. A FLO enrolment allows the WAVE Program to provide students with individualised case management and a learning program through a Flexible Learning Plan (FLP), facilitating successful learning outcomes within a wider learning space.</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Wollongong Flexible Learning Centre</p> <p>450 Princes Hwy, Towradgi, VIC, 2518 Telephone: (02) 4285 6810</p>
x	x	x	x		x	<p>Young Parents Access Program</p> <p>Goldsworthy Rd, Corio, VIC, 3214 Telephone: (03) 751158</p> <p>Program Description</p> <p>Corio Bay Senior College (CBSC) encourages young and expecting parents to continue their education by providing flexible learning options which encompass practical support. The Young Parents Access Program (YPAP) aims to make the transition back to school easier, with intensive case management and on-site child care</p>