

7 The changing character of outdoor education centres in the UK

Geoff Cooper

Introduction

Following the UK election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979, there was a considerable political shift towards right-wing, market-oriented ideals. This process has continued steadily to the present time as the New Labour governments of Blair and later Brown endorsed the neo-liberal model. Policies based on free market economics have wrought dramatic changes on all aspects of society, including education, health, social welfare and employment. This chapter considers how repercussions have spread to outdoor education and outdoor recreation. More particularly it examines the changes brought to outdoor education centres and includes some personal reflections from a long experience of working with young people in this field. To appreciate the changes that have occurred over the past twenty years it is necessary to understand why outdoor education centres emerged and how they have made an important contribution to both formal and informal education in post-war Britain.

Strands and traditions in outdoor education

The post-war years brought sweeping changes in society. The 1944 Education Act required local authorities to provide facilities for recreational, social and cultural activities and emphasised the educational benefits for young people from the towns taking part in residential experiences in the countryside. The Labour government established the National Health Service and opened up opportunities for outdoor recreation through the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949. Despite hardships during this period, such as the rationing of food, there was a sense of optimism and change for a more just society. In this climate outdoor recreation and outdoor education could thrive and the thirty-year period following the 1940s saw an enormous expansion in outdoor education centres across the UK.

The nature of these centres was influenced by two distinctive traditions, one through field studies and the other through outdoor pursuits. Since the 1940s local authorities and voluntary and private organisations have spawned a range

of day and residential outdoor centres unlike anywhere else in the world. These centres have developed their own specific aims, philosophies and practice.

The early development of field studies was linked to science education, particularly biology, geography and geology. Fieldwork was closely related to the school curriculum and in the case of older students to their examinations. The Field Studies Council was founded in 1943 and since that time has established a network of centres throughout Britain. From the 1960s many local education authorities opened field study centres where school children could learn about and through the environment. Urban study centres, which involve young people in studies of their local environment, arose as an offshoot of this tradition.

Drasdo (1972) distinguished two approaches in the teaching of outdoor pursuits. The first concentrates on the development of physical skills and technical knowledge and was promoted by the centres run by the Councils of Physical Recreation. The second approach uses challenging situations in the outdoors to develop personal qualities, such as self-reliance and leadership. This latter approach was influenced by the Outward Bound movement, which established its first centre in Britain during the 1940s. It can be argued that there is a third approach which is represented by local authority and voluntary outdoor centres established since the 1960s. Their programmes have been designed primarily to encourage both personal and social development. Many outdoor leaders today consider the development of these personal and social skills to be the focus of their work.

Two government reports in the 1960s emphasised the value of outdoor learning. The Newsom Report, "Half Our Future", appeared in 1963 and advocated the benefits of outdoor and residential experiences for students and especially those who were academically less able. In 1966 the Plowden Report on Children and Their Primary Schools gave a further boost by claiming that all children would benefit from direct experiences of nature. There were also individuals championing the outdoor cause. For example, Alex Clegg and Jack Longland, both chief education officers for local authorities, set up some of the first outdoor education centres during this period. Robert Mackenzie (1965), head of a secondary modern school in an industrial area of Scotland, had a strong vision for alternative education and offered his students real-life experiences through expeditions and using bothies and huts in the Scottish Highlands.

This was happening against the background of a more prosperous, vibrant 1960s, when there was freedom of expression in books, music, dress and behaviour. Expectations were high and there was the belief that the old order could be changed. Outdoor education was in tune with the times; it was alternative and freer and appeared more creative than the formal structures of the classroom. The period that followed up to the 1980s was probably the heyday of outdoor education centres in the UK. A survey carried out in 1980 established that there were some 400 day and residential outdoor education centres operated by education authorities and another 800 outdoor bases provided by voluntary, private and commercial organisations (Hunt, 1989).

ter of ntres

in 1979, there was a considered ideals. This process has Labour governments of Blair. Policies based on free market all aspects of society, including environment. This chapter considers education and outdoor recreation. to outdoor education centres the experience of working with centres that have occurred over the history of outdoor education centres contribution to both formal and

tion

society. The 1944 Education Act provided for recreational, social and cultural benefits for young people from the countryside. The Labour government opened up opportunities through Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. This period, such as the rationing period, for a more just society. In this period could thrive and the thirty-year expansion in outdoor education

two distinctive traditions, one of outdoor pursuits. Since the 1940s outdoor education has spawned a range of

Wigan local authority outdoor education centres: Personal reflections

When I was appointed with my wife, Lorna, in 1983 to develop Low Bank Ground Outdoor Education Centre in the English Lake District, Wigan Council already had a strong reputation for its outdoor provision for young people. Its facilities included an outdoor youth centre in Wales, another smaller residential centre in the Lake District, several educational farms and canal boats. It was unusual for a local authority to be purchasing and opening another outdoor centre during these early Thatcher years but Charles Hopkinson, the astute and charismatic director of education, had managed to obtain government funding following the inner city riots in nearby Liverpool. Outdoor education was clearly seen as a means of assuaging youth disaffection.

Our remit was to develop the two Lake District Outdoor Education Centres by providing outdoor activities and field studies for young people aged 8 to 18 and professional in-service courses for teachers. We were given considerable freedom to appoint staff, including a team of qualified teachers, and develop the centres' philosophy and practice. The informal management committee, which was mainly composed of councillors, was clear that the aim was to provide Wigan youngsters with the same opportunities to enjoy the outdoors as those in more wealthy parts of the UK. The director of education was involved personally in ensuring the Centres were set up with appropriate levels of staffing and high-quality furnishings and outdoor equipment.

We were keen to move away from the traditional UK outdoor pursuits centres, whose programmes at the time were based on a narrow range of adventurous activities. With an enthusiastic staff we set up the centres using the outdoors for a whole range of subjects and activities, including fieldwork in geography, geology and biology; art, drama and creative writing; environmental awareness; practical conservation and outdoor adventure. Some of the first children to visit the Centres were special needs groups and it quickly became clear how residential outdoor experiences could benefit children with physical disabilities, learning difficulties and behavioural issues. We welcomed groups from all of the twelve special schools in the local authority and managed to gain grants to purchase equipment and adapt and extend the buildings to allow access for all young people.

We were fortunate in working for an authority that recognised the value of the arts in education. It employed specialists in drama, music, performing and visual arts to work with schools. Mary Connolly joined us as an artist in residence for three years as part of the Wigan "Artists in Schools" programme. She taught on the Centres' courses and had time to develop her own work. A photographer and a potter also spent shorter periods working with groups at the Centres, and we invited writers and poets on weekend courses to inspire children's writing through the outdoors.

Activities such as canoeing, orienteering and rock scrambling were not seen as ends in themselves but a means of exploring different environments. This was reflected by the use of terms such as "on the water", "in the woods" and "on the

centres:

1983 to develop Low Bank Lake District, Wigan Council provision for young people. Its es, another smaller residential is and canal boats. It was un- ening another outdoor centre kinson, the astute and charis- n government funding follow- oor education was clearly seen

t Outdoor Education Centres or young people aged 8 to 18 : were given considerable free- ed teachers, and develop the anagement committee, which the aim was to provide Wigan he outdoors as those in more on was involved personally in e levels of staffing and high-

UK outdoor pursuits centres, narrow range of adventurous e centres using the outdoors ding fieldwork in geography, ng; environmental awareness; ne of the first children to visit y became clear how residential ysical disabilities, learning dif- s from all of the twelve special grants to purchase equipment for all young people. at recognised the value of the music, performing and visual is as an artist in residence for s" programme. She taught on r own work. A photographer th groups at the Centres, and to inspire children's writing ck scrambling were not seen erent environments. This was , "in the woods" and "on the

rocks". We deliberately avoided quick thrill activities, such as zip wires and ropes courses, which we believed are more in keeping with an urban setting or theme park, and favoured activities where students are in charge and can work as a team, making their own decisions and mistakes. Self-led journeys became a feature of most courses, and we were keen to maintain a mountain experience even though more and more young people found this physically demanding. Place-based activities, such as farm visits, lake journeys and conservation tasks in the nearby forests, clearly offered much greater potential for environmental understanding than "buzz" activities, such as abseiling or racing down tracks on mountain bikes.

We established Centres that were community-based but also "outward-looking". Links were made with the National Park, National Trust, Forestry Commission, Brantwood Trust and the local community, and young people were involved in conservation projects, such as planting hedgerows, restoring areas of lakeshore, rebuilding stone walls and improving footpaths. The grounds were managed to keep a balance between conservation, recreation and farming. European Union youth exchange programmes and youth leader training programmes based on outdoor and environmental learning were developed over the summer months, and these led to joint European projects with other education centres and youth organisations, notably in Greece, Norway, Spain and the Czech Republic.

This illustrates the direction in which the Wigan Outdoor Education Centres were developing in their early years; a fuller account has been published (Cooper, 1999). It offers a flavour of the freedom given to many local authority outdoor education centres at this time to develop their own character and methods. There were, however, already political, social and economic forces on the horizon which would change this situation.

Impact of government policies on education

From the mid-1980s there was a radical shift in the relationship of government towards education. Earlier governments had largely accepted that teachers and local education officers were the experts and could be trusted to make decisions in the best interest of students. The Thatcher government started to challenge this, treating education like a failing industry. The language of business, including such notions as "value for money", "performance management", "targets" and "customer satisfaction", began to be applied to the education sector. The aim was to change the nature of education from a public service to an enterprise subject to market forces. The language we choose for describing education portrays our values. Many outdoor teachers entered the profession because they believed that education is about "curiosity", "inspiration", "co-operation", "wonder", "enjoyment", "creativity" and "experience". This language is a far cry from the harder-edged business words of "quality control", "league tables", "attainment" and "accountability" that were thrust on the UK education system from the mid-1980s. In this economic model, teachers become "providers", heads become "managers" and the students and parents are seen as "consumers" (Smyth and Shacklock, 1998).

A sweeping change came with the 1988 Education Reform Act. This introduced a standardised National Curriculum of core and foundation subjects. Attainment targets were set for four Key Stages and a system of national tests imposed for 7-, 11- and 14-year-olds, taking power away from schools and teachers to develop their own curriculum and methods of evaluation. Sterling (2001, 40) remarks on the analogy with the factory system: "young people and qualifications are produced; there are precise goals and targets; the curriculum provides directives for each stage of production; and teachers are technicians and are therefore substitutable".

Along with these controls on teaching and learning came a transfer of power from local education authorities through a reform known as Local Management of Schools. This gave school-governing bodies control over their budgets, reducing the responsibility of local education authorities, which were allowed to retain only 10% of school expenditure. League tables were introduced and school budgets closely related to the number of students they could attract.

As a result there was pressure on central services, such as the peripatetic music, art, drama and outdoor education provision, which were funded by local councils. The impact of these changes was felt during the early 1990s and local authority outdoor education centres had to adapt to a more competitive, business-oriented climate. They also faced changing attitudes in the teaching profession. Some teachers felt demoralised by the imposition of a content-based National Curriculum, with management structures emphasising targets, testing and considerable increased paperwork. It became harder to justify leaving the classroom and the new curriculum offered fewer opportunities for outdoor experiences. There was less scope for the cross-curricular, process-based learning found in outdoor education centres.

A report prepared for the Sports Council (Taverner, 1994) drew attention to the harmful effects of the 1988 Education Reform Act on the future viability of outdoor centres. It included a survey which showed that thirty centres had closed since the introduction of Local Management of Schools and a further fifty-seven (33% of the total) were under threat of closure as a result of cuts in local authority funding.

It was unfortunate that these ideologically driven reforms to the education system coincided in the 1990s with changing attitudes throughout British society to health and safety.

A national outdoor tragedy and the rise of a culture of fear

In March 1993 there was a canoeing tragedy when four teenagers drowned in Lyme Bay off the coast of Dorset. This had a profound effect on the future of outdoor education in the UK and it had particular impact on outdoor education centres. Public opinion, fuelled by the media, led to the Activity Centres (Young Persons' Safety) Act of 1995, which established a compulsory registration and inspection scheme for outdoor activities. The Adventure Activities Licensing

tion Reform Act. This intro-
ore and foundation subjects.
and a system of national tests
away from schools and teach-
of evaluation. Sterling (2001,
: "young people and qualifica-
targets; the curriculum provides
s are technicians and are there-

ning came a transfer of power
known as Local Management
trol over their budgets, reduc-
, which were allowed to retain
e introduced and school budg-
could attract.

, such as the peripatetic music,
were funded by local councils.
arly 1990s and local authority
competitive, business-oriented
he teaching profession. Some
content-based National Cur-
targets, testing and consider-
stify leaving the classroom and
or outdoor experiences. There
sed learning found in outdoor

erner, 1994) drew attention to
a Act on the future viability of
d that thirty centres had closed
hools and a further fifty-seven
a result of cuts in local author-

ven reforms to the education
ides throughout British society

of a

ten four teenagers drowned in
found effect on the future of
r impact on outdoor education
to the Activity Centres (Young
a compulsory registration and
Adventure Activities Licensing

Authority (AALA) was set up to inspect and license a range of outdoor activities provided for young people up to the age of 18 (Barton, 2007). This occurred despite strenuous attempts by the outdoor profession to have a self-regulated voluntary accreditation scheme accepted by government.

These events coincided with a growing culture of risk aversion and fear of litigation if accidents occurred, which in the 1990s was spreading to the UK from the United States. Frank Furedi (2006, 14) commented that "hardly a week now passes without some new risk to the individual being reported and another safety measure proposed". As an example, there was the increased security imposed on schools, with their safety cameras, swipe cards, barriers and fences. Alongside this, there was a dramatic decrease in the proportion of children walking to school and a growing number of parents keeping children indoors because of fears of traffic and "stranger danger". Overprotection was insulating young people from the wider world around them. Basic outdoor activities, like going to the shops, crossing the road, building dens on wasteland or playing in the local park, were being denied or supervised by parents (Cooper, 1998). The implications were serious and could lead to an inward-looking generation, less independent, less critical and more easily shaped by mass media.

In the 1990s there was a golden opportunity for outdoor education centres to play a key role in addressing this culture of fear. Through their ethos and practice in providing stimulating activities they were well placed to encourage the confidence, independence and resilience that young people needed to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing society. However, the requirements to develop safety policies and risk assessments in line with the new licensing and inspection regimes meant that for a time centres became introspective and focused on ensuring staff had appropriate "hard" skills and qualifications and that their activities and programmes matched the new safety criteria.

A personal view from outdoor education centres in the 1990s

The reduced government funding to local authorities throughout the 1990s led to the decimation of many central services. I attended a series of annual meetings in Wigan for support staff, and each successive gathering in the 1990s saw a dwindling number of representatives for the many enriching educational services, such as music, drama, art, outdoor education and youth, adult and professional development, that had been a hallmark of the council.

Changes to the National Curriculum meant it was more difficult to justify secondary school groups leaving the classroom for a week's residential. There was less demand for fieldwork in geography and biology, and other groups were limited by the increases in costs of travel and accommodation and the willingness of teachers to work beyond their stipulated hours. There was greater freedom within the primary school curriculum, and visiting groups could more easily arrange for parents, non-teaching staff and school governors to accompany the students to reduce spending on cover for teachers. As a consequence, the annual programme

which had been shared evenly between secondary and primary schools in the 1980s became 85% primary-based by the end of the 1990s.

There was constant pressure to reduce the level of subsidy given to the two Lake District Centres from Wigan Council, and this led to exploring ways to increase income by attracting other groups in the school holidays. We succeeded in applying for EU funding for international youth events, organised family holidays and gained special grants to run courses for young people with special needs and asylum-seeking families. In addition, an increase in residential fees and the offer of shorter courses enabled the Centres to retain their provision for Wigan schools and maintain a high level of occupancy without compromising the educational ethos.

Early responses by the outdoor sector

There were positive outcomes of the combined threats to centres from educational reform and the preoccupation with safety. Organisations in the outdoor sector, such as the Association of Heads of Outdoor Education Centres, the National Association for Outdoor Education, the Field Studies Council and British Activity Holiday Association, began to work together to promote their common interests. One example of political lobbying at this time was a meeting between a large group of heads of outdoor education centres and Michael Jopling, an influential member of Parliament, who following a briefing raised questions in the House of Commons. In support of the centres he voiced the opinion that

A keyword in the work of the centres is "success". The centres encourage good citizenship. They often unlock talents that remain hidden in formal education. Young people experience challenging situations which involve problem solving, group co-operation, negotiation, creative thinking and decision making. It is common for teachers and leaders to comment on the improved levels of motivation and achievement which are often taken back into the classroom or workplace.

(Jopling, 1993)

A New Forum was established in 1994 and this later became the influential English Outdoor Council, a co-ordinating body to lobby for the outdoor sector. During the next decade two pressure groups, the "Foundation for Outdoor Adventure" and the "Campaign for Adventure", were set up to attempt to influence political leaders and the media. The latter group broadened the debate to consider the harmful effects of a culture of risk aversion and increasing litigation on society as a whole. A consultation on "Risk and Enterprise in Society" was organised at St George's House, Windsor Castle, in 2004, which involved contributions from leaders in education, industry and broadcasting.

New Labour: targets, inspections and bureaucracy

When New Labour came into government in 1997 there was optimism that this would lead to greater opportunities for outdoor learning. The decade that

ry and primary schools in the
the 1990s.
of subsidy given to the two
this led to exploring ways to
school holidays. We succeeded in
ents, organised family holidays
people with special needs and
residential fees and the offer of
provision for Wigan schools and
mising the educational ethos.

ats to centres from educational
sations in the outdoor sector,
ducation Centres, the National
lies Council and British Activ-
promote their common inter-
was a meeting between a large
Michael Jopling, an influential
ised questions in the House of
opinion that

cess". The centres encourage
that remain hidden in formal
gng situations which involve
iation, creative thinking and
id leaders to comment on the
it which are often taken back

(Jopling, 1993)

s later became the influential
o lobby for the outdoor sec-
he "Foundation for Outdoor
ere set up to attempt to influ-
oup broadened the debate to
sion and increasing litigation
d Enterprise in Society" was
2004, which involved contri-
adcasting.

eaucracy

97 there was optimism that
or learning. The decade that

followed proved the opposite, with a series of educational changes affecting the curriculum, inspections, school management and finance. Teachers faced mounting paperwork with endless targets linked to their performance management. It was a period when the creativity and dynamism of leadership were diminished by the burgeoning management systems that imposed a stultifying culture of vision statements, policies and tick boxes. Trust and judgement were devalued in favour of decision making that attempted to adhere to policy documents. The Wigan Outdoor Centres faced new tiers of management, with the head of centres receiving two sets of performance management and appraisal: one as a head teacher and the other as an officer of the local authority. A costly three-year best-value survey and plan for the Centres achieved much disruption and only marginal savings.

Putnam (2004, Foreword, xi) argues that this culture of "cost-effectiveness" and "best value" is fine where outcomes can be measured in cash terms but asks these questions: "What price do we place on curiosity, confidence or the propensity to care for others or the environment? What value do we attach to the beauty of a sunrise in the hills; the dappled shadows of a mature forest; the elemental power of wild seascape?" McDonald (2014) also questions whether the true value of outdoor education can be measured. He claims that to survive some outdoor education centres may choose to package their wares as a bundle of proven changes, positive outcomes, evaluated impacts and testable goals. This is a far cry from the inspirational and uplifting language used when the centres were first set up.

Some UK Outdoor Education Centres faced closure during this period, and it was common for others to seek savings by modifying employees' conditions of service and appointing unqualified teaching staff. Shorter courses were offered to schools and youth groups and more adventurous activities substituted by onsite activities requiring fewer leaders. It was also a time of increased privatisation, when a new breed of commercial outdoor activity centres appeared on the scene.

Competition from outdoor activity centres

As local authorities found it increasingly difficult to give financial support to their outdoor education centres and many of these centres were forced to increase their charges, opportunities arose in the private sector to establish outdoor activity centres. These centres were based on a more commercial model arising out of the outdoor recreation industry, and it can be argued that they represent a standardisation and commodification of outdoor learning (Loynes, 2007; Becker, 2008; Beames & Brown, 2014). They are typically large, usually with more than 100 beds, staffed by young temporary instructors, and the majority of activities take place on site. Often they are located close to their visiting schools. The emphasis is on a tightly packaged menu of recreational "fun" activities, with some reference to personal and social development of young people (Cooper, 2007).

Undoubtedly they offer young people excitement in a controlled, safe environment, with a range of quick thrill activities, including ropes courses, zip wires, archery, go-carts, quad biking, indoor climbing and abseiling, more in keeping with a theme park than an educational experience. They are instructor-led, give

little responsibility to young people, and are heavily dependent on the use of equipment. Children are not involved in managing their own risk. Many of the activities require queuing to take part and don't represent continuous movement, involvement or teamwork. Overall there is much less physical activity and little sustained exercise. There is an emphasis on the quantity rather than the quality of activities offered during the visit. Some centres publicise that they can pack as many activities into a two- or three-day course as traditional centres do in five days. Often there is no coherence; they are simply a collection of activities rather than an educational experience.

An issue that arises is that some parents, school governors and teachers are not always aware of the differences between outdoor education centres and activity centres. In general, outdoor activity centre instructors will have less understanding of the school curriculum and how adventurous activities can support classroom learning and lead to higher levels of achievement in schools. Arguably an even more significant difference relates to the narrowness of the experiences in activity centres. There is little chance for children to discover wild places in the locality and to develop a sense of place. They provide a playground for activities rather than a base for exploring the local environment. It is unlikely that children will experience the vagaries of the weather to the same extent as on a journey. Nor will they come into contact with landscapes, wildlife and the rich history and culture of an area. Travelling simply and freely in the outdoors often leads to chance encounters – chatting to a forester in the woods, watching a farmer working his sheepdog, catching a glimpse of a deer or getting a close-up view of a dung beetle. Theme park “buzz” activities do not lend themselves to making connections with the natural world.

The ethos of activity centres is based on providing fun, quick thrills and instant gratification and very much reflects the aims of our high-energy, over-commercial society. In contrast, the ethos of outdoor education centres is more conducive to the possibility of questioning these values and promoting the concepts of quality of life and more sustainable lifestyles.

Quality assurance, research and professionalism

The beginnings of a co-ordinated response by the outdoor sector from the mid-1990s to the threats imposed by government policies and society's aversion to risk have already been noted. In the following decade, heads of outdoor education centres and outdoor education advisers formed partnerships to promote a more robust presentation of their work. This also encouraged many commercial centres to examine their ethos and practices, and links were made between the leisure, sport and educational outdoor sectors. There was a move to change the narrow agenda focused on safety to a broader recognition of the overall quality of provision and the learning achieved by outdoor centres. This led to a clear statement dispelling some myths and misconceptions regarding safety and litigation and the need to address the balance between risks and benefits in the outdoors (Gill, 2010).

heavily dependent on the use of their own risk. Many of the present continuous movement, less physical activity and little quantity rather than the quality publicise that they can pack as traditional centres do in five a collection of activities rather

governors and teachers are not education centres and activity tors will have less understand- us activities can support class- ment in schools. Arguably an rowness of the experiences in to discover wild places in the ide a playground for activities ent. It is unlikely that children same extent as on a journey. , wildlife and the rich history ly in the outdoors often leads the woods, watching a farmer r or getting a close-up view of ot lend themselves to making

ing fun, quick thrills and instant high-energy, over-commercial centres is more conducive to noting the concepts of quality

nalism

the outdoor sector from the mid- ices and society's aversion to ade, heads of outdoor educa- ed partnerships to promote a encouraged many commercial links were made between the ere was a move to change the gnition of the overall quality of ntres. This led to a clear state- regarding safety and litigation s and benefits in the outdoors

To demonstrate their educational credentials many outdoor centres were keen to adopt the Quality Badge developed by the Council for Learning Outside the Classroom, and over fifty centres in the UK have now gained a higher-level gold standard award operated through the Association of Heads of Outdoor Education Centres. This higher award not only considers elements of the organisation, management and delivery but also provides an opportunity for professional development. In parallel to this, the Outdoor Education Advisers' Panel (OEAP, 2005) published its guidance on quality in outdoor education, which has been updated by the English Outdoor Council (EOC, 2015). The guidance lists ten key outcomes of outdoor learning, including a range of personal, social, activity and life skills, environmental awareness, enjoyment and health and well-being.

The promotion of outdoor learning and the value of residential experiences have benefited from a growing body of research from an increasing number of universities offering outdoor programmes and through reports from a range of outdoor and environmental non-governmental organisations. Randall Williams (2012) has explored the complex interactions that take place during an adventure-based residential experience for primary school students. He used a questionnaire survey of 232 9–11-year-olds to find the impact of this type of residential experience. The findings indicated four components of this impact: living with others, challenges through activities, the new relationships developed with teachers and the impact of learning about oneself. Williams discovered a correlation between the impact of living with others and teacher relationships and an improvement in classroom attainment but was cautious to claim direct causal links.

The "Learning Away" five-year research project, funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, involved the findings from sixty primary, secondary and special schools in the UK on a range of high-quality residential experiences (Paul Hamlyn Foundation, 2015). Independent evaluation of the project recognised there was strong evidence for a range of positive educational, personal and social outcomes, including improved student engagement, the development of knowledge, skills and understanding, deeper relationships with others and improved resilience, self-confidence and well-being.

Alongside this educational research there has been a series of reports on the health, social and environmental benefits for children of spending time in nature (Moss, 2012, Natural England, 2012). Gill (2011) analysed sixty-one previous studies based on experiences in natural settings and argued that there is strong evidence to support mental and physical health benefits. The English Outdoor Council has proved adept at using these reports and the growing body of research to lobby in support of outdoor education centres and the outdoor sector in general.

In their quest for recognition many practitioners in the outdoor sector have seen the benefits to be gained from professional accreditation. National Governing Body qualifications – for example, in climbing, canoeing and sailing – have long been established in the UK and the licensing and inspection of outdoor centres and other providers drove the demand for more technical qualifications. During the late 1990s greater emphasis was placed on short-term qualifications than

on the experience of leaders as educators ((Brown et al., 2016). With the later rebalancing of health and safety considerations with the many benefits gained from outdoor experiences, attention was turned to the need to develop the “soft” interpersonal and communication skills. The Institute for Outdoor Learning developed the first professional accreditation framework for outdoor leaders based on reflective practice and independent decision making. The scheme allows for progression with four levels related to the National Qualifications Framework. The Accredited Practitioner level (APIOL) has proved particularly successful and is used by outdoor leaders to reflect on their professional development and gain recognition for their range of skills and by employers as a valued benchmark to relate to their own requirements (Mason, 2005).

Future directions for outdoor education centres in the UK

The heyday of outdoor education centres in the UK was from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s. This was the period of great educational freedom, with child-centred approaches, opportunities to develop local curricula and independence of teachers from government interference. In this climate, outdoor centres flourished with their own identities and a belief that adventurous activities in the outdoors and contact with nature would inspire curiosity, learning and personal and social development. Government control over the curriculum, council finances and management of schools changed this and introduced a competitive business model to the outdoor sector. Further pressure arose in the 1990s with a health and safety agenda that imposed inspections, and outdoor centres were forced into reacting by staff chasing qualifications in hard skills and centres offering less adventurous activities. The growth of commercial activity centres proved an extra burden on centres which were desperately trying to reduce their costs to remain viable. Some centres were forced to close; others reduced their permanent staff, changed conditions of service, took on freelance instructors and devised programmes that were less staff-intensive.

The first decade of the twenty-first century saw a marked change in approach. This was orchestrated by a remarkable group of individual outdoor leaders, advisers and academics who worked tirelessly to bring the key outdoor education organisations together to promote their common aims. Ogilvie (2013) describes in detail how this convergence in the outdoor sector occurred and gives credit to many of the personalities involved. There was now the strength to set an agenda which involved challenging the overemphasis on risk by promoting the benefits of outdoor learning through high-quality residential and outdoor experiences.

There is no possibility of returning to the early days of unrestrained outdoor learning, but there is a recognition that it is possible to use and adapt the new management structures to support a thriving profession. The acceptance of quality assurance and accreditation enables the outdoor sector to set its own professional development to incorporate a range of technical and interpersonal skills

et al., 2016). With the later with the many benefits gained to the need to develop the : Institute for Outdoor Learning framework for outdoor leaders on making. The scheme allows Qualifications Framework. ved particularly successful and ssional development and gain ers as a valued benchmark to

UK was from the mid-1960s to ational freedom, with child- l curricula and independence limate, outdoor centres flour- enturous activities in the out- ity, learning and personal and curriculum, council finances duced a competitive business se in the 1990s with a health outdoor centres were forced skills and centres offering less tivity centres proved an extra , reduce their costs to remain , duced their permanent staff, instructors and devised pro-

marked change in approach. individual outdoor leaders, ring the key outdoor educa- mon aims. Ogilvie (2013) outdoor sector occurred and There was now the strength veremphasis on risk by pro- high-quality residential and

lays of unrestrained outdoor le to use and adapt the new ion. The acceptance of qual- sector to set its own profes- sional and interpersonal skills

and reflective practice and adopt a broad agenda, including issues relating to ethics, inclusion, gender, health, environment and sustainability.

If outdoor education centres are to survive they must achieve more than offering one-off short residential experiences removed from young people's lives at home and school. Research has shown that the impact of centres is greatest when students and teachers are involved in the whole experience, from the planning stage through to the follow-up back at school. It is also clear that progressive programmes of residential experiences through a student's school life, which may begin with simple overnight camps near to the school and lead to a later stay in a more distant outdoor centre, are particularly effective in producing social and educational benefits (Paul Hamlyn Foundation, 2015).

Although for survival outdoor education centres have to some extent had to accept the language and structures of the commercial world, it is imperative they retain their unique role in offering fresh and enjoyable experiences that for many are life-enhancing. Residential outdoor centres offer their participants a chance to step outside everyday existence, to adopt a simpler lifestyle, to build relationships and to reflect on and question their own and society's values.

References

- Barton, B. (2007). *Safety, Risk and Adventure in Outdoor Activities*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Beames, S., & Brown, M. (2014). Enough of Ronald and Mickey: Focusing on learning in outdoor education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 14(2), 118–131.
- Becker, P. (2008). The European Institute for Outdoor Adventure Education and Experiential Learning: A Report of the First Decade. Retrieved from www.eoe-network.eu
- Brown, H., Harris, I., & Porter, S. (2016). Professional accreditation in the UK outdoor sector. In B. Humberstone, H. Prince & K. Henderson (Eds.), *Routledge International Handbook of Outdoor Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cooper, G. (1998). *Outdoors With Young People*. Dorset: Russell House Publishing.
- Cooper, G. (1999). Changing roles for outdoor education centres. In B. Humberstone & P. Higgins (Eds.), *Outdoor Education and Experiential Learning in UK*. Luneburg: Universitat Luneburg.
- Cooper, G. (2007). Activity centres or outdoor education centres? *Horizons*, 37, 10–13.
- Drasdo, H. (1972). *Education and the Mountain Centres*. Tyddyn Gabriel: Welsh Universal Press.
- English Outdoor Council. (2015). *High-Quality Outdoor Learning*. London: OEC.
- Furedi, F. (2006). *Culture of Fear, Revisited*, (p. 14). London: Continuum.
- Gill, T. (2010). *Nothing Ventured . . . Balancing Risks and Benefits in the Outdoors*. London: English Outdoor Council.
- Gill, T. (2011). *Children and Nature- A Report for the London Sustainable Development Commission*. London: Greater London Authority.
- Hunt, J. (1989). *In Search of Adventure: Study of Opportunities for Adventure and Challenge for Young People*. London: Kogan Page.

- Jopling, M. (1993). Outdoor Education Centres in HC Deb (29 June 1993) vol.227 cc942-8 Retrieved from <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1993/jun/29/outdoor-education-centres>
- Loynes, C. (2007). Why outdoor learning should get real. In B. Henderson, & N. Vikander (Eds.), *Nature First*. Toronto, Canada: Natural Heritage.
- Mackenzie, R. F. (1965). *Escape From the Classroom*. London: Collins.
- Mason, E. (2005). APIOL out and about. *Horizons*, 30, 28–31.
- McDonald, P. (2014). A Comparison of Two Outdoor Adventure Centres. Retrieved from www.dropbox.com/s/h01fxu808y6dj2u/2Centres1983.pdf
- Moss, S. (2012). Natural Childhood, National Trust 2012. Retrieved from www.nationaltrust.org.uk/document-1355766991839/
- Natural England. (2012). Learning in the Natural Environment: Review of Social and Economic Benefits and Barriers, Natural England Commissioned Report NECR092. Retrieved from <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/1321181?category=10005>
- OEAP. (2005). *High-Quality Outdoor Education*. London: OEAP.
- Ogilvie, K. (2013). *Roots and Wings: A History of Outdoor Education and Outdoor Learning in the UK*. Dorset: Russell House Publishing.
- Paul Hamlyn Foundation. (2015). *Learning Away: Brilliant Residentials and Their Impact on Children, Young People and Schools, Final Evaluation Report*. Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- Putnam, R. (2004). Foreword. In P. Barnes & B. Sharp (Eds.), *The RHP Companion to Outdoor Education*. Foreword xi, Dorset: Russell House Publishing.
- Smyth, J., & Shacklock, G. (1998). *Re-Making Teaching: Ideology, Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Sterling, S. (2001). *Sustainable Education: Re-visioning Learning and Change*. p.40, Devon: Green Books.
- Taverner, S. (1994). *Local Education Authority Outdoor Centres as a Resource for Sport and Active Recreation*. London: SportsCouncil.
- The Newsom Report (1963). *Half Our Future, A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- The Plowden Report (1967). *Children and their Primary Schools, A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Williams, R. (2012). Complexity and emergence. *Horizons*, 60, 28–31.