

Last reviewed: November 2019

Intervention website: www.familiesandschools.org

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Families and Schools Together

Please note that in the ‘Intervention Summary’ table below ‘child age’, ‘level of need’, and ‘race and ethnicities’ information is **as evaluated in studies**. Information in other fields describes the intervention as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Intervention summary	
Description	Families and Schools Together (FAST) is a schools-based intervention for families with a primary school-aged child. Parents and children attend eight weekly, after-school sessions delivered a trained, multi-agency team of educators, members of the community and parents. During these sessions, parents and children participate together in activities aimed at strengthening family relationships, promoting positive child behaviour, and improving children’s academic success.
Evidence rating	2+
Cost rating	1
Child outcomes	- Enhancing school achievement and employment - Improved academic performance. - Preventing crime, violence and anti-social behaviour - Improved behaviour.
Child age (population characteristic)	5 to 9 years old
Level of need (population characteristic)	Targeted Indicated

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Intervention summary	
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	• African American • Latino.
Type (model characteristic)	Primary school
Setting (model characteristic)	Schools
Workforce (model characteristic)	School staff, community members and parents
UK available?	No
UK tested?	Yes

Model description

Families and Schools Together (FAST) is an after-school curriculum designed to reduce the risks to children's development associated with community disadvantage. The offer is universal in primary schools – so is open to all families regardless of the parent and child characteristics and participation is voluntary.

FAST consists of eight weekly sessions, each lasting 2.5 hours. The initial FAST weekly sessions are led by a trained, multi-agency team of professionals from health, education, and social care, with parents from the participating school as partners. The team must be culturally representative of the families being served in the groups.

Families recruited into FAST meet in groups of up to ten called 'hubs'. Each hub meets separately and engages in activities aimed at building stronger relationships between the parent and child, the parents as a couple (if couples attend), families and the school and families and the community. Family learning is promoted through 'table-based coaching' whereby practitioners pass all instructions for children and other family members through the parent.

Each session is structured by the following six elements:

1. A meal shared as a family unit

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

2. Family communication games played at a family table
3. Peer time for couples or buddies
4. A self-help parent group
5. One-to-one parent–child time
6. A fixed family hamper that allows every family to win once.

After the eight weekly sessions, the families who have participated in six sessions or more attend a graduation ceremony.

Parents are partners at every level of the FAST intervention – planning, training, and implementation and post-graduation – and are supported to set their own agenda for multi-family group meetings, called FASTWORKS. The ongoing meetings sustain the relationships which have been built during the eight weekly sessions.

With team support, parents design the FASTWORKS agenda to maintain FAST family networks and identify community development goals. All FAST models include FASTWORKS as a voluntary component.

Target population

Age of child	Children attending primary school, aged 4 to 10 years old.
Target population	Schools in disadvantaged communities

Please note that the information in this section on target population is as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.



Theory of change

Why		Who	How	What		
Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Intervention	Short-term outcomes	Medium-term outcomes	Long-term outcomes
Children growing up in disadvantaged communities are at greater risk of poor school engagement and behavioural problems as they develop.	Strong relationships between the parent and child, family and school, and school and community can protect children from the risks associated with community disadvantage.	Schools are well placed to strengthen positive relationships between children and parents, parents and schools, and schools and communities.	Children and parents attend 8 weekly after-school sessions. At these sessions, parents and children engage in activities aimed at promoting: • Parent–child communication • Positive relationships between parents • Improved engagement between parents and the school • Improved parental engagement with the community.	• The parent–child relationship is strengthened • Parents and children experience greater self-efficacy • Parents and children feel more connected to their schools.	• Children feel better about themselves as a learner • Children are more likely to feel positively about their schools and community • Children engage more positively with others at school • Children’s behaviour improves.	• Children are more likely to achieve academic success at school • Children are at less risk of behavioural problems when they grow older.



Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	Parents with a child aged 4 to 10 years old.
How is it delivered?	FAST is delivered in eight sessions of 2.5 hours' duration each by a trained, multi-agency team of professionals from education, community, and parents from the school as partners, to groups of children after school.
What happens during the intervention?	A series of structured family activities take place to promote positive communication, listening skills, turn-taking, community-building, meal-sharing, and relationship-building. Family learning is promoted through 'table-based coaching' whereby practitioners pass all instructions for children and other family members through the parent. Each session is structured by the following six elements: 1. A meal shared as a family unit 2. Family communication games played at a family table 3. Peer time for couples or buddies 4. A self-help parent group 5. One-to-one parent–child time 6. A fixed family hamper that allows every family to win once.
Who can deliver it?	FAST is delivered by a trained, multi-agency team of school staff, community partners, at least two parents with a child attending the school. The team must be culturally representative of the families being served by the intervention.
What are the training requirements?	The practitioners have 25 hours of intervention training each. Booster training of practitioners is not required. FAST facilitators are trained to coach and support parents through each activity.
How are practitioners supervised?	It is recommended that practitioners are supervised by one host-agency supervisor with 77 hours of programme training.



Implementation requirements (cont.)

What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	• Training manual • Other printed material • Other online material • Video or DVD training • Face-to-face training • Supervision • Fidelity monitoring.
Is there a licensing requirement?	Yes
Contact details	Email address: answers@familiesandschools.org Website: www.familiesandschools.org *Please note that this information may not be up to date. In this case, please visit the listed intervention website for up to date contact details.

Evidence summary

FAST's most rigorous evidence comes from two RCTs consistent with Foundations' Level 2+ evidence strength criteria. One of these studies was conducted in the United States and the other was conducted in the UK.

The US study identified statistically significant improvements in teacher ratings of FAST children's academic performance compared to children not receiving the intervention, two years after FAST was completed.

The UK study did not observe improvements in FAST children's academic performance. However, improvements in FAST children's behaviour were reported by teachers immediately after the intervention had concluded.

Level 2+ evidence means that FAST has preliminary evidence of improving a child outcome, but we cannot be confident that the intervention caused the improvement.



Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	7
Studies reviewed	2
Meeting the L2 threshold	2
Meeting the L3 threshold	0
Contributing to the L4 threshold	0
Ineligible	0

Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	RCT
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	473 children and their families from urban schools in the vicinity of Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	• 46% African American • 39% Latino • 13% Other • 2% not reported.
Population risk factors	Two-thirds of the families were living below the poverty line. 58% of the children scored at or about the clinical threshold for behaviour problems
Timing	• Pre-intervention • Post-intervention • One-year and two-year follow-ups
Child outcomes	• Two-year follow-up • Improved child academic performance (Teacher report).



Study 1	
Other outcomes	<i>Post-intervention</i> Increased parental engagement in school (Parent report) <i>Two-year follow-up</i> Reduced social support (Parent report)
Study Rating	2+
Citation	Moberg, D. P., McDonald, L., Posner, J. K., Burke, M. L. & Brown, R. L. (2007) <i>Randomized trial of Families and Schools Together (FAST): Final report on NIDA Grant R01-10067.</i>

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 473 families with a child aged between 6 and 9 years old attending 10 schools in low-income areas of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 44% of the children were boys.

The schools, mostly attended by African American or Latino children, were chosen based on their size, location, ethnicity, and economic factors such as mobility and eligibility for free or reduced-price lunches. Two-thirds of the families were living below the poverty line, with an annual income of less than \$20,000.

58% of the children scored at or above the clinical threshold for externalising and/or internalising behaviours on the Child Behavior Checklist (CBC).

46% of the children were African American, 39% Latino and 13% other.

Study design

The study involved a cluster RCT with 72 first to fourth grade classrooms from 10 schools. Within each school, similar classrooms were selected and randomly assigned (via a coin toss) to either FAST or a family education control group (FAME) during each of two semesters.

Families were recruited universally from classrooms once they had been assigned to the FAST/FAME condition, resulting in 272 families receiving FAST and 201 families receiving FAME.

Both FAST and FAME were delivered to groups of up to 16 families, resulting in 20 groups per each condition. FAST was delivered to these groups in an eight-week cycle. During the same eight weeks, FAME families received parenting skills booklets (one per week) and an invitation to a parenting lecture.



Cycles were repeated consecutively for 10 schools, six of which took place during the 1997/98 school year, followed by the remaining four schools in 1998/99. Over the course of the study, 20 cycles of FAST/FAME were delivered.

The FAST and FAME groups were comparable on demographic and baseline characteristics at the start of the study.

Measurement

Assessments took place at baseline (pre-intervention), post-intervention, and at 1-year and 2-year post intervention follow-ups.

Post-intervention

- **Parent report** measures included the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL), the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS), the Family Attachment and Changeability Index, the Social Support Index (SSI), the Generalised Expectancy of Success, and the Parent-School-Community Involvement Survey. Parents assessments were completed during interviews with a researcher who was not blind to group assignment. Spanish translations were made of all family data collection materials, and bilingual interviewers were assigned to families preferring that the interviews be conducted in Spanish.
- **Teacher report** measures included the CBCL and the Child Social Skills Rating System (SSRS).
- **Researcher-led** assessments included videotaped observations of family interaction using the Structural Family Systems Rating Scale (SFSR).

One-year follow-up

- **Parent report** measures included the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL), the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS), the Family Attachment and Changeability Index, the Social Support Index (SSI), the Generalised Expectancy of Success, and the Parent-School-Community Involvement Survey. Parents assessments were completed during interviews with a researcher who was not blind to group assignment. Spanish translations were made of all family data collection materials, and bilingual interviewers were assigned to families preferring that the interviews be conducted in Spanish.
- Researcher-led assessments included videotaped observations of family interaction using the Structural Family Systems Rating Scale (SFSR).

Two-year follow-up

- **Parent report** measures included the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL), the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS), the Family Attachment and Changeability Index, the Social Support Index (SSI), the Generalised Expectancy of Success, and the Parent-School-Community Involvement Survey. Parents assessments were completed during interviews with a researcher who was not blind to group assignment. Spanish translations were made of all family data collection materials, and bilingual interviewers were assigned to families preferring that the interviews be conducted in Spanish.



- **Teacher report** measures included the CBCL and the Child Social Skills Rating System (SSRS).
- **Administrative** records included the child's involvement in county children's court.

Reading scores from the Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam were compared at the end of grades 3 and 4.

Children's academic attainment was assessed with the Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam at the end of grade 4.

Spanish speaking children's understanding of reading and math was assessed at the end of grade 4 with the Supera.

Study retention

Post-intervention

98% (463) of the families completed assessments immediately after the FAST/FAME cycle was completed, including 97% (265) of the FAST families and 99% (198) of the families recruited to FAME.

One-year follow-up

92% (436) of the families completed assessments at the one-year follow-up, including 92% (249) of the FAST families and 93% (187) of the families recruited to FAME.

Two-year follow-up

76% (359) of the families completed assessments at the two-year follow-up, including 79% (216) of the FAST families and 73% (143) of the families recruited to FAME.

At the two-year follow-up, rates of attrition were found for African American families and children with higher risk scores at baseline for CBCL. Additionally, 68% of the FAST children had complete Teacher reports compared to 56% of the FAME children. No other differential attrition was found between the intervention and control.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

A hierarchical repeated measures regression model was fit to the data to assess the effects of intervention at post-intervention, one-year, and two-year follow-up. The two levels in the analysis were children/families nested in treatment or comparison group cycles.

The hierarchical models utilised all available data at each time period, thus optimising the estimates even with missing data. A secondary adjustment was also carried out using an inverse propensity measure for adjustment due to missing values. All analyses were conducted as intent-to-treat with the retained sample.



Findings

Post-intervention

No statistically significant differences were observed between the FAST and FAME children at the post-intervention assessment. However, FAST mothers were observed to be more engaged with their schools in comparison to the mothers who did not receive the FAST intervention.

One-year follow-up

No statistically significant differences were observed between the FAST and FAME children or parents at the one-year follow-up assessment.

Two-year follow-up

Teacher ratings of children's academic performance were significantly higher for FAST children than they were for those receiving FAME ($d = .24$). However, FAST parents were significantly more likely to report reduced social support in comparison to parents who received the FAME booklets two-years previously ($d = -.20$).

Limitations

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by the fact that the only improved child outcome occurred at the two-year follow-up, when differential attrition was greater than 5%.

Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Internalising problems	CBCL (Parent report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Internalising problems	CBCL (Parent report)	0.02	No	436	One-year follow-up
Internalising problems	CBCL (Parent report)	0.04	No	359	Two-year follow-up



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Externalising problems	CBCL (Parent report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Externalising problems	CBCL (Parent report)	-0.09	No	436	One-year follow-up
Externalising problems	CBCL (Parent report)	-0.05	No	359	Two-year follow-up
Prosocial behaviour	SSRS (Parent report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Prosocial behaviour	SSRS (Parent report)	0.10	No	436	One-year follow-up
Prosocial behaviour	SSRS (Parent report)	0.11	No	359	Two-year follow-up
Internalising problems	CBCL (Teacher report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Internalising problems	CBCL (Teacher report)	0.19	No	296	Two-year follow-up
Externalising problems	CBCL (Teacher report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Externalising problems	CBCL (Teacher report)	0.00	No	296	Two-year follow-up
Academic attainment	CBCL (Teacher report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Academic attainment	CBCL (Teacher report)	0.24	Yes	296	Two-year follow-up
Prosocial behaviour	SSRS (Teacher report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Prosocial behaviour	SSRS (Teacher report)	0.08	No	296	Two-year follow-up
Academic competence scale	SSRS (Teacher report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Academic competence scale	SSRS (Teacher report)	0.20	No	296	Two-year follow-up
Reading	3rd Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	301	3rd grade assessment



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Reading	4th Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	275	4th grade assessment
Language	4th Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	275	4th grade assessment
Maths	4th Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	275	4th grade assessment
Science	4th Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	275	4th grade assessment
Social science	4th Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	275	4th grade assessment
Writing	4th Grade Wisconsin Knowledge and Comprehension Exam	Not reported	No	275	4th grade assessment
Reading	4th Grade Supera (Spanish)	Not reported	No	65	4th grade assessment



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Language	4th Grade Supera (Spanish)	Not reported	No	65	4th grade assessment
Maths	4th Grade Supera (Spanish)	Not reported	No	65	4th grade assessment
Child behavioural problems	County children's court	Not reported	No	473	Two-year follow-up
Parent outcomes					
Family attachment	Family Attachment and Changeability Index (Parent report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Family attachment	Family Attachment and Changeability Index (Parent report)	-0.01	No	436	One-year follow-up
Family attachment	Family Attachment and Changeability Index (Parent report)	0.12	No	359	Two-year follow-up
Family social support	Social Support Index (Parent report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Family social support	Social Support Index (Parent report)	-0.12	No	436	One-year follow-up



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Family social support	Social Support Index (Parent report)	-0.2	Yes	359	Two-year follow-up
Self-efficacy	Generalised Expectancy of Success (Parent report)	Not reported	No	463	Post-intervention
Self-efficacy	Generalised Expectancy of Success (Parent report)	0.12	No	436	One-year follow-up
Self-efficacy	Generalised Expectancy of Success (Parent report)	-0.07	No	359	Two-year follow-up
Parent School Engagement	Parent-School-Community Involvement Survey (Parent report)	Not reported	Yes	463	Post-intervention
Parent School Engagement	Parent-School-Community Involvement Survey (Parent report)	-0.14	No	436	One-year follow-up
Parent School Engagement	Parent-School-Community Involvement Survey (Parent report)	-0.04	No	359	Two-year follow-up



Individual study summary: Study 2

Study 2	
Study design	RCT
Country	UK
Sample characteristics	7,207 children between 5 and 7 years old attending 158 state schools in England.
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Not reported
Population risk factors	Schools on the basis of 20% of pupils or more being eligible for free school meals
Timing	• Pre-intervention • Post-intervention • Key stage 1 assessment.
Child outcomes	<i>Post-intervention</i> • Improved child behaviour (Teacher report) • Improved prosocial behaviour (Teacher report). <i>Year 2 follow-up</i> • Reductions in prosocial behaviour (Teacher report).
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	2+
Citation	Lord, P., Styles, B., Morrison, J., White, R., Andrade, J., Bamford, S., Lushey, C., Lucas, M. & Smith R. (2018) <i>Families and Schools Together (FAST) Evaluation report and executive summary</i> .

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 7,207 children between 5 and 7 years old attending 158 state schools in England.



Schools with greater than 20% Free School Meals (FSM) status were targeted to include disadvantaged children in the trial. Both rural and urban schools were included.

Year 1 children were recruited so that KS1 assessments could be used as the primary outcome measure. In some of the schools Reception and year 2 families were invited to participate in the intervention to ensure that FAST could run optimally but were not included in the trial.

The demographic characteristics of the children or their parents were not reported.

Study design

79 schools were randomly assigned to FAST and 79 to control. Pupils included in the study were those whose parents provided consent to data linkage. This resulted in 3,482 pupils in the FAST group and 3,725 in the control.

Baseline data was collected prior to randomisation. A statistician affiliated with the evaluators carried out the randomisation via stratified block design, taking into account region and school size.

Randomisation and delivery took place sequentially, starting in the autumn of 2015 and finishing in the spring of 2016.

The schools were similar with the exception that fewer schools with poor Ofsted ratings ('requires improvement' and 'inadequate') were the intervention group compared to the control.

The study additionally embedded a quasi-experimental component comparing the outcomes of 632 year 1 pupils who attended FAST with their parents and a propensity score matched subsample of pupils from the control group. Pupils were matched on the basis proportion of target children compared to whole year 1, gender, free school meal edibility and Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) scores.

Measurement

Assessments were conducted at baseline, at the end of the intervention and the end of year 2, occurring at least one year after the intervention.

Post-intervention

- **Teacher report** measures included the teacher version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). Teachers were not blind to school assignment and may have been aware of which pupils participated in the intervention.

Year 2 assessment

- **Teacher report** measures included the key stage 2 assessment, as well as the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. Teachers were less likely to be aware of which pupils had participated in the intervention.



Study retention

Post-intervention

- 82% (130) of the schools were participating in the study when the FAST intervention was completed, including 73% (58) of the FAST schools and 92% (72) of the schools allocated as controls.
- SDQ scores were available for 81% (5,859) pupils, including 70% (2,410) of the children in the FAST schools and 95% (3,449) of the pupils in the control schools.

Year 2 assessment

- 73% (115) of the schools provided information at the year 2 assessment, including 65% (52) of the schools that had offered FAST and 81% (64) of the schools participating as controls.
- Key stage 1 assessment scores were available for 59% (4,221) of the pupils, including 50% (1,736) of the pupils in the FAST schools and 67% (2,485) of the pupils in the control schools.
- 63% (99) of the schools provided SDQ data, including 47% (37) of the FAST schools and 79% (62) of the control schools.
- SDQ scores were available for 62% (4,485) of the pupils, including 45% (1564) pupils exposed to FAST and 80% (2,921) of the pupils attending the control schools.

Analyses of missing data showed that pupils attending FAST schools were significantly less likely to have a key stage 1 score.

Findings

Data-analytic strategy

A two-level random intercepts model (school and pupil) accounted for cluster randomisation in the main analyses involving the key stage 1 scores. The model included key stage 1 attainment as the dependent variable and prior Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) scores as a covariate. Randomised group, randomisation block, and region (north/south) used as dummy indicators. All pupils were retained in the analyses as intent-to-treat.

Missing data was explored using a two-level (pupil and school) logistic model of whether a pupil had a KS1 score. The model contained the following covariates: intervention group, randomisation block, region, EYFSP, and ever FSM. A multilevel multiple imputation model was run to address the missing pupil data, using iterations to reflect the proportion of missing data. This model utilised National Pupil Database (NPD) KS1 reading and maths age-related expectations (AREs) to help impute KS1 scores. In addition to the missing data analysis which used KS1 AREs, an additional analysis of KS1 AREs as the outcome measure was undertaken with 6,783 children and only 5.9% pupil-level attrition.

To measure the effect of the intervention on the children's behaviour at school level and its duration, a two-level model that estimates the mean value of the total difficulties score in a school was used. Covariates included: baseline SDQ score (school mean); randomised group; randomisation block; and region. Due to the anonymity of the data collection, the SDQ could only be linked between time-points at the school level.



Additional analyses exploring the KS1 assessment included a Quasi Experimental Design that looked at KS1 assessments of intervention children and a matched control group and a Complier Average Causal Effect (CACE) analysis was run at the pupil level using compliance data from the FAST family register in the form of number of sessions attended.

Findings

Post-intervention

Statistically significant reductions were observed in FAST teachers' reports of child behaviour problems in comparison to Teacher reports in non-FAST schools. FAST teachers were also more likely to report improvements in pupils' prosocial behaviour in comparison to pupils not attending FAST schools.

Year 2 follow-up

No statistically significant differences were observed between the FAST and non-FAST pupils on any of the year 2 academic assessments, either with the retained sample or with imputation for missing data.

Additionally, the improvements observed in Teacher reports of FAST pupil's behaviour post-intervention were non-significant at the time of the year 2 follow-up. Specifically, behavioural outcomes were comparable between the pupils at FAST and non-FAST schools at the year 2 follow-up and teacher ratings of FAST pupils' prosocial behaviour were, in fact, significantly lower than the prosocial ratings of pupils not attending FAST schools.

Limitations

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by methodological issues pertaining to high attrition and non-blind data collection

Study 2: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Reading and arithmetic	Key Stage 1 (teacher assessment)	0.01	No	4221*	Follow-up
Reading	Key Stage 1 (teacher assessment)	0.03	No	4294*	Follow-up



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Arithmetic	Key Stage 1 (teacher assessment)	-0.02	No	4309*	Follow-up
Combined reading and maths	Age-related Expectations (ARE) (teacher assessment)	Not reported	No	6783**	Follow-up
Reading	Age-related Expectations (ARE) (teacher assessment)	Not reported	No	6857**	Follow-up
Maths	Age-related Expectations (ARE) (teacher assessment)	Not reported	No	6860**	Follow-up
Total difficulties score	SDQ (Teacher report)	-0.43	Yes	5859*	Post-intervention
Total difficulties	SDQ (Teacher report)	0.15	No	4485*	Follow-up
Difficulties impact on child's life	SDQ (Teacher report)	-0.22	No	5859*	Post-intervention
Difficulties on child's life	SDQ (Teacher report)	0.05	No	4485*	Follow-up
Prosocial behaviour	SDQ (Teacher report)	0.33	No	5859*	Post-intervention



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Prosocial behaviour	SDQ (Teacher report)	-0.42	Yes	4485	Follow-up
*Analysis includes the retained sample **Analysis includes the imputed sample					

Other studies

The following studies were identified for this intervention but did not count towards the intervention's overall evidence rating. An intervention receives the same rating as its most robust study or studies.

Crozier, M., Rokutani, L., Russett, J. L., Godwin, E. & Banks, G. E. (2010) A multisite program evaluation of families and schools together (FAST): Continued evidence of a successful multifamily community-based prevention program. *School Community Journal*. 20 (1), 187–207. **This reference refers to a pre-post study, conducted in the USA.**

Knox, L., Guerra, N. G., Williams, K. R. & Toro, R. (2011) Preventing children's aggression in immigrant Latino families: A mixed methods evaluation of the Families and Schools Together program. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 48 (1–2), 65–76. **This reference refers to a randomised control trial, conducted in the USA.**

Kratochwill, T. R., McDonald, L., Levin, J. R., Scalia, P. A. & Coover, G. (2009) Families and schools together: An experimental study of multi-family support groups for children at risk. *Journal of School Psychology*. 47 (4), 245–265. **This reference refers to a quasi-experimental design, conducted in the USA.**

Kratochwill, T. R., McDonald, L., Levin, J. R., Bear-Tibbetts, H. Y. & Demaray M. K. (2004) Families and schools together: An experimental analysis of a parent-mediated multi-family group program for American Indian children. *Journal of School Psychology*. 42 (5), 359–383. **This reference refers to a randomised control trial, conducted in the USA.**

McDonald, L. & Fitzroy, S. (2010) *Families and Schools Together (FAST): Aggregate FASTUK evaluation report of 15 schools in 15 local education authorities (LEAs) across the UK.*

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to Foundations' terms of reference (or the Early Intervention Foundation's terms of reference), and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the intervention provider.