

Extended schools

Report of the Children's Services and Education
Scrutiny Sub-Committee

October 2007



Introduction

“Extended schools provide a range of services and activities, often beyond the school day, to help meet the needs of children, their families and the wider community.”¹

In 2006/07 the Children’s Services and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee undertook a ‘light-touch’ review into extended school provision. The intent was to obtain a snapshot view of the services currently being delivered, with the possibility of revisiting the subject in the future to see how things have advanced. The review is intended to inform the current implementation process and to raise issues that have been highlighted through discussions regarding site visits and to contribute further to planning and implementation. The Members of the Sub-Committee were particularly interested in looking at community engagement, the mix of extended schools activities, funding and sustainability and the behavior management of students.

The Sub-Committee chose to visit three schools. Despite the small sample of schools and organisations, it did provide the Members with an initial understanding of how the scheme was being implemented and highlighted to the Sub-Committee information that could be used constructively in the further development of the scheme. The Members also heard from the project coordinator of Southwark Supplementary Education and Mother Tongues Association (SSEMTA) – an organisation that provides support and advice to supplementary schools in Southwark.

Extended School Expectations

The government’s vision is for mainstream and Special Educational Needs (SEN) schools to provide a core level of service which would include:

- High-quality ‘wraparound’ childcare provided on the school sites or through local providers and available from 8am to 6pm all year round
- A varied choice of activities such as; homework clubs, study support, sport (at least two hours a week beyond the school day), arts and drama, special interest clubs, visits to museums and galleries, learning a foreign language, volunteering and business and enterprise activities

Parenting support and access to information for parents at key transition points: Parenting programmes run with the support of other children’s services and family learning sessions to allow children to learn with their parents.

- Wider community access to ICT, sports and arts facilities and access to adult learning.

According to Government directives, schools can either provide the extended schools activities themselves or use external providers or develop a combination of working between the schools and external partners. Ofsted will inspect the quality and take-up of the school’s extended services, examining the reasons for the school’s choice of provision.

¹ *Extended schools: access to opportunities and services for all*, Department for Education and Skills, 2005 (page 7).

Diversity of approach

The three schools chosen by the Sub-Committee included two secondary schools providing ‘full service’ and a third which was a special needs school catering for children with severe learning difficulties and complex needs. These three schools demonstrated the diversity of their individual approaches to the scheme.

The first academy visited by the Sub-Committee provided wider community access to their facilities for people over 18. The courses included training in ICT, parenting classes, motor vehicle mechanics and a women’s football club. This particular school was absorbing the costs of providing these services until the numbers of participants increased, at which time charges would be introduced.

The second academy chosen had undertaken partnership arrangements with ‘Fusion Lifestyle’ to manage its sports hall, dance studio and health and fitness studio. The facilities were open after school and during weekends and holidays. The charges were at a reduced rate for students, staff, parents and a number of other local external groups such as football, basketball and volleyball clubs. The partnership arrangements also provided increased access to class and meeting rooms to community groups and students bodies. The school was also made available for other out of hours uses such as accommodating the provision of a polling stations for General and Local elections; facilitating a Turkish school on Saturdays and other church groups on Sunday.

Both schools had lunchtime workshops and study classes along with after-school activities for their students. Breakfast clubs and the use of the library were available before school and one of the schools provided study groups at holiday periods. The range of activities varied between schools: one offered football, dance, art and writing workshops with an army cadets training programme after school. The other offered cake-making, business enterprise, self-defence and song-writing technology programmes.

The third school visited; specialising in the development of children with learning disabilities; did not provide an early morning extended school service. The particular needs of this group of children meant that after-school provision, provided by an external organisation, was more appropriate to meet the children’s needs. **However, at the time of the Sub-Committee visit, it was found that the service was not operating due to the lack of funding for the transportation of children to their homes afterwards.** The school did, however, provide a much more successfully attended and varied range of lunchtime activities for its students including arts, music, story-telling and dance sessions.

All three schools had established links with external organisations in the community, such as the Southwark Playhouse. Students were able to take part in performing Shakespeare and were involved in the Bacon’s College Dance Festival. The academies had also made links with local businesses with the aim to develop vocational opportunities for their students in the future.

One of the schools had undertaken research in to a pilot scheme to offer educational programmes to parents. This was seen as a positive way to strengthen relationships and enhance communication with parents. The SEN school provided parenting information packs and ran workshops throughout the year,

although it was made clear to the Sub-Committee that resources for more intense training and support for parents of children with special needs were not enough to provide the quality of training that it would like.

One of the academies had developed a multi agency panel, comprising representative from the Police, Connexions, Primary Care Trust and Children Unit, together with staff and counsellors from the school. This facilitated swift and easy referral to specialist support services. The panel was also responsible for monitoring students on individual programmes and/or students causing concern.

The diversity of approaches and activities provided by the schools impressed the Sub-Committee. **The visits also illustrated the need for the Extended Schools Programmes to be grown organically, developing from the school's individual strengths. It was also thought that schools who comprised the needs of the school with the local community would have more success overall.**

Progress with strategic direction

The Sub-Committee felt that there was concern around the progress of setting in place the structures with which to enable the scheme to make progress.

The background evidence to these concerns is as follows:

- **For some time there had been no one in the position of extended schools coordinator at the council. Schools reported that it had been difficult to move forward with plans and found it difficult to know who to approach when problems arose. Schools were aware of the need to plan things locally but were hindered by a lack of information and advice as to how to go about it. It was thought that the appointment of an Extended Schools Coordinator could help to alleviate some of these problems, if one had not already been appointed.**
- **The timetable for establishing base information about the extended services had slipped considerably. The request to see an audit of extended school activities and services provided by schools had been made by the previous incarnation of the Scrutiny Sub-Committee in February 2004. It was observed that the audit had taken three years to complete. Whilst the outcomes of the audit had now been provided (See Appendix 1) any context to explain the outcomes of the audit was not available making understanding the figures provided difficult.**
- **The Committee was informed by a senior member of school's staff that schools in Bermondsey had been told by the council that they had £69,000 to spend on extended school provision and half of this amount needed to be spent by August 2007. However, the delays and confusion over the recruitment to the post of the schools coordinator and its line manager meant that spending on sensible planning was compromised and could not be spent in the short timeframe.**
- **One of the schools visited reported that they had problems obtaining information and found vagueness in the available information meant that schools could possibly regard the scheme with caution and viewed working with statutory agencies frustrating.**

- **The Sub-Committee felt that there was the potential for tensions between schools and partnership agencies as a result of the lack of information and engagement with the community in the programme planning.**
- **It was also thought that information sharing between partner agencies and schools could be improved, leading to more harmonious working. It was also thought that more clarity around the definition of Extended Schools and to which groups the programme was aimed specifically would go some way to alleviate any confusion in this area.**

The Sub-Committee understood that Schools would decide on the mix of extended schools activities, how they will be managed and the way in which they would charge for this provision. The local authority will be responsible for leading on the strategic planning and auditing of the programmes. The council is also responsible for the borough-wide commissioning of services and providing advice and information, such as working with third party providers and governance arrangements².

Members heard from officers, that the council was developing ‘localities’ as a configuration for establishing four community learning networks across the borough, based on dual community council boundaries. The intention was that the extended schools planning (such as needs assessment, local priorities and partnership-working) would be done collectively at a local level. The Children’s Trust would then provide the strategic direction and development for the extended schools programme and work on evolving partnerships borough-wide and at a local level. The council would be expected to assess the effectiveness of the information sharing processes and protocols.

It was felt that despite the obvious benefits to locality-based working it was important not to be restricted to this. Schools needed to be able to look to neighbouring schools - or indeed any other extended schools activity providers - that are in close proximity, avoiding the duplication of extended schools activities and emphasising the importance of coordination and information-sharing across all schools and networks.

The Scrutiny Sub-Committee understood that the Extended Schools Scheme presented a challenge and appreciated that setting up adequate structures and information sharing protocols was not a simple process. There were other related factors that needed further investigation, such as the development of children’s centres, initiatives associated with the council’s priority of “providing more for youth to do”, the Building Schools for the Future and the academies programmes.

The Sub-Committee expressed concern at the perceived slowness of progression and that schools would not be in a position to provide the government’s core service requirements for the extended schools programme by 2010.

Partnership working

Partnership working is imperative to successful Extended Schools – the government makes it clear that schools are not expected to provide the entire extended schools offer in isolation. Southwark’s history of partnership working between schools and

² Draft extended schools strategy, Southwark Council, 2006

other organisations has not always been smooth with a reported sense of disconnection felt by some parties.

The Sub-Committee heard from a senior school representative who found some frustration with the Council run holiday play schemes. It was reported that there were some schools who regularly allowed the use of their premises, without being mindful of the community's needs. The representative also reported that there had been difficulty contacting other schools in the spirit of partnership working. SSEMTA reported that luck and skilled negotiation could be the only factors in whether supplementary schools had any success building relationships with mainstream schools.

Fortunately it was thought that this example of not taking the opportunity to strengthen partnership working was not representative of all schools and it was thought that the general attitude was changing to a more positive view of partnership working. One school visited had a desire to be a 'community hub' and had allowed the use of their facilities for a range of purposes including, conversion to polling stations during elections and allowing community, church and ethnic-minority groups to use the facilities along with other joint partnership initiatives. The Sub-Committee received evidence of a Sports Partnership set up by a secondary school to provide after hours sports activities to a number of primary schools in the borough. Both headteachers and senior council officers have reported that relationships between headteachers are improving.

It was noted by Members that it was not reasonable to attribute responsibility for poor partnership working solely on schools. Teachers can have limited resources and capacity for going out in to the community to meet partner agencies. One senior schools representative commented that there should be a sound educational reason for schools staff to be out in the community during the school day and the Sub – Committee was sympathetic as to why head teachers and other staff would wish to remain in and be protective of their environment. The Members were very impressed with the facilities they saw and the work the students had on display.

The Sub-Committee heard how some schools had become disillusioned with trying to establish consistent working relationships with external agencies and in particular with the statutory agencies. Voluntary organisations were praised by senior school staff although it was noted that links with them were fragile due to their own funding instability. It was also observed that the inconsistency and unreliability of contacts had also led to problems with strengthening relationships with external organisations.

Developing and maintaining partnerships takes time and effort but is key in moving extended schools forward. There needs to be commitment on all sides to benefit both students and the wider community. It was thought that more work needed to be done to lay the foundations for sound structures to ensure that partnership working can be successfully enabled.

Involvement of supplementary schools

The Members heard from the project co-ordinator of Southwark Supplementary Education and Mother Tongues Association (SSEMTA), who relayed concerns that supplementary schools had not had the opportunity to be involved in developing the council's extended schools policy – even though there were at least 30

supplementary schools operating in the borough and a several thousand people were involved with supplementary schools in Southwark.

It was recognised by Members that potentially supplementary schools have a valuable role to play in the extended schools programme. The role of the supplementary schools is to support children to achieve in core curriculum subjects such as English, maths and science. Some also specialise in languages and culture studies, to help children gain a comprehensive understanding of their mother tongues. Both of these are services that mainstream schools are expected to provide under the extended schools scheme core service provision. According to a survey that SSEMTA conducted, some supplementary schools felt that there was a range of initiatives that they could bring to the extended schools programme and expressed their desires to be included in the development of the scheme.

The representative from SSEMTA, reported that some mainstream schools did not recognise or realise that their colleagues and/or students were involved with supplementary schools. Few supplementary schools operate out of mainstream schools and supplementary schools were sceptical about whether the mainstream schools would open their doors to them. The key issue appears to be that many schools are not aware of the existence of supplementary education providers and the services they provide. The thought was that once the message is communicated to other schools that they exist, they have in the past, shown interest in finding out more about their work.

It seems that there is a potential opportunity in the extended schools programme to enable greater access by supplementary and mother tongue schools to use other school premises. If mainstream schools were open after hours for their own students, then it could make sense to enable services to use those premises at the same time, whilst taking in to consideration any small increase in cost for maintenance and security cover for the building. Ultimately, the Sub-Committee felt that how well the supplementary schools achieve is down to how well they can promote themselves to other schools and external partners, the quality of their provision, and the value they could add to the extended schools programme.

Community engagement

It was thought that schools could do more to involve and inform the community of their extended schools intentions and greater community involvement should be sought in all cases of extended school development so that the community surrounding Extended School facilities are aware of the pros and cons of the extended hours of educational provision.

Although the Sub-Committee did not approach schools directly regarding whether, or how much, they had engaged with the local community when deciding on their mix of extended activities, there was evidence to suggest that community needs were not always being taken in to consideration. One of the schools visited had set up adult education courses which had been proposed by teachers. It was thought by that this could be an opportunity for the staff to earn extra money outside school hours. Subsequently some of the courses had been closed due to poor take-up the Sub-Committee had deliberated to what extent community consultation had taken place, how detailed research of local needs had been, how comprehensive the business cases had been put together and how courses had been established. It was noted, however that some of the courses had done well and this would hopefully lead to better sustainability of the programme.

Important considerations when setting up the scheme:

- **Defining the 'community' for which extended schools activities are being directed and ascertaining whether this corresponded with the views of the community through consultation. Consultation could involve for example, secondary school students/parents of students who tend to travel further to and/or may not reside in Southwark. The Definition of the Extended Schools Programme could be an evolving concept based on information gathered from individual schools and providers as they continue to proceed in accordance with their own strengths.**
- **The challenge of supporting the government's 'core offer' of parenting support and family learning sessions for students' families who do not live locally. The Extended Schools Scheme needs to be mindful of the 'Core Offer', parenting support and the 'Youth Offer' Government initiatives.**
- **Clarity needed to be sought related to the funding and sustainability of the programmes, as well as consideration of the timing of funds being made available and allocated at the appropriate times. Any delay in grants being made available could do one of two things: It could stop existing Extended School provision in its tracks or it could stop people/organisations from venturing in to the programme at all.**
- **Accessibility both in terms of transport and disabled access to the school premises.**
- Teenagers wanting independence from their parents may further complicate engagement with parents in this way. However, one school believed that parents were more likely to engage if they could see the direct relevance to their child's development. This seems to add to the growing evidence that consultation and consideration of parent's views would increase the success of the scheme.

Access to school facilities

During the school visits, the Sub-Committee was made aware of some of concerns surrounding the enabling of community access to school facilities. These may not be limited to:

- Security and layout of school i.e. the ability to secure areas of the building that do not warrant public to access.
- Additional costs to the school for opening outside normal school hours. (Security, caretaking, lighting, heating, and other maintenance costs).

Schools held differing views on the additional costs that would be incurred. Some schools had chosen to absorb the costs of extended schools activities. Other schools were intending to pass on costs to the groups who had chosen to use the facilities. It was noted that ultimately, it would be up to the school governing body to decide how schools should charge for its facilities.

Primary schools were not viewed as ideal facilities for a community education purposes. They were found to be usually quite small with limited space for additional or non-school activities. The equipment and infrastructure, such as toilet facilities, chairs and tables in the classrooms, were smaller in size and would not be adequate to meet the needs of adult learners.

The Sub-Committee observed that that it was unlikely that all schools would be suitable for community learning. Generally, the secondary schools visited had more space and had the potential for public/disability access in designated areas. It was thought that the responsibility for community access to ICT, sports and arts facilities is likely to be borne by secondary schools, at least in the near future with the new extended schools programme being incorporated under the Building Schools for the Future scheme.

School staff

The Sub-Committee found that there was some evidence to suggest that there was reliance on the voluntary contributions staff made to the extended school activities. It was noted that a scrutiny committee at Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council³ reported that this was what most schools relied on in delivering extended schools activities.

This was borne out by the sample of schools the Sub-Committee visited, it was indicated that the extended schools programme would be aimed at the school's own students. For example, teachers oversaw the lunchtime activities provided at the primary school visited (dance, drama), and there was study support being undertaken during the Easter holidays. One academy explained that although school staff are paid to run extended schools activities, much of their devoted time was goodwill. It was thought that this reliance on goodwill could affect sustainability of the programme in the long-term. In Contrast during a visit to a sports academy it became apparent that staff devoting extra unpaid time was not in evidence.

The question of the impact on the day to day running of a school was discussed by the Members. For example; to provide flexible start times for teachers who taught evening courses may impact on the daily timetable of the school. The smooth running of the timeslots could also depend on whether the school chose to provide extended schools activities in-house rather than using external providers. The effects of either of these options could have significant implications for students and effect teachers and the terms of their employment contracts.

Impact on students

One of the concerns raised by the Sub-Committee during this exercise was around the effect of extended schools on the behaviour of children and young people. When attending activities outside of the school's core hours, there was a different kind of ethos and not necessarily any consistency in the behaviour management strategies employed.

³ *Extended schools*, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council's Lifelong Learning, Leisure and Cultural Services Scrutiny Committee, April 2004.

There were some questions around the how the children would adapt to extended school learning. Senior schools representative commented that the behaviour of students outside the schools core hours might not be subject to the same behaviour management strategies that the usual school day employed. It was also reported that some students did not find it easy to adapt between the school day and the extended learning environment. Members of the Sub-Committee also questioned if it was desirable to keep children in the same environment for both day and extended evening study. Some senior school representatives confirmed that this may not be the best way to engage children and young people and actively discouraged parents from leaving their children at the school for between 8am till 6pm.

In the case of SEN school provision however, it was thought that the school had a very impressive range of special needs equipment to cater for its students and it was thought unlikely that the same facilities could be offered off-site by any other after-school providers.

It was thought that there was no 'one-size-fits-all' remedy for schools. Schools need to have flexibility to be able to work out how best to suit the needs of the students, within the boundaries of their resources.

Sustainability and resources

It is thought that ensuring the sustainability of extended school activities is likely to be a challenge for schools, with resources and capacity limiting the amount of activities provided.

Overall the SEN School was thought to function better, providing its own after school activities because it was thought that staff understood children's needs better than external providers could. This also meant that the school/s could feel reassured that the quality of after-school provision was to a proper standard. However, the pupil-staff ratios for special needs children meant that on-costs would be higher compared to mainstream schools. There was concern that there may be tension between ensuring services are sustainable and yet be provided at an affordable rate.

School governing bodies needed to consider whether to use mainstream funding on activities for the local community. The academy who had brought in an external partner to manage its sports and community facilities reported that the external organisation had absorbed some costs of the depreciation of its equipment and the infrastructure of the programme. The contract was managed at nil-cost and overall the school believed the partnership had been successful.

The SEN school had a shortfall in funds for transporting students home but some schools were able to absorb extra costs associated with the programme. Members thought that information detailing the way in which funding streams were rationalised and allocated would be very helpful to those either seeking to start up or further develop the scheme.

The representative from SSEMTA reported to the Sub-Committee that it was not just schools that struggled with resourcing. SSEMTA were lacking the funding to enable them to raise the necessary awareness of supplementary schools' activities and to evaluate the benefits of such activities in Southwark. Community groups faced continual challenges in order to survive. The fact that there was no long term guarantee for funding made it difficult to plan ahead. Added to that, this year (07/08), there had been a delay in notifying voluntary and community groups about their

council grants. The Sub-Committee were concerned that delays of this kind wouldn't re-occur, as these groups are seen to be crucial in extended schools provision.

The Members also felt that expectations around what the extended schools programme means for voluntary groups also needed to be considered. There appeared to be an expectation by supplementary schools that government funding for mainstream schools would facilitate the inclusion of community groups. SSEMATA reported that they were interested to know if mainstream schools would now be purchasing the services of supplementary schools or whether schools would want to charge community groups to use their premises.

This raised the question of how local community groups would be charged. It was thought that it would be dependent on negotiation between community groups and the school. The Sub-Committee understood that government funding to mainstream schools is generally time limited and once this funding runs out, schools will have to incorporate the local charges in to their mainstream budget, if they find the activity is of value.

Conclusion

The Sub-Committee was expecting additional information in the shape of baseline audit results to inform part of this report. In the absence of the context with which the results of the audit have been provided to the Sub-Committee, it has not been possible to incorporate with any context and clarity the findings of the audit in to this report to date.

The Extended Schools Programme presents an exciting, yet challenging time for Southwark. It could raise the profile of the Supplementary Programme within the local community and assist adults and young people to reach their potential and fulfil their goals. It also means that the extended school provision would promote a sense of a community hub for students, their families and the wider community.

It is thought that it would be beneficial for Southwark to focus on developing robust structures to assist with developing relationships and promote information sharing between all partners. It was also thought important to bear in mind that community engagement seems key to the success of the scheme. What also had to be considered was the way in which Southwark could make the scheme sustainable.

This scrutiny exercise has sought to form part of the learning process. It is hoped that this light touch, general review has contributed a number of constructive elements for consideration to help make the on going processes of implementation as smooth as possible. This is a positive initiative which could give residents from all the communities of Southwark the opportunity to improve their education and skills for life and may also go some way to promote community cohesion.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in a spirit to further enhance and inform the current Extended School Strategy and related work in the implementation process.

1 EXTENDED SCHOOL COORDINATOR

- 1.1 It was recommended that Southwark recruit an Extended Schools Coordinator if one had not already been appointed. The post holder may have responsibility for:
 - 1.1.1 Over seeing good information sharing practices and partnership working
 - 1.1.2 Giving advice on planning locally for Extended School Provision for children and the community.
 - 1.1.3 Giving advice on community consultation exercises.
 - 1.1.4 Giving advice and guidance on the statutory services and how to obtain useful information including the Council's funding streams and schedules available to the Extended Schools Programme.

2 DEFINITIONS: SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY NEEDS

- 2.1 The infrastructure for good partnership working needs strengthening. Schools and other providers need to be given assistance and guidance by the statutory bodies on how to go about approaching other partners with a view to making robust partnership relations.
- 2.2 It was recommended that the schools, where at all possible should be encouraged to research the local community needs and ascertain form consultation exercises what may be of benefit and desirable for that particular community.
- 2.3 The visits to service providers illustrated the need and benefits for extended schools programmes to be grown organically, stemming from the school's individual strengths. It was also recommended that schools and service providers comprised the needs of the school with the local community as this was found to have more success overall. Service providers need to be encouraged to keep this in mind when planning their programmes.
- 2.4 'Extended Schools Programme' needed a tighter definition to avoid uncertainty and confusion when service providers were planning their programmes or thinking of taking part in the scheme. This was seen as crucial to the enable a more positive approach to the development of the scheme and partnership relationships. (It could be that if the Definition of the Extended Schools Programme cannot be adequately provided, then it could be an evolving concept based on information gathered from individual schools and providers as they continue to proceed with the scheme in accordance with their own strengths).

- 2.5 Those implementing the Extended Schools Scheme needs to be mindful of the 'Core Offer', parenting support and the 'Youth Offer' Government initiatives. Also, consideration needs to be given to the kind of support that families out of the locality may need.
- 2.6 It was recommended that schools could do more to involve and inform the community of their extended schools intentions and greater community involvement should be sought in all cases of extended school development so that the community surrounding Extended School facilities are aware of the pros and cons of the extended hours of educational and recreational provision.

3 FUNDING

- 3.1 It was recommended that funding and the proposed sustainability of the programmes needed more clarity. Consideration of the timing of funds being made available with allocation at the appropriate times detailed to those embarking/developing the scheme. Any delay in grants being made available could do one of two things: It could stop existing Extended School provision in its tracks or it could stop people/organisations from venturing on to the programme at all.
- 3.2 The SEN school had a shortfall in funds for transporting students home but some schools were able to absorb extra costs associated with the programme. More clarity was sought detailing the way in which funding streams were rationalised and allocated would be helpful to those either seeking to start up or further develop the scheme.
- 3.3 The Sub-Committee felt that there should be more information provided on whether there was funding available to transport pupils/students to their placements.
- 3.4 Accessibility both in terms of transport and disabled access to school premises and the cost that may be incurred in converting buildings to allow public access should be considered. Any provision available for conversion work should be made known to potential service providers.

4 EXTENDED SCHOOLS AUDIT

- 4.1 Now that the audit has been finalised it is recommended that the availability of full explanatory context also be made available so that Members and the public are able to clearly understand the outcomes.
- 4.2 Thought should be given to how to monitor areas of Extended School provision, taking in to consideration the outcomes of the audit and any areas of weakness that may have been highlighted as a result.

5 USING EXISTING RESOURCES

- 5.1 Further exploration should be undertaken in to the opportunity to use supplementary school activities when planning services, incorporating them in to the Extended School's Programme.

- 5.2 If/when a mainstream schools opens after hours for their own students extended activities, then it could be fortuitous to use the opening of that school premises to enable other services to take place at the same time.

6 PARTERSHIP WORKING AND INFORMATION SHARING

- 6.1 Developing and maintaining partnerships takes time and effort but it is key in moving the Extended Schools process forward. There needs to be commitment on all sides to benefit both students and the wider community. It was thought that more work needed to be done to lay the foundations for sound structures to ensure that partnership working can be successfully enabled.

- 6.2 A map detailing the locations of placements with transport availability for ease of reference should be made available for all of those taking part/using the scheme networking schools and local service providers facilitating a 'hub' feel to the local schools and the communities.

7. EXTENDED SCHOOLS PROGRAMME 2010

- 7.1 The Sub-Committee wanted to draw attention to Southwark the need to have made sufficient progress with the Extended Schools Programme's Core Service requirements for the Extended Schools Programme by 2010.

Appendix 1:

Results from the Extended Schools Audit.

	Childcare	Varied menu of activities	Swift and Easy access	Parenting support	Community use	Full core offer
Southwark	34	62	90	64	56	33
Bermondsey	8	10	16	13	13	8
Borough and Bankside	2	5	8	6	6	3
Camberwell	5	10	10	9	5	5
Dulwich	1	7	10	5	5	3
Nunhead and Peckham Rye	4	7	14	7	9	4
Peckham	6	4	10	9	8	4
Rotherhithe	6	7	9	6	6	5
Walworth	2	12	13	9	4	1

Appendix 2:

Acknowledgements

Thank you to all those who kindly contributed to our review:

- Ms Kowalska, project co-ordinator at SSEMTA
- The Schools that took part in this review
- The council's assistant director of community access and inclusion

Background documents

We made use of the following background documents during our review:

Draft extended schools strategy, Southwark Council, 2006

Extended schools, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council's Lifelong Learning, Leisure and Cultural Services Scrutiny Committee, April 2004

Extended schools: access to opportunities and services for all, Department for Education and Skills, 2005

Planning and funding extended schools: a guide for schools, local authorities and their partner organisations, Department for Education and Skills, 2006

Minutes and reports of the education, youth & leisure scrutiny Sub-Committee, Southwark Council, February 4 2004 and November 30 2005.

Children's Services and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Members of the Sub-Committee during the review were:

Councillor John Friary (Chair)
Councillor Nick Vineall (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Sandra Rhule
Councillor Bob Skelly
Councillor Veronica Ward
Reverend Nicholas Elder
Ms Ann Marie Eastwood
Mr Alie Kallon
Ms Josie Spanswick