

Meeting:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date:	4 September 2008
Subject:	Draft scope for Extended Schools scrutiny review
Responsible Officer:	Tom Whiting Assistant Chief Executive
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Anjana Patel Schools and Children's Development
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Draft scope

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the scope for the 'Extended Schools as Community Resources' scrutiny review, for agreement by the Committee. This has been substantially revised since it was presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee 22 April 2008 as the 'Future of Schools' scrutiny review.

Recommendations:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and agree the attached scope.

Reason: (For recommendation):

To allow progress on a scrutiny review that is prioritised within the scrutiny work programme for 2008/09.

Section 2 – Report

Background

In November 2007, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a feasibility study on a scrutiny review of the Future of Schools and agreed that a scrutiny review should be undertaken.

A scope was developed by members of the review group. However given the changed timescales around Harrow's work on the Building Schools for the Future initiative, at Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 22 April it was decided to change the nature of the scrutiny review to focus on extended schools as community resources.

This report sets out the revised scope for the review, for formal agreement. This scope has been developed and finalised by members of the review group. In line with the scrutiny protocols for scoping scrutiny reviews, it has been discussed with the relevant Council Director and further it has been sent to the portfolio holder with an invitation for comments.

Current situation

A project plan for the review will be developed and this will be informed by the scope and Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comments.

Why a change is needed

Not applicable.

Main options

The review group welcomes the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comments, however it should be noted that the scope has been agreed by the review group.

Other options considered

Not applicable.

Implications of the Recommendation:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to agree the attached scope.

Considerations

Resources, costs and risks

Costs associated with this scrutiny review will be contained within the scrutiny budget 2008/09.

Staffing workforce

The scrutiny review will be delivered using in-house resources. This will mainly draw on resources from the Scrutiny Team (support and administration) but will also ask officer time of colleagues in other service departments, namely Children's Services.

Equalities impact

It will be endeavoured at all times that this scrutiny review be sensitive to and respect equalities issues and the needs of all those participating.

Legal comments

There are no legal issues directly arising from this report.

Community safety (s17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998)

There are no specific community safety issues directly related to this report.

Financial Implications

There are no financial issues arising from this report. As included in the scope, resources for this review will be met from the existing scrutiny budget. No significant additional expenditure is anticipated.

Performance Issues

There are no performance issues specific to this report. The review will add value to a corporate priority for 2008/09 – ‘extending the community use of schools while making education even better’.

Risk Implications

Key risks identified at this stage relate to the completion of the scrutiny work programme.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? No

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Sheela Thakrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 21 August 2008		
Name: Sharon Clarke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 12 August 2008		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Nahreen Matlib, Senior Professional Scrutiny
nahreen.matlib@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee 22 April 2008 – ‘Draft scope for Future of Schools scrutiny review’

If appropriate, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE 2008/09**



**SCRUTINY LIGHT-TOUCH REVIEW
OF EXTENDED SCHOOLS AS
COMMUNITY RESOURCES**

DRAFT SCOPE – JULY 2008

1	SUBJECT	Extended Schools as Community Resources
2	COMMITTEE	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	Councillor Margaret Davine Councillor Mitzi Green Councillor Manji Kara Councillor Dinesh Solanki Councillor Yogesh Teli Ramji Chauhan (education co-optee – parent governor) Despo Speel (education co-optee – parent governor)
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	<p><i>Impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess the impact and connectivity of cluster activities - whether all clusters of extended schools are helping the authority deliver and promote the Every Child Matters outcomes. To gauge whether all of Harrow's extended schools and clusters are meeting the core offer of services well and identify any gaps in provision. <p><i>Strategy and vision</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To add value to the corporate priority on 'Extending the community use of schools while making education even better' and help develop the corporate vision around the extended schools agenda and the overall connection with the 'wider family' of provision through the children's centres. <p><i>Sustainability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider whether extended schools services are a good investment and sustainable – including value for money considerations around finance, performance, attendance rates, exclusions and uptake of services. To identify and share good practice within extended schools clusters.

		<p><i>Service development and partnerships</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maximise links between children’s centres and extended schools to ensure joined up services. • To consider the strategic development of extended schools services and the links to the different priorities of partner agencies. <p><i>Adding value to community resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To evaluate the value added to the community through the provision of extended services in schools, including engagement with stakeholders. • To highlight any issues that warrant further study by scrutiny.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion in the capacity of schools to meet the wider partnership agenda, for example in relation to extended schools, children’s centres. • Enhanced culture of learning in Harrow, e.g. enhanced participation in school life for Harrow’s children and young people (including extra-curricular activities). • Contribution to the authority’s progress on sustained school improvement. • A tangible input into the process of external evaluation of Harrow’s services for children and young people.
6	SCOPE	The scope of the review will only consider issues where there is the potential for the local authority to make an impact – what the Council can add to the wider strategic operation of schools and the schools’ clusters, the Council as promoting the cohesiveness of schools in Harrow.
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	Corporate priority 2008/09 – ‘Extending the community use of schools while making education even better’
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Paul Clark, Corporate Director Children’s Services
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	Lynne McAdam, Service Manager Scrutiny
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Nahreen Matlib, Senior Professional - Scrutiny
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	Scrutiny Team
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	Possible input from the following may be considered during the course of the review:

		<p>Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people • Parents and carers • Harrow Association of Governing Bodies • Headteachers • Teaching staff and support staff in schools • School councils and the Youth Parliament • Other local authorities • Staff within children’s settings e.g. schools, children’s centres, extended schools services • Relevant corporate director(s) • Relevant portfolio holder(s) • Integrated Early Years and Community Services Partnership • Service providers within extended school clusters • The ‘wider community’ e.g. residents within cluster areas <p>Partner agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harrow Primary Care Trust • Harrow Police • Harrow Colleges • North West London Hospitals Trust <p>Experts/advisers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisor from SACRE • Representative interest groups • Centre for Public Scrutiny • Academic experts • Public policy think-tanks
13	METHODOLOGY	<p>During this light-touch review, the Review Group may draw upon the following methodologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desktop performance research sessions – small working groups to analyse population data and policy directions, to ascertain Harrow’s current position, identify the challenges/opportunities faced, and the relevant timescales for implementation of government direction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevant documents will include demographic data, performance information (results, trends) for Harrow schools, reviews by external bodies (Ofsted evaluation of Harrow LA, Joint Area Review), audit and survey findings and any relevant previous scrutiny reviews 2. Stock take of extended services within schools 3. Benchmarking against other local authorities with specific reference to value for money considerations in delivering extended school

		<p>activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups - of parents, children and young people, headteachers, governors, cluster co-ordinators (different focus groups for service users and service providers) • Fact finding visits – to extended schools in Harrow's clusters and to other local authorities where best practice has been identified • Challenge session(s) – evidence gathering from key witnesses from within the local authority and more widely from partner organisations • Survey of users (e.g. parents and children) in one or more clusters – to gather feedback on users' access to a full menu of activities under the extended schools initiative <p>Methodologies open to the Review Group include: Written evidence, oral evidence, research, questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, presentations, questioning senior managers and members, inspections, site visits, expert witnesses, public meetings etc.</p>
14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	<p>Equality considerations will be of paramount importance to this review. The review will consider during the course of its work, how equality implications have been taken into account in current policy and practice and consider the possible implications of any changes it recommends.</p> <p>In carrying out this review, the Review Group will also need to consider its own practices and how it can facilitate all relevant stakeholders in the borough to have their voices heard.</p>
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	<p>The review will require a long-term commitment from members and officers.</p> <p>Success will depend upon the ability and willingness of officers, partners and stakeholders (as relevant) to participate and contribute fully in this review.</p>
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	<p>The review will have regard to the possible community safety implications of any recommended changes to policy/practice.</p>
17	TIMESCALE	<p>A light-touch review to be carried out over Autumn 2008 so as to allow enough time for the transfer of responsibility for extended schools services from the</p>

		<p>Community Learning Directorate to Children's Services to be embedded.</p> <p>The Review Group will ensure that it flags up any potential budgetary implications of its findings in a timely fashion. The final report of the review will be presented to Cabinet in Spring 2009 so as to allow recommendations to be implemented in time for the 2009/2010 academic year (September 2009).</p>
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	To be met from the existing scrutiny budget. No significant additional expenditure is anticipated.
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Nahreen Matlib, as advised by the Review Group.
20	SCRUTINY PRINCIPLES	A feasibility study was undertaken and presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November 2007, assuring compliance with the scrutiny principles.
21	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Outline of formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Service Director <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> throughout the course of the review and when developing recommendations</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> as a witness in the review and when developing recommendations</p> <p>To Corporate Strategic Board <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be confirmed</p> <p>To Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spring 2009</p>
22	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)	Initial monitoring by Overview and Scrutiny Committee (after 6 months) then monitoring by the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee on a 'by-exception' basis.