



MINIMISING BURDENS IN SCHOOLS  
THE IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW UNIT

## **Implementation Review Unit – Position Statement on Extended Services in Schools – November 2007**

The Implementation Review Unit (IRU) is an independent panel of school practitioners appointed in 2003 by the then Secretary of State for Education and Skills. Our remit is about supporting and challenging the government and its agencies, including local authorities, in removing and avoiding unnecessary burdens on schools.

We have kept in touch with work to develop and roll out 'extended services'. We recognise that work on the roll out is in progress rather than complete. We have had several presentations from Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) officials who are in the lead on 'extended services'. This statement sets out our current analysis of the situation. What we have seen and heard from DCSF is set out in more detail at the annex.

During the next 12 months we will review this policy area, hearing again from officials in DCSF about progress and probing as thoroughly as we are able to on the evidence supplied on the impacts on the school workforce in respect of burdens and bureaucracy. With this in mind we will be revisiting and updating this position statement in the Spring of 2008.

In the meantime we value your experience of 'extended services' - good and bad. Please contact us at [IRU.PANEL@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:IRU.PANEL@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk).

annex  
IRU Position statement on Extended Services in Schools

The panel believes that opportunities should be provided for further engagement with children, families and the community, and that schools have a key role to play in such wider provision. The potential benefits, both educational and in wider ways have been shown and continue to emerge.

We have concerns, however, that in the roll out of extended provision, unnecessary burdens and expectations are being placed on schools and their leaders and staff.

- We strongly support the concept of extended provision in and through schools. The term “extended schools” should be dropped, as should the tendency to migrate between the term extended schools... services ...provision in DCSF literature. To say that a school is an “extended schools” implies for youngsters, parents and the wider community that that school delivers all of the services that are associated with the core offer. In many cases, this is simply not the case.
- The emphasis on a clustered approach to extended provision in which all schools signpost provision, but don't always directly deliver it, must be encouraged for workload and sustainability reasons.
- We urge the DCSF and its implementation body, the TDA, to move away from the traffic light system of monitoring. We are told that this system is in place to enable DCSF/TDA to direct support to those LAs which are most in need of extra support in this area. Our experience though is that this may be creating a tick box attitude at LA Coordinator level and pressure on heads and school staff to do the same, with very little regard to quality and coherence.
- It is encouraging that the SEF now carries questions about extended services. Accountability must continue to be through the NRwS, the single conversation, and Ofsted inspection. Critically too, no new or separate streams of funding (drawn down through writing extensive plans or through a bidding process) should be established. There should be one funding stream to serve multiple provision needs in any one school. We should be judged on our outcomes and not the processes in getting there.
- At school level the use of professionals and specialist services other than school staff should be encouraged and assumed. Governors must monitor the burden placed on school staff.

Policy makers at the DCSF should manage the delivery chain so that the messages given regarding national, regional and local implementation are consistent with the guidance and non-statutory status of this initiative.

We will continue to press DCSF on these matters.