

Appendix 2 Annexe 1

Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow

Consultation Responses and Analysis

High Level Reporting of Views

Contents

1. Introductory comments
2. Consultation response form
3. Key themes
4. Governing bodies
5. Interested party responses

1. Introductory comments

1. Over 30,000 response forms were distributed in the consultation booklets to parents of children attending Harrow schools, and to a wide range of interested parties. There was also publicity about the consultation given through posters, Harrow People, newsletters and Harrow Council website.
2. The response rate for a consultation of this size is low, and the numbers contained in this analysis number fewer than 1,000 responses. It is difficult to give a definitive reason for the low response rate, though the following possibilities are suggested by comments on responses and anecdotal comments:
 - A view that this is a 'done deal' and therefore there is no point responding
 - General support for the proposals leading to a low response rate
 - Not responding to this consultation because view has been expressed previously
3. The low response rate could be for a range of reasons and is not believed to reflect on the consultation process. The view of officers is that the low response rate reflects general support among Harrow's community for the proposals. This view draws on:
 - Support for change in the ages of transfer in the school organisation debate and consultation of 2002/3.
 - Support from representatives of key stakeholder groups on the Stakeholder Reference Group

2. Consultation response form

4. A consultation response form was included in each consultation booklet and also was available on the Harrow Council website to download or complete online. Additional copies were sent to schools. This high level analysis is of those who identified themselves as individual respondents (i.e. pupil, parent/carer, school governor or employee at a Harrow school). High level analysis of those who identified themselves as representing an organisation or governing body is given in the interested party responses section below.

5. The high level analysis needs to be considered in light of the following caveats:
- It is evident from paper copies received and from comments on response forms that some individuals have completed more than one response form. This would usually be because a parent has more than one child attending a Harrow school(s). Sometimes a parent has completed both an electronic and a paper form. All these responses are counted in this analysis because there was no means of identifying all multiple responses (e.g. those completed on-line).
 - It is apparent that some respondents experienced difficulty with completion of the response form. For example, some respondents expressed different views in the two consultation questions, without the reasons for this being consistent or apparent from the comments entered. Also there may have been confusion experienced by some in completing the form electronically, or leaving the on-line facility before completion of all fields.
 - For high level reporting purposes, a view has had to be taken at times about the status of the individual respondent. This has been necessary because of difficulty interpreting some handwritten individual responses, and because of difficulty inputting multiple status on to the electronic system. Where more than one role is entered, the priority order used for entering status has been parent/carer, pupil, governor, employee.
 - If an individual respondent has named a primary sector school, but not specified whether it is the first or middle school, then both schools have been entered.
 - Comments have been produced as written, and not corrected for grammar or spelling.

Do you agree with the proposals to change the ages of transfer in Harrow by creating Infant, Junior, Primary and Secondary Schools in September 2010?

Table 1

Total	Yes	No	Not Sure
686	376 (54.8%)	206 (30.0%)	104 (15.2%)

Status of individual respondents as declared on consultation response forms

Table 2

Status	Totals	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Pupil	17	9	6	2
Parent	595	327	178	90
Governor	18	13	4	1
Employee	44	24	10	10
Not specified	12	3	8	1
Totals	686	376	206	104

Self declaration by respondents on consultation response forms

Table 3

Total	White	Mixed	Black or Black British	Asian or Asian British	Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	Not declared
686	260	22	66	277	20	41

13 of the respondents self declared that they are registered disabled.

Do you agree with the proposals for an individual school?

Notes: The table below shows the numbers of views made about specified schools. The figures are shown by the phase of the school specified.

Not all respondents stated views about individual schools.

The totals do not match the number of respondents because some respondents specified more than one school when giving views. Figures have been entered for the numbers of views made about specified schools, and also where views were given but no school specified.

The responses and comments have been transcribed and made available to Cabinet and are available to view as background information.

Table 4

	Totals	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure	
First school	166	75	45%	65	39%	26	16%
Middle school	148	83	56%	46	31%	19	13%
Combined school	95	55	58%	14	15%	26	27%
High school	77	47	61%	21	27%	9	12%
No school specified	25	10	40%	9	36%	6	24%

3. Key themes from analysis of consultation responses

6. The following tables show the count of comments grouped into eight main theme areas, with twenty-eight sub-theme areas. These theme areas contain all the comments made by respondents who are agreeing, disagreeing and not sure about the proposals.

Table 5

Theme	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
School Organisation				
General comments	21	25	4	50
Unique and successful	0	39	6	45
Alternative suggestions for school organisation	4	8	1	13
Amalgamation	2	1	2	5
In line with other LA school organisation	38	1	5	44
Timing	13	6	1	20
Total number of comments	78	80	19	177

Appendix 2 Annexe 1 of Cabinet Report dated 15 January 2009
Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow

Theme				
Educational	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Curriculum – including Year 7	11	4	1	16
Benefits/ Best interests	2	12	3	17
Continuity including key stage alignment	15	1	1	17
Total number of comments	28	17	5	50
Pupils				
	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	Total
Maturity	6	37	9	52
Age range	0	2	1	3
Special needs	1	2	0	3
Total number of comments	7	41	10	58
Staffing				
	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
General staffing	3	6	7	16
High School staffing	1	6	2	9
First School staffing	2	2	3	7
Middle School staffing	1	1	1	3
Headteacher	1	0	0	1
Total number of comments	8	15	13	36
Implementation in September 2010				
Logistics/Transition Issues	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Management of two year groups transferring during the first year	6	9	7	22
Planning for transition	5	6	6	17
Total number of comments	11	15	13	39

Appendix 2 Annexe 1 of Cabinet Report dated 15 January 2009
Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow

Theme				
Finance/Resources	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Revenue	6	9	5	20
Capital	2	5	0	7
Transition period	4	8	1	13
Total number of comments	12	22	6	40
Buildings				
	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Temporary Accommodation	2	5	1	8
School size	6	8	1	15
Crowding on high school sites	3	8	3	14
Availability/access to playground/outside space on high school sites	1	2	0	3
Total number of comments	12	23	5	40
Admissions				
	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Choice	3	6	0	9
Admission arrangements	4	0	4	8
Total number of comments	7	6	4	17

4. Governing bodies

7. All school governing bodies were asked to consider the consultation proposals and to give their views. Responses were received from 50 of the 68 governing bodies about the overall proposals to change the ages of transfer in Harrow. The responses are as follows:

Table 6

Total schools	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No view expressed
68	33 (48.5%)	10 (14.5%)	7 (10.3%)	18 (26.7%)

Table 7

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Percentage of responses received	66%	20%	14%

5. Interested party responses

8. A number of responses to the consultation were received that have not been analysed with the consultation response forms. The reasons for this include:
- a. response from an organisation;
 - b. responses received by email or letter.
 - c. responses on forms that represented views of more than one person;
 - d. Harrowkidz website (that used different wording for the consultation questions asked).

a. Response from an organisation

9. A letter from the Paediatric Therapy Services supported the changes. An on-line response stated to be from Harrow Association of Disabled People did not state a view but gave the comment: *The proposals are basically positive. I have some concerns about the situation for Shaftesbury High – is it excluded because it already takes that age group? It is important that it is in line with all the other schools, as the transition process is already very difficult for disabled children.*

b. Responses received by email or letter

10. 35 letters and emails were received from persons associated with five schools: Alexandra and Shaftesbury (6); Cannon Lane (27); Grange (1); Pinner Park (1). 29 of these responses were from persons identifying themselves as parents.

Table 8

Question	Totals	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No view expressed
Proposals for all Harrow schools	35	2	29	4	0
Proposals for an individual school	35	0	28	4	3

The responses and comments have been made available to Cabinet and are available to view as background information.

11. 136 letters by pupils of Stanburn First School were sent to Heather Clements, Director of Schools and Children’s Development, and were received on 17 December 2008. The main themes were:
- keep the school the same, and not to be one big school
 - become Stanburn Infant School and:
 - make a Nursery out of Year 3 classrooms, for brothers, sisters and friends to be able to come
 - more children to come to the school, and have another class in each Year
 - have more teachers, and keep two headteachers.

c. Responses on forms that represented views of more than one person

12. There were five responses from Cedars Manor year groups/classes that contained figures about views.
- one group agreed with the proposals, and another group mainly agreed
 - two groups disagreed with the proposals, and another group mainly disagreed

d. Harrowkidz website

13. Harrowkidz website posed two questions about the consultation on its website.

Q1 Do you agree with the changes to the age when you move into Middle and Secondary Schools?

- 12 responses were posted
- Two agree
- Seven disagree (though two respondents appear to have repeated their answer)
- Three appear to disagree, though do not state this directly

Q2 Do you agree to the changes that may happen at your school?

- 2 responses were posted
- Both agree