

**Comments and Discussions from the Post 16 Study Feedback Sessions**

**Representative Primary Headteachers**

The Headteachers asked about the development of the models and the assessment criteria. It was considered that there was a provider bias in the models and criteria. The clients/parental views did not appear to be incorporated and those views expressed by parents were not reflected in the assessment. For example the contribution that 6<sup>th</sup> form pupils give to a school's ethos and culture - expectations and aspirations.

In relation to the cluster models, it was suggested that for the perception to change then it was important that Students were registered with the schools. There was a need for the provision to re-assure parents that the provision retained a school ethos. Some parents expressed concern about the age range of a college 18 –23 year olds. For some students this would not be an issue but for others this environment was not considered appropriate.

The Heads did not consider that they had been consulted on the models. It was explained that the consultants had worked with three recognised and working models and that Harrow College had proposed the spokes and hubs model.

The perceptions of the colleges amongst parents were not positive. Although it was acknowledge that this can be misinformed, it was a common perception. It would be important for colleges to provide a school day type of experience.

Increasing the opportunity for vocational courses, flexibility and work training were welcomed, although further information was required. There was some discussion about the need for some colleges in the cluster model to have specialisms.

It was agreed that Primary headteachers had an important role in the development of Post 16 provision and promoting opportunities to parents.

**High School Headteachers**

Discussion about the statistical base used by the consultants and it was generally recognised that this was a snapshot and that further work was needed to analyse curriculum patterns.

It was felt that the current pattern of school organisation in Harrow was a contributory factor in the loss of pupils at 11+ and this aspect should not be lost when looking at post 16. The 11+ and 16+ consultations should be run together if possible.

Agreed the need for a strategic group looking at 14-19, but it was felt that the existing groups working in this area should be subsumed into the new group rather than proliferate groups.

Recognised that the quality debate on provision was at the centre of perceptions. Harrow provided a very good system of education throughout the age range continuum but some parents and students had different perceptions.

Need to provide a further session to examine the partnership model in much greater detail.

Agreed the need for all stakeholders to meet together to discuss outcomes of the discussions held with different groups.

### **Colleges Senior Management**

Felt strongly that there was a need for all parts of the education service to be aspirational about what it wanted to achieve.

Attention needs to be given to an analysis of accommodation and curriculum offer as the next stage of work.

Agreed the need for a 14-19 Strategic Steering Group but felt that other groups should be subsumed.

Need to address perceptions of parents and students on the quality of provision in the colleges. Recognition that there was a great deal of quality provision and able students currently.

Need to clarify with LWLSC the timing of the Strategic Area Review.

Strong support to increase skills offer and work based learning and to increase pathways. Guidance systems needed to rely on accurate, up to date information so that students have clear advice on provision available.

Need for strong political support for changes in the post-16 offer and for more awareness throughout the school sector.

Agreed the need to share the management and governance framework being developed between Park and Stanmore as this issue is central to effective partnership working.

Agreed to stakeholders meeting to discuss the outcome of the consultative feedback sessions.