

The background features abstract, overlapping geometric shapes in various shades of blue, ranging from light sky blue to deep navy blue. These shapes are primarily located on the left and right sides of the slide, framing the central text area.

CSFW Leadership Pre Market Engagement Event Breakout Groups Outputs

6 July 2021

Other comments:

- ❑ Information sharing – would be helpful to see indicative numbers/contract length/value ASAP even if not final to help give an idea of what the requirement will be.
- ❑ Upon – how will the new provider interact with existing Upon provider and how will that transition work? (added to Q&S log DP)
- ❑ ITT – Be clear that you are interested in new providers and not old providers, outline the rationale for why moving away from existing provision and in a new direction.
- ❑ Outcome – be clear on outcomes in the spec and specific in areas where there isn't flexibility
- ❑ Need to be clear around whether there is a preferred delivery model – delivered online or in person. Online will be a specific barrier for some. Deliverability of organisation – is that going to make it accessible. How do we ensure that we make it possible for everyone across the country.
- ❑ Tender and spec needs to be clear around what is required. Clear guidance around weighting and scoring, how it will be assessed. Interesting to know how the different streams will be weighted and perhaps get information on relative volumes provided and not sure how directly it has been matched to the current delivery model
- ❑ Are there other options for DFE to streamline the programme? for example suppliers of different components could work together in the design phase and could achieve some of the outcomes without creating challenges associated with a single supplier model; the delivery model will have knock on impact and that needs to be some sense in the specification of exactly what that means.
- ❑ The size of the programme needs to be proportionate to the size of the workforce for example there are under 150 practice leader posts in England so no point training up people for posts that won't be there for them to fill
- ❑ Alumni who have been through the programme - what support can be given to that group if it's a different provider to the current provider; will they choose who they continue to support out of those who have been on programmes previously.

Other comments:

- ☐ Information sharing – would be helpful to see indicative numbers/contract length/value ASAP even if not final to help give an idea of what the requirement will be.
- ☐ could there be something in there about looking at longitudinal benefits or a mixed method approach; also impact needs to be captured for the future
- ☐ Flag that not everyone is aware of the services that we provide – how do we share this information better?
- ☐ LA perspective – a lot of different takes on leadership. A lot of different messages that can come through. How do we ensure that the research we draw on is accurate/timely? Lots of research on resilience/psychological safety.