East Yorkshire College of Further Education Reinspection of Technology: January 2000 Report from the Inspectorate The Further Education Funding Council

# THE FURTHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL

The Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) has a legal duty to make sure further education in England is properly assessed. The FEFC's inspectorate inspects and reports on each college of further education according to a four-year cycle. It also assesses and reports nationally on the curriculum, disseminates good practice and advises the FEFC's quality assessment committee.

## REINSPECTION

The FEFC has agreed that colleges with provision judged by the inspectorate to be less than satisfactory or poor (grade 4 or 5) should be reinspected. In these circumstances, a college may have its funding agreement with the FEFC qualified to prevent it increasing the number of new students in an unsatisfactory curriculum area until the FEFC is satisfied that weaknesses have been addressed.

Satisfactory provision may also be reinspected if actions have been taken to improve quality and the college's existing inspection grade is the only factor which prevents it from meeting the criteria for FEFC accreditation.

Reinspections are carried out in accordance with the framework and guidelines described in Council Circulars 97/12, 97/13 and 97/22. Reinspections seek to validate the data and judgements provided by colleges in self-assessment reports and confirm that actions taken as a result of previous inspection have improved the quality of provision. They involve full-time inspectors and registered part-time inspectors who have knowledge of, and experience in, the work they inspect. The opinion of the FEFC's audit service contributes to inspectorate judgements about governance and management.

## **GRADE DESCRIPTORS**

Assessments use grades on a five-point scale to summarise the balance between strengths and weaknesses. The descriptors for the grades are:

- grade 1 outstanding provision which has many strengths and few weaknesses
- grade 2 good provision in which the strengths clearly outweigh the weaknesses
- grade 3 satisfactory provision with strengths but also some weaknesses
- grade 4 less than satisfactory provision in which weaknesses clearly outweigh the strengths
- grade 5 poor provision which has few strengths and many weaknesses.

Audit conclusions are expressed as good, adequate or weak.

Cheylesmore House Quinton Road Coventry CV1 2WT Telephone 02476 863000 Fax 02476 862100 website: http://www.fefc.ac.uk

© FEFC 1999

You may photocopy this report and use extracts in promotional or other material provided quotes are accurate, and the findings are not misrepresented.

## East Yorkshire College of Further Education Yorkshire and Humberside Region

#### **Reinspection of technology: January 2000**

#### Background

East Yorkshire College of Further Education, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, was inspected in October 1998 and the findings published in inspection report 04/99. Provision in technology was awarded a grade 4.

The key strengths in the original inspection report were effective systems for monitoring the progress of construction students and the range of equipment to support motor cycle and power products courses. The weaknesses were: poor management of some courses; insufficient technical support; some weak teaching; poor retention and pass rates, particularly on level 2 programmes; inadequate access to IT at the Carnaby centre.

Reinspection took place over three days in January 2000. Inspectors observed eight lessons of which four were judged to be good or outstanding. They also examined a range of documents, scrutinised student achievement and retention data and had meetings with managers, teachers and students.

#### Assessment

The college has made significant progress in addressing the weaknesses identified in the original inspection. It has improved the resources available to support technology. Technology provision, comprising engineering, motor vehicle, motor cycle, construction, furniture and wood machining, has been centralised at the Carnaby centre. This supports good communication and the sharing of good practice between related subject areas. However, these arrangements are new and it is too early to assess their impact on the quality of provision. The layout of workshop accommodation has been redesigned to provide separate workshops for each vocational area. The learning resource centre has been enlarged and includes a suite of computers with printing facilities. Learning support in literacy, numeracy and IT is readily available to students. IT facilities are available to staff in their workroom. A bistro, providing refreshments and meals for staff and students, has been provided.

A programme area manager has been appointed recently. Course management is effective. The number of technicians has been increased from one to five and these are timetabled to particular duties and workshops according to their skills, to carry out appropriate maintenance work and to support teaching. They work flexibly and provide appropriate support. Since the last inspection the college has begun a rigorous programme of lesson observation. All teaching observed during the reinspection was at least satisfactory. Improved quality assurance procedures have been introduced.

There have been some improvements in student achievement. Data for 1999, are broadly in line with national averages. For example, in 1999, achievement on level 2 engineering courses was 62% compared with the national average of 58%. At level 3, the achievement rate was 69%, some 20% above the national average. In construction, the achievement rate for NVQ bricklaying was 100% in 1999. Some retention rates continue to be poor. For level 2 engineering courses, retention was 76% in 1999 which was below the national average for these courses. At level 3, retention was poor at 52%. The retention rate for NVQ bricklaying

was 44% in 1999, which is slightly below the national average. Overall, for these courses, the proportion of enrolled students who are successful in achieving their qualifications is in line with national averages.

**Revised grade:** technology 3.