

## Quality and Standards

### Reviewing Performance: Arrangements for Colleges and Other Providers

#### Summary

This consultation circular is addressed to Learning and Skills Council (Council) funded colleges, Ufi hubs and other providers, including those delivering further education, work-based learning, adult and community learning, information, advice and guidance services and education-business links. Following evaluation of the current Council framework for performance review, the Council seeks a response to its proposals for a refined framework. Responses are sought from colleges, other providers and their representative bodies, learners and their representative bodies, inspectorates and awarding bodies as well as other stakeholders and those with an interest in post-16 learning.

# Contents

---

	Paragraph numbers
Introduction	1
Performance Review	7
Context	9
Evaluation of Performance Review	16
Proposed Refinements to the Performance Review Framework	21
- Re-statement of the Purposes of Performance Review	22
- Proposed Frequency of Reporting	24
- Proposed Key Performance Areas	26
- Re-statement of Evidence	29
- Proposed Use of Evidence From Inspection	31
- Proposed Revision to the Performance Review Assessment Scale	35
- Proposed Greater Transparency	43
- Proposed Increased Consistency of Assessments	44
- Proposed Arrangements for Disagreements	46
The Consultation	47

## **Annex:**

Annex A: Pro-forma for Responding to the Consultation Paper

## About this Consultation

This consultation paper conforms to the Code of Practice on Written Consultations published by the Cabinet Office. The Code specifies that:

The consultation should allow adequate time for its results to be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service. This will help ensure the best prospects for improving the proposals.

The consultation should be clear about who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.

The consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible for you to read. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for you to respond, make contact or complain.

Documents should be widely available to you, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of other means of consultation). The document should be effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.

Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the minimum period for a consultation.

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

The organisation should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

## Further information

For further information contact the appropriate Learning and Skills Council local office or write to: Toni Fazaeli, Assistant Director

Quality and Standards Directorate  
The Learning and Skills Council 101 Lockhurst Lane Foleshill Coventry CV6 5SF

A copy of this document can also be found on the Learning and Skills Council's website ([www.lsc.gov.uk](http://www.lsc.gov.uk))

## Responses

Responses are requested by **28 May 2002**. Responses from colleges and other local providers or local organisations should be sent to: The Executive Director of your local Learning and Skills Council (details available on [www.lsc.gov.uk](http://www.lsc.gov.uk))

Responses from other providers or organisations should be sent by the same date to:  
Toni Fazaeli, Assistant Director, Quality and Standards Directorate

The Learning and Skills Council 101 Lockhurst Lane Foleshill Coventry CV6 5SF  
Tel: 087 0900 6800 Fax: 02476 703316 E-mail: [CVH-performancereview@lsc.gov.uk](mailto:CVH-performancereview@lsc.gov.uk)

The Learning and Skills Council may, under the terms of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, make individual consultation responses available on public request unless individual consultees have asked for their comments to remain confidential.

# Executive Summary

---

**Date:** February 2002

**Subject:** Consultation on refinement of the Learning and Skills Council's Performance Review framework.

**Intended recipients:** Colleges, other providers, and their representative bodies; Ufi hubs; learners and their representative bodies; inspectorates and awarding bodies as well as other key stakeholders and those with an interest in post 16 learning.

**Status:** For information and response by 28 May 2002.

## Summary:

1 The Remit Letter from the Secretary of State for Education and Employment to the Learning and Skills Council (Council) states that the Council will have 'the key responsibility to plan, fund, monitor and improve the quality of post 16 learning up to higher education'. Performance Review is a key way in which the Council is delivering these responsibilities.

2 The Council and Jobcentre Plus are working together to harmonise arrangements for performance review in order to maximise consistency wherever appropriate.

3 This consultation circular outlines the performance review framework that the Council has in place, and the evaluation of that framework following two reviews of the performance of colleges and other providers. The evaluation, including an independent consultant and views of external stakeholders, found that the principles of performance review are essentially sound, but there is scope for streamlining and improving implementation.

4 In addition, this circular clarifies the types of evidence used for review of the key areas. It is emphasised that performance reviews draw upon existing data and information and are part of regular partnership working between the Council and colleges and other providers.

5 This consultation circular sets out proposals for simplification and refinement of the performance review framework. These proposals restate the purposes of performance review and propose: a reduction of the formal reporting of performance review outcomes from three times to twice a year; a streamlining of the framework from ten to three key areas; the use of a five point assessment scale, with revised descriptors, or possibly a four point scale to categorise performance.

6 The document is set out as follows:

- an introduction to the consultation process; performance review and its context and evaluation of performance review
- proposed refinements to the performance review framework
- an annexed proforma for responses to the circular's proposals.

# Reviewing Performance: Arrangements for Colleges and Other Providers

---

## Introduction

1 This consultation circular is addressed to Learning and Skills Council (Council) funded colleges, Ufi hubs and other providers, including those delivering further education, work-based learning, adult and community learning, information, advice and guidance services and education-business links. Performance review is part of the Council's strategy for improving quality and an important way in which we work with colleges and other providers to raise standards. The Council needs to ensure that it is taking into account a range of data and information relating to performance, so that support is targeted in inverse proportion to success.

2 Following evaluation of the current Council framework for performance review we seek a response to proposals for a simplified and refined framework. Responses are sought from colleges and other providers and their representative bodies, learners and their representative bodies, inspectorates and awarding bodies as well as other stakeholders and those with an interest in post-16 learning.

3 The responses to this consultation circular will be analysed and the results, giving an account of the views expressed and reasons for the decisions finally taken, will be posted on the Council website.

4 The revised framework will be designed to operate over several years. However, the Council will continue to monitor its effectiveness and seek the views of those to whom it applies. The Council and Jobcentre Plus are working together to harmonise arrangements for performance review in order to maximise consistency wherever appropriate.

5 The refined performance review framework will be implemented from the autumn of 2002. Associated training for Council staff will take place during July, August and September and then on an ongoing basis, as required. The Council's framework for the performance review process will be published in September 2002 and local Learning and Skills Councils (local Councils<sup>1</sup>) will brief colleges and other providers on arrangements.

6 This consultation circular sets out the current performance review framework, the context for performance review and the outcomes of evaluation activities. Proposed changes to the performance review framework are explained and questions for response are posed.

## Performance Review

7 Performance review uses a comprehensive and formal framework to regularly record the Council's assessment of colleges and other providers it funds, based on a range of quality and performance indicators. It is an important part of the Council's ongoing relationship with colleges and other providers.

8 From the outset, the framework's prime purposes were to:

- help drive up standards and quality by promoting a culture of continuous improvement
- identify colleges and other providers experiencing difficulty
- identify areas of good practice and of weaker performance

<sup>1</sup> And, where appropriate, the Council's national contracts service.

- enable the Council to allocate staff time and other resources to help colleges and other providers tackle areas of weakness and resolve problems swiftly
- inform strategic planning of post-16 provision.

## Context

9 The Learning and Skills Council (Council) was established on 1 April 2001. It brought together the Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) and the Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs). It is responsible for all post-16 education and training in England, excluding higher education. It operates through 47 local Learning and Skills Councils across England and the national contracts service. Two committees, the Adult Learning and the Young People's Learning Committees, support the sixteen-member National Council.

10 The Remit Letter from the Secretary of State for Education and Employment to the Learning and Skills Council states that the Council will have 'the key responsibility to plan, fund, monitor and improve the quality of post-16 learning up to higher education.'

11 To discharge some of these responsibilities and to ensure that there was no hiatus in the reviews formerly conducted by the FEFC of colleges, and of other providers by the TECs, the Council decided to undertake regular performance reviews. The Council was also determined to deliver commitments made to the Public Accounts Committee in March 2001 'to apply rigorous review at a local level' and to carry out 'very close monitoring of providers that will have an impact'<sup>2</sup>. Similarly, the Council is committed to do more 'to identify potential problems earlier' and 'to take a more proactive, preventative approach to resolving the causes and spend less management time on reactive measures'<sup>3</sup>. Two reviews of further education colleges and work-based learning providers were conducted in June and October 2001.

12 Performance review reports are based on information available to the Council as part of normal data gathering, monitoring activity and partnership working. The data are supplied by colleges and other providers and key evaluation agencies such as the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) and the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI).

13 The present arrangements for performance review comprise:

- performance review panel meetings at which information available to the Council about the performance of each college or provider is assessed in ten key areas
- categorisation of colleges' and other providers' overall performance on a five point scale (excellent, good, satisfactory, some concerns, serious concerns)
- feedback and agreement of focus and actions for improvements
- reports of the outcomes of the review panel meetings to the Council's national office three times a year.

14 Performance review is conducted by local Councils and the outcomes are moderated by a national review board which also oversees follow-up action, in particular with those categorised as causing concern. In the case of some national providers, review arrangements are undertaken by the Council's national contracts service.

15 It is important to distinguish between performance review and inspection. The Council's performance review is a continuous process, based on information from a range of sources. Much of the information is collected through regular contact between the Council and those it funds as part of routine monitoring and support activities. Inspection is a separate, highly-focused process undertaken

<sup>2</sup> Public Accounts Committee hearing March 2001, on improving student performance in English further education colleges.

<sup>3</sup> Public Accounts Committee Ninth Report, *Managing finances in English further education colleges*, March 2001.

by OfSTED and the Adult Learning Inspectorate (the ALI) on a four-yearly cycle. Performance review is intended to help colleges and other providers devise and implement strategies to achieve consistently high standards of performance and quality. Inspection provides external validation of performance against a common inspection framework at a given point in time.

## Evaluation of Performance Review

16 The Council has already undertaken a number of activities to evaluate the performance review process. These include consideration by the national review board; evaluation events; a published document on the Council's website seeking comments; a national task group of Council staff; liaison with stakeholders; and Dr Terry Melia CBE, independent consultant, seeking the views of external stakeholders.

17 In evaluating the performance review process the Council has taken account of Dr Melia's findings; and the views of colleges, other providers and their representative bodies; the Department for Education and Skills; the Local Government Association; OfSTED and the ALI and feedback from a number of other stakeholders.

18 Feedback from those consulted confirmed that quality improvement is an important purpose of performance review. It was also recognised that strategies need to be devised to ensure that the findings of reviews translate rapidly into action to support quality improvement. Many respondents also emphasised the role of performance review as a risk management strategy that identifies difficulties and enables the Council to provide appropriate support.

19 The key messages that have emerged from evaluation activities are that:

- the principles underpinning the performance review process and the objectives are essentially sound
- the performance review process has the potential to deliver the stated purposes
- there is scope for streamlining the framework
- implementation is not yet consistent or fully effective
- some good practice in implementation is developing that can be built upon to improve the effectiveness of the review process.

20 Feedback during the evaluation suggests that to strengthen and improve performance review arrangements, whilst minimising unnecessary bureaucracy, the issues outlined in the table overleaf need to be addressed.



Issues to be addressed	How the Council is addressing the issue
Encourage dialogue between Council staff reviewing performance and those being reviewed	throughout the Circular emphasis is given to performance review as a key aspect of partnership working with colleges and other providers
Clearly state and disseminate the purpose of the performance review process	see paragraphs 22-23
Report the formal review panel meeting decisions less often	see paragraphs 24-25
Refine the review process	see paragraphs 26-28
Strengthen the evidence base	see paragraphs 29-30
Distinguish the process from inspection	see paragraphs 31-34
Involve colleges and other providers in any review of the framework	see paragraph 43
Establish an advisory group with a membership representing a range of interested parties, including colleges and other providers, to advise on the performance review framework	see paragraph 43
Clarify the arrangements for colleges and other providers to make a formal complaint if the outcomes of performance review have led to interventions that are contested	see paragraph 46
Extend the review process as appropriate across different types of providers funded by the Council	Work in progress: evaluating the Council's pilot project on performance review of LEA Adult and Community Learning, in order to inform the application of performance review more widely across types of provider.
Rationalise the way in which providers working in more than one Council area are reviewed.	'Lead' arrangements being considered by a Council working group due to report early Summer 2002.



## Proposed Refinements to the Performance Review Framework

21 In the light of the evaluation of over 2,000 performance reviews in June and October 2001, a number of refinements are proposed to the review framework. The proposed adjustments and the reasons for them are outlined below.

### Re-statement of the purposes of Performance Review

22 The purposes that guide the performance review of providers stem from the Council's need to monitor and improve the quality of post-16 learning and in order to fulfil the responsibilities assigned by the Secretary of State for Education and Employment. The purposes of performance review are restated below, and are placed in the context of the Council's partnership working with those it funds.

23 Performance review uses a comprehensive, formal framework for regularly recording the Council's assessment of Council-funded provision, based on performance data and information. It is an important part of the Council's ongoing relationship with colleges and other providers through which the Council can:

- help drive up standards and quality
- strengthen partnership working to raise standards, support continuous improvement and resolve problems quickly
- identify areas of weaker performance as well as colleges or other providers experiencing difficulty
- help in the planning of effective follow up activity to tackle potential problem areas swiftly, before they become serious

- help in the allocation of Council staff time and other resources in supporting and monitoring colleges and other providers
- identify and disseminate good practice
- inform Council strategic planning of post-16 provision.

**Q1 Do you consider that the purposes of performance review, as stated in paragraph 23, are appropriate?**

### Proposed frequency of reporting

24 The performance review process should not duplicate other activities as it should be based on information and data already collected by the Council as part of the Council's normal interaction with colleges and other providers. Performance review draws upon evidence from a range of established data returns and monitoring activities. Periodic review meetings to consider and report on performance enable the Council to gain an overview and co-ordinate feedback to colleges and other providers, and to establish what development work is needed. The outcomes of performance review are confirmed in writing to the college or provider. In the case of colleges causing concern or serious concern, the feedback letter is copied to the chair of governors. The Council also discusses with the college or provider the main messages from the review and agrees with them what actions need to be taken to bring about further improvements. Intervention is intended to be in inverse proportion to the confidence placed in a college or provider, with Council staff devoting more time to working with those 'causing concern' than with those deemed to be 'effective' or 'outstanding'.

25 To reduce bureaucracy and leave sufficient time between reviews to work on improvements it is proposed to reduce the present cycle of reporting on performance reviews from three times to twice a year. The reporting dates will be established to make use of the latest data available to the Council.

**Q2 Do you support reducing the formal reporting of reviews from three times a year to twice a year?**

**Proposed key performance areas**

26 In the first rounds of performance review, performance was assessed across ten key areas, namely:

- quality of education and the standards achieved by (a) 16-18 year-old and (b) 19+ year-old learners
- continuous improvement
- other aspects of leadership and management of learning
- quality of planning
- data management
- financial viability and assurance
- delivery of the volumes of provision agreed with the Council
- learner health and safety
- equality and diversity
- other priorities including national initiatives (for example, basic skills).

27 There is growing support among those consulted during evaluation of the review framework that a more efficient approach would be to group these areas into fewer key performance areas. We propose that there are three groupings:

1 **Participation and recruitment**, which would include achievement of targets for enrolments/starts, widening participation, and ability to deliver special initiatives for particular target groups;

2 **Learner experience and performance**, which would embrace learner retention, achievement, destination/progression, learner satisfaction;

3 **Management**, which would include planning, financial and data management, self-assessment and continuous improvement, quality assurance arrangements, equality and diversity, learner health and safety, and, where appropriate, governance.

28 Having formed a view on all of the factors contributing to each of these three groups, a view will be formed by the Council about overall performance, using a four or five-point scale as discussed in paragraphs 39 - 42, below. In order to avoid a mechanistic process, we do not intend to apply a weighting formula to any of the three groups, nor to any of the contributory factors within each group.

**Q3 Do you consider that streamlining the performance review framework into three key performance areas provides an adequate basis for the Council to make an overall assessment of performance?**

**Re-statement of evidence**

29 Colleges and other providers should not normally be asked for additional information specifically for performance review but should have the opportunity to provide additional information if they wish to do so. The types of evidence shown below should already be available to the Council teams responsible for monitoring and liaison with the provider. The evidence used will be derived from a range of established monitoring, information and data gathering activities.

30 A key source of evidence is the self-assessment report, the under-lying source data and information cited in the report, and the updated development plan. The following list of examples of evidence is indicative rather than definitive. In general, the examples will be relevant for colleges and the diversity of providers funded by the Council.

**1 Participation and recruitment**

- evidence relating to guidance given to learners

- recruitment and enrolment data against targets
- evidence of achieving widening participation recruitment targets
- evidence of effectively responding to initiatives to recruit particular target groups
- up-to-date inspection reports.
- evidence of policies and procedures (for example, equality and diversity policy documents; quality assurance arrangements; learner health and safety arrangements; information management arrangements)
- evidence of effective implementation of policies and procedures (for example, equality and diversity monitoring data and reports; rigorous self assessment reports; learner health and safety data and reports; evaluation and review reports; ILR/data audit reports; ILR/data returns to the Council; reports evaluating the impact of standards funding in improving quality)

## 2 Learner experience and performance

- reports evaluating the support given to learners
- reports analysing patterns in learners' attendance
- reports evaluating work with learners
- learner retention data
- achievement data, including results of public examinations
- comparisons with national benchmarking data, where available
- progression and destination data
- where available, value added data
- up-to-date inspection reports
- learner satisfaction surveys and other sources of customer opinion, including relevant surveys conducted by other bodies
- monitoring reports on the qualifications and expertise of staff.
- evidence of effective financial management and financial viability (for example, financial forecasts; audited financial reports; management accounts)
- evidence of continuous improvement (for example, responsiveness to inspection findings and to reports from external bodies such as awarding bodies; the organisation's latest annual report)
- where appropriate, evidence of effective governance
- up-to-date inspection reports.

**Q4 Do you agree that the proposed types of evidence are suitable for assessing performance of the key areas?**

### Proposed use of evidence from inspection

31 The review process complements, and does not replicate, inspection. Inspection and re-inspection reports are a valuable source of evidence for performance reviews, as are the plans prepared by colleges and providers in response to inspection. However, the value of inspection evidence will depend upon how recently the inspection was conducted. In consequence, we propose that performance

## 3 Management

- evidence of effective planning, setting and meeting of challenging targets (for example, strategic/business plans and improvement targets; development plans; post-inspection action plans, adult learning plans and other relevant plans and progress reports)

review should summarise the most recent inspection findings, together with an assessment of how well the college or provider has responded to the findings of inspection and the extent to which the actions planned to address weaknesses have been successfully completed.

32 Once the post-inspection actions have been completed, the self-assessment report and development plan provide a more relevant source of evidence, and enable a view to be taken about the success or otherwise in responding to inspection findings.

**Q5 Do you agree with the proposed use of evidence from inspection reports within the performance review process?**

33 Performance review of colleges and other providers is conducted by the Council, drawing on inspection findings as a key source of evidence. The inspectorates and local Councils have arrangements for regular liaison where the link inspectors can assist with the interpretation of inspection evidence. Therefore, it is not normally necessary for inspectors to attend performance review meetings. This will also help to avoid potential confusion of roles.

34 In line with its commitment to the concordat agreement, the Council intends to share the overall categorisation of colleges and other providers with OfSTED and the ALI, on a confidential basis, to assist them with the planning of their inspection programme.

**Proposed revision to the Performance Review assessment scale**

35 The present performance review arrangements result in categorisation on a five-point scale (excellent, good, satisfactory, some concerns, serious concerns). This scale seeks to enable early identification of difficulties and of excellence as well as to chart progress and improvements in performance.

36 We recognise that appropriate terminology and clarity of language in any review process is important. Some colleges, providers and the inspectorates have expressed the view that the Council's current five point scale may be perceived as too similar to that used by inspectors, and lead to the Council's performance review being considered to be a more frequent but a different kind of inspection. Where there has been some confusion this is partly attributable to the newness of arrangements for inspections, using the Common Inspection Framework, and of the Council's performance review.

37 The Council wishes performance review to be recognised as a distinct, regular assessment of performance. The performance review process seeks to encourage and support colleges and other providers to strive for continuous improvement in the standard of their performance by identifying where the evidence indicates areas in which improvement is needed. The process should both draw upon and feed into self-assessment and development plans and also support preparation for, as well as effective response to, inspection. It is in this way that the review process complements, and does not replicate, inspection. Where the Council has concerns about a college or provider, an early inspection may be requested.

38 The proposed revision of the performance review assessment scale takes into account other proposals outlined above, including:

- the reduction of the 10 key reporting areas to three, to streamline categorisation
- making explicit that performance review is based on established and ongoing monitoring and partnership working, which emphasises its difference from inspection.

39 It is proposed that the performance review framework should retain the five point scale but re-title the performance categories using language that helps to confirm the

distinctions between the performance review process and inspection:

- outstanding performance
- effective performance
- acceptable performance, with scope for improvement
- performance gives cause for some concerns
- performance gives cause for serious concerns.

40 The advantage of this scale is that it offers scope for recognising improvement and achievement of outstanding performance. It delivers the dual purposes of performance review to recognise positive performance as well as to identify concerns at an early stage. It enables a category of acceptable performance with scope for improvement, to operate as an incentive for 'some concerns' providers to achieve improvement. This scale also operates as an early warning of potential difficulties if performance falls from the 'effective' to the 'acceptable' category. The scale will also enable the Council to establish its confidence in colleges and other providers demonstrating 'effective' or 'outstanding' performance as part of the framework for recognition of excellence that the Council is developing for 2002/03.

41 An alternative option is that, in order to avoid potential confusion with the inspectorates' five grades, performance review should adopt a four-point scale for categorising providers. This scale would indicate colleges and other providers whose performance places them at some risk, and give scope for identifying outstanding practice. The four point scale would omit 'effective performance' as a category.

42 The disadvantage of the four point scale is that it does not recognise effective performance and the step from 'acceptable performance, with scope for improvement' to the 'outstanding' category may be too great.

A four point scale also gives little scope for recognising progress towards excellence. Potential confusion with the inspectorates' five grades may lessen and could disappear in time, so this consideration may not be of prime concern in the medium term.

**Q6 Do you agree that the performance review framework should categorise performance on a five point scale?**

**Proposed greater transparency**

43 To ensure that the sector is involved in advising on refinements to the performance review framework, the Council intends to set up an advisory group. The group's remit will be to advise on how the Council should respond to the outcomes of this consultation, and to assist in the revision of the performance review arrangements. Membership of the group will be drawn from colleges and other providers and their representative associations, other key stakeholder organisations, the two inspectorates, and member(s) of the group chaired by Sir George Sweeney that is considering the reduction of unnecessary bureaucracy. It is anticipated that the advisory group would convene for a limited period to guide the introduction of the refined performance review arrangements.

**Proposed increased consistency of assessments**

44 To help ensure that the assessments made in performance review and follow up with colleges and other providers are consistently effective, the Council proposes:

- to work on refining performance and quality indicators for the three key areas and making these transparent
- a further programme of staff development and training for Council staff focusing on the interpretation and assessment of evidence and appropriate follow up



- to disseminate good practice in review processes within the Council
- to strengthen moderation and quality assurance arrangements for performance review and arising intervention, including seeking feedback from the different parties involved.

45 In taking these steps, the Council will draw on the views of the advisory group.

**Q7 Do you consider that there are other activities that will help to ensure that performance review assessments and follow up with providers are consistently effective?**

## **Proposed arrangements for disagreements**

46 Performance review is intended to operate as a part of partnership working to improve standards. If any minor disagreements arise in relation to performance review, between colleges or providers and the Council, these should be settled through constructive dialogue. If, as a result of performance review, any decision is taken on intervention which would result in reduction or withdrawal of funding, or would significantly impact on the college or provider in some other way, then arrangements will be made for the college or provider to seek a review of that decision and to have the opportunity to make representations.

## **The consultation**

47 Those with an interest in post-16 learning, and performance review helping to drive up standards, are invited to comment on our proposals for a revised framework. We look forward to hearing your views.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Harwood', with a stylized flourish at the end.

*John Harwood, Chief Executive*

# Annex A: Pro-forma for Responding to the Consultation Paper

101 Lockhurst Lane  
 Foleshill, Coventry  
 CV6 5SF  
 T 087 0900 6800  
 F 024 7670 3316

www.lsc.gov.uk  
 info@lsc.gov.uk

(Reference Circular 02/05)

Please use this pro-forma in responding to the consultation paper. Responses must be received by 28 May 2002

Completed forms from local colleges and other providers or local organisations should be returned to: the Executive Director of your local LSC (details available on (www.lsc.gov.uk))

Forms completed by other providers or organisations should be returned to:  
 Toni Fazaeli, Assistant Director, Quality & Standards Directorate, The Learning and Skills Council, 101 Lockhurst Lane Foleshill Coventry CV6 5SF  
 Fax: 024 7670 3316  
 E-mail: CVH-performancereview@lsc.gov.uk



**Learning+Skills Council**

Name <i>(please print)</i>
Role title
Organisation
Address

The Learning and Skills Council may, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, make available, on public request, individual consultation responses. This will extend to your comments unless you inform us that you wish them to remain confidential.

Is your response confidential? Yes

Please tick **ONE** of the following boxes that best describes you as a respondent

FE College (incl representative body)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Public Sector Provider (incl representative body)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sixth form college (incl representative body)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employer (incl representative body)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist college	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ufi hub	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Training Provider (incl representative body)	<input type="checkbox"/>	NTO/Sector Skills Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Voluntary Sector Provider (incl representative body)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Please specify	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Education Authority – Adult and Community Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____



## Consultation Circular on Performance Review

Please respond by ticking the appropriate box and entering your comments in the space provided.

1. Do you consider that the purposes of performance review, as stated in paragraph 23, are appropriate?

Very appropriate  Quite appropriate  Neither appropriate nor inappropriate  Have reservations as detailed below

**Comments**

---

---

2. Do you support reducing the formal reporting of reviews from three times a year to twice a year? (paragraphs 24 - 25)

Strongly support  Support with some reservations  Neither support nor oppose  Have reservations as detailed below

**Comments**

---

---

3. Do you consider that streamlining the performance review framework into three key performance areas provides an adequate basis for the Council to make an overall assessment of performance? (paragraph 27)

Strongly agree  Agree with some reservations  Neither agree nor disagree  Have reservations as detailed below

**Comments**

---

---

4. Do you agree that the proposed types of evidence are suitable for assessing performance of the key areas? (paragraph 30)

Strongly agree  Agree with some reservations  Neither agree nor disagree  Have reservations as detailed below

**Comments**

---

---

5. Do you agree with the proposed use of evidence from inspection reports within the performance review process? (paragraph 31-32)

Strongly agree  Agree with some reservations  Neither agree nor disagree  Have reservations as detailed below

**Comments**

---

---

6. Do you agree that the performance review framework should categorise performance on a five point scale? (paragraphs 39 - 40)

Strongly agree  Agree with some reservations  Neither agree nor disagree  Have reservations as detailed below

**Comments**

---

---

7. Do you consider that there are other activities that will help to ensure that performance review assessments and follow up with colleges and other providers are consistently effective? (paragraph 44)

---

---

8. Do you have any other comments?

---

---

# Notes

---

© LSC February 2002

Published by the Learning and Skills Council. Extracts from this publication may be reproduced for non-commercial educational or training purposes on condition that the source is acknowledged and the findings are not misrepresented.

This publication is available in an electronic form on the Council's website: [www.lsc.gov.uk](http://www.lsc.gov.uk)

Publication enquiries: 0870 900 6800

Reference CIRC/0137/02