



WORKING IN HAMPSHIRE
PORTSMOUTH
SOUTHAMPTON

PQR

Peer Quality Review

Handbook

2016-17

Wessex Group PQR

The Wessex Group Peer Quality Review scheme is a rolling programme of reviews of college quality systems. It was set up in 2012 as a mechanism for colleges in the partnership to validate their own judgements about quality and plans for improvement. It works via an annual programme of reviewers from other colleges examining the robustness of colleges' quality assurance and improvement processes.

The antecedents for PQR can be found in the long history of working together as a partnership of Wessex Sixth Form Colleges. In 2011 partner colleges accepted that membership of the Wessex group obliges them to take part in the PQR scheme in order that all member colleges continue to meet high standards, and to demonstrate that the Wessex Group has the expertise and maturity to self-regulate and provide effective support for improvement.

PQR is a supportive and rigorous way to ensure that colleges' judgements about quality are sound and consistent outcomes of an appropriate self-assessment and quality system. This means that some aspects of the PQR are non-negotiable in order to test out judgements about the core business of the college.

Other aspects can be included within the PQR at the request of the host college, although specialised reviews of particular aspects of college life (eg Equality and Diversity), would be better conducted by External Quality Review (EQR).

Contents

	page
PQR Protocol	
Process	4
Review template	6
Review process including milestones, roles and responsibilities	10
Aide memoire for an effective review	12
Sample PQR visit programmes	13
Sample Questions	17
Sample Questions – for specific managers	21
Sample Reviews	25
Introductory words for meeting staff in colleges	34

The Wessex Group of Sixth Form Colleges

Peer Quality Review Protocol 2015



Introduction

1. The Wessex Group considers that there is substantial, demonstrable expertise in quality improvement within the Group, and each member college has robust quality assurance and improvement processes in place.
2. All member colleges have a long history of working together which pre-dates and goes well beyond the activity of the established Peer Review & Development Groups. It is envisaged that these activities will continue as a means of sharing best practice and tackling underperformance in specific areas.
3. Participation in this Peer Quality Review Scheme is intended to ensure that all member colleges continue to meet this high standard, and to demonstrate that the Wessex Group has the expertise and maturity to self-regulate and provide effective support for improvement.

The Process

4. In order to guarantee the rigour and effectiveness of the quality assurance processes across the Wessex Group, each member college will participate in a rolling audit programme.
5. The purpose of the audit will be to test out the robustness of the over-arching quality assurance system of the college by checking the validity of judgements via college visits, data analysis and staff / student interviews.
6. Each college will be reviewed every three years as a minimum, although member colleges might ask for additional reviews at any time.
7. Each college will identify two designated members of staff with significant responsibility for quality within their organization to participate as Reviewers in the scheme.
8. A PQR Group will be established from the group identified above to
 - co-ordinate training;
 - co-ordinate and schedule reviews;
 - monitor their implementation;
 - moderate the outcomes of reviews;
 - review the effectiveness of the process.
9. The planned schedule of reviews (including the identification of potential reviewers) will be reported to Wessex Principals' Group annually.
10. Each review will be conducted by three colleagues from the pool of Reviewers. The college being reviewed has the right to ask for alternative members of the Group to conduct the review if there are specific sensitivities pertaining to that choice of personnel/college. For each new review, the team will involve someone from the team of the previous review.
11. All members of the Group will be required to participate in any relevant training provided through the Wessex Group, and updated after every full cycle of reviews.
12. The starting point for each review is the self-assessment report and related targets, considered in conjunction with the Qualification Achievement Rates Report (QAR) and Ofsted's key questions (see template: RMF). The latter will enable colleges to highlight their individual priorities and contexts. The college under review would also provide evidence of collaborative practices with other members of the Wessex

Group. Performance measures will only be shared with colleagues from colleges conducting the review and any data shared during the review process will be destroyed at the end of the review. See Appendix 1

13. Each review visit will last two days, which are normally consecutive. A pre-review meeting will also be necessary to explain contextual information, and to undertake necessary planning. See Appendix 3.
14. Each review will consider specified performance measures within the context of the individual college, and from this perspective either endorse or fail to validate the judgments about the relative strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement identified (including suggestions for improvement).
15. Outcomes from each review will be reported directly to the reviewed college, including to the Principal. An annual report of reviews will be produced which will indicate findings in an anonymised way and which will report on observed good practice.
16. An outcome form will also be submitted to the Partnership Manager. This form will include the yes/no outcomes and any good practice noted. All recommendations will be included on the form to the Partnership Manager¹.
17. If a college has an area of non-compliance - a "no" – the college will be required to develop an action plan to deal with the systems for measuring quality in the area of concern and would be re-reviewed in one year. The Principals' group would be made aware of remaining problems in the named college following that second review.
18. Reviewed colleges have the right to disagree with the reviewers' findings although it is hoped that 3 reviewers would self-moderate. The Wessex Group will develop a disputes procedure.
19. If as a result of a review it is not possible to endorse the judgments of a particular college, a further review would be scheduled within one year of the original review.
20. In the event of a second review failing to validate judgments the Wessex Principals' Group would determine the appropriate course of action to bring about improvement. Failure to adhere to advice from the Principals' group given in this circumstance could ultimately lead to expulsion from the Wessex Group.

Templates are below:

Template to be used when conducting the review

Template to be completed after the review

Example of a review process, including an overview of roles and responsibilities

Aide memoire for an effective review

¹ The Principals agreed that the Partnership Manager should receive the unedited version of the RMF including recommendations at their meeting on 14th June 2013. This would allow the Partnership Manager to produce the anonymised report to Principals and also to note whether further action was needed.

Template to be used when conducting the review – note that although this is based on the CIF it is not as comprehensive as that which would be used in a full inspection.

Wessex Group

Peer Quality Review

Record of Main Findings

Name of College:

	Priority for the College	SAR judgment	Review judgment	Comments
Grades using the 4 point scale 1: Outstanding; 2: Good; 3: Requires improvement; 4: Inadequate				
Overall effectiveness	YES			
The effectiveness of Leadership and Management: Reviewers will consider:	YES			
How successfully ambitions for the provider's performance are set, reviewed and communicated with staff, learners, employers and other partners and the impact this has on the quality of provision and outcomes for all learners				
How successfully leaders, managers and governors secure and sustain improvements to teaching, learning and assessment through high quality professional development and robust performance management to tackle weakness and promote good practice across all types of provision	YES			
The rigour of self-assessment, including through the use of the views of learners, employers and other stakeholders, its accuracy and how well it secures sustained improvement across the provider's work, including in any subcontracted provision	YES			
The strategic priority that leaders and managers give to the provision of English and mathematics to ensure that learners improve their levels of skills in these subjects compared with their starting points	YES			
How effectively leaders, managers and governors monitor the progress of groups of learners so that none is disadvantaged or underachieve				
How effectively leaders, managers and governors monitor the progression and destinations of their learners (including whether learners enter secure and sustained employment) and use this information to improve provision	YES			
The extent to which leaders promote all forms of equality and foster greater understanding of and respect for people of all faiths (or those of no faith), races, genders, ages, disability and sexual orientations (and other groups with protected characteristics), and how well learners and staff are protected from harassment, bullying and discrimination, including those based with employers and at other sites external to the provider				

How well the provider prepares learners for successful life in modern Britain and promotes the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different backgrounds, faiths and beliefs				
The effectiveness of safeguarding practice, including the prevention of radicalisation of learners and compliance with the Prevent duty				
Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment <i>Reviewers will consider the extent to which:</i>	YES			
Learners are supported to achieve their learning goals, both in and between learning sessions				
Staff identify learners' support and additional learning needs quickly and accurately through effective initial assessment, leading to the provision of high quality and effective support to help learners achieve as well as they can				
Staff work with learners to ensure that teaching, learning and assessment are tailored to enable all learners to make good progress and prepare for their next steps				
Staff assess learners' progress and performance and ensure that assessments and reviews are timely, frequent, fair, informative and reliable	YES			
Learners receive clear and constructive feedback through assessment and progress reviews and/or during personal tutorials so that they know what they have to do to improve their skills, knowledge and understanding to achieve their full potential	YES			
Teaching, learning and assessment promote equality, raise awareness of diversity and tackle discrimination, victimisation, harassment, stereotyping, radicalisation and bullying				
Staff are aware of and plan for individual learners' diverse needs in teaching or training sessions and provide effective support, including making reasonable adjustments for disabled learners or those with special educational needs				
Teaching, learning and assessment support learners to develop their skills in English, mathematics and ICT and their employability skills, including appropriate attitudes and behaviours for work, in order to achieve their learning goals and career aims.				
Personal development, behaviour and welfare of learners: <i>Reviewers will consider, where relevant and appropriate:</i>	YES			
The extent to which learners take pride in their work, become self-confident and self-assured, and know that they have the potential to be a successful learner on their current and future learning programmes, including at work				
The proportion of learners who benefit from purposeful work-related learning, including external work experience where appropriate to their learning programmes and/or their future career plans, and how well they contribute to their workplace, including on work experience, as a valued member of the workforce	YES			
How well learners develop the personal, social and employability skills, including English, mathematics and ICT skills, required to achieve their core learning aims and appreciate the importance of these skills in the context of their progression and career aims	YES			
The extent to which learners achieve the specific units of their main vocational qualifications and relevant additional qualifications that enhance their learning and are likely to increase their future employability				
Learners' use of the information they receive on the full range of relevant career pathways from the provider and other partners, including employers, to help them develop challenging and realistic plans for their future careers				
How well learners know how to protect themselves from the risks associated with radicalisation, extremism, forms of abuse, grooming and bullying, including through the use of the internet, and how well they understand the risks posed by adults or young	YES			

people who use the internet to bully, groom or abuse other people, especially children, young people and vulnerable adults				
The extent to which learning programmes, including enrichment activities, allow all learners to explore personal, social and ethical issues and take part in life in wider society and in Britain				
How well learners attend learning sessions and/or work regularly and punctually, including through participation in any distance learning activities, such as online learning and the use of virtual learning environments				
Whether learners comply with any guidelines for behaviour and conduct stipulated by providers or employers and manage their own feelings and behaviour at work and during learning sessions.				
Outcomes for learners: <i>Reviewers will consider, where relevant and appropriate, the extent to which:</i>	YES			
Learners make progress during their programme compared with their starting points, with particular attention to progress by different groups of learners	YES			
Learners attain their learning goals, including qualifications, and achieve challenging targets				
Learners progress to relevant further learning and employment or self-employment relevant to their career plans or gain promotion at work				
Learners acquire qualifications and the skills and knowledge that will enable them to progress to their chosen career, employment, and/or further education and training that have been planned in line with local and national priorities for economic and social growth				
Severely disabled learners or those with severe and complex special educational needs gain skills and progress to become more independent in their everyday life and/or progress to positive destinations such as employment				

Form to be submitted to Partnership Manager once agreed manager@wessexfc.ac.uk

Priorities marked YES in the template are non-negotiable and will always form the basis for PQRs.

To be completed after the review:

Wessex Group
Peer Quality Review

Name of College:

Review conducted by:

Dates of Review:

1. Are quality assurance processes effective in identifying key strengths and weaknesses?	Y / N*	Evidence:
		Recommendations:
		Best practice observed:
2. Has the identification of strengths and weaknesses led to an appropriate, realistic, comprehensive action plan?	Y/N*	Evidence:

		Recommendations:
<p>3. Are improvement plans implemented effectively, leading to demonstrable and measurable outcomes?</p>	<p>Y / N*</p>	Evidence:
<p>4. Are there other aspects of best practice for consideration by members of the Wessex Group?</p>	<p>Y / N</p>	Recommendations:
		Best practice observed:
		Best practice observed:

**If there is a "no" judgement, the college will be reviewed again within a year.*

This form also needs to be submitted to the Partnership Manager manager@wessexfc.ac.uk

Example of review process, including an overview of roles and responsibilities

College being reviewed	Reviewers	PQR Group
In the academic year before the review		
		<p>Ensures that all members of the Peer Review Group have been trained.</p> <p>Draws up the schedule of reviews and possible reviewers for the Wessex Principals' Group, including the identification of lead reviewers</p>
8 weeks prior to the review		
<p>Submits data to review team:</p> <p>College SAR, headline results and value added summary</p>	<p>Reviewers consider background data in advance of pre-review meeting</p>	
No less than 6 weeks prior to review		
<p>Member of PQR Group</p> <p>contacts reviewers to confirm dates and schedule pre-review meeting</p>	<p>Lead reviewer contacts co-reviewers to arrange a pre-review meeting</p>	<p>Ensures that appropriate contacts have been made</p>
4 weeks prior to review		
<p>Sends co-reviewers a copy of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College SAR and QIP; • Organisational chart • Performance and quality cycle outline • Sufficient data and information to validate judgements eg QAR (if not in SAR); • Success rates by course (to include value added data) • Overall lesson observation outcomes • completed Record of Main Findings indicating specific college priorities beyond those fixed as priorities on the proforma; • additional data to support specific additional college priorities 	<p>Review documentation with other reviewers</p> <p>Draft a two day programme for the visit</p> <p>Assess whether information provided is sufficient to validate the judgements. Any requests for additional documents should describe content rather than rely solely on document titles which may vary.</p> <p>Identify areas where reviewers will conduct a detailed analysis of data – from college through to course level. Likely to involve strong and less strong areas.</p>	<p>Checks with lead reviewer that documentation has been received and meeting scheduled</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of collaborations with colleges in the Wessex Group 	<p>Identify people that reviewers wish to meet; including 2 student groups and a general group of staff. It will be helpful to meet with someone in the college at the start of the review who can provide an overview/context eg of the student journey.</p> <p>Care is needed to ensure that there is clarity over the job tile/role of the people reviewers wish to meet.</p>	
At least 2 weeks prior to review		
<p>Organises a timetable for the review, to include a final feedback session which includes the college members of the PQR Group and the principal.</p> <p>Distribute timetable to reviewers at least one week prior to the review and brief staff about purpose of the review.</p> <p>Ensures that appropriate base room and facilities and refreshments will be available for reviewers.</p>	<p>Liaise with host college over the programme for the review; time of arrival on day 1 of the review.</p> <p>Requests for additional documentation / information to be made available during the review.</p>	<p>Checks with reviewer that preparation for review is progressing well and offers support where necessary e.g. in interpretation of data.</p>

Post-review responsibilities

College being reviewed	Reviewers	PQR Group	Principals' Group
<p>Receives report and arranges for appropriate distribution and follow-up e.g. post-review action plan with review and monitoring.</p> <p>Completes evaluation of review and returns to Steering Group. This will be 2 stages</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Process review soon after the review Impact review within the year after the review. 	<p>Writes up report and sends a hard and electronic copy to the college being reviewed within two weeks of the Review.</p> <p>Submits a simplified report form to the Partnership Manager.</p> <p>Recommends to the steering group the timing of the next review (eg in one year where there are</p>	<p>Notes feedback from reviewed college.</p> <p>Notes the timing of the next review.</p> <p>Collates material for anonymised Annual Report to Principals</p>	<p>Considers the annual report findings and also a college report (only if there has been a second review which has indicated non-compliance) and any appropriate actions needed.</p>

	<p>concerns about judgements; 3 years where judgements match reviewers')</p> <p>Destroys data provided for the purpose of the review to maintain confidentiality.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Aide memoire for an effective review

At the pre-review meeting with the college being reviewed

- Clarify language/terminology for documents and job titles (when requesting meetings with people), as these can vary from college to college.
- Aim for a clear steer from the college being reviewed about the main college priorities.
- It can be helpful if the host college provides short position papers (1 side of A4 max) about certain aspects of the college
- Determine and agree the areas of the review which cannot then be overruled by the reviewed college. If at the pre-review meeting stage it is not possible to agree the areas of the review, this will be referred to the Chair of the PQR Group.
- Identify a senior manager in the host college to greet Reviewers to provide an overview and set a context at the start of the Review days

Preparation with co-Reviewers

- A question sheet which has been used in other reviews is available and may be a useful starting point

During the Review

- It is often helpful to meet with the Principal at the start of the review to clarify the PQR process and the focus for the visit
- It may be useful to meet with a more general group of staff in addition to the few Departments selected for an in-depth review.
- Introduce PQR carefully to each group of staff you meet so that expectations are clear and purpose understood – a sample introduction is appended on page 34
- Two groups of students may be better than one.
- On the final day of the Review comments and findings should be fed back to the reviewed college (PQR group members) and the Principal. The findings of review should not be circulated beyond reviewers and the reviewed college, apart from to the Partnership Manager
- The proforma for strengths and weaknesses will need to be supported by verbal feedback and confidential notes.
- Where it is not possible to make a definite judgement, the reason for this should be recorded in the RMF ie that there was insufficient time to examine the area properly **OR** insufficient evidence had been provided.
- Although good practice in a curriculum or other area in the review should be highlighted and fed back, it is not within the scope of the PQR to report on any subject specific findings or provide a grade. The focus of PQR is the quality process.

To avoid disappointment it is important that host colleges brief the areas taking part that this is the case so that their expectations are realistic.

- An annual report of reviews is produced by the PQR group to indicate findings in an anonymised way. If a college has had an area of non-compliance - a "no" – this will be recorded as a statistic, not named. However, the college concerned will be required under the terms of the Wessex Group Concordat to develop an action plan to deal with the systems for measuring quality in the area of concern and will be re-reviewed in one year. The Principal group will be made aware of remaining problems in the named college following that second review.

After the review

- Report to Chair of PQR a summary of outcomes of the Review
- Submit review report to confidential vault (Partnership Manager)
- Destroy all material and data relating to the reviewed college
- Ensure that any best practice that had good generic value is captured on the review findings form

Sample Programmes

These are offered as a guide only and colleges will devise programmes which will differ to some extent according to the focus of the PQR beyond the non-negotiable key areas:

Sample 1

Peer Quality Review – NAME College DATES (2 days)

Key curriculum areas of focus: Humanities and Creative Industries with a specific focus on Sociology & Psychology, Film & Media and Performing Arts/Drama/Dance/Music

Timetable:

Thursday

Objective for Day 1 – understanding structures and support

Time (Provisional)	Activity	Subject of discussion	Room	Meeting with
9.00	Meeting with Principal and VP	Discussion about: quality systems/how data is managed and disseminated. SAR process/further understanding of roles etc		All
9.45 – 10.30	Meeting with VP and Director for T&L	What are the key changes that are needed for success to improve? How are judgements made at each level regarding quality? How is T&L checked? Do changes at a senior level impact upon classroom teaching?		All
10.30 – 10.45	Break			
10.45 – 11.15	Meeting with AP (Learner Journey & Community Engagement)	Understanding of roles, how does learner journey & engagement work with quality procedures?		
11.15 – 11.45	Meeting with two Heads of Faculty	What is the HoF role? Areas of concern in faculties. How does HoF work with Q&TL?		All
11.45 – 12.30	Meeting with two Quality & Tutorial Leads	What is Quality & Tutorial Lead role? How is quality embedded? How are students supported? What are perceived problems in specific subject areas managed by these two staff (English/Languages and Sociology/Psychology)?		All
12.30 – 1.15	Lunch + meeting with students (ideally a selection of students taking Sociology, Psychology,	Consistency of student experience, student progress and expectations		All

	Film & Media and Performing Arts/Drama/Dance/Music – see focus above for this example review)			
1.15 – 2.15	Meeting of reviewers	Emerging issues, looking at lesson observation findings, looking at job descriptions, SoW and marked work in Sociology & Psychology, Film & Media and Performing Arts/Drama/Dance/Music		All
2.15 – 3.00	Meetings with Curriculum Leads: Reviewers interview separately	Understanding of data, how well management structure is working. Classroom issues		
3.00	Break			
3.15	Meeting of reviewers	Comparison of findings, emerging issues		All
4.00	Meeting with VP	Emerging issues. Is there agreement with whole college SAR judgements?		All

Friday

Objective for day: test structures and support

Time (Provisional)	Activity	Subject of discussion	Room	Meeting with
9.00 – 9.45	Meeting with other HoFs:	Discussion about: quality systems/how data is managed and disseminated.SAR process/further understanding of roles etc		All
9.45 – 10.30	Meetings with subject staff:	Understanding of data, how well management structure is working		Small group meetings
10.30 – 10.45	Break			
10.45 – 12.30	Possible meeting with some other subject staff or other Quality & Tutorial Leads. Tbc during day 1			
12.30	Lunch			
	Meeting of reviewers to discuss feedback			All
3.00	Feedback to Principal and VP			All
3.45	Review of process			All

Template for PQR at NAME College DATE

Monday	Reviewer (Lead)	Reviewer	Reviewer
8.30 – 9.15	Meeting for reviewers in base room if needed		
09.15-09.45	Welcome and introductory meeting		
09.45-10.45			
10.45-11.00	Break and time for discussion		
11.00-12.00			
12.00-12.35	Lunch		
12.35-13.10			
13.15 – 14.00			
14.00-15.10	Time for reading/discussion/ perusal of students' marked work		
15.10 - 16.00			

16.00-16.30	Short update meeting/questions/clarification with VP +		
Tuesday	Reviewer (lead)	Reviewer	Reviewer
8.30 – 9.15	Meeting for reviewers in Base Room if needed		
09.15 – 10.00	Touch base with VP in Base Room and time for reading/discussion/ perusal of students' marked work		
10.00-10.45			
10.45-11.45	Break /time for reading & discussion		
11.45 – 12.30	Meeting with course leaders/co-ordinators [if roles exist] to discuss their involvement in the Quality Cycle (SAR/IQRs/EQRs/course reviews/Lesson observations) and Teaching and Learning (training focus/SoW, assessment and feedback)	Meeting with a group of teachers to discuss their involvement in the Quality Cycle (SAR/IQRs/EQRs/course reviews/Lesson observations) and Teaching and Learning (training focus/SoW, assessment and feedback)	
12.30-15.00	Lunch and time to prepare report		
15.00-16.00	Feedback/discussion with SMT in		
16.00	Depart		

Sample Questions

Leadership & Management

Do targets in your QIPs effectively impact on learners' performance and ambition? Can you describe a specific example of an intervention you have made and the positive outcome achieved?

Do middle managers clearly understand roles and responsibilities in managing colleagues' performance to drive up achievement?

Are there any examples of where actions taken have brought about positive outcomes and the impact has brought about improvements for students?

How does the college measure and monitor "the progress of groups of learners so that none is disadvantaged or underachieve"?

Alongside the College mission – do staff and students understand what it is and are they fully behind what it stands for?

How does CPD impact on improving students' achievements and fulfilling the College mission?

How does the college performance management system drive improvement? Do you have examples of where this has had an impact?

Teaching, Learning & Assessment:

How does the college ensure consistency in the assessment of learners' progress?

How quickly are underperforming students identified? What support mechanisms are triggered automatically and/or by exception?

Are students aware how to use feedback to improve their attainment? Can you give examples of ways that this is given and used?

Personal development, behaviour and welfare of learners

How does the college develop confident life-long learners?

How does teaching and learning develop English, Mathematics ICT and employment skills, and support the achievement of learning goals and career aims?

How do you help your students to identify risks and develop the skills to mitigate them for themselves and others?

Outcomes for Learners

How do both staff [at all appropriate levels] and students know how they are doing?

What assessment strategies exist that allows students to know what it is they need to improve and how they might achieve that progress?

How do you monitor the performance of students in your curriculum areas to ensure that they achieve their MG at the very least and that you are able to take timely and effective interventions to correct any underachievement?

Additional Peer Quality Review Sample Questions – for specific managers

Questions for VP

- How does the college's quality system work?
- What are the key responsibilities of your role?
- What are the key responsibilities for each role in the management system? Are there overlaps?
- How are SAR improvement plans monitored and followed through?
- How is data managed and disseminated?
- How effectively does the pastoral system support the curriculum (and vice versa)?
- Are the quality processes already in place working?
- Do staff understand the college mission and are they on board?

Questions for Quality Lead

- What are the key responsibilities of your role?
- What are your key areas of concern within your area?
- How do you work with the HoDs to ensure quality? Are the individual roles and responsibilities clear to all?
- How is data managed and disseminated? Is it understood?
- How effectively does the pastoral system support the curriculum (and vice versa)?
- Are the quality processes already in place working?
- Do staff understand the college mission and are they on board?

Monitoring/supporting students:

- What guidance and advice is provided for students – particularly when they are in difficulties?
- How do you identify 'at risk' students? How are they supported?
- Students are monitored and supported through both the curriculum and pastoral elements of the college's provision. How effective is this? Does anything fall through the gap?
- Some students have additional learning support needs. How are these identified and supported in the curriculum area?
- Are teachers (and managers) aware of the different prior attainment levels of individual students and do they know how well each is performing (or underperforming!) relative to this? How is it tracked/monitored? What action is taken to deal with issues?

Self-Assessment:

- What is your role in the self-assessment process in the area? What contribution did you make to the reviewing of the area, making judgements on strengths and areas for improvement and setting appropriate actions or targets?
- How was the overall grade for the subject/department arrived at?

- How are SAR improvement plans monitored and followed through?

Questions for person i/c TLA

- What are the key changes that have already happened and that still need to happen for success to improve to get you to a higher overall grade?
- How are judgements made at each level regarding quality? How is T&L checked?

Teaching, Learning & Assessment:

- What measures have you taken to further improve teaching, learning and assessment over the past year?
- What impact have these changes had upon classroom teaching? How do you know?
- How are learners' starting points assessed and subsequent progress monitored? Are students clear about their targets?
- What measures do you take for areas/staff that continually underperform? What support is available?
- How are you working at ways in which "Teaching and learning develop English, mathematics and functional skills"

Lesson observations:

- How are lesson observations used as quality improvement and quality assurance?
- Who undertakes them?
- Are they developmental? What's the evidence?
- Are there graded, ungraded, peer observations?
- What has been the impact of lesson observations last year on practice this year?
- What other quality systems do you have to flag up problems other than lesson observation?

Questions for Student Support

- What are the key responsibilities of your role?
- How does learner journey & engagement work with quality procedures?

Monitoring/supporting students:

- What guidance and advice is provided for students – particularly when they are in difficulties?
- How do you identify 'at risk' students? How are they supported?
- How do other roles in the college (eg. Quality and Curriculum) feed in to pastoral support?
- Are students are monitored and supported through both the curriculum and pastoral elements of the college's provision? If so, how effective is this? Does anything fall through the gap?
- Some students have additional learning support needs. How are these identified and supported in the curriculum area?
- Are teachers (and managers) aware of the different prior attainment levels of individual students and do they know how well each is performing (or

underperforming!) relative to this? How is it tracked/monitored? What action is taken to deal with issues?

Questions for Heads of Department

- What are the key responsibilities of your role?
- What are your key areas of concern within your dept?
- How does the HoD work with other staff to ensure quality? Are the individual roles and responsibilities clear to all?
- Are the quality processes already in place working? What evidence do you have?
- How are SAR improvement plans monitored and followed through?
- How is data managed and disseminated?
- How effectively does the pastoral system support the curriculum (and vice versa)?
- Do staff understand the college mission and are they on board?

Teaching, Learning & Assessment:

- Have changes at a senior level impacted upon classroom teaching?
- What measures have been taken to improve teaching, learning and assessment in your dept over the past year?
- How are learners' starting points assessed and subsequent progress monitored? Are students clear about their targets?
- What is attendance and punctuality like in this area?
- What is being done to improve retention issues within the department? What is the current in year retention figures suggesting?
- What is being done to improve value added within this department? How do you know it is effective and having an impact?
- How do you know that assessment is effective within the department?
- What measures do you take for areas/staff that continually underperform? What support is available?

Monitoring/supporting students:

- What guidance and advice is provided for students – particularly when they are in difficulties?
- How do you identify 'at risk' students? How are they supported?
- How does the role of HoD feed into pastoral support?
- Are students monitored and supported through both the curriculum and pastoral elements of the college's provision? If so, how effective is this? Does anything fall through the gap?
- Some students have additional learning support needs. How are these identified and supported in the curriculum area?
- Are teachers (and managers) aware of the different prior attainment levels of individual students and do they know how well each is performing (or underperforming!) relative to this? How is it tracked/monitored? What action is taken to deal with issues?

Lesson observations:

- How are lesson observations used in your area?
- Who undertakes them?

- Are they developmental? What's the evidence?
- Are there graded, ungraded, peer observations?
- What has been the impact of lesson observations last year on practice this year?

Sample Reviews

Wessex Group				
Peer Quality Review				
Record of Main Findings				
Name of College: NAME COLLEGE				
	Priority for the College	SAR judgment	Review judgment (Y/N)	Comments
Grades using the 4 point scale 1: Outstanding; 2: Good; 3: Requires improvement; 4: Inadequate	YES			
Overall effectiveness	YES	2	Y	Agreed
A. Outcomes for learners		3	Y	Success rates on all long courses have improved over a three year period and are in line with national rates for all colleges. Value added measures suggest that students make the progress that would be expected of similarly qualified students in other colleges, though there are some areas of concern, including within the vocational provision.
A1. All learners make progress relative to their start points and learning goals	YES			Largely, yes they do, but student experience and outcomes seem linked to the course type and subject followed. Overall performance masks significant variation at subject level: both in terms of variations between subjects, and variations in individual subjects over time.
A2. Achievement gaps are narrowing between different groups of learners	YES			The review did not identify that any particular groups are underachieving.
A3. Learners develop personal, social and employability skills				There is clear emphasis on developing personal, social and employability skills, particularly through the tutorial programme (e.g. Deloitte Employability Skills)
A4. Learners progress to courses leading to higher level qualifications and into jobs that meet local and national needs.	YES			Internal progression information was detailed but external progression was less clear.

B. Quality of teaching, learning and assessment		2	Y	Agreed.
B1. Learners benefit from high expectations, engagement, care, support and motivation from staff	YES			Students are absolutely clear that they are well supported and that both teaching and support staff have their best interests at heart. However, students and teachers reported variability in expectations regarding homework, and the degree of stretch and challenge is not even across the curriculum. In business studies, the 'where are they now' board provides aspirational case studies of former students.
B2. Staff use their skills and expertise to plan and deliver teaching, learning and support to meet each learner's needs				Students are very positive about their teachers and the support that they get in and out of lessons. Lesson observations give evidence of well-planned lessons across the college.
B3. Staff initially assess learners' starting points and monitor their progress, set challenging tasks and build on and extend learning for all learners	YES			Initial assessment is used effectively to identify additional learning support needs. These are addressed through well-attended support lessons.
B4. Learners understand how to improve as a result of frequent, detailed and accurate feedback from staff following assessment of their learning	YES			Students, tutors, and teachers value the one-to-one review days, but on occasion targets / actions are not completed. Some students are unclear about the various target grades they receive. Where they happen students are very positive about 1-1 subject progress interviews. The college should explore ways of ensuring that all students benefit from this system. Homework booklets in business studies are a good example ongoing assessment for learning.
B5. Teaching and learning develop English, mathematics and functional skills and support the achievement of learning goals and career aims				(Where we saw evidence of this, development of these wider skills was good)
B6. Appropriate and timely information, advice and guidance supports learning effectively				Personal tutors are valued, and days where timetable is suspended (settling in day, careers morning, etc) are effective. Staff can volunteer to be mentors in a range of different capacities according to their interests and expertise.
B7. Equality and diversity are promoted through teaching and learning				
C. Effectiveness of leadership and management		2	Y	Agreed

<p>C1. Leaders and managers demonstrate an ambitious vision, have high expectations for what all learners can achieve and attain high standards of quality and performance</p>	<p>YES</p>		<p>Y</p> <p>There is a clear inclusive vision which is genuinely shared by everyone. While some curriculum areas have high aspirations, conversations with others suggest that there is still a belief in some quarters that being outstanding and being inclusive are mutually exclusive. There is clear evidence in the college that this is not the case.</p>
<p>C2. Leaders and managers improve teaching and learning through rigorous performance management and appropriate professional development</p>	<p>YES</p>		<p>Y</p> <p>Processes for improving teaching and learning and performance management are well established. The theme for the year of 'active learning' has been embraced by all. The 'Review and Development' process is outcome focused, and increasingly linked to staff development and college objectives.</p>
<p>C3. Leaders and managers evaluate the quality of provision through robust self-assessment, taking account of users' views, and use the findings to promote and develop capacity for sustainable improvement</p>	<p>YES</p>		<p>Y</p> <p>SAR processes are clear to all and in the best cases clearly used to drive improvement. Learning area 'away days' have been very well received by those who have experienced them, and are focused on evaluating the quality of provision and identifying actions for improvement.</p> <p>User views are collected through the tutorial programme and other subject processes.</p> <p>It is not always clear what the key issues and strengths are in curriculum SARs. In some cases (e.g. SAR for Geography/Travel) norms are cited as strengths.</p> <p>In the college SAR, detail on the prior attainment profile of students is overlong.</p>
<p>C4. Leaders and managers successfully plan, establish and manage the curriculum and learning programmes to meet the needs and interests of learners, employers and the local and national community</p>			<p>There is a very broad comprehensive curriculum in place which is designed to meet the needs of the students and the community. Analysis of the impact of mixed programmes on student outcomes and progression is worthy of further exploration. In some subjects there is evidence of unusually detailed</p>

				enrichment programmes.
C5. Leaders and managers actively promote equality and diversity, tackling bullying and discrimination and narrow the achievement gap				
C6. Leaders and managers safeguard all learners				

Sample RMF 2

Wessex Group PQR				
Record of Main Findings				
Name of College: NAME COLLEGE				
	Priority for the College	SAR judgment	Review judgment (Y/N)	Comments
Grades using the 4 point scale 1: Outstanding; 2: Good; 3: Requires Improvement; 4: Inadequate				
Overall effectiveness	YES	3	Y	Agreed. The college has clearly made rapid progress in overall effectiveness and is becoming a much more effective institution.
A. Outcomes for learners	YES	4	Y	Agreed. Outcomes improved considerably in 2012-13 but there is still inconsistent achievement and poor ALPs score. Overall success rate 5% below national provider benchmark.
All learners achieve and make progress relative to their starting points and learning goals	YES			Not enough evidence gathered during this PQR to make a judgement
Achievement gaps are narrowing between different groups of learners				
Learners develop personal, social and employability skills				
Learners progress to courses leading to higher-level qualifications and into jobs that meet local and national needs.				
B. Teaching, Learning & Assessment		3	Y	Agreed. Signs that this may rise and there seem signs of significant improvements
Learners benefit from high expectations, engagement,	YES			Learners feel well supported and cared for by staff but there are some

care, support and motivation from staff				inconsistencies in staff expectations and motivation of learners.
Staff use their skills and expertise to plan and deliver teaching, learning and support to meet each learner's needs				
Staff initially assess learners' starting points and monitor their progress, set challenging tasks, and build on and extend learning for all learners	YES			There were some good examples of progress monitoring and challenge for students but sometimes learners were not pushed hard enough. Progress monitoring is varied.
Learners understand how to improve as a result of frequent, detailed and accurate feedback from staff following assessment of their learning	YES			In some areas learners were very clear about the level they were working at and what they needed to do in order to improve. This was not always consistent over all subjects and in some cases what learners need to do to improve is not always clear. There is a need for an overarching college policy on the level and frequency of work set outside the classroom and how this is recorded
Teaching and learning develop English, mathematics and functional skills, and support the achievement of learning goals and career aims	YES			It was difficult to make a comment on this during the time of the review. There was clearly some good practice but a clear policy on how to tackle the development of English, mathematics and functional skills needs developing
Appropriate and timely information, advice and guidance supports learning effectively				
Equality and diversity are promoted through teaching and learning				
C. Leadership and management		2		After discussion, we agreed not to grade this area as we felt that we were not yet able to measure the full impact of changes that had been put in place.
Demonstrate an ambitious vision, have high expectations for what all learners can achieve, and attain high standards of quality and performance	YES			[College MISSION AND STRATEGY DOCUMENT] is valued by staff and considered to be a realistic goal for all to achieve. Some managers are attaining much higher levels of quality and performance but this is not yet consistent. Some staff need to raise expectations for what learners can achieve.

Improve teaching and learning through rigorous performance management and appropriate professional development	YES			There is a clear focus on improving teaching, learning and assessment which is underpinning improvement. New performance management processes are now being developed.
Evaluate the quality of the provision through robust self-assessment, taking account of users' views, and use the findings to promote and develop capacity for sustainable improvement	YES			The new self-assessment procedures are valued by staff who feel included in the judgements that are made and the processes being put in place to improve. Some more training is needed to further develop the full effectiveness of self-assessment procedures. New systems to gain user views are being put into place.
Successfully plan, establish and manage the curriculum and learning programmes to meet the needs and interests of learners, employers and the local and national community				
Actively promote equality and diversity, tackle bullying and discrimination, and narrow the achievement gap				
Safeguard all learners				

<p>Wessex Group</p> <p>PQR</p>
<p>Name of College: NAME COLLEGE</p>
<p>Review conducted by:</p>
<p>Dates of Review:</p>

<p>1. Are quality assurance processes effective in identifying key strengths and weaknesses?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Evidence:</p> <p>Examination of college and departmental QA processes, conversations with managers and teachers in order to test effectiveness of processes,</p> <hr/> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Clarify lesson observation protocols. Further refine SAR and QIP process to allow all staff to become more evaluative and more focused on key actions for improvement</p> <hr/> <p>Best practice observed:</p> <p>QA processes have clearly identified areas for improvement and have specified distinct actions to take to achieve improvements. Collaborative SAR process was valued by staff.</p>
<p>2. Are improvement plans implemented effectively, leading to demonstrable and measurable outcomes?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Evidence:</p> <p>Conversations with managers and teachers, examination of college and departmental QIPs, [COLLEGE MISSION AND STRATEGY]</p> <hr/> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Consider clarifying responsibilities for managers who have multiple quality roles (eg HoF & CL etc).</p> <hr/> <p>Best practice observed:</p> <p>New SAR and QIP processes in place leading to more positive staff buy-in.</p> <p>Managers are clear about how to improve success and have high aspirations. They are positive about [COLLEGE MISSION & STRATEGY DOCUMENT]</p>

<p>3. Are there other aspects of best practice for consideration by members of the Wessex Group?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Best practice observed:</p> <p>Clear overall college focus on improving teaching, learning & assessment.</p> <p>Regular meetings for all staff directly focused on improving teaching, learning and assessment and directed at improving student outcomes</p> <p>Excellent systems for collecting and displaying student data.</p> <p>Weekly data report summaries sent to managers allowing them to prepare for effective meetings with colleagues</p> <p>Effective Learning Mentor scheme (using graduates) that was valued by staff and students alike</p>
---	----------	--

STRENGTHS
<p><i>Staff are supported yet challenged in their roles to improve success and see this as a two-way process</i></p>
<p><i>All managers were positive about the new SAR and QIP processes and felt that there was much more staff buy-in this year.</i></p>
<p><i>The new meetings structure is valued by managers who feel that this gives staff many more opportunities to monitor student attendance and progress. These meetings have led to improved lines of communication.</i></p>
<p><i>Managers are clear about how to improve success and are supported to bring about this change.</i></p>
<p><i>Managers have high aspirations. They are positive about the new direction of the college and want to succeed.</i></p>
<p><i>Managers feel that [COLLEGE MISSION & STRATEGY DOCUMENT] is realistic and achievable</i></p>
<p><i>Weekly Sunday reports are valued by managers and provide a clear focus for meetings.</i></p>

Restructuring has driven change. The new management structure is well understood by staff. They are generally clear who to go to in the case of concerns/problems

[MIS] provides huge amounts of very relevant data

There is a clear focus on improving teaching, learning and assessment which is underpinning improvement

Tutors teach their tutees. This is seen as highly important to give tutors "buy-in".

The Learning Mentor scheme is working well and it is valued by staff and student.

A Humanities council is being set up to further gather student voice.

Introduction to PQR to brief staff in meetings

At the beginning of each meeting:

Here is a suggested context for introducing PQR at each meeting in host colleges.

Set the context for the PQR by:

- Explaining who we are and our roles in our colleges
- Explaining that the host college have asked us to come in to look at their self-assessment and quality systems to ensure that their judgements about quality are sound and consistent.
- Explaining that we will be asking a number of questions and then triangulating responses during our other meetings
- Explaining that this is a supportive peer review system and the more information that we can be given, the more effectively we can fulfil our role. We are NOT Ofsted and not carrying out an "inspection"