

Annex D: Form for Responding to this Consultation Document

Cheylesmore House
Quinton Road
Coventry
CV1 2WT
T 024 7682 3264
F 024 7682 3334
www.lsc.gov.uk



Leading learning and skills

(Reference: Consultation on the development of the Framework for Excellence – a comprehensive performance assessment framework for the further education system)

Please complete and post this form to the above address (or fax to 024 7682 3334) by no later than **20 October 2006**. A copy of your response will also be forwarded to your local LSC for information. A Microsoft Word version of this response form is available on the LSC website (www.lsc.gov.uk) and can be completed and emailed back to: framework-for-excellence-consult06@lsc.gov.uk if preferred.

Early responses would be greatly appreciated.

Name (*please print*): SHERI-LEIGH MILES

Role or title: DEPUTY CONVENOR

Organisation: EAUC

Address: EAUC UK OFFICE, MEDWAY BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTER, THE PARK, CHELTENHAM,

Postcode: GL50 2RH

Please respond below by ticking the appropriate box or deleting as appropriate and entering your comments in the space provided.

Do you wish your response to remain confidential?

Yes No

Which of the following organisations do you work in and/or represent?

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Further education college (including representative bodies) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Higher education institution with further education provision | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local authority | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public sector institution (including representative bodies) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Private training institution | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| School | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sixth-form college | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist college (for example, agriculture or art and design) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist college for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist designated institution | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ufi/learnirect | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Voluntary sector institution (including representative body) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The EAUC (Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges) is a member-led charitable organisation representing the FHE sector.

Comments are invited on the following questions:

Question 1: Do you think that a comprehensive performance assessment should incorporate the Common Inspection Framework? Yes No

Comment: Review of the CIF during process of aligning the frameworks could explore potential for including aspects of sustainability within the OFSTED process also.

Question 2: Do you agree that the three dimensions of responsiveness, effectiveness and finance based on the seven key performance indicators (KPIs) are sufficient for comprehensive performance assessment or are there other aspects that need to be included? (*please specify*) Yes No

Comment: Difficult to determine without some idea of the detail contained within them - arguably they have the potential to be if sufficient is contained within them.

Question 3: Do you agree that the proposed Framework of KPIs is applicable to all the types of colleges and providers that make up the further education system? Yes No

Comment:

Question 4: Do you agree that the information needed for the proposed Framework should be assembled, as far as possible, from the information that any well-managed college or provider would collect and analyse? Yes No

Comment: Colleges or providers collect information they are required to by assessment such as this. It could be argued that a well managed college should be analysing data relating to various sustainability indicators and the vast majority are not. Pressure to do so from this process would be a key driver.

Question 5: Do you agree that the principles proposed in Section 4 provide a suitable basis for the development of the KPIs? Yes No

Comment: Potential for stand alone sustainability indicator here. Pressure should theoretically come from employers seeking a workforce with sustainability skills but this may realistically be a way off and would also be dependent on the engagement process. Quality of provision links to OFSTED judgement which is reason for need to pressure them to include sustainability aspects also. Sustainability linked to financial health does include sustainability measure - potential here but limited context financial sustainability very different.

Question 6: Do you think that the proposed factors contributing to the KPIs described in paragraphs Yes No

31 to 37 are a suitable basis for initial development and trials?

Comment: Would like to see sustainability as a key performance indicator or perhaps more appropriately as a cross cutting theme across all seven.

Question 7: Do you think that there are any additional or alternative objective, quantifiable indicators that should be used to define the KPIs, particularly where they draw on existing data sources? Yes No
(please specify)

Comment: Range of quantifiable sustainability indicators could be added. Not widely used in FE. Potential for development here.

Question 8: Do you agree that the approach to determine the KPIs, as proposed in Section 5, should include an element of qualitative assessment as well as quantitative measures? Yes No

If not, how do you think the KPIs should be determined? (please specify)

Comment:

Question 9: Do you think that all the KPIs and dimensions should carry the same weight or significance when contributing to the overall performance rating? If not, what should be the weighting or significance placed on the KPIs and/or the dimensions and why? (please specify) Yes No

Comment: Perceiving equal value in all areas is necessary for ensuring all areas are given equal attention.

Question 10: Do you think that the requirement to assess the dimensions against the five-point scale place a significant additional burden on colleges and providers? If so, please explain why. Yes No

Comment: Provision of support from organisations such as EAUC could be invaluable.

Question 11: Do you agree with the interim arrangements for grading scales proposed in paragraph 49? Yes No

Comment:

Question 12: Do you think that the overall performance rating should be a Star rating, a one-word descriptor, a statement or a combination of these?

Star rating	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
One-word descriptor	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Statement	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Combination of the above (<i>please specify</i>)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

Question 13: Do you think that your organisation or those you represent will have difficulty in implementing the Framework and, if so, why? (*please specify*)

Yes No

Comment:

Question 14: Do you agree with the proposed schedule for the operational introduction of the Framework for Excellence set out in Section 7?

Yes No

Comment:

Question 15: Is there anything else that you would like to add? (*please specify any other considerations, comments or issues you may have*)

Comment: Potential for including the many and varied elements of sustainability is significant within the framework and hopefully many elements will be identified and included within each of the KPI's, our involvement at the more detailed stages should be offered. Definitions of 'excellence' with reference to colleges should include environmental and social performance. There is significant opportunity for joined-up thinking with SD strategy - this should not be missed.