

Organisation name	City School of Languages, Swansea
Inspection date	17 August 2018
Current accreditation status	Accredited
Reason for spot check	Signalled: check course not running at inspection and follow up on Points to be addressed

Recommendation

We recommend in view of the unsatisfactory findings, that accreditation be placed under review. An action plan is to be submitted within three months to show how issues relating to safeguarding under 18s and other weaknesses in M3, M14, M27, R2, W4, W28 and C7 have been addressed. The period of review to be ended by a spot check within three to 12 months focusing on these areas.

Organisation profile

Inspection history	Dates/details
First inspection	November 2008
Last full inspection	June 2017
Subsequent spot check(s) (if applicable)	August 2018
Subsequent supplementary check(s) (if applicable)	N/a
Subsequent interim visit(s) (if applicable)	N/a
Other related non-accredited activities (in brief) at this centre	N/a
Other related accredited schools/centres/affiliates	N/a
Other related non-accredited schools/centres/affiliates	N/a

Student and staff profile	At inspection	In peak week: July
Total ELT/ESOL student numbers (FT + PT)	24	30
Minimum age (including closed group or vacation)	16 adults 14 juniors	16 adults 14 juniors
Typical age range	18–35	18–35
Typical length of stay	12 weeks	12 weeks
Predominant nationalities	Saudi Arabian, Kuwaiti	Saudi Arabian, Kuwaiti
Total number of teachers on eligible ELT courses	3	4
Total number of managers including academic	2	2
Total number of administrative/ancillary staff	2	3

Premises profile

Address of main site	93/94 Mansel Street, Swansea SA1 5TZ
Additional sites in use	N/a
Additional sites not in use	N/a
Sites inspected	Main site

Introduction

Background

The inspector was asked to carry out this spot inspection on the specific date of 17 August 2018. The recommendation from the last full inspection indicated that there should be a spot check within six months at a time when one of the groups of under 18s was studying at the school and that weaknesses in M3, R2, W4, C1 and C5 had been addressed. The vice principal had notified the Accreditation Unit that since receipt of the 2017 report there had been no bookings for juniors. In November 2017 the school was informed that although there had been no bookings for junior courses, the Unit reserved the right to spot check at a time to suit the Unit to check the points to

be addressed. On arrival the inspector learnt that there had been a three-week junior course running from 30 July to 10 August. The Unit had not been informed that the course was running.

Preparation

The inspector received a copy of the June 2017 inspection report. She looked at the school website and other websites promoting the school.

Programme and persons present

The inspector arrived at 13.00 and left just before 17.00. She had meetings with the principal, the director of studies and one teacher. She could not meet the vice principal, who had been responsible for all aspects of the junior course, as he was not in the school, due to ill health. The student support officer and the welfare and accommodation officer were also not in the school as they do not work in the afternoons. The inspector was provided with some of the documentation she requested, but was unable to see documentation relating to the junior course which had recently finished, in particular, parental consent forms, staff references and the register.

Findings

Significant changes since the last inspection

Management

There have been two new posts created since the 2017 inspection. The vice principal's responsibilities are now focused more on administrative duties and an experienced DoS/academic manager was appointed in April 2018. She teaches 15 hours in the mornings each week. The work of the student support officer has also been reduced. She is now the welfare officer and a new staff member has been appointed as a student support officer with administrative duties.

Safeguarding under 18s	Need for improvement
S1 There is a safeguarding policy which specifies procedures to ensure the safety and well-being of all students under the age of 18. A named member of staff is responsible for implementing this policy and responding to child protection allegations.	Not met
S2 The provider makes the policy known to all adults in contact with under 18s through their role with the organisation, and provides guidance or training relevant to its effective implementation.	Not met
S3 The provider has written parental/guardian consent reflecting the level of care and support given to students under 18, including medical consent.	Not met
S4 Recruitment procedures for all roles involving responsibility for or substantial access to under 18s are in line with safer recruitment good practice and the organisation's safeguarding policy.	Not met
S5 There are suitable arrangements for the supervision and safety of students during scheduled lessons and activities.	Met
S6 There are suitable arrangements for the supervision and safety of students outside the scheduled programme.	Met
S7 There are suitable arrangements for the accommodation of students.	Met
S8 There are suitable arrangements to ensure contact between the provider and parents, legal guardians or their nominated representatives concerning the welfare of students.	Met

Comments

As the inspector did not have access to all the required documentation and was unable to meet relevant staff, it is not possible to comment fully on some of the criteria, in particular S6, S7 and S8. Therefore these criteria remain Met as they were in the previous inspection.

There were no 16 or 17 year olds on adult courses and no students under 16 at the time of the spot inspection. A three week junior course had run from Monday 30 July to Friday 10 August with a group of five Chinese students and four other students from Italy, Kuwait, Qatar and Saudi Arabia. Six of the students were under 16 and three were 17. The published minimum age for junior groups is 14. However, three of the Chinese students were aged 13. C1 (2018: S1) The safeguarding policy has been updated since the inspection in 2017. Several versions of the policy, which were seen by the inspector during the inspection, were undated and there was no review date. The Prevent policy was included in the safeguarding policy, but the lead Prevent person named is no longer employed by the school. A later version was sent to the inspector (not at her request) with the dates included. However, this version is also not up to date; it contains the names of several staff who no longer work in the school. The language is somewhat clearer, but attention still needs to be paid to ensure that all school staff, homestay providers and parents can understand the policy. The Prevent policy is not included in this later version.

C2 (2018: S2) This criterion was Met at the last inspection, but it was not clear to the inspector conducting the spot

check which version of the safeguarding policy was given to staff, homestay providers and parents. As all the versions contained out of date information this criterion cannot be met.

C3 (2018: S3) There were no completed parental consent forms available for the inspector to see.

C4 (2018: S4) There is a safer recruitment policy included in the safeguarding policy. However, references were not available in staff files. One reference request letter, which was seen, asked about the candidate's *'suitability to work with young learners with regard to safeguarding'* but the age was not specified. The policy with regard to delayed suitability checks only requires the new employee to sign a self-declaration form stating that they have no criminal record and are fit to work with students under 18. A risk assessment is not required and a separate barred list check is not carried out.

C7 (2018: S7) The inspector was informed that students under 16 in the summer programme 2018 were all staying with family members, but evidence of this was not provided.

Action taken on points to be addressed

Points from the previous full inspection and/or subsequent spot checks or interim visits with comments (in bold) to indicate how far these have been addressed.

Points to be addressed

Points which must be addressed within three months

Management

M3 (2018: M9) Job descriptions do not accurately specify duties and responsibilities. There is no mention of who is responsible for health and safety, safeguarding and the Prevent strategy. The vice principal's job description defines his academic role, but his role is actually more extensive. The student support officer's job description covers areas for which she is not yet qualified.

Partially addressed. Most job descriptions have been updated and now include details of specific responsibilities. However, the vice principal's job description does not reflect the recent changes in his role; he now supports the principal with school management and is responsible for CSL marketing. The change occurred when a DoS was appointed to take over much of the academic management. The principal is the designated safeguarding officer (DSO) and she is supported by two trained deputy DSOs, but safeguarding duties are not included in their job descriptions. The welfare and accommodation officer's job description mentions that she is responsible for *'the implementation and overall delivery of safeguarding procedures'*, but these duties are not specified. A revised copy of the principal's job description, sent to the inspector after the spot check, now indicates that she is the DSO, but her safeguarding responsibilities are not made clear. The welfare and accommodation officer (previously the student support officer) has completed a welfare training course.

M16 (2018: M7) Some of the points to be addressed from the last inspection have not yet been addressed, namely: M2, R2, W28 and C5.

Partially addressed. See comments below.

Resources and environment

R2 (2018: P1) There are some areas, notably the prayer room, where there is unsightly damp penetration. The student toilets need repair and redecoration. There is no procedure for checking the cleanliness of the toilets and the provision of hand towels during the course of the day. The men's toilet had no hand towels throughout the first day of the inspection.

Partially addressed. The prayer room has been satisfactorily renovated. Hand dryers have been installed in the toilets, but the toilets are still in need of repair and decoration.

Welfare and student services

W4 (2018: W4) The language used in the policy and procedures for dealing with abusive behaviour is, at times, too difficult for lower level learners. The Prevent policy is out of date and very brief.

Partially addressed. The abusive behaviour policy has been simplified to some extent, but still contains language which is too difficult for students below the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) B1 level to understand. At induction students are given a simpler presentation which includes information about the policy, with examples of abusive behaviour and the procedures for reporting and recording any incident that occurs. Core British values are introduced in the presentation.

Care of under 18s

C1 (2018: S1) The safeguarding policy had not been reviewed for some time. The person named as the safeguarding lead had delegated her responsibilities to the DSO.

Partially addressed, but new weaknesses have been noted. See above under S1 in the safeguarding under 18s section of this report.

C5 (2018: S5) There is a need to further clarify supervision arrangements before the arrival of the next junior group.
Addressed. The inspector was unable to meet any of the staff directly involved with the junior group which

was present in July and August, however, she learnt from the student induction information and the principal that procedures for ensuring the supervision of juniors when they are onsite had been put in place.

Other points to be addressed

Management

M18 (2018: M5) Action taken on initial feedback is not always recorded.

Addressed. Action taken as a result of initial informal feedback is now recorded by the DoS.

M24 (2018: M24) A definitive maximum class size is not made clear.

Addressed.

Teaching and learning

T4 (2018: T4) There is no suitably-qualified support for when the vice principal (academic manager) is on holiday.

Addressed. A suitably qualified and experienced DoS was appointed in April 2018.

Welfare and student services

W1 (2018: W1) Fire alarms are tested very infrequently.

Addressed. Fire alarms are tested weekly.

Conclusions

Safeguarding under 18s is an area in need of improvement and there are some weaknesses in management, resources and welfare. Accreditation should be placed under review.
