

Organisation name	Target English International, Hull and Hatfield centres
Inspection date	5 July and 18 July 2017

BACKGROUND
Organisation profile

Inspection history	Dates/details
First inspection	2012
Last full inspection	July 2016
Subsequent spot check (if applicable)	N/a
Subsequent supplementary check (if applicable)	N/a
Subsequent interim visit (if applicable)	N/a
Other related non-accredited activities (in brief) at this centre	N/a
Other related accredited schools/centres/affiliates	None.
Other related non-accredited schools/centres/affiliates	None.

Current accreditation status and reason for spot check

Current accredited status	Accreditation under review
Reason for spot check	Signalled: end period under review

Premises profile

Address of main site	Head Office: Target English, First Floor, Norwich House, Savile Street, Hull HU13 1ES
Details of any additional sites in use at the time of the inspection	Centres for 2017: 1. University of Hull, The Lawns Centre, Harland Way, Cottingham, East Yorkshire HU16 5SQ 2. University of Liverpool, Merseyside L69 3BX3 3. University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY 4. Hatfield, University of Hertfordshire, DeHavilland Campus, Hatfield, Hertfordshire AL10 9EU 5. Lincoln, Bishop Grosseteste University, Longdales Road, Lincoln LN1 3DY 6. Myerscough College, St Michael's Road, Bilbottle, Preston PR3 0RY
Details of any additional sites not in use at the time of the inspection	None.
Sites inspected	The University of Hull programmes are based at a residential campus in the village of Cottingham, five miles outside Hull. Target uses the main building in which are located a reception area, six classrooms, an office, a teachers' room, an activities room, a social area, a laundry room, a canteen with a large screen, and toilets. The organisation also uses the common rooms in eight residential blocks as additional classrooms. Sports facilities include a multi-use games area and five-a-side football pitches. The Hatfield centre is based at the residential

	DeHavilland campus of the University of Hertfordshire, about 20 miles to the north of London. Target uses a building with up to ten classrooms available; there is also a teachers' room. The centre manager's office is in a separate building, together with a room for activity staff. Students are accommodated in single ensuite rooms in two residential blocks nearby. There are two all-weather sports fields, a tennis court and an indoor sports hall. There is a dining hall, and a lecture theatre used for showing films.
--	--

Student and staff profile	At inspection	In peak week <i>July</i>
Total ELT/ESOL student numbers (FT + PT)	Hull: 381 Hatfield: 153	Hull: 420 Hatfield: 168
Minimum age (including closed group or vacation)	Hull: 10 Hatfield: 11	Hull: 10 Hatfield: 11
Typical age range	Hull: 12–17 Hatfield: 11–18	Hull: 12–17 Hatfield: 11–18
Typical length of stay	2 weeks in both centres	2 weeks in both centres
Predominant nationalities	Hull: Italian, Spanish Hatfield: Italian	Hull: Italian, Spanish Hatfield: Italian
Total number of teachers on eligible ELT courses	Hull: 14 Hatfield: 10	Hull: 14 Hatfield: 10
Total number of administrative/ancillary staff	Hull: 7 Hatfield: 20	Hull: 7 Hatfield: 20

INTRODUCTION

Background

Target English International (TEI) was first accredited in 2012. In 2016 eight residential summer centres for 11 to 18 year-olds ran in universities and colleges in England. Following the full inspection in July 2016 accreditation was placed under review because the section standard for teaching and learning was not met, and there were weaknesses in publicity. The period of review was to be ended by a spot check of a minimum of two centres focusing on teaching and learning, and publicity.

In summer 2017 six residential summer centres were run for 10 to 18 year-olds. The 2016 centres in Nottingham and Penrith did not run in 2017.

All students take an externally validated oral English examination as part of their course programme. There is an academic manager based at head office who is responsible for academic matters in all centres; there are also two area academic managers (AAMs) who visit the bigger centres, observe classes and provide support for the two directors of studies (DoSs). A new post of Trinity examinations co-ordinator (TEC) was created for each centre for 2017.

Preparation

The spot check of the two centres was carried out by two inspectors, neither of whom had been to any of the organisation's centres before. The reporting inspector made contact with the director at the head office in Hull to check which centres were running for summer 2017, to get an estimate of student numbers in July and August, and to check whether any days should be avoided for the visits. The inspectors received documentation, including the last full inspection report, from the Accreditation Unit, and an organogram and action plan from the TEI head office. The inspectors checked the organisation's website before visiting the two centres.

The inspectors chose to visit the Hull centre as it is a very big centre, also inspected in 2016, and the Hatfield centre as it was one of the centres not inspected in summer 2016.

Programme and persons present

On 5 July the inspectors arrived at the Hull centre at 09.00, and left at 15.30. They had discussions with the centre manager, the two DoSs, the academic manager, who was visiting the centre that day, and the TEC. They observed four classes. They also talked to some of the teachers in the break, to a group of group leaders, and to students in two classes. Documentation was checked. A short feedback session was held at the end of the visit with the centre manager and the AAM.

On 18 July the inspectors arrived at the Hatfield centre at 09.15, and left at 15.30. They had discussions with the

centre manager, the DoS, the AAM who was spending time at the centre that week, and the TEC. They observed four classes. They talked to some teachers in the break, and to students in two classes. Documentation was checked. A short feedback session was held at the end of the visit with the centre manager, the DoS and the TEC.

Following the two spot check visits the reporting inspector was in telephone contact with the director at the TEI head office to discuss the organisation's publicity materials, to receive confirmation of DBS numbers/dates for all staff, and to give him feedback on the visits.

FINDINGS

Management

The management structure is clear. The director at TEI head office is supported by an academic manager, and a sales and recruitment team. In Hull and Hatfield there is a centre manager, a DoS (in Hull, two DoSs), a TEC and an activity manager. There was a good balance of experienced and new staff in both centres.

Staff management

Communication in both centres is generally satisfactory. In Hull, communication is facilitated by the centre manager's office being close to rooms used by the other centre staff, and by the fact that all staff have mobile phones. In Hatfield, the DoS and teachers were working in one building, and the centre manager, the activity manager and activity staff were in a separate building, five minutes' walk away. Communication was by mobile phone, rather more often than face-to-face. The centre manager reported some issues with the effectiveness of communication with the university.

At each centre there is a management staff meeting every Friday to review the week. There is a teachers' meeting each morning and at the end of the week.

The inspectors were told in both centres that communication with head office staff was excellent: the director is always available by phone and makes regular visits to each centre. Almost all the students come in groups. The group leaders have an induction meeting on the second day of the course, receive a group leader manual, and have regular briefing meetings with the centre manager and the activity manager. The group leaders told the inspectors that they felt very well informed about what was going on in the centre.

Induction for staff working in all centres had taken place on the weekend prior to the start of courses. The programme included safeguarding training by an external expert for senior staff; all teachers and activity leaders are required to do basic awareness safeguarding training. The centre academic management staff had a full day's induction with the academic manager to explore all aspects of their role; they receive a very comprehensive continuing professional development (CPD) manual and they reported that communication and support from the academic manager was excellent. Teachers had a full-day induction and told the inspectors this had been very useful, especially to be given a teachers' manual and links to the online resources.

Publicity

There were four criteria relating to publicity that were not met in the 2016 inspection (M22, M24, M28, M29). These points have all been addressed satisfactorily. See below. The 2017 website contained a statement that 'Target English International is a *British Council accredited company* operating junior summer schools'. The reporting inspector discussed the inaccuracy of this statement with the director immediately following the spot check visits, and the statement was removed from the website.

The organisation's publicity materials now meet all the publicity criteria (M21–M29). There is also clear and detailed information on the website about the level of care and support the organisation provides for students aged under 18; criterion C3 is met.

Premises

The Hull premises are entirely suitable and spacious enough for the numbers of students enrolled.

The teachers' room is rather small for 14 teachers and staff do not have sufficient access to computers to enable them to use easily the online drive where many useful materials are stored. There is also no convenient access to tea/coffee and water. Immediately following the spot check the AAM confirmed that two additional laptops had been made available in the teachers' room, with access to two further printers in the office next door. An adjoining room had been made available as an overflow teachers' workroom, with an additional set of resources for easy access. Tea and coffee-making facilities had also been provided.

In Hull, one teacher was teaching in a lecture theatre, which was not easy to manage in terms of promoting communicative language learning.

In Hatfield, the premises are suitable and spacious. The DoS shares the teachers' room and there is sufficient space for everyone to work.

Teaching and learning

A new post of TEC was created for 2017. There is a TEC in each centre with responsibility for managing all aspects of the external oral English examinations which all Target students take as part of their course. This includes materials, induction sessions and support for teachers, as well as enrolments and all other administrative arrangements for the exams. This was the responsibility of the DoS in each centre in 2016. The inspectors were told that the creation of this post had had a very positive impact on the workload of the DoSs, allowing them to spend more time on individual teacher support and monitoring, and on delivering CPD sessions.

The academic manager based in head office also has a key role in supporting teachers. She runs the induction session for academic staff, liaises closely with the AAMs and DoSs while courses are running, and visits all centres at least twice each summer. The DoSs in both centres were very positive about the support she provides. The AAMs visit the centres on a weekly basis to do observations, provide feedback and liaise with the DoS on CPD.

Teachers in both centres confirmed their appreciation of the support they received, especially from the TEC in relation to the organisation and provision of preparatory materials.

There were 14 teachers in Hull, and 10 teachers in Hatfield at the time of the spot check.

Academic staff profile

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T1 General education (and rationales)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/a	<input type="checkbox"/>	
T2 ELT/TESOL teacher qualifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T3 Rationales for teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
T4 Profile of academic manager(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T5 Rationale for academic manager(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments

T2 All teachers had appropriate ELT qualifications.

T4 In Hull there were two DoSs, rather than one DoS, for the first time. One DoS had experience of being a teacher in the centre, and the second DoS had been the assistant DoS in 2016. In Hatfield, the DoS was in his third year as DoS in the centre. All have Level 6 qualifications, are TEFLI and have sufficient and relevant teaching experience. Support from the AAM is good, with regular weekly visits, as well as support from the academic manager.

T5 No rationales were requested but the inspectors checked the distribution of academic management tasks. The TEFLI DoSs were deployed in entirely appropriate ways, including testing and teacher support. The AAM carries out quality assurance observations of teachers, and discusses her feedback with the DoSs, as well as with the teachers concerned.

Academic management

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T6 Deployment of teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T7 Timetabling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T8 Cover for absent teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T9 Continuous enrolment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T10 Formalised support for teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T11 Observation and monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments

T7 Attention had been paid to ensuring that the age range in classes did not exceed five years in Hull, and three years in Hatfield.

T8 Cover arrangements are satisfactory. In Hull, the two DoSs do not have teaching timetables so are available for cover teaching, and the TEC is also qualified to teach. In Hatfield, the DoS was the only cover and the AAM had been teaching in the week of the spot check. The TEC in Hatfield is not a qualified teacher.

T10 The TEC is available to support teachers in relation to examination preparation classes. The AAM visits the centres regularly. The DoSs provide good daily support for their teachers, including checking weekly plans and

helping with lesson planning, and planning and delivering CPD sessions every week. In Hull, sessions had included examination preparation ideas, and ways of correcting pronunciation. In Hatfield, sessions had included lesson planning and classroom behaviour management. The DoSs receive a CPD outline from the academic manager to help them plan sessions. Teachers spoke positively of the usefulness of such practical sessions.

T11 The academic manager from head office and the AAMs are responsible for teacher observations. Teachers are observed twice, with one short and one formal observation, followed by one-to-one feedback. Observations were in progress at Hull and observation feedback notes on file were seen to be constructive. In Hatfield, observations were also in progress but the feedback notes lacked sufficient focus on action planning to support improvement of teaching.

Classroom observation record

Number of teachers seen	Hull: 4; Hatfield: 4.
Number of observations	8
Parts of programme(s) observed	Morning classes
Comments	None.

Classroom observation

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T23 Models and awareness of English in use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T24 Appropriate content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T25 Learning outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T26 Teaching techniques	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T27 Classroom management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T28 Feedback to students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
T29 Evaluating student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
T30 Student engagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Comments	<p>T23 Teachers generally gave clear explanations and were able to provide accurate written and spoken models of English. Sometimes new spoken language was not practised sufficiently to ensure every student could pronounce it satisfactorily.</p> <p>T24 Topics were generally well chosen for the age group.</p> <p>T25 Lesson aims were on the whiteboard with, generally, a focus on learning outcomes. Lesson plans showed a sequence of activities leading to the planned outcomes.</p> <p>T26 A range of techniques was seen. Most teachers used elicitation techniques well, as well as prompting and checking meaning. In some instances, teachers asked for definitions and often explained new language themselves, resulting in excessive teacher talking time.</p> <p>T27 Teachers were observed using the whiteboard, handouts, and video clips for examination preparation.</p> <p>T29 Teachers sometimes used short exercises to check that students had learnt new language.</p> <p>T30 In some classes students were working in different interaction patterns, moving around and working with different partners. In both centres, some of the classes observed were working at rather a slow pace, resulting in students not being fully engaged. Teachers needed more guidance on how to check quickly whether students know the target language, and if they do, how to move on and challenge them with more difficult language.</p>				

The inspectors gave feedback in general terms about the lack of pace seen in some lesson segments in both centres. Immediately following the spot check the academic manager informed the inspectors that an additional voluntary CPD session had been run the following afternoon in Hull to discuss how to maintain effective pace in lessons and keep students engaged. The session was attended by all teachers and the AAM who was in the centre that day.

Overall the teaching observed was satisfactory.

Welfare and student services

When the inspectors arrived in Hatfield, the receptionist at the main university reception did not know whether Target were on campus and it took 15 minutes to verify this, and to locate the centre office by telephone. The centre manager rectified this lack of information in the course of the spot check visit.

In both centres, there are regular checks throughout the day and evening to ensure students are attending classes and activities, that they return to the residential blocks and are safe. There is a final patrol at 23.00 every evening. Students are not allowed to leave the campus. First aid provision in both centres is good. In Hatfield, there had been no fire drill by the time of the spot check visit.

In Hull, all students and staff were wearing lanyards. In Hatfield, there was insufficient checking of whether students were wearing lanyards, important because the campus is very open. In one class observed, six of the 12 students had no lanyard.

Group leaders in both centres were generally very satisfied. The group leaders in Hull were particularly positive about the efficient transfer and arrival arrangements for their students.

The food in both centres was only just satisfactory with an emphasis on chips, fried potatoes and pizza. Although staff were on duty at lunchtimes to check the queues, there was no check that students were eating healthily. Following the spot check visit, the Hull centre manager and the director discussed increasing the healthy options with catering staff, and the provision of more fruit and more attractive salads was agreed.

The leisure programme was not the focus of this spot check but there was evidence of a full and varied programme being run well by activity staff in both centres. Students receive a very professionally produced centre-specific activity book to take with them on excursions; it has information and language activities about the local area and the places they will visit.

Care of under 18s

The organisation has a safeguarding policy in place and staff receive appropriate levels of training. Up-to-date DBS numbers were on file for all staff.

In Hatfield, the maximum age for students is 18 if they come in groups. Any such 18 year-olds follow the same rules as the students aged under 18.

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.

M4 Meetings in centres are not minuted. There are no formal end-of-week or end-of-course meetings held with teachers. A DoS log failed to record all of the critical incidents in one centre. Teaching staff in some centres had not received information about the special educational needs of some of their students.

Addressed. Minutes of meetings were seen. There are regular meetings for teachers every day and at the end of the week. There was no evidence of missing information about any special educational needs of students.

M7 In Hull some teachers were dissatisfied with the short length and content of their on-site induction.

Addressed. Teachers had a full-day induction and spoke positively of how useful it had been.

M8 At the end of the summer managers in centres state whether they would or would not recommend the re-employment of staff, or recommend them for promotion. The criteria by which staff are evaluated at the end of their summer employment are not made sufficiently clear to staff.

Addressed. Staff receive appraisal documentation prior to their end-of-summer appraisal.

M18 No initial feedback is obtained from students.

Addressed. Some samples of feedback collected from students within three days of their arrival were on file.

M22 The publicity claim that the 'summer schools are based at some of the UK's most prestigious universities, giving access to some top-class teaching, sports and recreation facilities' is potentially misleading and does not accurately reflect all of the provision. Some of the quotations in the brochure are unattributed.

Addressed. This statement has been removed from the publicity materials. All quotations in the brochure are attributed.

M24 Students below the minimum age and above the maximum age specified in the publicity were studying in centres at the time of the inspection. The stated maximum class size of 15 was exceeded in nine of the classes in Hull.

Addressed. There were no students outside the advertised age ranges for the Hull and Hatfield centres studying in the centres at the time of the spot check visit. Class sizes in Hull and Hatfield did not exceed the advertised maximum class size.

M28 The brochure states that: 'All our teachers are recruited in line with British Council guidelines on qualifications

and experience'. Some of the teachers do not have first degrees or TEFL qualifications that meet Scheme requirements.

Addressed. All the teachers in the Hull and Hatfield centres had a level six qualification and TEFL qualifications that meet Scheme requirements.

M29 The brochure and some of the TEI banners display the British council logo, not the Accreditation Scheme marque.

Addressed. The correct version of the Accreditation Scheme marque is used in the brochure. No TEI banners were seen.

Resources and environment

R3 Two of the classrooms in Nottingham were too small for the number of students in them.

No longer applicable as the Nottingham centre did not run in 2017.

R8 There are fewer teaching resources available for use with the lower age students.

Addressed. Additional resources for younger students have been made available.

Teaching and learning

T1 The rationales for nine teachers who do not have an appropriate general level of education are not accepted as the proportion of such teachers is too high.

Addressed. Recruitment procedures have been amended and the inspectors were told in 2017 all but two of the total 54 teachers have Level 6 qualifications. This was not checked. All teachers in the two centres visited had Level 6 qualifications.

T2 Three of the teachers do not have ELT qualifications appropriate to the courses they are teaching.

Addressed. All teachers in the two centres visited had appropriate ELT qualifications.

T4 The rationales for a DoS who does not have a level 6 qualification or an ELT qualification that meets Scheme requirements is not accepted within the context of this inspection. The rationale for another DoS who does not have an ELT qualification that meets Scheme requirements is not accepted within the context of this inspection. The centre DoSs were not receiving sufficient monitoring of their own performance or given enough guidance on how to support teachers, many of whom needed daily support to write weekly plans and daily lesson plans.

Addressed. See T4 above.

T7 The age range in some of the classes in both Hull and Nottingham was too great. There were timetabling issues regarding the availability of classrooms in both Nottingham and Lincoln. The Nottingham centre had had to use another teaching block in the second week of the summer and two of the classrooms assigned were too small for the number of students using them.

Addressed. See T7 above.

T8 The DoSs are first cover in most centres and this led to problems in Nottingham where the DoS, the AAM and an activity leader had had to cover lessons and classes had been merged. Overall the cover arrangements were inadequate.

Partially addressed. In Hull arrangements were satisfactory. In Hatfield, the DoS was the only cover and the AAM had been providing cover in the week of the spot check.

T10 In some cases the AAMs had not given one-to-one feedback to teachers or discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers with the centre DoSs. There was no evidence that any professional development sessions related to teachers' needs were planned in any of the centres visited, including how to teach preparation lessons for the oral exams. DoS administrative workloads and welfare responsibilities made it extremely difficult for them to give less experienced teachers the personal attention they required in devising lessons and weekly plans. Overall the support for the teachers in general and for the less experienced teachers in particular was inadequate.

Addressed. See T10 above.

T11 The AAMs had not observed the DoSs who had been teaching in the centres at the time of their visits. One-to-one oral feedback had not been given to all of the teachers observed. The feedback given to teachers did not sufficiently identify not only *what* aspects of teaching needed to be improved but also *how* they might be improved.

Partially addressed. In Hatfield, observation feedback notes lacked sufficient focus on action planning to improve teaching.

T14 Written course outlines, in the form of weekly plans, and intended learning outcomes, are not made available to all students.

Addressed. The syllabus is posted on noticeboards.

T17 The age range in some classes exceeded five years in both Hull and Nottingham. For example, in Hull, age ranges included from 10 to 22, 11 to 16, 11 to 17 and 11 to 17.

Addressed. Attention had been paid to the age range in classes to ensure a range of no more than five years in Hull, and three years in Hatfield, was adhered to.

T19 In Nottingham, the process by which students were assigned a level for the oral examination had not been conducted in a timely manner and to the satisfaction of all parties.

No longer applicable as the Nottingham centre did not run in 2017. There was no evidence of any issues relating to the assessment of students' spoken English in the centres visited during this inspection.

T23 Some teachers used unnatural language and requested students to speak and write responses in 'full sentences'. Very little attention was paid to pronunciation or intonation in most lessons observed.

T24 In some examination preparation classes the mixed levels in classes made it hard for lessons and materials to

be at the appropriate level and on appropriate subjects for all learners. In some non-exam classes the lesson topics and materials were not clearly linked to the needs of students.

T25 In many classes topics were highlighted, rather than learning outcomes, and many general English classes had unclear aims and a sequence of activities that lacked coherence.

T26 In some classes students were working in large groups on tasks that did not require many of them to speak. Discussions between students were often conducted in their first language and not in English. There was a lack of controlled practice in most of the classes observed. Overall instruction techniques were poor and teachers failed to give clear examples of target utterances.

T27 In Hull some teachers were hampered in using their whiteboards effectively by their small size in some rooms and others struggled to use flip chart alternatives appropriately.

T28 In the weaker lesson segments many opportunities for giving oral feedback were missed.

T29 There was little evidence in lessons of activities designed to evaluate whether learning had taken place.

T30 Too much first language was spoken in many classes and even when this had been identified as a difficulty, most teachers did not have effective strategies for countering this.

T23–T30 here relate to the teaching seen at the last inspection in 2016. In 2017 the teaching observed was judged to be satisfactory. See T23–T30 above.

Welfare and student services

W3 Not all centres have photoboards displaying all main personnel and the names of staff do not appear in student manuals.

Addressed. Photoboards had been set up in Hull and Hatfield.

W5 Students are not required to enter emergency numbers on their mobiles and a number of students at each site were observed without their lanyards.

Partially addressed. Not all students had the emergency numbers in their mobiles. In Hull, all students were wearing lanyards. In Hatfield, at least 30 per cent of the students had no lanyard and there was no evidence of regular reminding from the staff.

W14 There is no formal initial feedback from students in relation to their accommodation.

Addressed. Initial feedback procedures are now in place.

Care of under 18s

C5 A 22 year-old was enrolled on a course as a student at Hull. There were sometimes insufficient staff on duty during the breaks.

Addressed. There were no students outside the advertised age range in either centre visited.

C6 The 'lights out' time for all students is 23.00 which is rather late for students aged 11 to 13.

Addressed. Group leaders will be consulted in 2017 on the appropriacy of one 'lights out' time for all their students. Activities have finished by 22.30, which is when students go to their rooms.

Points to be addressed arising from this visit

W1 At the time of the spot check there had been no fire drill in the Hatfield centre. In Hatfield, there was insufficient checking of whether students were wearing lanyards, important because the campus is very open.

CONCLUSIONS

The organisation has responded fully to the areas of concern from the last inspection in 2016. Communication is generally good and the 2017 induction procedures thorough. Publicity materials are satisfactory. The academic staff profile is entirely satisfactory. Support provided for teachers is very good; the creation of the role of the TEC has much reduced the workload of the DoSs and allows them to focus more on teacher support. Documented procedures for academic staff are much improved. The teaching observed was satisfactory.

RECOMMENDATION

The period of review may now be ended and accreditation continued until the next full inspection, which falls due in 2020. However, the committee requested the submission of documentary evidence to demonstrate that W1 has been addressed before the next season begins. The required evidence was subsequently submitted.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Changes to summary statement

An updated summary statement can now be issued.

Summary statement

The British Council inspected and accredited Target English International, Hull in July 2016. The Accreditation Scheme assesses the standards of management, resources and premises, teaching, welfare, and care of under 18s and accredits organisations which meet the overall standard in each area inspected (see www.britishcouncil.org/education/accreditation for details).

This private language teaching organisation offers residential vacation courses in general English for under 18s.

An area of strength was noted in leisure opportunities.

The inspection report stated that the organisation met the standards of the Scheme.
