

Organisation name	Twin English Centre, Eastbourne		
Inspection date	3–5 August 2016		
		ſ	
Section standard		Met	Not met
Management: The management of the provision will operate to the benefit of its students, in accordance with its publicity and in accordance with the <i>Declaration of legal and regulatory compliance</i> .		\boxtimes	
Resources and environment: The learning resources and environment will support and enhance the studies of students enrolled with the provider, and will offer an appropriate professional environment for staff.		\boxtimes	
Teaching and learning: Teachers will have appropriate qualifications and will be given sufficient support to ensure that their teaching meets the needs of their students. Programmes of learning will be managed for the benefit of students. The teaching observed will meet the requirements of the Scheme.			
Welfare and student services: The needs of students for security, pastoral care, information and leisure activities will be met; any accommodation provided will be suitable; the management of the accommodation systems will work to the benefit of students.			

Care of under 18s section	N/a	Met	Not met
There will be appropriate provision for the safeguarding of students under the age of 18 within the organisation and in any leisure activities or accommodation provided.		\boxtimes	

Recommendation

We recommend continued accreditation with a spot check next summer focusing on accommodation, C4 and C7.

Summary statement

The British Council inspected and accredited Twin English Centre, Eastbourne in August 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 large private language school offers courses in general English for adults (16+) and for closed groups of under 18s or adults (16+) and vacation courses for under 18s and adults (16+).

Strengths were noted in the area of quality assurance.

The inspection report noted a need for improvement in the area of accommodation.

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

Organisation profile

Inspection history	Dates/details
First inspection	May 1983
Last full inspection	August 2012
Subsequent spot check (if applicable)	August 2013
Subsequent supplementary check (if applicable)	N/a
Subsequent interim visit (if applicable)	N/a
Current accreditation status	Accredited
Other related non-accredited activities (in brief) at this centre	Internships
Other related accredited schools/centres/affiliates	Twin English Centre Greenwich
Other related non-accredited schools/centres/affiliates	Twin Summer Centres

Private sector

Date of foundation	1993
Ownership	Twin Training International; Company number: 3118260
Other accreditation/inspection	N/a

Premises profile

Premises prome	
Address of main site	25 St Anne's Road, Eastbourne BN21 2DJ
Details of any additional sites in use at the time of the inspection	Eastbourne College Science Centre, Old Wish Road, Eastbourne BN21 4JX
Details of any additional sites not in use at the time of the inspection	N/a
Profile of sites visited	Twin English Centre, Eastbourne (TECE) is located in a two-storey Victorian building, which is owned by the company, in a residential area of Eastbourne. It has retained many of its original features, and is close to local amenities, including the station, shops and cafes. The school has 10 classrooms of varied sizes spread throughout the building. On the ground floor is reception, offices for the principal and director of studies, and the staffroom. The basement houses the students' common room, a small canteen, and a library/study room. There is a large garden.
	The junior provision is located in a three-storey science block at Eastbourne College, an independent school a 20-minute walk from TECE. The school has 11 classrooms allocated, some of which were not in use at the time of the inspection, which fell towards the end of the summer season. Although the rooms are technically laboratories each is designed with a spacious area furnished as a classroom. There is a large room on the ground floor which the school uses as a staffroom which is shared by the teachers, the activity leaders, the summer director of studies and the centre manager.

Student profile	At inspection	In peak week: July (organisation's estimate)
Of all international students, approximate percentage on ELT/ESOL courses	100%	100%
ELT/ESOL students (eligible courses)	At inspection	In peak week
Full-time ELT (15+ hours per week) 18 years and over	42	45
Full-time ELT (15+ hours per week) aged 16–17 years	45	47
Full-time ELT (15+ hours per week) aged under 16	100	222
Part-time ELT aged 18 years and over	0	0
Part-time ELT aged 16–17 years	0	0
Part-time ELT aged under 16 years	0	0
Overall total ELT/ESOL students shown above	187	314
Minimum age	11	11

Typical age range	12–25	12–25
Typical length of stay	2 weeks	2 weeks
Predominant nationalities	Israeli, Chinese, Japanese, Russian	Italian, Spanish, Chinese
Number on PBS Tier 4 General student visas	0	0
Number on PBS Tier 4 child visas	0	0
Number on short-term study visas	59	25

Staff profile	At inspection	In peak week (organisation's estimate)
Total number of teachers on eligible ELT courses	13	20
Number teaching ELT under 10 hours/week	0	
Number teaching ELT 10–19 hours/week	10	
Number teaching ELT 20 hours and over/week	3	
Total number of administrative/ancillary staff	13	

Academic staff qualifications to teach ELT/ESOL

Profile in week of inspection	
Professional qualifications	Total number of teachers
Diploma-level ELT/TESOL qualification (TEFLQ)	2
Certificate-level ELT/TESOL qualification (TEFLI)	9
Holding specialist qualifications only (specify)	0
YL initiated	0
Qualified teacher status only (QTS)	0
Rationale(s) required for teachers without appropriate ELT/TESOL qualifications	2
Total	13
These figures evolute the coordenic menager(s)	·

These figures exclude the academic manager(s)

Comments

Both academic managers are TEFLQ.

Course profile

Eligible activities	Year round		Vacation		Other - N/a	
	Run	Seen	Run	Seen	Run	Seen
General ELT for adults	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\square		
General ELT for juniors (under 18)	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\square		
English for academic purposes (excludes IELTS preparation)						
English for specific purposes (includes English for Executives)						
Teacher development (excludes award-bearing courses)	\boxtimes					
ESOL skills for life/for citizenship						
Other	\boxtimes					
Comments						

Students aged 16 and 17 are enrolled on adult courses year round; the published minimum age for junior courses [closed groups] is 10+. The age range for junior summer vacation [published] is 12–17, 10 and 11 year olds are accepted at the school's discretion.

Accommodation profile

Number of students in each at the time of inspection (all students on eligible courses)				
Types of accommodation	Adults	Under 18s		
Arranged by provider/agency				
Homestay	39	144		
Private home	N/a	N/a		
Home tuition	N/a	N/a		
Residential	N/a	N/a		
Hotel/guesthouse	N/a	N/a		
Independent self-catering e.g. flats, bedsits, student houses	N/a	N/a		
Arranged by student/family/guardian				
Staying with own family	0	0		
Staying in privately rented rooms/flats	3	1		
Overall totals adults/under 18s	42	145		
Overall total adults + under 18s	1	87		

Introduction

The head office of the Twin group is in Greenwich in south London, where the company also has a year-round school. The group also runs vacation courses in a number of venues in the UK. All of them are centrally managed, with the exception of the junior summer centre held at Eastbourne College, which is managed directly by the Twin English Centre, Eastbourne (TECE), whose staff are responsible for all aspects of the delivery of the programme.

The school building in Eastbourne is owned by the company, and, although there had been intentions in the past to move to new premises, this aspiration has been set aside, and repairs to the roof were under way at the time of the inspection.

A very high percentage of the adult students are returners or have enrolled at the school on the recommendation of previous students. Outside the summer season the school accepts closed groups of students from a range of countries, with a range of needs, including work experience. By the time of the August 2016 inspection there had been 22 such groups from 13 clients this calendar year; their average stay was a week.

The junior centre accepts groups and individual enrolments, and over the eight weeks of the summer programme these are roughly evenly divided. Enrolments consisted of 18 groups, whose average stay was just over two weeks. At the time of the inspection the four groups enrolled were all from institutions which had previously sent learners to TECE, some for many years.

The inspection was carried out by two inspectors over three days. Meetings at the main school were held with the principal/manager, the director of studies (DoS)/assistant manager, the senior teacher, and the accommodation and activities manager for both centres. At the junior centre meetings were held with the summer DoS, a group of activities leaders, a group of group leaders, and the facilities bursar of Eastbourne College. Meetings with teachers and students were held at both centres. All teachers were observed teaching, and one inspector visited four homestays and examined the systems of the two accommodation agencies used by the school to supplement their own stock. The round-up was attended by TECE managers and by one of the Twin managing directors.

Management

Legal and statutory regulations

Criteria	See
	comments
M1 Declaration of compliance	\boxtimes

Comments

M1 The items sampled were satisfactory.

Staff management

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
M2 Management structure		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M3 Duties specified		\boxtimes	N/a	\boxtimes	
M4 Communication channels		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M5 Human resources policies		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M6 Qualifications verified	\boxtimes		N/a	\boxtimes	
M7 Induction procedures		\boxtimes			
M8 Monitoring staff performance		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M9 Professional development		\boxtimes			

Comments

M2 The management structure is simple and clear. The junior centre manager role is merged with the activity and accommodation manager roles, which involves a heavy burden of work for one person, especially at peak times. M3 The manager and assistant manager roles both involve multi-tasking. The latter is the child protection officer, which is reflected in her responsibilities in her job description, but not in the overview of the role. The

accommodation officer's job description needs modifying to include his activities manager responsibilities. M4 There are regular academic briefing and senior management meetings, as well as weekly teachers' meetings at both centres. Informal communication was also reported to be effective. Communication between head office and TECE is generally good, although formal senior leadership team meetings involving the principal have been reduced since a recent change in management structure.

M5 The policy is robust, with references taken up and special attention paid to contact with under 18s, with gaps in CVs interrogated, and proof of identity and safeguarding training indicated as a requirement.

M6 Although the qualifications and experience of all prospective employees are checked, and copies of certificates are signed and dated, the validity, in relation to the Scheme, of some non-standard TEFL qualifications had not been followed up. The qualifications expected of activity staff are particularly high.

M8 There is an annual professional development review for all core teachers, managers and support staff. Some long-term summer school teaching staff without continuous employment are not included in the process. The activities manager monitors activity leaders' performance, giving written feedback, and also appraises his staff. There is a capability procedure, which is included in the teachers' handbook.

M9 Short teacher development (TD) sessions take place weekly at the main school and twice weekly at the junior centre. As part of their development core teachers are asked to deliver some of the TD sessions at the junior centre in their areas of interest or expertise. Core teachers may attend external workshops. Although the school pledges to support up-grading of qualifications, no funding has been awarded to the summer school DoS for her Diploma course, though this may be granted retrospectively.

Student administration

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
M10 Administrative staff and resources		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M11 Information on course choice		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M12 Enrolment procedures		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
M13 Contact details		\boxtimes			
M14 Student attendance policy		\boxtimes			
M15 Students asked to leave course		\boxtimes			

Comments

M10 Extra office staff are taken on during the summer to support the centre managers.

M11 Some prospective students book through head office, and some students and agents book directly through Eastbourne. Both groups receive adequate advice.

M12 Refunds are processed through head office. Where the time this takes may cause hardship to students, staff at TECE are able to mitigate the problem.

Quality assurance

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
M16 Action plan		\boxtimes	N/a		
M17 Continuing improvement		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
M18 Student feedback and action		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
M19 Staff feedback and action		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M20 Complaints and action		\boxtimes			

Comments

Duch linite

M17 A lot of data is collected from students and staff. These include an annual junior summer school report written by the summer DoS and discussed with the assistant manager. They all contribute towards a comprehensive self-assessment report, which identifies areas of strength and areas for improvement in the three categories of curriculum and teaching, welfare, and governance.

M18 Students are given an arrival questionnaire, a first week satisfaction check and an exit survey. Summer school students give weekly feedback. Views are gathered individually and from groups. These are collated and help to inform the self-assessment document.

M19 Teaching staff receive a feedback questionnaire and views are also gathered at minuted staff meetings.

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
M21 Accessible accurate language		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
M22 Realistic expectations	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
M23 Course descriptions		\boxtimes			
M24 Course information	\boxtimes		N/a	\boxtimes	
M25 Costs		\boxtimes			
M26 Accommodation		\boxtimes			
M27 Leisure programme		\boxtimes			
M28 Staff qualifications		\boxtimes	N/a		
M29 Accreditation		\boxtimes	N/a		

Comments

Publicity consists of two brochures and the website, and social media sites.

M21 Language is generally accessible by a prospective adult student or the parent of a junior. However, the terms 'multi-bedded' and 'trusted partners' in the summer centres brochure do not convey the reality of a student's twinbedded room nor the status of an accommodation agency respectively. 'A business etiquette environment' is also opaque.

M22 The publicity relates to both the London and Eastbourne schools, and the statements about technological resources do not apply to both equally. This point was also made in the previous report. In addition, there are no captions on the pictures.

M24 Publicity states the age range for junior courses is 12–17, but in fact it is 11–17, as the policy changed in 2015.

Management summary

The provision meets the section standard and exceeds it in some respects. Both centres are well run by committed staff who are well supported by their managers. An efficient and personalised service is offered to students whose feedback is valued, and acted upon. Publicity is generally accurate and fair, but two areas need attention. *Quality assurance* is an area of strength.

Resources and environment

Premises and facilities

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a	
R1 Adequate space		\boxtimes		\boxtimes		
R2 Condition of premises		\boxtimes				
R3 Classrooms and learning areas		\boxtimes		\boxtimes		
R4 Student relaxation areas and food		\boxtimes		\boxtimes		
R5 Signage and display		\boxtimes		\boxtimes		
R6 Staffroom(s)		\boxtimes		\boxtimes		
Commonto						

Comments

R1 Premises at the year-round school are satisfactory, though at peak some classrooms lack circulation space. Toilet provision is just adequate, reflecting the age of the building. The junior summer school has dedicated use of the modern science block at Eastbourne College. Although other language schools were using other buildings on the site, each external client has a discrete designated area and TECE had sole use of the entrance to the science block,

R3 At the main school the classrooms are of various shapes and sizes, and need ingenuity on the part of the DoS in terms of deployment of students. At the summer school further classrooms are available if required.

R4 The students have a common room in the basement in the main school, with a television, table-tennis table and a piano, and there is a small canteen adjacent which is opened by the office staff at break times for hot drinks and pre-packed snacks. There is also a pleasant garden. Eastbourne College has an outdoor space with tables near the entrance to the science block where students can gather.

R5 In the main school there are no signs on the stairs to indicate which classrooms are situated on that floor. There are ample noticeboards at both sites giving opportunities for administrative and student displays.

R6 There is a large ground-floor room which is used as a staffroom at the junior centre. The staffroom at the main school is less spacious but staff felt that it was just satisfactory, with collaboration, at peak times.

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
R7 Learning materials for students		\boxtimes			
R8 Resources for teachers		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
R9 Educational technology	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
R10 Self-access facilities		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
R11 Library/self-access guidance		\boxtimes			
R12 Review and development		\boxtimes			

Learning resources

Comments

R8 The senior teacher has responsibility for resource development and has produced useful supplementary material for teachers' use.

R9 There is one interactive whiteboard at the main school, which means teachers have to arrange to swap rooms if they want to use it; this is not ideal for ensuring general confidence in its use. At Eastbourne College all the rooms have interactive whiteboards/data projectors.

Twin e-learning (TeL), the company's own virtual learning platform, which is advertised in the publicity, has material designed to develop students' reading skills, to provide storage for tutorial records and to which students and staff can upload work. However, is not useable at the main school by staff due to the slow Wi-Fi. The DoS tries to mitigate this for students by uploading tutorial records.

R10 There is a library/study area in the basement at the main school which contains six book cases with an eclectic collection of books for all levels, which may be borrowed on an honesty basis. There are aspirations to buy more copies of readers. It provides a pleasant, quiet working space, which, on the basis of the borrowing record, is under-used.

Resources and environment summary

The provision meets the section standard. The premises and facilities at both sites are of a satisfactory standard.

Resources for teachers and students are more than adequate, but teachers at Eastbourne are not able to exploit the company's virtual learning environment due to weak Wi-Fi coverage. However, overall the learning resources and environment support the studies of students enrolled at the school and offer an appropriate professional environment to staff.

Teaching and learning

Academic staff profile

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T1 General education (and rationales)		\boxtimes	N/a	\boxtimes	
T2 ELT/TESOL teacher qualifications	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
T3 Rationales for teachers		\boxtimes	N/a	\boxtimes	
T4 Profile of academic manager(s)		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
T5 Rationale for academic manager(s)			N/a		\boxtimes
0					

Comments

T1 Four members of staff did not have a Level 6 qualification. Rationales were accepted within the context of this inspection, although TECE was warned that this was a high proportion. Evidence that the relevant teachers had considerable post-school learning and/or wide life experience was presented.

T2 Two of the teaching staff did not have externally validated TEFL qualifications.

T3 The rationales for these staff members were accepted within the context of this inspection. Both had wide experience in relation to the posts they currently hold.

T4 The DoS/assistant manager and the junior centre DoS are both well qualified for their roles, and the former provides excellent overall academic leadership. She is supported by a senior teacher whose main responsibility outside teaching is resource management.

Academic management

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T6 Deployment of teachers		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T7 Timetabling	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
T8 Cover for absent teachers		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T9 Continuous enrolment		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T10 Formalised support for teachers		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T11 Observation and monitoring		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	

Comments

T6 The primary criterion on which teachers are deployed is their strength in a particular area. At both centres two teachers share a class, and at the junior centre the DoS also aims to provide a complementary pairing. At the main centre the DoS is concerned to ensure teachers rotate sufficiently to give opportunities for development.

T7 At peak season in the adult centre the main factor is managing class sizes so they fit the space available in particular rooms, while at the same time ensuring that the ability range in any one class is not too great. This is not an issue at the junior centre where room size is uniform. As numbers diminish, however, the ability and age range does become an issue there, and this is exacerbated by the lowering of the minimum age to eleven. Some low-level classes contained students from 11–17 with the majority of students of one nationality, which impacts negatively on teachers' management of classes and lesson content.

T8 There is a list of cover teachers available, with the DoS as back-up.

T9 Enrolment is continuous, with new students arriving weekly. At the junior centre, where the framework for the syllabus is thematic, cumulative assumptions do not underlie the course structure. In contrast, at the main school, where coursebooks form the framework, assumptions that learning is incremental do apply, so the school needs to consider in more depth how the impact of students arriving 'half way through' can be mitigated.

T10 The teachers were very positive about the amount and quality of support offered at both centres by dedicated academic managers. However, firmer guidance of junior centre teachers might result in greater uniformity of programme and student experience.

T11 Observations are undertaken within the first two weeks of a teacher's contract, and then six monthly at the main

school. Observations are graded on a 1–10 scale. Formal peer observations are scheduled twice yearly at the main school and are also in place at the junior centre, where group leaders are encouraged to take part alongside the TECE staff. Comprehensive written and oral feedback is provided, which was appreciated by the teaching staff at both centres.

Course design and implementation

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T12 Principled course structure	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
T13 Review of course design		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T14 Course outlines and outcomes		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T15 Study and learning strategies	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
T16 Linguistic benefit from UK		\square		\square	

Comments

T12 Course design at the main school is based on a coursebook, supported by can-do statements derived from the Council of Europe Framework of Reference (CEFR). Afternoon classes for those who opt for a more intensive course are skills- or IELTS- focused.

At the junior centre a different approach is taken, in line with the students' ages and the length of the average stay. The *Summer Centre Curriculum Policy* states that the lessons are based on topics, and at placement students are asked to select some preferred topics from a range. In addition, the policy mentions a notional/functional approach, a lexical approach, as exemplified by the coursebook teachers may choose to use, systems and skills, communication, content-based learning exploiting teachers' own expertise, weekly project work, and preparation and follow-up to the half-day excursion. Teachers design a weekly plan which 'should also meet students' expectations (a grammar-based syllabus is still very popular in their own countries).' This course design is based on too many principles to be coherent and does not guarantee parity across levels, effectively offering teachers carte blanche.

T13 Course design is reviewed annually in preparation for the self-assessment exercise, but this needs to be more thorough with a view to streamlining the junior curriculum.

T14 A weekly plan is devised by the main class teacher in conjunction with their colleague, and at the main school this is discussed with the students on Mondays. It is then displayed on the classroom wall for the adult students. T15 At the main school there are, in principle, weekly learner-training sessions, held at a time available to all students. However, these sessions are now exclusively focused on IELTS training. The school might consider integrating learner training into the syllabus for both adult and junior centres.

T16 The students make external visits in their classes, as well as having regular excursions in the junior centre, and homestay hosts are really encouraged to converse with their students. However, more could be done to exploit the language of the local environment in the classroom.

Learner management

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
T17 Placement for level and age		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
T18 Monitoring students' progress		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
T19 Examination guidance		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T20 Assessment criteria					\boxtimes
T21 Academic reports		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
T22 Information on UK education					

Comments

T17 Comprehensive placement tests, in terms of both skills and systems, devised by TECE staff, are in place at both centres, and appear to work satisfactorily. The junior centre's oral component incorporates some limited target setting, which is later used for students to evaluate their own progress. In the case of the lower level students this is achieved with the support of their group leaders.

T18 At the main school there are monthly progress tests, which are followed by a tutorial. Individual learning plans are drawn up. A proficiency test is used as an exit test which enables students to progress to the next level. If students are dissatisfied with the results of this, a barrier test is administered which makes it clear to students what they need to achieve before they can move up. The DoS reported that since the introduction of the barrier test the issue of progression had been much less problematic. The system at the junior centre is outlined in T17 above.

T19 Currently only IELTS preparation is delivered, although other public examinations can be catered for if there is sufficient demand.

T21 All students at both centres receive a report at the end of their stay.

Classroom observation record	
Number of teachers seen	13
Number of observations	14
Parts of programme(s) observed	All parts, including morning and afternoon classes at the main school.
Comments	

One teacher was unintentionally seen twice due to a change of room in the teaching timetable.

Classroom observation

Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
	Not met		$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Not metMetStrength commentsII

Comments

T23 Generally teachers produced accurate models of spoken and written English and gave accurate explanations. In better segments good extension activities were demonstrated, for example by exploring morphemic changes in vocabulary items. But in some lower level segments teachers used incidental language without short forms and resorted to pidgin.

T24 Project and drama work was effective as students could work at their own level of competence and confidence, and develop their own interests. Appropriate material was in use for work experience students and activities focusing on photography and describing pictures suited students' ages and interests. Little attention in planning was paid to differentiation, particularly in relation to early-finishers. In weaker segments some fun activities had been planned but, at times, there was barely any linguistic content.

T25 Most teachers expressed their aims in terms of outcomes for the learners, and all shared these with the students in some form, often as a menu on the board, as appropriate to the group's level of understanding. Coherence in the lessons was often achieved through the theme, but in weaker segments lessons appeared to be a series of fun activities with no cohesive links.

T26 A range of techniques was in evidence: matching activities to check vocabulary, elicitation, sequencing of questions to lead students to a conclusion, effective monitoring. In the better segments there was a good mixture of teacher-led, pair and group work. On the weaker side, teachers of the younger students made insufficient use of nomination and techniques such as the raising of hands to help classroom management and avoid domination by more confident students. Sometimes there were very limited lead-ins so students had little time to adjust their schemata before, for example, a reading activity. Although choral drilling of single words was in evidence, there was very little drilling of whole utterances, and drilling was often tentative and not fully exploited for its potential for fun. Grammatically, there was often too much metalanguage and talking about the language, followed by insufficient practice or repetition. At higher levels not enough was done to help students to generate useful rules from the linguistic evidence.

T27 When interactive whiteboards were employed their use was effective. Conventional whiteboards were often neat and well organised, though this was not consistent, especially in classes with younger learners and those non-Roman alphabet users for whom clear written records are especially important. In better segments there were clear instructions and exemplification, in some cases written on the board as back-up to oral instructions. Good use was made of classroom space by moving tables into café formation or clearing them out of the way altogether for whole group activities. Many younger learners needed encouragement to speak up in order to help train students to listen to each other, and needed clearer indication of the stages of the lesson, for instance, giving timed periods for students to copy from the board.

T28 There was some effective correction of students' oral and written work while working in pairs and groups, as well as delayed oral correction and written correction with incorrect utterances put on the board. In weaker

segments there was no correction, particularly of pronunciation and word stress in the flow of the lesson when the focus was not on language production. Feedback on exercises from coursebooks did not involve reviewing the rules by exploring why one answer was right and another wrong.

T29 The lesson plan template has a section on 'Achievement of learning', and this focused teachers well on evaluating learning. Evaluation often took place via the next activity which provided practice and extension. Although outcomes were shared with students, very few teachers explicitly checked the achievement of those outcomes, particularly with older students, or reviewed them at the end of a stage or lesson.

T30 At best, friendly but firm teaching won the class's respect and interest, and student involvement was total, because of both the theme or activity and the teacher's encouraging manner and rapport. In addition, a good pace was maintained with an appropriate choice of language pitched at the students' level. But at the other end of the scale, students' attention was sometimes not held for the opposite reasons.

Classroom observation summary

The teaching observed met the requirements of the Scheme and ranged from excellent to unsatisfactory, with the majority satisfactory. Inevitably with this range what was done well in better segments was not reflected in weaker ones, so consistent patterns are hard to identify. All students, and their group leaders, were positive about participants' classroom experience, and judged that good progress was being made. At lower levels in the junior provision 'primary' techniques to better manage classrooms were often lacking, and at the adult school insufficient guidance was offered to students to help them derive generative rules from the language samples.

Teaching and learning summary

The provision meets the section standard. The academic staff profile is satisfactory, despite a high proportion of teachers lacking a Level 6 qualification. Academic management generally works well to deal with the issues raised by a wide age range and a narrow nationality range in the later weeks of the junior summer school provision. However, course design at the junior centre needs firmer monitoring and streamlining to ensure parity and coherence across the provision. More attention could be paid to the impact of continuous enrolment in the main school. Support for teachers is good, while learner management is also of a high standard. The teaching observed met the requirements of the Scheme.

Welfare and student services

Care of students

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
W1 Safety and security onsite		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W2 Pastoral care		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W3 Personal problems		\square			
W4 Dealing with abusive behaviour		\square		\boxtimes	
W5 Emergency contact number		\square	N/a		
W6 Transport and transfers		\square		\boxtimes	
W7 Advice		\boxtimes			
W8 Medical and dental treatment		\square	N/a		
Commonto					

Comments

W1 Appropriate provision is made for the safety and security of students at both sites. Fire drills are carried out regularly and the premises risk assessment at the main school is updated at regular intervals. External areas at the time of the inspection at the main school were encased in scaffolding to enable roof repairs, for which a risk assessment had been drawn up. Staff were vigilant about ensuring that this was not used by students as a climbing frame. The large jeep and open trailer containing rubbish, which has been parked immediately outside the school for a number of months, is potentially a health hazard. In addition, the host school's risk assessment at the summer centre has not been adapted to Twin's context.

W2 Students' pastoral needs are well taken care of with activity leaders and the centre manager at the summer centre playing key roles. Individual students at the summer centre know who to go to for advice and support. Provision is made for religious observance at both sites.

W4 Policies and procedures for dealing with abusive behaviour can be found in all handbooks and on notices in classrooms, the latter written in language that can be easily understood by students. The school is addressing its responsibilities relating to the Prevent strategy, with an appropriate risk assessment, training and awareness-raising.

W6 Clear information on transport between students' point of entry to the UK and the Eastbourne is provided but approximate costs are not included. Where transfers are provided for under 18s, arrangements are clear, effective and responsive to unforeseen circumstances.

Accommodation profile

Comments on the accommodation seen by the inspectors

All accommodation for all ages of students is homestay. Because of the high demand for homestay accommodation in the Eastbourne area during the summer, Twin use, as well as their own homestays, two accommodation agencies, neither of which is registered with the British Council. One inspector visited four homestays: two Twin homestays and one homestay organised by each of the two agencies. He also visited one of the two agencies' offices and inspected their systems. The school does not use residential accommodation.

Accommodation: all types

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
W9 Services and facilities		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W10 Accommodation inspected first	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
W11 Accommodation re-inspected		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W12 Accommodation registers	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
W13 Information in advance		\boxtimes			
W14 Student feedback		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
W15 Meals in homestay/residences		\boxtimes			

Comments

W9 Services and facilities in three of the four homestays visited were of a high standard but in the fourth homestay, there was inadequate hanging and drawer space for clothes.

W10 All accommodation is inspected by a responsible representative of the school or the two agencies before students are placed. However, one host visited was unaware of the need for a Gas Safe certificate, and inspectors were informed that overall just under 50 per cent of Twin's hosts do not have Gas Safe certificates.

W11 All accommodation is re-inspected at least every two years. However, as noted in W10 Gas Safe certificates are not checked.

W12 Accommodation registers are kept up to date but there is no record to show that a Gas Safe certificate is not in place.

W14 All students complete a first week questionnaire, which includes questions about their satisfaction with their homestays, with questions on how many other students are staying in the house and on whether the host and family talk to them. Any action taken in response to dissatisfaction is recorded meticulously.

Accommodation: homestay

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
W16 No more than four students	\boxtimes		N/a	\boxtimes	
W17 Rules, terms and conditions	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
W18 Shared bedrooms		\boxtimes	N/a	\boxtimes	
W19 Students' first language		\boxtimes	N/a	\boxtimes	
W20 Language of communication		\boxtimes	N/a		
W21 Adult to welcome		\square	N/a		

Comments

W16 There were two examples of a homestay hosting more than four students. One of these, found in the records of homestay complaints, resulted in this host being removed from Twin's list of homestays; the other current instance had four Twin students and two students from another source all staying at the same homestay. W17 Although all hosts, both those recruited by Twin and those by the two agencies, are given copies of rules, terms and conditions, one host left her three students (aged 11 and 12) alone two mornings a week when she left for work, and had given them a house key.

W18 The document that agents or group leaders send the school with rooming lists for their students is taken as

written confirmation that three or four students can share a room. This document is the result of a process that involves parents being informed and agreeing to the fact that students will be sharing a room with two or three other students in the same group.

W19 The same document is taken as written confirmation that students with the same first language can be lodged in the same home.

Accommodation: residential

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
W22 Cleaning					\boxtimes
W23 Health					\boxtimes
Comments					
None.					

Accommodation: other

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
W24 Information and support		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W25 Other accommodation		\boxtimes	N/a		
Comments					

W24 A useful advice sheet informs students of the implications of their living in bed-sits or flats.

Leisure opportunities

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
W26 Information and access		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W27 Leisure programmes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
W28 Health and safety		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
W29 Responsible person		\boxtimes			

Comments

W26 Both the main school and the summer centre offer a reasonable range of social, cultural and sporting activities, although some long-stay students at the main school commented that there was too much repetition. W27 The member of staff in charge of the leisure programme, who is also the accommodation manager and the summer site's centre manager, has written a series of very useful information booklets for each local trip and full-day excursion for activity leaders to use. These often include quizzes. Many of the activity leaders come from the Eastbourne area and have good local knowledge. At the summer centre, afternoon activities include arts and crafts and drama options, suitable for the younger, less sporty student. Wet weather alternatives are available. W28 Good systems are in place to ensure the health and safety of students on all on-site and off-site activities with well-written risk assessments.

Welfare and student services summary

The provision just meets the section standard. The needs of students for security, pastoral care and leisure activities are well met. The management of homestay accommodation systems is not sufficiently robust. There is a need for improvement in the area of *Accommodation*.

Care of under 18s

Criteria	Not met	Met	Strength	See comments	N/a
C1 Safeguarding policy		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
C2 Guidance and training		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
C3 Publicity		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	

C4 Recruitment procedures	\boxtimes		N/a	\boxtimes	
C5 Safety and supervision during scheduled lessons and activities		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
C6 Safety and supervision outside scheduled lessons and activities		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
C7 Accommodation	\boxtimes			\boxtimes	
C8 Contact arrangements		\boxtimes	N/a	\square	

Comments

At the time of the inspection, there were 126 under 18s at the summer centre and 19 under 18s at the main school. C1 The safeguarding policy shows evidence of expert input in its framing. The policy includes comprehensive safe recruitment checks with appropriate information on DBS, references, police certificates and provision for exceptions, for example the appointment of members of staff still awaiting DBS clearance. The policy also includes codes of conduct and incident reporting procedures.

C2 All staff and homestay hosts have received basic awareness safeguarding training and designated safeguarding officers and the safeguarding lead have had either advanced or specialist training. Safeguarding training is an integral part of staff inductions, including the one-day induction for summer staff. Group leaders sign a declaration which informs them that the safeguarding policy is available in the centre manager's office and includes a statement to say that they have read the policy. There is a summary of the policy in the homestay handbook. Codes of conduct are clear and appropriate and seen by all adults who come into contact with under 18s.

C3 Publicity provides an accurate summary of the level of care and support given to under 18s.

C4 Staff recruitment procedures are in line with safer recruitment best practice. However, a significant number of homestay hosts who were hosting under 18s at the time of the inspection had not undergone criminal record checks. Some group leaders did not have evidence that they had been police checked in their home countries. Although the two agencies claimed that all their hosts who were hosting under 18s had had criminal record checks, there was no formal agreement between Twin and the agencies to ensure that appropriate suitability checks had been carried out.

C5 Students who are aged 16 and 17 who study in adult classes at the main school have their names highlighted on class registers and both the academic manager and the accommodation officer check their welfare regularly. Winter groups of under 18s have separate breaks and lunchtimes from adult classes. Great care is taken to ensure that there is sufficient adult supervision of under 18s at the summer centre. Group leaders are only responsible for their own students, while individual students always go on excursions as one group, with at least two activity leaders accompanying them. Activity leaders check attendance at regular intervals throughout the day.

C6 Rules for what students may do outside scheduled lesson or activity times without supervision are known to students, staff, group leaders and homestay hosts. There are very good arrangements for activity leaders and other staff, including the principal, to collect students from meeting points near their homestays in the mornings and to deliver them to the same points in the evenings. Curfew times are clear and are repeated on each week's leisure programme handout, a copy of which all homestay hosts receive. Risk assessments of travel to and from accommodation have been completed and homestay-specific risk assessments, particularly of those in less safe areas, are being prepared.

C7 The school is responsible for providing accommodation and all meals for students at the summer centre. At the main school 16 and 17 year-olds do not have their lunches provided and parents do not confirm that they agree to this arrangement. In one case, a responsible adult was not at home at all times when her 11 and 12 year-old students were in the house.

C8 Parents, agents and guardians all have the school's emergency number. The school collects and holds parents' or legal guardians' 24-hour contact details.

Care of under 18s summary

The provision just meets the section standard. There is appropriate and often very good provision for the safeguarding of students under the age of 18 both within the school and the summer centre, and in leisure activities. However, there are significant weaknesses in the safeguarding of students in accommodation, particularly in the carrying out of suitability checks on hosts. These must be addressed urgently.