

Question and area of Assessment	Strong demonstration (4 points)	Good demonstration (3 points)	Moderate demonstration (2 points)	Inadequate demonstration (1 points)
<p>Application response to Question 4: What is the identified quality improvement need the college is seeking to address?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application shows a clear and detailed understanding of a quality challenge(s) facing the college. Application's diagnosis of its quality challenge(s) is supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong evidence from a recent Ofsted report, Ofsted Support and Challenge letter or FEC diagnostic assessment. Strong evidence from supplementary information such as college's own internal analysis (as contained for instance in a college's Quality Improvement Plan). Application is clearly focused on targeting a specific area(s) of improvement such as improving attendance or quality of delivery in specific curriculum areas. Application provides a very clear and comprehensive demonstration of why addressing the challenge(s) is a priority for the college. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application shows a good understanding of a quality challenge(s) facing the college. Application's diagnosis of its quality challenge(s) is supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good evidence provided from a recent Ofsted report, Support and Challenge letter or FEC diagnostic assessment. Good evidence from supplementary information such as college's own internal analysis (as contained for instance in a college's Quality Improvement Plan). Application shows some focus on targeting a specific area(s) of improvement such as improving attendance or quality of delivery in specific curriculum areas. Application provides a good explanation of why addressing the challenge(s) is a priority for the college. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application shows some evidence understanding of a quality challenge(s) facing the college. Application's diagnosis of its quality challenge(s) is supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evidence provided from a recent Ofsted report, Support and Challenge letter or FEC diagnostic assessment. Some evidence from supplementary information such as college's own internal analysis (as contained for instance in a college's Quality Improvement Plan). Application lacks focus on targeting a specific area(s) of improvement such as improving attendance or quality of delivery in specific curriculum areas. Application provides limited explanation of why addressing the challenge(s) is a priority for the college. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application shows minimal or no understanding of quality challenge(s) facing the college. Application's diagnosis of its quality challenge(s) is support by : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or minimal evidence provided from a recent Ofsted report, Support and Challenge letter or FEC diagnostic assessment. No or minimal evidence from supplementary information such as college's own internal analysis (as contained for instance in a college's Quality Improvement Plan). Application shows no or minimal focus on targeting a specific area(s) of improvement such as improving attendance or quality of delivery in specific curriculum areas. Application fails to provide sufficient evidence about why addressing the challenge(s) is a priority.

Question and area of Assessment	Strong demonstration (4 points)	Good demonstration (3 points)	Moderate demonstration (2 points)	Inadequate demonstration (1 points)
Additional information from Further Education Commissioner's team and ESFA's Intervention teams provided to the panel corroborates or challenges the information provided in response to question 4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information fully corroborates the judgement that the college has clearly identified the challenge(s) that SCIF funding could help address. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information partially corroborates the judgment that the college has accurately identified challenge(s) that SCIF funding could help address. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information provides some challenge to the judgment that the college has accurately identified challenge(s) that SCIF funding could help address. 	Additional information does not corroborate that the application has accurately identified any significant quality challenge(s) that SCIF funding could help address.
Application response to Question 5: How is the college planning to address the quality improvement need identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, the link between the identified challenge(s) outlined in question 4 and the activities specified in the planned programme of work is comprehensively and persuasively demonstrated. In the application, there is a very clear and compelling argument outlining how the programme of work will address the underlying challenges outlined in question 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, the link between the identified challenge(s) outlined in question 4, the activities specified in the programme of work, and their projected outputs and outcomes is reasonably demonstrated spelled out. In the application, there is a well spelled out argument outlining how the work will address the underlying challenges outlined in question 4. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, the link between the identified challenge(s) outlined in question 4, the activities specified in the programme of work, and their projected outputs and outcomes is partially demonstrated. In the application, there is a partial argument outlining how the work will address the underlying challenges outlined in question 4. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, the link between the identified challenge(s) outlined in question 4, the activities specified in the programme of work, and their outputs and outcomes is not clearly outlined, or important elements are absent. The application provides insufficient evidence of how the programme of work will address the underlying challenges outlined in question 4.
Additional information from Further Education Commissioner's team and ESFA's Intervention teams provided to the panel corroborates or challenges the information provided in response to question 5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information fully corroborates that the programme of work outlined is well suited to address the quality challenges identified in the application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information partially corroborates that the programme of work outlined is suited to address the quality challenges identified in the application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information partially challenges that the programme of work outlined is suited to address the quality challenges identified in the application. 	Additional information does not corroborate that the programme of work outlined is suited to address the quality challenges identified in the application.

Question and area of Assessment	Strong demonstration (4 points)	Good demonstration (3 points)	Moderate demonstration (2 points)	Inadequate demonstration (1 points)
Application response to Question 6: Does your college have the capacity and capability needed to successfully implement the quality improvement programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, there is a well spelled out argument as to why the college has the capacity and capability to deliver the programme of work outlined in question 5. The college demonstrates a good track record of successful quality improvement. The programme of work outlined in question 5 is well aligned to the college's broader quality improvement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, there is an acceptable argument as to why the college has the capacity and capability to deliver the programme of work outlined in question 5. The college demonstrates an adequate track record of successful quality improvement The programme of work outlined in question 5 is sufficiently aligned to the college's broader quality improvement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, there is a partial argument as to why the college has the capacity and capability to deliver the programme of work outlined in question 5. The college demonstrates an adequate track record of successful yet limited quality improvement The programme of work outlined in question 5 is sufficiently aligned to the college's broader quality improvement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the application, there is little or no evidence demonstrating how the college has the capacity and capability to deliver the programme of work outlined in question 5. The college does not demonstrate any record of successful quality improvement The programme of work outlined in question 5 is not well aligned to the college's broader quality improvement strategy.
Additional information from Further Education Commissioner's team and ESFA's Intervention teams provided to the panel corroborates or challenges the information provided in response to question 6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information fully corroborates that the college has the resources and capacity required by the programme of work, and is likely to successfully undertake it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information partially corroborates that the college has the resources and capacity required by the programme of work, and is likely to successfully undertake it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information challenges the judgement that the college has the resources and capacity required by the programme of work, and is likely to successfully undertake it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information does not corroborate that the college has the resources and capacity required by the programme of work, and is likely to successfully undertake it.