



STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting on Thursday 11 February 2016

Present:	Mr J Kirk (<i>Chair</i>)	Governor
	Ms N Cuffy	Governor
	Ms L Hammond	Governor
	Ms S Overton-Edwards	Principal
	Mr J Turner	Chair of Governors
In Attendance:	Mr J Bagley	Vice Principal Curriculum
	Mr N Leivas-Mistry	Vice Principal Quality
	Mr B Goddard	Teacher (<i>Item 9 only</i>)
	Mr R Mansfield	Clerk

Ref.		Action
Q/16/01	<p>Item 1 – Apologies for Absence: An apology for absence was received from Margo Moore. The meeting was declared quorate. Robert Mansfield advised the Committee that it first duty was to elect a new Chair to succeed Tony Lawson. John Turner then proposed and Nelista Cuffy seconded John Kirk as Chair. The Committee voted unanimously to elect John Kirk as its Chair. John Kirk welcomed Lesley Hammond, as a new Committee member, and Blake Goddard to the meeting.</p>	
Q/16/02	<p>Item 2 – Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items: There were no declarations of interest in agenda items.</p>	
Q/16/03	<p>Item 3 – Minutes of previous Meeting and Matters Arising: The minutes of the meeting on 6 October 2015 were accepted by the Committee as an accurate record and were duly signed by John Kirk. Under matters arising, it was confirmed that the actions stipulated had been taken, with the following exceptions. Projected results for 2015/2016 were as yet not available; a comparison of 'currently working at' (CWA) with minimum expected grades would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee. In future academic years CWA grades would be updated twice: in November and around the February half term. John Kirk asked whether trend data would be presented. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that he would have to discuss this with Will Diaz. Naz Leivas-Mistry also</p>	<p>NLM</p> <p>NLM</p>

reported that it had not been possible to present trend data relating to high grades as national figures for 2014/2015 had been withdrawn. It was agreed that this action should be carried forward to the next meeting.

John Kirk then with the agreement of the meeting took item 9 as the next item of business. Items are however recorded in these minutes in agenda order.

Q/16/04

Item 4 – Student Performance:

4.1 Examination Results November 2015

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented examination results for November 2015. Some papers had been re-marked since these results had been scrutinised by the Performance Improvement Group. Students re-sitting GCSE Mathematics had achieved the best results by College students over the previous four years.

The Committee received the November examination results.

4.2 Added Value Data

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the College's added value (ALPS) data. ALPS data were used by most sixth form colleges, although there were various other systems. He explained the grading system that applied to the data. In summary the data showed that the College scored well at AS level, although there were some inconsistencies in the scores. There needed to be improvement in the grades attained at 'A' Level. Data for BTEC students needed to be interpreted with care because many of the cohorts were small. He regretted that CVA (contextual value added) scores, a more realistic assessment of the College's performance, were no longer published.

John Turner observed that OfSTED seemed often to use Learner Achievement Tracker (LAT), rather than ALPS, data. John Kirk said that ongoing changes to examinations would make meaningful historical comparisons more difficult in the years ahead.

The Committee received the paper on added value data.

Q/16/05

Item 5 – Curriculum Development:

James Bagley presented a short report on curriculum development. The report summarised the factors considered during a recent audit of the curriculum. The College was focusing its provision upon the achievement of specific career pathways and HE destinations. Whilst it was intended to retain a broad choice for students, care was being taken to ensure that this did not result in programme inefficiencies. Various additional courses were being marketed in response to perceived opportunities; these courses would be confirmed if sufficient numbers were recruited to make the courses viable only. Further

efforts were being applied to timetabling and programme content to improve space utilisation and class economics, and to reduce clashes. The College was actively pursuing its engagement with employers and HE providers. He confirmed to John Turner that the College was actively engaged in discussion with the LLEP in various capacities. John Kirk thanked James Bagley for the report and said that he was encouraged by the College's current links with employers.

The meeting received the report on curriculum development.

Q/16/06

Item 6 – Student Attendance, Retention and Support Contracts:

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the dashboard data relating to student attendance, student retention and support contracts. He demonstrated the levels to which it was possible for governors to drill down. There was particular interest in why the number and profile of student support contracts had been changing. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that the change was the result of an earlier start to instilling standards and a tougher stance on failure to meet them. This was having a small negative impact on retention. It was noted that the report on contracts would be better expressed as percentages of the student roll. John Kirk asked that the number of contracts 'rolled over' from one year to the next should also be shown.

The Committee received the presentation of the dashboard data.

NLM

Q/16/07

Item 7 – Self-Assessment Report:

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the highlights of the latest draft of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) for 2014/2015. He reminded the meeting of the profile of the prior academic attainment of the students recruited by the College. Success rates had declined a little in 2014/2015 but were still 4% above GFE national rates. In line with the latest inspection framework, the SAR included a new section on Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare. (A rating of below 'Good' on this section in an inspection would act as a limiting grade.) The judgment was that the College was currently Good in this regard.

The Committee expressed its concerns about the quality of the Mathematics and English provision at GEMEG and the effectiveness of the College's involvement in addressing this.

The Quality Improvement Plan would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee. John Kirk asked that this should be prefaced with a summary of the key points.

The meeting received the College Self-Assessment Report.

NLM

Q/16/08

Item 8 – Safeguarding:

8.1 Annual Safeguarding Report 2014/2015

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented the Annual Safeguarding Report 2014/2015. This set out the duties of the College as defined under relevant legislation, and the delivery mechanisms, policy and team through which the duties were met. The report provided an overview of the issues reported, number of cases, referrals and other actions over the previous three years.

In answer to questions Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that she would check whether the safeguarding policy was displayed on the College website. Nelista Cuffy raised questions about the recording of Prevent cases. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that there had in fact been no such cases during 2014/2015. Prevent cases would appear in the Annual Safeguarding Report if and when they occurred. Nelista Cuffy asked how governors could assess the College's performance in respect of safeguarding. John Kirk said that it had proved currently not possible to obtain comparative data from other local colleges. However he believed that the College was performing extremely well, particularly because of the excellent relationships between students and staff.

The meeting received the annual safeguarding report.

8.2 OfSTED Survey Visit Report

Suzanne Overton-Edwards provided a short oral briefing on the themed survey visit by OfSTED in January 2016. The visit had examined the College's performance in implementing the Prevent strategy. In general the feedback from the Inspector had been very positive. The College's strengths had been identified as partnership working, training, the understanding demonstrated by staff and students, and IT. Points for action or consideration were to do with outside speakers, ensuring that risks were comprehensively identified, and drawing upon and sharing expertise in student support.

There was then a discussion about the College's Reflection Rooms. John Kirk was most uncomfortable to learn that there were now separately designated male and female reflection rooms and that these were in practice being used by students of one faith only. He believed that this arrangement was contrary to the ethos of the College and to British values. Lesley Hammond agreed.

The meeting received the report.

8.3 Prevent Strategy

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented the Prevent strategy. The strategy had been further developed since governors had received Prevent training in June 2015. She reminded the meeting that the city of Leicester remained on severe alert as regards counter-terrorism. The College's strategy

SOE

had been scrutinised by external partners and by OfSTED and judged fit for purpose. She confirmed that Liz Ward was a member of Channel. John Kirk asked for clarification about the operation of the strategy when students were off-site. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that students' work experience placements were with organisations for which a formal risk assessment had been undertaken. These organisations had responsibility for students on their premises. The position with sole traders was slightly different in that the traders had also to have DBS clearances.

The meeting received the Prevent strategy.

8.4 Prevent Risk Assessment / Action Plan

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented the Prevent risk assessment / action plan. This was a live document to ensure that all risks were covered as they were identified. She confirmed to John Kirk that everyone was aware that Liz Ward was the College's single point of contact. In her absence reference should be made in first to a member of the safeguarding team, then to a member of the SLT, then to a Director of Studies and so on. Nelista Cuffy asked what information had been provided to students. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that training had so far been given to student governors, members of the Student Executive Team and Student Ambassadors. It was planned that these would be trained, with the support of Will Baldet, to cascade the training to the entire student body.

The meeting received the Prevent risk assessment and action plan.

Q/16/09

Item 9 – ILT Plan:

Blake Goddard presented the ILT Plan updated to show actions and progress in 2015/2016. He was pleased to report a considerable increase in the use of Moodle by students and staff. Although there were significant variations, staff had responded positively to recent training and had taken up the coaching support that had been offered by him. Staff were now generally more confident and optimistic about the usefulness of Moodle. He advised John Turner that staff were mainly using Moodle as a readily available store for student learning resources and to upload work. The College was becoming more accessible to students at any time and via any device. Naz Leivas-Mistry undertook to present a display at the next meeting showing how the use of Moodle had increased over the previous three years. There had also been a significant increase in the use of iPADS by staff following the provision of iPad trolleys. It was intended to increase this provision.

The Committee raised concerns about the apparent capacity limitations on the College's computer drives. Naz

NLM

Leivas-Mistry said that he would investigate this matter and report back to the Committee.

NLM

Blake Goddard reported that student induction had been improved by including a one-hour session on the College's IT systems and how to use them. This session would be retained in future years. It was agreed that a brief comparable session should be run for the Committee at the start of its next meeting.

Blake Goddard said that some programme areas were using social media to provide quick updates and urgent communications. This practice was slowly growing, although there was little data as yet.

He reported that Apple Classroom for iPads was soon to be released. This would enable teachers remotely to monitor student activity on iPads. (There was as yet no similar means on monitoring activity on mobile phones.) There was to be a stock-take of progress at the year-end, to inform next steps. Blake Goddard said that his 'A' level course was now entirely paperless, with students able to access all their notes and previous work via the Cloud at any time.

John Kirk entered a plea for a single cross-College system for recording and tracking student results and progress. This should be updated at least monthly. John Turner requested a report by the end of the academic year on how and how soon this could be achieved.

NM/BG

The meeting received the report.

Q/16/10

Item 10 – College Strategic Plan – Progress against relevant Targets:

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented a report of progress against the strategic targets due for review by the Committee. There had been reports on many of the items earlier in the meeting. Progress was generally in line with the plan.

Lesley Hammond questioned how the planned inter-generational learning pilot fitted with funding criteria. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that she had in mind a community project, in which students in relevant disciplines might help senior generations to learn, the students thereby themselves gaining useful enrichment. It was also possible that members of the community might be given the opportunity to sit in on various classes. The project would not constitute a formal curriculum offering.

The meeting received this report.

Q/16/11

Item 11 – Notes of the Performance Improvement Group:

11.1 Meeting on 27 October 2015

11.2 Meeting on 14 January 2016

John Kirk presented the notes of the meetings of the Performance Improvement Group on 27 October 2015 and 14 January 2016, briefly summarising the main contents of

the meetings. The situation at GEMEG had been subject to thorough scrutiny at the meeting on 14 January 2016.

The Committee received the notes of the meetings of the Performance Improvement Group.

Q/16/12

Item 12 – Date and Time of Next Meeting:

The date and time of the next meeting were confirmed as Thursday 21 April 2016 at 5.30 p.m. at the College.

Q/16/13

Item 13 – Any Other Business:

There was no other business.