



STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting on Tuesday 4 October 2016

Present:	Mr J Kirk (<i>Chair</i>)	Governor
	Ms N Cuffy	Governor
	Ms S Overton-Edwards	Principal
In Attendance:	Mr J Bagley	Vice Principal Curriculum
	Mr N Leivas-Mistry	Vice Principal Quality
	Mr R Mansfield	Clerk

Ref.		Action
Q/16/35	<p>Item 1 – Apologies for Absence: An apology for absence was received from Margo Moore. The meeting was declared quorate. The Committee noted with regret that Lesley Hammond had resigned her College governorship.</p>	
Q/16/36	<p>Item 2 – Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items: There were no declarations of interest in agenda items.</p>	
Q/16/37	<p>Item 3 – Minutes of previous Meeting and Matters Arising: The minutes of the meeting on 9 June 2016 were accepted by the Committee as an accurate record and were duly signed by John Kirk. Naz Leivas-Mistry informed the meeting that action in response to the recent student survey would be presented in the College Self-Assessment Report.</p>	
Q/16/38	<p>Item 4 – Examination Results Summer 2016 and the Remit of the Performance Improvement Group: Naz Leivas-Mistry advised the meeting that the data shown in the paper distributed prior to the meeting about the summer examination results were already slightly out of date. Pro-Achieve was now showing that the College's aggregated A and AS level results were just 0.62% below national benchmarks. (He drew the attention of the</p>	

meeting to changes in the terminology used: for example 'success rates' were now termed 'achievement rates'.) Within this there were however areas of concern. He suggested two optional approaches to determining the remit of the Performance Improvement Group. The first was, as previously, to focus on low-performing areas; these would once again be Mathematics; and Sports, Public Services and Health & Social Care. The second approach would recognise that the College's value added scores had been falling across the board; in the light of this each faculty team could in turn be asked to present its plans for improving high grades.

Robert Mansfield advised the Committee that there were in his view potential difficulties with the second option, as faculties might be seen at different points in the College year, some much too late for the Group's input to have any impact. He considered it was a matter of concern that two of the subject areas previously under scrutiny were still under-performing and that the Group needed in the interests of good governance to maintain a focus on them. It might however be possible to combine the proposed approaches in some way.

John Kirk said that he believed that there was a deep-seated problem of low aspirations on the part of students and low expectations on the part of staff that needed to be addressed. James Bagley said that the circumstances and backgrounds of students varied widely. The many who came after under-achieving at other colleges, for example, knew that they had been 'written off' by the more prestigious universities and could gain entry to others with poor grades. Nelista Cuffy agreed and said that she would like to hear about different student cohorts and to receive case studies. It was therefore agreed that the first and fourth meetings of the Group would focus upon actions and efforts across all faculties to improve high grades and that the other two meetings would concentrate upon the under-performing areas earlier identified. Robert Mansfield said that he would in the light of this decision try to bring forward the Group's second meeting to November or December 2016.

The Committee received the examination results and determined the remit of the Performance Improvement group as described.

RM

Q/16/39

Item 5 – Student Enrolments / Subjects Analysis:

James Bagley presented a report on student recruitment for the current academic year. The College was now full

to capacity. The report highlighted curriculum areas where recruitment had been respectively strong and weak. In total the College had considerably exceeded its target. Efforts would be focused on attendance and possible withdrawals to ensure that numbers were as far as possible maintained. John Kirk congratulated staff on the high numbers recruited. He was disappointed that the College had not recruited more Creative Arts students, but accepted that this in line with national trends.

The meeting received the report.

Q/16/40

Item 6 – College Strategic Plan 2016/2017 – Progress against relevant Targets:

Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that data were not yet available in respect of the one item due for report. This would be carried forward to the next meeting.

The meeting noted this oral report.

SOE

Q/16/41

Item 7 – Self-Assessment Report Action Plan 2015/2016 – Update:

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented an updated version of the Quality Improvement Plan. The report was based on the data available to date and was liable to further change.

The meeting received the update on the Quality Improvement Plan.

Q/16/42

Item 8 – Annual Safeguarding Report 2015/2016:

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented the annual safeguarding report for 2015/2016. This set out the College's duties, delivery mechanisms, policy and team, the training provided during the year and an analysis of safeguarding referrals. The meeting noted that there had been significant numbers of referrals for depression and mental health issues. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that additional time of specialist staff was being made available in the current year in recognition of this trend.

The meeting received this report.

Q/16/43

Item 9 – Curriculum Development:

James Bagley presented a paper on curriculum development, summarising the many changes taking place nationally and setting out the College's position in seeking to offer appropriate academic, vocational and hybrid pathways matched to students' needs and abilities. This continued to pose a range of challenges.

The meeting received this report.

Q/16/44

Item 10 – Annual Learner Involvement Report 2015/2016:

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the annual learner involvement report for 2015/2016. The report was an innovation in response to the Code for Good Governance in English Colleges. The report set out the importance attached by the College to the learner voice and the various channels through which student opinion was heard. There was a summary of the key messages received and the resultant actions. John Kirk said that he had been particularly struck by comments from students about the impact of staff attitudes and a desire for more recognition of achievement. Naz Leivas-Mistry concurred and said he believed recognition could be used to encourage positive behaviour.

The Committee received the annual learner involvement report.

Q/16/45

Item 11 – Joint Ventures Update:

11.1 GEMEG

Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that for the previous two years the College's partnership with GEMEG had provided football-focused education for nearly 40 students. During discussions about action to improve GEMEG's performance at Easter GEMEG had disclosed that they were looking to open a centre in Northampton. In the summer term it became apparent that some GEMEG students presenting themselves at the College to sit examinations had in fact been taught in Hinckley. Attempts by the College to gain clarification led to the abrupt termination by GEMEG of the partnership arrangement. This had forestalled intended action by the College to end the partnership.

The Committee noted this oral report.

11.2 Mattioli Woods Academy

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented a short review of the Mattioli Woods Academy. The paper provided a summary of the history of the partnership, the programme, student numbers and progression. The relationship had been complicated by a change of key personnel at Mattioli Woods, but was now on 'an even keel' again. A meeting had been arranged to discuss expansion and future development. John Kirk said that he saw the Mattioli Woods Academy as an excellent model, which he believed the College should be seeking to replicate.

The meeting received this report.

Q/16/46

Item 12 – Committee Terms of Reference:

Robert Mansfield presented the Committee's terms of reference for review. He saw no reason to change them. The Committee noted that its membership had fallen below the minimum set by the Board. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that she knew of a possible candidate to fill the vacancy on the Committee. It was agreed that the proper course of action would be for her to discuss this matter further in the first instance with John Kirk outside the meeting, and then as appropriate to pursue it via the Search Committee.

The Committee concluded that there was no current reason to request a change to its terms of reference.

Q/16/47

Item 13 – Committee Self-Review 2015/2016 and Targets for 2016/2017:

Robert Mansfield presented an analysis of the Committee's performance against its targets for 2015/2016. These had been met except insofar as members of teaching staff had not been involved in the meetings of the Committee. However he felt that the importance of this target (target 15) might have reduced since the inception of the Performance Improvement Group and invited the meeting to consider whether it should be dropped. He reminded the meeting that efforts to monitor students 'at risk' had been largely frustrated by problems of definition and data and therefore asked whether target 6 also should be abandoned. He proposed that an additional target should be set for 2016/2017 in respect of the monitoring of student destinations, notwithstanding the difficulties of obtaining reliable information. The remaining targets should be retained.

In discussion it was agreed that target 15 should be abandoned as a formal target, although Suzanne Overton-Edwards said she would invite members of teaching staff to attend as observers. Target 6 was to be retained in the light of an assurance from James Bagley that there was new thinking on this matter to share with the Committee at its next meeting. It was agreed that there should be an additional target for monitoring student destinations.

The meeting received the report and set targets for 2016/2017 as described.

SOE

JB

RM

Q/16/48

Item 14 – Date and Time of Next Meeting:

The date and time of the next meeting were confirmed as Thursday 9 February 2017 at 5.30 p.m. at the College.

Q/16/49 | **Item 15 – Any Other Business:**
There was no other business.

|