



STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting on Tuesday 10 January 2017

Present:	Mr J Kirk (<i>Chair</i>)	Governor
	Ms N Cuffy	Governor
	Ms M Moore	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/17/01	<p>Item 1 – Apologies for Absence: There were no apologies for absence. The meeting was declared quorate.</p>	
Q/17/02	<p>Item 2 – Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items: There were no declarations of interest in agenda items.</p>	
Q/17/03	<p>Item 3 – Minutes of previous Meeting and Matters Arising: The minutes of the meeting on 29 November 2016 were accepted by the Committee as an accurate record and were duly signed by John Kirk. The Committee reviewed the actions specified in the minutes. Suzanne Overton-Edwards reported that Regent College had indicated a readiness to share practice in respect of BTEC courses. She was asked to arrange for this to be done. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that action on the use of classroom time had commenced, for example via learning walks. Lesson observation training was to make clear what was required, and student surveys would be used as a cross-check on practice. He assured John Kirk that the College had a homework policy, and that this was communicated also to all students and parents. John Kirk referred to support offered via the good offices of</p>	SOE

the Education Funding Agency (EFA) from two high-performing colleges. He, Steve Holderness and Suzanne Overton-Edwards were to visit Prior Purslove College, and there was to be a visit from Rochdale College, with a view to improving the effectiveness of governance.

Q/17/04

Item 4 – Student Achievement and Progress:

James Bagley presented an overview of the data held within the recently introduced grade book software, and the reports now available to teachers and managers. Data were entered each half term by published deadlines. The completion rates for the previous term had been very high. The Progress and Target Grade Report tracked value added and attendance etc. in a format that facilitated timely remedial action. There was also a detailed Attendance and Punctuality Report.

Nelista Cuffy asked why the grade book did not record the grades given for each piece of marked work. James Bagley replied that that would be likely to provide spiky profiles and risked triggering overreaction to isolated instances of poor work. 'Yoyo' effects would not help the effective targeting of support. Nelista Cuffy was concerned that the data presented were therefore subjective. John Kirk said that he accepted that teachers should be allowed to use professional judgments to predict outcomes.

James Bagley reported that data for period 2 showed 44% of students as working below their minimum expected grade (MEG), and 15.5% above MEG. For period 1 48% had been shown as working below MEG. He cautioned against over-reliance on these figures, but advised that they appeared not to give grounds for concern about the direction of travel.

John Kirk asked why there were blank entries in the grade book. James Bagley said that the comparatively few blank entries had arisen for reasons such as staff absence and students leaving the College. John Kirk said that he hoped that staff understood the value of the grade book as a tool. Robert Mansfield asked the meeting to note that what had been presented was in a format of more use to managers and staff than to governors. Governors needed to start from a high level of aggregation and then be able selectively to drill down. James Bagley confirmed that he understood this and said that more suitable reports should be available in about a month. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that the contracted input of Will Dias had been increased in response to mounting demands for

JB

management information.

John Kirk said that he was impressed by the quality of the new reports, and asked that the congratulations and thanks of the Committee should be passed to all those who had been involved.

The Committee received the presentation on student achievement and progress.

Q/17/05

Item 5 – Recent Reports on Current Quality Status:

5.1 EFA Visit Report

Suzanne Overton-Edwards reported that the report issued by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) on its first monitoring visit on 29 November 2016 had focused on the OfSTED inspection report, with references to the related EFA recommendations. John Kirk advised the meeting that he considered that the risk of staff relations adversely affecting the College's recovery had been considerably overestimated. An active search was in hand to find governors with suitable educational experience to strengthen the Board.

John Kirk informed the Committee that the draft report had been sent to the Minister, the Right Hon. Robert Halfon, and had been accepted. The Minister had written to John Kirk formally requesting clarification on how the College was addressing its weaknesses. Lisa Hawes, Head of the EFA Intervention Team in Leicestershire (and certain other counties), would be attending future meetings of the Performance Group and the Board as the EFA's representative.

The meeting received the report.

5.2 Report from Marina Gaze

Suzanne Overton-Edwards explained that the College had secured consultancy input from Marina Gaze, a former OfSTED Senior Inspector who had been very much involved in developing the current Common Inspection Framework. Marina Gaze was providing support visits in November 2016 and January and March 2017 focused upon teaching learning and assessment. The report contained a summary of the visit in November 2016 and the resulting recommendations.

Nelista Cuffy asked at what point teachers recorded attendance and whether registers were kept on-line. Naz Leivas-Mistry replied that individual practice varied widely. John Kirk asked what progress had been made in achieving five learning walks per week. Naz Leivas-Mistry replied that this would require discussion with the Joint

Negotiating and Consultative Committee (JCNC), and was on the agenda for a meeting on 19 January 2017. John Kirk said that in addition to feedback from managers based on their observations, governors needed a 'third point of reference' through direct feedback from staff and students, such as might be obtained through accompanying staff on learning walks or lesson observations. It was not clear how many governors could find time to do this. Margo Moore said that this approach would be an excellent way of establishing how far the discussion of Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity was included in lessons. John Kirk welcomed Margo Moore's suggestion. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that the door was always open to governors to be involved in this way, and that John Turner had sometimes done so.

James Bagley said that lesson observations were currently limited to three, of which one only could be graded, per teacher in any year. Nelista Cuffy said that she hoped that there was a fresh opportunity 'given some changes of face round the table'. She then asked whether governors visiting lessons should be accompanied. John Kirk said that it was intended to learn from other colleges how best to deal with this matter. The key point was that there should be independent verification by governors of reports from College managers and other sources. John Kirk said that he was attending the meeting of the JCNC on 19 January and would raise the matter there. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that circumstances had changed, and that individuals might well not wish to stick strictly to NUT policy. Nelista Cuffy hoped that by now it was generally accepted that the purpose of lesson observations was not punitive.

The meeting received the report.

Q/17/06

Item 6 – Arrangements for Scrutiny of Post-Inspection Action Plan and its Implementation:

Robert Mansfield presented a short paper proposing that the Performance Improvement Group should have as its sole responsibility the scrutiny of the Post-Inspection Action Plan (PIAP) and its implementation. This would satisfy the recommendation of the EFA on this matter. The paper contained the definition of the remit for the Group in terms that should avoid overlap between its work and that of the Committee.

The Committee endorsed the proposed remit for the Performance Improvement Group.

Q/17/07

Item 7 – Continuing Professional Development:

7.1 CPD Policy

Robert Mansfield introduced the Continuing Professional Development policy by advising the meeting that hitherto this had been classified as an 'operational policy' and as such had not been submitted to the Committee. Having reviewed its contents he had concluded that the policy required scrutiny by governors. Naz Leivas-Mistry then presented the CPD policy.

John Kirk asked whether those who undertook CPD received any credit for this. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that previous arrangements for giving such credit no longer applied. He said that the policy required to be sharpened, so that CPD was more clearly linked to lesson observations and performance. Marina Gaze would on her next visit provide lesson observation training and would be addressing this issue. The College was also not good at evaluating the quality of CPD or its impact. John Kirk noted that the Committee would benefit from professional input on this issue.

John Kirk asked whether the policy did not require amendment, to include greater clarity about the monitoring of compliance. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that he would amend the policy by including a statement that the annual report on CPD should include an analysis of how fully practice had complied with the requirements that CPD should be relevant and should provide value for money.

The Committee received the policy noting that it would be amended as described before submission to the Board on 24 January 2017 for endorsement.

7.2 Annual Report on CPD 2015/2016

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the first annual report on CPD. This had been produced in response to the Code for Good Governance. He recognised that the report showed a need for greater focus on individual development needs and impact. John Kirk asked who was responsible for evaluating CPD plans and actions. Naz Leivas-Mistry replied that for teachers' CPD this responsibility lay with Programme Area Managers and Directors of Study. John Kirk asked whether these staff had been sufficiently trained in this regard. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that further training was to be provided by Marina Gaze.

Nelista Cuffy asked how much use was made of on-line training, as opposed to staff going out for training or trainers coming in to the College, as on-line training was

NLM

more readily accessible and often more cost-effective. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that Progress Coaches made some use of on-line training. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that staff also made use of social media and attended webinars. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that more focus was needed on teaching learning and assessment, differentiation, employability and such matters.

The meeting received the report.

Q/17/08

Item 8 – Behaviour and Discipline Policy:

Naz Leivas-Mistry reported that the behaviour and discipline policy had been further considered by the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) in the light of the Committee's discussion at the previous meeting. The SLT had concluded that a target of 95% attendance was unattainable, given that student attendance was currently just above 88%. Margo Moore said that she considered that too much licence was being allowed to a teenaged student population that lacked maturity. Students should be required to show respect for the College and its teachers. A change of culture was needed. Nelista Cuffy said that she agreed with the tenor of these remarks, but also accepted that manageable steps were appropriate. After discussion it was agreed that it should be made clear to students and to staff that the College expected 100% student attendance. If attendance fell below 95% this would trigger action with students and their parents. Those students falling below 90%, other than for exceptional reasons, would be disciplined.

The Committee received the policy on the basis set out above and commended it to the Board.

SOE

Q/17/09

Item 9 – Equality Diversity and Inclusivity Policy:

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the equality policy (previously the equality diversity and inclusivity policy). This had not been significantly changed

The Committee commended the policy to the Board.

Q/17/10

Item 10 – Progress against Strategic Targets:

Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented an update on progress against her strategic targets. The Committee noted that the first target relating to student progression was based on out-of-date data and requested that it should be rewritten. It was also noted that a reference (on page 4) to the regular reporting of grade book data to the Performance Improvement Group should be removed.

The meeting received the report subject to the actions

SOE

noted.

Q/17/11

Item 11 – 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/17/12

Item 12 – Any Other Business:

12.1 Future Membership of the Committee

Robert Mansfield advised the meeting that efforts were continuing to find one, or preferably two, new governors with relevant understanding and experience of education. These new governors would join the Committee and/or the Performance Improvement Group.

The members of the Performance Improvement Group would be the Chair and Vice-Chair of Governors plus one or two others with relevant professional experience. It was likely that John Kirk would, in the interests of managing his own workload, need to leave the Standards & Quality Committee and join the Performance Improvement Group. If this happened the Committee would need to elect a new chair.