



## STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of Meeting on Thursday 1 February 2018

<b>Present:</b>	Mr J Kirk ( <i>Chair</i> )	Chair of Governors
	Mr J Bagley	Principal
	Ms N Cuffy	Governor
	Mr R Laher	Governor
	Ms M Moore	Governor
	Ms J Rossa	Governor
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Ms N Martin	Assistant Principal
	Ms J Moss	Head of Quality
	Ms F Rippin	Assistant Principal
	Mr R Mansfield	Clerk

Ref.		Action
Q/18/01	<p><b>Item 1 – Apologies for Absence:</b> There were no apologies for absence. The meeting was declared quorate.</p>	
Q/18/02	<p><b>Item 2 – Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items:</b> There were no declarations of interest in agenda items.</p>	
Q/18/03	<p><b>Item 3 – Minutes of previous Meeting and Matters Arising:</b> The minutes of the meeting on 2 November 2017 were accepted by the Committee as an accurate record and were duly signed by John Kirk. Matters arising not covered by agenda items were reviewed as follows. James Bagley reported that flags had been introduced into Cedar to cater for 'at risk' students and safeguarding concerns. However, care was needed over access to flagged data in view of the new General Data Protection Regulations, on which the College was awaiting advice from the Sixth Form Colleges Association. This item was therefore carried forward, as was a review of the use of CCTV to monitor sensitive locations round the College.</p>	<p><b>JB</b> <b>JB</b></p>

Q/18/04

**Item 4 – OfSTED Inspection – Preliminary Report:**

Nicola Martin presented an oral report on the preliminary feedback from the recent OfSTED Inspection. This report covered the key findings, strengths identified and specific guidance provided on how to maintain momentum, including the need for greater challenge from governors. The College Self-Assessment Report (SAR) had been endorsed as accurate. In discussion it was noted that the dates of the meetings of the Committee might need to be changed to allow time for the preparation of suitable reports for governors after Key Assessment Point data had been collected. James Bagley agreed that there were issues of timeliness and appropriate detail to be considered. Josette Moss welcomed an offer from Jackie Rossa to provide suitably anonymised examples of reports that she provided to governors.

John Kirk thanked Nicola Martin for her contribution as College Nominee. Nicola Martin advised Jackie Rossa that the inspection had unearthed no surprises because the SAR was accurate, as had been recognised. James Bagley said there was a need to clarify how best to involve and inform governors in target-setting and progress monitoring. Jackie Rossa asked whether too much emphasis had been placed during the Inspection on the June 2017 examination results. James Bagley said that OfSTED had accepted that there was positive recent evidence regarding destinations and in-year progress. There was still much to do. John Kirk said that the tone of the feedback from the Lead Inspector had been extremely positive. The College now needed to consolidate the improvement made. On behalf of governors he thanked all staff who had contributed to the outcome.

***The Committee received the oral report on the inspection outcome.***

S/18/05

**Item 5 – Student Performance:**

Josette Moss presented an oral update on student performance. In 2016/2017 whilst there had been a modest improvement in added value scores, achievement had in aggregate declined. The focus of remedial interventions in the previous year had been on students considered to be at risk of failing. In the current year the focus had shifted to students at risk of under-achieving. She then presented data showing that the percentage of students assessed as being on or above target had increased between Assessment Points 1 and 2 and then

declined slightly at point 3. This was probably attributable to the input of mock examinations results, a more robust measure, at point 3. The data highlighted subject the subject areas of greatest strength and those where progress appeared concerning. A validation module in Cedar was to be run on 9 February to provide an indication of predicted ALPS scores. A Student Review Board would be held in the first week after half-term to identify the most appropriate interventions in each area. John Kirk asked whether there was any correlation between currently low scoring courses and optimistic predictions made in 2016/2017. Josette Moss said that predictions in the previous year were based upon a less rigorous approach; close monitoring was already in place for most low scoring subject areas.

Jackie Rossa questioned whether the College thoroughly analysed or clearly understood the correlations between factors such as attendance, lesson observation outcomes, learner voice etc. and progress. Frances Rippin said the College was very clear that high attendance and good teaching were closely correlated with good progress. Nicola Martin said that general concerns had been raised by student representatives about the quality of lesson preparation. The views expressed had been very mixed and the College was exploring this further. Jackie Rossa questioned what steps the College was taking to identify the underlying causes of mismatches in the data. Margo Moore asked how far different styles of learning were considered, as different courses tended naturally to favour particular styles and these might not suit all the learners. Nicola Martin said that differentiation had been addressed in Continuing Professional Development. Frances Rippin said that this was a key area for future attention as OfSTED had identified a mismatch between the College's planning and execution.

John Kirk said that he recognised that there had been little time after the collection of the latest data to prepare a presentation for the meeting and looked forward to more considered presentations at future meetings.

***The Committee received the report on student progress.***

**Q/18/06**

**Item 6 – Student Attendance and Punctuality:**

James Bagley presented a report on student attendance and punctuality. There had been a marginal dip in attendance in January, as predicted, though less than might have been expected given the usual seasonal factors. Aggregate attendance had remained above

target. The main concerns related to second year students, influenced by learned behaviour in the previous year and some possibly enrolled on the wrong programmes. Problem students would be flagged by the Student Review Board and appropriate actions agreed at Quality Monitoring Meetings. There was no complacency about poor attendance, and there was regular follow-up through student assemblies and other channels. It was clear that action taken in the present year had been fruitful, as attendance was 5 percentage points above the level in 2016/2017. Nicola Martin said that one of the greatest difficulties faced by the College was the number of students taking holidays, often of several weeks, in term time. The number of such students had reached 88. Riyaz Laher described the 'zero tolerance' approach adopted at the Madani schools; although the age range was different the College might be able to draw upon features of this approach. There needed to be viable sanctions on students who failed to attend. James Bagley tabled some analysis of College data just undertaken by the Association of Colleges. This highlighted some statistically significant groups for further investigation.

***The meeting received the report.***

**Q/18/20**

**Item 7 – Lesson Observation Outcomes:**

Frances Rippin presented a report on lesson observations during the current academic year and invited questions. Nelista Cuffy said she had found the report informative and sought clarification about the use of RAG ratings. Frances Rippin said that RAG ratings had been applied in an effort to maintain standards after modification of the recording of outcomes used in the 2016/2017. The decision followed discussion with Marina Gaze. Unfortunately, the ratings had been viewed by some teachers as an attempt to apply grading, to which they were opposed. Nelista Cuffy said that she found the RAG ratings helpful and asked how widespread was the opposition to their use. It was explained that claims that the ratings were a form of grading were unhelpful as this suggested that they were in conflict with NUT policy. Jackie Rossa said that she did not consider that there was enough data on the impact of teachers' practice upon learners. If more emphasis was placed on this the process should prove less contentious. Frances Rippin agreed that the process needed further development and provided insufficient information about learners' progress. Nelista Cuffy said that the report demonstrated progress on the previous year's report.

	<p>Jackie Rossa undertook to send examples of reports on lesson observations to Frances Rippin. Frances Rippin was asked to provide anonymised examples of the College's reports and action plans to the next meeting of the Committee.</p> <p><b><i>The meeting received this report.</i></b></p>	JR FR
Q/18/08	<p><b>Item 8 – Behaviour for Learning Policy:</b> Nicola Martin presented the Behaviour for Learning policy. This had been revised in the light of the Committee's previous guidance.</p> <p><b><i>The meeting commended the revised policy to the Board for ratification.</i></b></p>	RM
Q/18/09	<p><b>Item 9 – Learning Teaching and Assessment Policy:</b> Frances Rippin presented the Teaching Learning and Assessment policy. This had been amended to include new content on assessment. Nelista Cuffy received assurances that additional teaching staff were receiving development as external assessors.</p> <p><b><i>The meeting commended the policy to the Board for ratification.</i></b></p>	RM
Q/18/10	<p><b>Item 10 – Audit of Work Experience:</b> Nicola Martin provided an oral update on work experience. The processes for planning, arranging, monitoring and celebrating work experience had been significantly enhanced. The target for participation had been raised by 50% over that for the previous year, and it was planned that nearly 300 students would start work experience within the next two weeks. A total of around 550 placements was expected to be achieved.</p> <p><b><i>The meeting received this report.</i></b></p>	
Q/18/11	<p><b>Item 11 – Notes of Performance Improvement Group:</b> <i>11.1 Meeting on 12 December 2017</i> John Kirk presented the notes of the meeting of the Performance Improvement Group on 12 December 2017. At that meeting it had been agreed that the Group had discharged the remit required by the Education &amp; Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) that it should devote its attention solely to monitoring the previous Post-Inspection Action Plan, and the Group had therefore stood down until further notice. With the agreement of the Committee John Kirk signed the notes as an accurate record.</p> <p><b><i>The meeting received the notes of the meeting.</i></b></p>	

**Q/18/12**

**Item 12 – Date and Time of Next Meeting:**

The date and time of the next meeting were later confirmed as Thursday 18 April 2018 at 5.30 p.m. at the College.

**Q/18/13**

**Item 13 – Any Other Business:**

James Bagley advised the meeting that the ESFA had earlier that day removed the College from quality monitoring and Commissioner's Visits. There would therefore be no further attendance at meetings of the (Performance Improvement Group or) Standards & Quality Committee. John Kirk was pleased to note this as another positive step.