

MINUTES

PRESENT:	Gordon Smith Jean Cook Clare Mackie Frances Wadsworth (Principal)
ALSO ATTENDING:	Andy Smith (Deputy Chief Executive) Ann Monaghan (Assistant Principal)
CLERK:	Melissa Drayson
APOLOGIES	Craig O'Donnell Matt Sims Anita McGowan (Academic Staff Governor)
QUORUM	The meeting was quorate throughout
TIMING	6.05pm – 7.45pm

1.	Apologies for absence Jean Cook was welcomed to her first committee meeting. Apologies were as noted above.	
2.	Declaration of interest There were no additional declarations of interests	
3.	Minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2015 Jean Cook's apologies were added to the minutes.	
4.	Matters arising from the minutes not already on the agenda In view of the fact that there were several new governors on the Board, a further briefing on data would be scheduled.	DCE
5.	Quality improvement plan monitoring and mid-year review of targets <i>Focus on attendance</i> Governors asked why the QIP list did not include attendance as one of the five areas of focus as this was such a key issue for the College. The response was given that attendance was an impact measure, which should improve when actions had been achieved. The impact on attendance rates was given in the commentary against each section. It was noted that there had been some improvement although the target of 88% had yet to be reached. There was, however, more consistency and smaller gaps across college between courses. Within English and Maths,	

	<p>attendance had risen to 76% from just over 50%. Although attendance did not guarantee success, there was a clear link between poor attendance and non-achievement,</p> <p>Progress had been made in all five key areas in the QIP, but it had not been possible to RAG-rate more of them as green because of the timing of data.</p> <p>The college was currently focussing heavily on Maths, and was part-way through Maths Month. Activities were being organised at course level to make maths fun and raise awareness. External mock exams were due to be held the following week, and these would provide firmer evidence of the impact of the college's actions in this area. It was considered that Maths was the most vulnerable area in terms of achieving targets. It was recognised that this was a sector-wide issue. The amount of staff resources required to achieve targets was very high, and the recruitment of high quality maths teaching staff was a key barrier.</p> <p>The successful delivery of Maths functional skills was also a problem for many colleges. Governors who attended the strategy day were reminded of the discussion about transferring all students to GCSE.</p> <p>Governors asked if there were any specific curriculum areas giving rise to concern. Management responded that work was needed within Engineering to strengthen management, although apprenticeships were strong. Success rates had also been a concern in Construction. There had been a focus on improving retention and short level 1 courses had been introduced to enable students to achieve a qualification in the first term before proceeding to a full year qualification. Achievement of the short qualifications has been good and contributed to improved retention..</p> <p>As always the College was looking to test out its own evaluations through external challenge which would complement the views of managers and governors; therefore a former associate inspector would conduct reviews of some areas of provision. Feedback would be reported to the next LQC meeting.</p> <p>There was a discussion about recruiting high calibre teaching staff. It was noted that a number of good technician demonstrators were working at the College, several of whom were studying teacher training.</p>	DCE, APCQ
6.	<p>Spring report on teaching, learning and assessment</p> <p>Key points from the report were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the teaching and learning observation grade profile was similar to the previous year. However, the underlying picture was one of greater stability in staffing and consistency in performance. • The grade profile was considered to be realistic and comparable to similar colleges • A positive impact this year was the reduction in the differential in attendance between good and less good lessons • Although the outcomes of graded observations applied only to FE provision, it was considered that the quality of teaching and 	

	<p>learning in HE courses was comparable.</p> <p>Governors asked whether a fresh look at how teaching and learning was improved was due. Management responded that the methodology for judging quality in 2016-17 was currently being reviewed although it was likely that graded observations would be retained. It was likely that peer review feedback would be formalised and included within the overall judgement. The current peer-to-peer briefings were led by teachers and were proving to be well attended and effective.</p> <p>Governors reflected further on how learning was evaluated. It was confirmed that monitoring learner progress was the priority, through reviews of predicted success rates and other student tracking. The strength of this approach had been reflected in the 2014 Ofsted feedback, and its continuing effectiveness was noted by governors</p> <p>The College's HR Strategy and Continuing Professional Development were key factors in improving teaching and learning. CPD was considered a strength, with staff feedback showing how it was applied within the classroom.</p> <p>There was a discussion of the potential to develop the use of recorded teaching sessions for students to access outside lessons. This had proven to be successful in universities, with evidence suggesting that access to recorded lectures increased attendance by enabling students to keep up with coursework. Some colleges also used recorded lessons as part of continuing professional development.</p> <p>Comment was made that there had been a positive shift in culture, in that staff were open to their lessons being both formally observed, and visited during learning walks. Many staff were now keen to demonstrate what they did. Governors commented that the data presented in the report was very much in line with what they observed on the learning walks undertaken in February.</p>	
7.	<p>Higher Education annual monitoring report</p> <p>The Committee noted that the reports had been reviewed and approved by the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the Audit Committee under delegated authority, in order to meet the deadlines for returns. They were now brought to LQC to discuss and seek clarification where necessary.</p> <p>Governors sought an overview of the main issues, and how well students were doing.</p> <p>The previous year, staffing had been a problem area, particularly in Health and Social Care. The breadth of provision in Art also created difficulties if key staff left. Many Art staff were well qualified specialists but employed on fractional contracts with commitments elsewhere, including professional practice.</p> <p>There followed a discussion about the number of non-submission of assignments, requests for mitigation, appeals and requests for intermission which have an impact on students' progress, lecturers' workload and programme management..</p>	

	There was a discussion on the potential for penalties for late submission of coursework, as was common practice in universities. Different practice in applying mitigation was also shared and discussed.	
8.	<p>Curriculum planning 2016/2017</p> <p>It was noted that this was a discursive report at present based on discussions at Executive Team level. The next step would be to take the discussion to the curriculum managers.</p> <p>The paper raised a number of questions and proposed options for timetabling and accommodation utilisation, which would require further exploration. The evaluation of these would also be undertaken in the context of wider strategic developments, including the discussions with the University of Sussex on expanding HE provision.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the impact of a move toward providing enhanced access to on-line learning and e-books on the use of learning resources space.</p>	
9.	<p>Safeguarding monitoring report</p> <p>The safeguarding update was to be provided to the LQC as a standing termly report. The designated safeguarding governor would review the report before its submission to the Committee. The contents of the report were noted, along with the recommendation that all governors should complete the online Prevent training module by 11 March.</p>	
10.	<p>Risk monitoring report – LQ items <i>Supporting paper for discussion</i></p> <p>No changes to the risk register were reported and it was not anticipated that there would be any significant changes in the near future.</p>	
11.	<p>Review of LQC Terms of Reference</p> <p>RESOLVED: that it should be recommended to the Board that the revised LQC Terms of Reference be approved.</p>	
11.	<p>Date of next meeting <i>14 June 2016</i></p>	
12.	<p>Any other business <i>Urgent matters notified in advance of the meeting</i></p> <p>The Chair made a proposal that Jean Cook, should be invited to become Chair of the Committee; Jean has strong experience in FE, teaching and learning and student standards and would bring a strong insight to the role Jean Cook confirmed that she would be happy to take on the role.</p> <p>RESOLVED: that Jean Cook should become the Chair of LQC with effect from the 14 June meeting.</p>	

Chair _____ Date _____