



Croydon
College

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS
LEARNING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2016 at 6.00pm**

MINUTES

PRESENT: Gordon Smith
Jean Cook (Chair)
Clare Mackie
Craig O'Donnell
Frances Wadsworth (Principal) - from 6.40pm

ALSO ATTENDING: Andy Smith (Deputy Chief Executive)
Ann Monaghan (Assistant Principal)

CLERK: Melissa Drayson

APOLOGIES Anita McGowan (Academic Staff Governor)
Matt Sims not present

QUORUM The meeting was quorate throughout

TIMING 6.00 - 8.40pm

1.	Apologies for absence Jean Cook welcomed attendees to the first meeting of the LQC with her as new Chair. Apologies were noted as above	
2.	Declaration of interest Clare Mackie reminded the committee of her role as partner representative of the University of Sussex. There were no additional declarations of interests relating to items on the agenda.	
3.	Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2016 The minutes were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair	
4.	Matters arising from the minutes not on the agenda Item 5: The DCE and APCQ provided the Committee with an overview of the feedback from the associate inspector who had visited the college in February. The early stages, which had involved a high level review of teaching and learning assessment and reporting to the Board, had been useful.	

<p>5.</p>	<p>College position statement and QIP <i>Supporting paper by the APCQ</i></p> <p>A revised version of the position statement, correcting a formatting issue, was tabled. Reports were taken as read, and governors proceeded straight to questions.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the intention was to develop the position statement into the Self- Assessment Report. It did not, as yet, include proposed grades for component parts. The final SAR would also include a summary of key strengths and areas requiring improvement. Clarification was sought about the involvement of governors in the SAR validation process. It was confirmed that governors would be invited to attend the meetings to validate the final report, which would be taking place toward the end of October.</p> <p>Governors asked for more information about the issues affecting the provision of work experience. It was estimated that around 40% of 16-18 year olds had completed work-experience with a further 40% gaining experience of work, or employer-related activities. However, the picture across the curriculum was variable. For example, all , health and social care and early childhood studies students have undertaken work experience as part of their programme of study for many years.. In addition, all students with learning difficulties and disabilities and students with English as an Additional Language had had work experience within the College. This was considered unusual for colleges, but provided great benefits to the students. Conversely, it was difficult to arrange work experience for Level 3 students , many of whom already had part-time jobs.</p> <p>It was reported that the College would be working with the National Citizenship Service (NCS) during 2016-17 to strengthen work experience opportunities. All entry level, L1 and L2 16-17 years students would be taking part in a 3 day residential activity in November and a further 8 days in college and all 18 year olds would undertake 8 days of work-related endeavour in November/December. Overall, NCS will work with 550 students.</p> <p>Governors asked whether volunteering counted toward work experience. It was confirmed that, although this was valuable enrichment activity, it did not count as work experience.</p> <p>An update was given on the ‘red’ rated action on the Quality Improvement Plan. Both ESOL and Construction were showing improvement, with predicted achievement for vocational aims in Construction at 79%. However, Engineering remained an area of concern.</p> <p>Governors considered that it would be helpful if there was an overview in the Executive Summary, of key curriculum strengths and weaknesses, to enable continuity in terms of the committee’s scrutiny and to enable assessment of the impact of actions being taken to address weaknesses.</p> <p>AGREED:</p> <p>(i) agreed that future reports to the committee should also be prefaced by a summary of key issues, including by</p>	<p>DCE/ APCQ</p>
-----------	--	----------------------

	<p>curriculum area (strengths, weaknesses, risks and action being taken)</p> <p>(ii) that the data from the national Quality and Achievement Rate report, presented to the Chairs Strategy Group, should be circulated to Committee members with the notes of the meeting for context.</p> <p>(iii) that governors would be informed, with good notice, of the dates of the SAR validation meetings.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>APCQ Clerk</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>A Report on Value Added: DfE Shadow Measures <i>Supporting paper by the APCQ</i></p> <p>It was noted that the Chair's Strategy Group had agreed that the Committee should receive a report on Level 3 Value Added. In future it had been suggested that an over-arching analysis should be brought to the committee following the publication of data, and that LQC meetings might be scheduled to tie in with the external reporting schedule. It was anticipated that 2015-16 data would be published early in 2017 so would, therefore, be brought to the 7 March LQC meeting.</p> <p>In preparation for full implementation in 2015-16 of new Level 3 performance measures, shadow data had been produced which was based on 2014-15 results. This would replace the previous L3 Value Added report.</p> <p>It was important to bear in mind that the comparator in the new reporting framework was all schools and colleges, rather than just similar colleges.</p> <p>Members asked for more information to help them to understand the points system being used for A Levels. This would be circulated by email.</p> <p>The Committee noted the data pending further developments.</p>	<p>APCQ/ Clerk</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Annual Student Feedback and Complaints Report <i>Supporting paper by APCQ</i></p> <p>This was the second annual report using the same format, combining a summary of complaints received during the year and an overview of qualitative feedback from FE and HE student voice mechanisms.</p> <p>Although overall few in number, most of the complaints were from FE students and their parents. It was considered that many of the complaints which had reached the formal stages could have been resolved quickly or averted at an earlier stage. Staff learning days would continue to cover the handling of complaints, communications and dealing sensitively with people.</p> <p>Governors asked whether there might be any barriers to students using the complaints policy to raise more serious concerns. It was reported that some students did feel uncomfortable using formal complaints procedures. However, other routes, such as GOAL and Breakfast with the Principal, had proved invaluable in terms of picking up individual issues and directing these to the appropriate staff to be resolved.</p> <p>A comparison of the complaints profile with earlier years was also</p>	

	<p>requested. It was confirmed that numbers of complaints recorded had decreased year on year as follows:</p> <p>2012-13: 84; 2013-14: 81; 2014-15: 72; 2015-16: 69</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging this overall picture, governors considered that there would be more value in receiving a breakdown of complaints by category and level in future reports. It was considered important to know that informal complaints, dealt with outside the formal procedures, were not included in the numbers and that other processes for dealing with complaints were working.</p> <p>The committee discussed the feedback from student engagement activities. The Chair reported that she had attended a student parliament meeting and had been impressed at how the college had acted on student issues raised, such as changes to the library configuration.</p> <p>Governors asked whether quantitative student feedback was also sought. The College had decided to move away from surveys two years ago, as response rates had been low and the results not always easy to interpret. It was considered, however, that snapshot surveys on individual issues might provide useful data.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the College participated in the National Student Survey for higher education, and that participation had been the same as the previous year.</p> <p>AGREED:</p> <p>(i) that future reports would include a breakdown of complaints by type and level</p> <p>(ii) that governors would share engagement strategies from their workplaces with managements.</p>	<p>APCQ</p> <p>Craig</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Review of College's Equality Duty <i>Supporting paper by the DCE</i></p> <p>Governors provided comments and questions on the revised Equality Strategy, which was due for its four-yearly review.</p> <p>Objective 1: The work to communicate vision and values for E&D and inclusion to the college community had been recognised as a strength by Ofsted. Reporting would take place to governors through LQC for students and F&R for staff,</p> <p>Objective 2: Governors asked more information about the student profile. Headlines were that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looked After Children and Afro-Caribbean students were over-represented in the student population compared to the local community • White and Indian/Pakistani males were under-represented <p>After some discussion, it was agreed that Objective 2 should be</p>	

	<p>refocussed only on student attainment. The following wording was agreed:</p> <p>“The College will review the attainment of students by protected characteristic and implement actions to narrow and eliminate gaps in attainment between groups”</p> <p>The monitoring arrangements for each objective were discussed:</p> <p>Objective 2 would be monitored through a report to LQC every Spring Term meeting. Governors asked that the report should also give assurance that measures were being taken to identify discrimination at curriculum level which might present a barrier to access to or achievement on particular courses.</p> <p>Objectives 3 and 4 would be monitored by the Finance and Resources Committee in the annual HR Equality and Diversity report.</p> <p>Management was asked whether a separate action plan would be provided to facilitate monitoring by governors. It was considered more appropriate that actions would be included in the QIP.</p> <p>AGREED: that equality and diversity actions would be integrated into the Quality Improvement Plan, with equality objectives explicitly referenced within the QIP.</p> <p>RESOLVED: that, subject to the agreed amendment to Objective 2, the Equality Strategy should be recommended to the Board for approval.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Termly safeguarding update <i>Supporting paper by the DCE</i></p> <p>It was noted that there were no matters of organisational concern. Clarification was provided that “Referral of staff to the DBS” did not refer to routine DBS checks performed on all new employees</p> <p>Governors indicated that it would be useful to have the following additional information in the termly update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextual data in the report, including a breakdown of comparisons with previous years, in order to assess whether the number and types of referral were changing. • background to Prevent referrals, even if these did not result in further action. This would be helpful to assist governors in gaining an understanding of how the new policy was being implemented. <p>Governors asked what the risk-rating of the College was for Prevent. Advice on this would be sought from the Metropolitan Police. It was suggested that the Met should also be asked to provide a Board briefing</p> <p>AGREED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) that future safeguarding updates would include additional contextual data and information (ii) that the possibility of a board briefing by the Metropolitan Police be explored further 	<p>DHR</p>

<p>10.</p>	<p>Curriculum Planning 2016-17 <i>Supporting paper by the DCE</i></p> <p>Governors remarked that future reports should include comparative data which would help them to understand recruitment to different curriculum areas against previous years figures and targets. Management agreed to add this in future, although this would be more meaningful for some income streams than others, particularly the adult skills budget. There were a number of changes taking place to the ASB, with little guidance from funding agencies about its management, or how to prepare for the introduction of the apprenticeships levy. Discussions with Learning Curve were currently taking place to develop a delivery model.</p> <p>Governors picked up on the links between the curriculum strategy and property strategy. This was also being kept under discussion by both the Chair's Strategy Group and F&R Committee, especially in terms of the impact of future curriculum and strategic options on the design of the new College building. It was considered that much of this would need to be decided in in the Autumn.</p> <p>The Committee noted that it was highly improbable that the current curriculum would be maintained in the new college. The role of the committee in exploring and providing a view on curriculum options was noted.</p> <p>AGREED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) that future curriculum reports should contain comparative data (ii) that a proposal for future partnerships with Learning Curve would be brought to F&R Committee in Autumn Term 2016. 	
<p>11.</p>	<p>Policy Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Admissions and Progression Policy <p>The revised wording of paragraph 4.1, relating to entry criteria was discussed. It was considered that, although the College should be consistent in applying its entry criteria at offer stage, it should retain the right to alter this according to context, for enrolments.</p> <p>RESOLVED: that the Admissions and Progression Policy be approved subject to a rewording of paragraph 4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Student disciplinary procedure and Respect for All policy <p>The main change to the policy was the inclusion of a reference to extremist activity and radicalisation under Prevent.</p> <p>A set review period for temporary suspension was recommended. Within schools, the maximum allowed by law was five days.</p> <p>It was confirmed that students had had input into setting the policy in accordance with the Instruments and Articles. The original version arose from a presentation by students and they were consulted on updates</p>	

	<p>each year.</p> <p>Levels of exclusions were reported as 2-3 permanent and 15-20 temporary exclusions a term. Since the meeting it has been confirmed that there have been 11 permanent exclusions in this academic year.</p> <p>Governor monitoring of the implementation of the policy was discussed. It was agreed that governors should be alerted to high risk issues as soon as they arose. Routine monitoring should take place through a report to LQC at least annually, and include a breakdown by relevant protected characteristic. From this, governors should be able to identify any trends and understand measures being taken to mitigate risk</p> <p>RESOLVED: that the revised Respect for All – Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure be approved.</p>	
12.	<p>Risk monitoring report – LQC items</p> <p>It was noted that there were no proposed changes to the risk register.</p> <p>There was a discussion of the continued grading of the net risk relating to OP2, Income and Contribution targets, as red, as this suggested that mitigating actions were not having an impact. The executive were asked to review whether actions taken to control and influence contributions would warrant a reduction of the probability score to 2, and the overall net risk to 12.</p> <p>AGREED: that the net risk scoring of OP2 would be reviewed and reported to the Board.</p>	Exec
13.	<p>Future reporting to LQC: the Annual Quality Cycle</p> <p>The Committee considered proposals to continue with three meetings a year unless there was a particular need for extra meetings.</p> <p>The standing items for each meeting were discussed. It was considered, however, that more work was needed to develop a means to monitor systematically the progress of students throughout the year against the predicted position. The Chair's Strategy Group had recommended that this report might be comparable with the financial monitoring report received by F&R Committee at each meeting in terms of format and levels of information.</p> <p>Governors stressed that reporting should not require managers to produce new data. The suggestion that progress reporting would link with the five census points was supported.</p> <p>It was recognised that the QIP was the main tool available to governors to monitor progress on addressing weaknesses, and challenge the executive where progress was not being made.</p> <p>The termly Teaching, Learning and Assessment report would reflect the Common Inspection Framework and would develop continuously through the year so that it became the position statement by the summer term meeting.</p>	

	<p>Meetings should also balance the need for robust monitoring role with time for strategic, forward-looking discussion. It was suggested that adopting a themed approach for meetings, with a drill down on a smaller number of topics, would allow for this. In addition, a 'consent agenda' might be adopted which highlighted those reports for noting or approval with no discussion.</p> <p>AGREED:</p> <p>(i) that the calendar of business would be updated to schedule in the five census points, and circulated by email to governors.</p> <p>(ii) that the executive would bring proposals for the content and format of the reports to LQC</p>	<p>DCE/ Clerk</p> <p>DCE/ APCQ</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p>Meeting dates for 2016-17</p> <p>22 November 2016 7 March 2017 20 June 2017</p>	
<p>15.</p>	<p>Any other business <i>Urgent matters notified in advance of the meeting</i></p> <p>The Chair of the Board was congratulated for the recent Ofsted rating of Outstanding awarded to Riddlesdown Collegiate.</p>	

Chair _____ Date _____