

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Jean Cook (Chair)
Gordon Smith
Craig O'Donnell
Frances Wadsworth (Principal)
Anita McGowan
Claire Mackie

ALSO ATTENDING:

Andy Smith (Deputy Chief Executive)
Ann Monaghan (Vice Principal)
Julie Percival (Assistant Principal Academic Support) – item
16.10 only

APOLOGIES

Clerk Evan Williams

QUORUM The meeting was quorate throughout

TIMING 6.00pm – 8.00pm

		Lead
16.1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE There were no apologies for absence. The Chair welcomed Evan Williams, Clerk, to his first LQC meeting.	
16.2	DECLARATION OF INTEREST No additional interests were declared in connection to items on the agenda.	
16.3	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 JUNE 2016 The minutes were approved as a correct record with one amendment on page 7, paragraph one, to read "10 exclusions in total"	
16.4	Matters arising from the minutes not already on the agenda Action Data from the national Quality and Achievement Rate (QAR) report presented to the Chairs Strategy Group to be circulated to LQC committee members. There were no matters arising that were not already covered on the agenda.	VP

		Lead										
16.5	<p>SAR and QiP 2015/16</p> <p>The Committee considered the SAR for 2015/16 and initial discussions focused on the process that had been followed to produce the SAR, the improved grade profile and the main reasons for this.</p> <p>The whole college SAR builds on close monitoring of the QIP, termly Position Statements and ‘moderation’ or ‘validation’ by relevant senior managers/externals. This process is mirrored at curriculum level and the summation of the curriculum team evaluation processes is used to shape the SAR. To ensure the rigour of judgements for this year’s whole college self-assessment two external experts were used as critical friends, namely Tony Noonan (ex Senior HMI for London) and Richard Atkins (ex Principal of Exeter College and now FE Commissioner).</p> <p>The VP informed the Committee of the proposed grades for 2015/16:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="446 761 1165 929"> <tr> <td>Outcomes for learners:</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare:</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Effectiveness of Leadership and Management:</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall Effectiveness:</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table> <p>The DCE and the VPCQ presented the main summary points from the SAR across all key aspects evidencing the proposed grading. Governors were reminded of the importance of considering progress made since the last inspection (May 2014) and where further improvements had been made as well as areas where progress had been slower.</p> <p>Governors recognised the strengths outlined in the SAR as well as the main areas for improvement and probed for additional information to ensure that the proposed grading was robust as well as ‘best fit’ alongside the Common Inspection Framework grading guidance.</p> <p>A discussion ensued regarding the grade given proposed for Outcomes for Learners and the justification for a grade 2 over a grade 3. The VP summarised the reasons; namely, vocational outcomes had improved for the third year running and this was consistent at all levels and all ages. In addition, high grade pass rates had also further improved and various ‘progress measures’ showed incremental improvements; particularly at level 3 year 1. It was agreed that the results had moved from a ‘requires improvement’ to ‘good’ in the Ofsted grade descriptors albeit there was still significant work to do in terms of English and maths outcomes. LQC members had already reviewed the RCU report on progress measures across the sector and acknowledged that the negative progress scores for English and maths were far too low but were also in line with other GFE colleges. It was suggested that the grade boundaries be spilt for internal purposes so that teams and managers could see where they had moved into a new grading band – for example, governors supported the proposed grading of Outcomes as a Good but also recognised that there was much more to do before the college’s Outcomes were a strong ‘Good’</p> <p>The DCE circulated the Success and Achievement yearly comparison figures to the committee. The key figures highlighted were:</p>	Outcomes for learners:	2	Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:	2	Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare:	2	Effectiveness of Leadership and Management:	2	Overall Effectiveness:	2	
Outcomes for learners:	2											
Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment:	2											
Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare:	2											
Effectiveness of Leadership and Management:	2											
Overall Effectiveness:	2											

		Lead
	<p>Summary by College and age group: All Qualifications 16-18 14/15 66.7% success rate 15/16 73.1% success rate</p> <p>19+ 14/15 79.2% success rate 15/16 82.5% success rate</p> <p>He advised that figures shaded green for 15/16 were an improvement in results and those in pink (a very small minority) were where results were slightly lower than the previous year.</p> <p>A request was made that the tables provided needed an interpretation. A discussion ensued based on the figures provided by the DCE with a focus on which departments were performing particularly well and which were not performing so well. It was suggested that a breakdown relating to contribution would be beneficial for Governors. GS asked that any data that varied from expectation (positively or negatively) be highlighted.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the executive team for their preparation of the detailed data and supported the proposed grading for the subsequent more detailed validation of content.</p> <p>Action The Chair of LQC would report on the SAR validation process and meetings to full Board.</p>	DCE
16.6	<p>AMR and QiP 2015/16 Paper circulated and supported by the DCE.</p> <p>The chair stated that there had been a very useful meeting on 18 November to assess the AMR. A very full review of the process and all of the evidence considered was undertaken and the Chair confirmed the improvements to this process so that student feedback was central. Progress against the QEPs was regularly reviewed alongside 'in year' data and other evidence as well as more qualitative student feedback.</p> <p>Issues that had been raised on reviewing the AMR were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a strong link between the academic literacy skills of students on entry/level of support given to students and their success on programme • Some programmes had a relatively high rate of non-submissions - although this is a strong feature of in year QEPs with actions to address this • Student feedback is regularly cited as the main area for improvement (by students) and teams are clear that this is their priority. However, feedback from external examiners does not concur with this view and the teams recognise that there is more to do around formative feedback strategies and gaining student feedback to further shape and refine these. Again this area is carefully monitored via QEPs and in year monitoring and review <p>Governors discussed the NSS feedback both at whole college level and</p>	LQC Chair

		Lead
	<p>also for particular programmes. Whilst the improvement from 2014/15 to 2015/16 was noted, managers and governors agreed that student satisfaction levels need to be further improved in some programmes. Governors were assured that in year monitoring via QEPs and student voice feedback was closely aligned to these priorities. A further update would be brought to the next LQC meeting and governors were asked to let the Clerk know if they would like to attend any relevant student facing meetings.</p> <p>AGREED: that all members would be invited to comment, and that the Chair should have delegated responsibility review and take a recommendation to the Board for approval</p> <p>Governors to liaise with the Clerk if they would like to attend relevant meetings (eg the Student Council meeting or a Programme Board meeting)</p>	All
16.7	<p>Proposed 2016/17 targets for approval. DCE presented the proposed targets paper.</p> <p>DCE advised that following the review of performance in 2015/16 the executive were proposing the targets referred to in the paper. DCE informed the committee that the student performance targets were stretching and included the new progress measures for GCSEs in English and maths based on the college's performance for 2015/16 compared to the sector norm (as outlined in the previous RCU report on English and maths). He also advised that the additional quantitative and qualitative targets had been introduced in anticipation of changes in the progress measures by which providers were likely to be measured in the future.</p> <p>RESOLVED The Committee approved the 2016/17 annual targets</p>	
16.8	<p>Governors' Assurance of HE Quality. DCE presented the paper.</p> <p>DCE reminded the committee of the new requirement placed on colleges offering Higher Education programmes for an annual return to be sent to HEFCE confirming the quality of the student academic experience and outcomes. He advised that the return need to be sent to HEFCE by 1 December each year for the previous academic year.</p> <p>RESOLVED The Committee approved the HEFCE Quality Assurance for recommendation to the Board.</p> <p>ACTION Clerk to ensure Board members have sight HEFCE Quality assurance documentation for ratification.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the Committee</p>	
16.9	<p>Report of Teaching , Learning and Assessment The VP spoke to the report.</p>	

		Lead
	<p>The VP presented the first of the new reports which had been revised to form a more rounded position statement against QiP priorities and improved student experience and outcomes.</p> <p>The VP advised that the report focused on the evaluation of teaching, learning and assessment for the college's FE and HE provision for November 2016. She advised that the report included a summary of the actions that had been taken to monitor, support and evaluate learning including learning walks, graded lesson observations, wider checks on teaching and the emerging CPD themes. Such reports will now also include a summary evaluation of the Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare of students and so will provide a richer and more detailed overview of the student experience to date.</p> <p>The chair asked about equality and diversity within lessons and how this was captured during lesson observations?. The VP informed the committee that observers would be making judgements on both the teacher's planning and ability to meet the needs of all students within lessons as well as the planned (and spontaneous) promotion of equality and diversity within the content and delivery of the lesson. It was noted that some examples had been drawn out in the report to illustrate this. The VP advised that a key theme for this year is ensuring 'stretch' for all students particularly the most able and that this has formed a consistent part of all CPD and teacher support strategies with lesson observers being trained to evaluate the success of this within the classroom. The chair thanked the VP for her report.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">RESOLVED The committee noted the report.</p>	
16.10	<p>Termly report on Stakeholder (student) feedback The VP spoke to this report.</p> <p>The VP reminded the committee that at the previous LQC meeting governors had received the Annual Stakeholder Feedback Report and asked that this be changed to a termly report from the start of the current academic year. The aim was to ensure that governors were more aware of issues/common themes as they arose during the year and would be better able to triangulate feedback against other types of information presented on student and college performance.</p> <p>The VP advised that the report was the first report and that it focused on student feedback; she advised that subsequent reports would also include student feedback and would incorporate feedback from other stakeholders such as staff, employers and parents when relevant through the year. Thus over the academic year, governors would receive summary information on the various student feedback mechanisms with key findings drawn out, common themes identified and actions arising included.</p> <p>Governors noted the continued use of the variety of student feedback mechanisms and how this continues to be a strength of the college ie student voice. The VP reminded governors of the forthcoming Student</p>	

		Lead
	<p>Parliament (9th November) as they are always welcome to attend plus the monthly GOAL activity (first week of the month). All agreed to contact the Chair when they can participate.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the report and thanked the VP for the report and noted that it was work in progress with other stakeholder feedback being added through the year.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">RESOLVED The committee noted the report.</p>	
16.11	<p>Risk Monitoring Report The DCE presented the report.</p> <p>The DCE informed the committee that the overall risk register had been recently reviewed by the Executive for currency. He informed the committee of proposals to amend risk ratings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OP2 Income and Contribution Targets. Whilst income targets have not always been achieved contribution targets had been maintained by judicious reductions in expenditure. Therefore, the executive proposes to reduce the net financial impact from 3 to 2, the consequence of which is to reduce the net risk from 12 to 10. However, the overall net score remains in the possible concern category • OP5 Ineffective Safeguarding Practices. The executive reflected on the external assurances and internal reviews of safeguarding to propose a reduction in the probability from 2 to 1 which reduced the net risk from 12 to 6. The net score falls into the category of acceptable. <p>The committee discussed the reputational impact of a supplier going into liquidation on OP1 and OP2. With regards to OP2 a discussion ensued regarding the reputational impact, financial impact and probability scores based on supplier issues, these figures were discussed as possibly being Reputation 2 and not 3, Financial 2 and not 3 and probability remaining at 3, therefore overall score being 12 and not 18!</p> <p>OP5 Safeguarding – reputation – 3, financial 3 but probability being changed to 1 with overall score changing to 6 from 18.</p> <p>It was agreed that the executive team should review the risk scores for OP2 and OP5 in light of the discussion.</p> <p>Action Executive team to review the risk scores for OP2 and OP5 in light of the discussion.</p>	

		Lead
16.12	<p>Safeguarding and Prevent Incident Report Julie Percival Assistant Principal spoke to the report</p> <p>The AP Academic Support was welcomed to the meeting. She explained the remit of her responsibilities and her new role which included Safeguarding lead. She informed the committee that the report was for the period 1 May 2016 to 30 September 2016. She advised that there had been one DBS referral and two adults referred as being deemed of being at risk of self-harm.</p> <p>GS asked if the pink lanyards gave staff a message that safeguarding was deemed to be someone else's responsibility. The VP assured GS that the message to all staff was that staff with pink lanyards were there to give advice and that safeguarding remains a key responsibility for all staff.</p> <p>RESOLVED The committee noted the report.</p>	
16.13	<p>Policies for review There were no policies tabled at the meeting for review by the committee.</p>	
16.14	<p>DATE OF 2016-17 MEETINGS 7 March 2017 20 June 2017</p>	
16.15	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS <i>Urgent matters notified in advance of the meeting</i></p>	

Signed

Date

Actions

LQC meeting 22 November 2016

Item	Action	By whom	Status
16.4	Data from the national Quality and Achievement Rate (QAR) report presented to the Chairs Strategy Group to be circulated to the LQC committee members	VP	Action Complete
16.5	The Chair of LQC would report on the SAR validation process and meetings to full Board	DCE	Action complete
16.8	Clerk to ensure Board members have sight of HEFCE Quality assurance documentation for ratification	Clerk	Action Complete