



STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting on Thursday 21 April 2016

Present:	Mr J Kirk (<i>Chair</i>)	Governor
	Ms N Cuffy	Governor
	Ms L Hammond	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/16/14	<p>Item 1 – Apologies for Absence: There were no apologies for absence. The meeting was declared quorate.</p>	
Q/16/15	<p>Item 2 – Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items: There were no declarations of interest in agenda items.</p>	
Q/16/16	<p>Item 3 – Minutes of previous Meeting and Matters Arising: The minutes of the meeting on 11 February 2016 were accepted by the Committee as an accurate record and were duly signed by John Kirk. Naz Leivas-Mistry presented data relating to questions raised by the Committee at its previous meeting. The data showed that there had been a significant year-on-year increase in the use of Moodle by students and other users. Robust arrangements were in place for the daily backup of all College systems. The College had ample spare capacity on its P, S and U drives. The meeting received these reassurances.</p>	
Q/16/17	<p>Item 4 – Student Performance: <i>4.1 Predicted Results</i> Naz Leivas-Mistry presented a paper about predicted success rates. This showed that predictions in 2014/2015 of success rates in mathematics had generally been over-optimistic. For many other courses predictions had been reasonably close, though some had been over-pessimistic. He reminded the meeting that the predictions for</p>	

2015/2016 were a snapshot, based upon mock examination results or other recent work. Colour coding had been used to highlight areas where there were concerns about success rates and / or high grades. The paper recommended actions to target support and improve the quality of prediction and planning.

Nelista Cuffy sought clarification about the treatment of different entry level groups studying mathematics. It was explained the College had to follow rules set by funding agencies according to whether the new entrants had previously obtained grade D or otherwise. Naz Leivas-Mistry asked the meeting to note that the College could not afford the levels of resources that were available to schools to support these students.

John Kirk expressed his concern at the marked imbalance towards optimism in previous predictions, and the wide range of the inaccuracies depicted. Suzanne Overton-Edwards said that there was evidence of greater realism in some areas in the current year's predictions. John Kirk said that until the College had instituted a system of regular monthly grading prediction would be largely 'a wet finger exercise'. He felt it most important that staff should regard predictions not 'as a stick to beat them with' but as a guide to remedial action and the application of resource.

The Committee received the predicted success results.

4.2 CWA vs MEG Latest Comparisons

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented a paper comparing Currently Working At (CWA) and Minimum Expected Grades (MEGs). John Kirk questioned the significance of the data, as this comparison was infrequently done. It also transpired that there was a lack of consistency in the determination of CWA grades. John Kirk repeated his wish that there should be regular monthly grading of students' work. Nelista Cuffy and Lesley Hammond said that they doubted the nature of some courses would lend itself readily to this approach. Robert Mansfield said that he felt that the Committee was receiving very mixed messages from the various reports provided about quality. The Committee's need was to monitor the quality of the education provided by the College and the performance and progress of students, so as to be able to identify the College's strengths and areas for development. Suzanne Overton-Edwards agreed that there was a need to address this matter better. It was left that staff would consider the issue further and would present proposals to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee received the paper on student grades.

4.3 Qualifications Achievement Rate Data

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented a short paper showing that the Education Funding Agency (EFA) had again portrayed the College's performance in an incorrect and unfavourable

SOE/NLM

light. The EFA had now acknowledged the error and had provided guidance on action that the College should take to avoid having enrichment activities included in future and thereby being incorrectly reported as failures to obtain qualifications. The error had not however been corrected in the current display.

The meeting noted this report with some frustration.

Q/16/18

Item 5 – Quality Matters:

5.1 Quality Improvement Plan

Naz Leivas-Mistry presented the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). The plan set out actions in response to the reasons given at the last OfSTED inspection why the College was not yet outstanding.

There was a discussion about the College's success rates in GCSE English and Mathematics. Naz Leivas-Mistry advised the Committee that although the College's success rates were well above national GFE benchmarks, results in Mathematics were still not good enough for the College to avoid being downgraded at a future inspection. This was a national problem.

John Kirk said that he was convinced that the best way to embed equality, diversity and inclusivity (EDI) routinely into lessons was to foster critical thinking and to reinforce the values of tolerance and respect. It was also noted that some inspectors would nevertheless expect to observe specific references and examples in lessons.

The meeting received the Quality Improvement Plan.

5.2 Quality Manual

Naz Mistry presented a summary of the Quality Manual that he had prepared for governors. The summary explained that the structure of the Quality Manual was now aligned with the themes in the current inspection framework. The effectiveness of leadership and management on the other themes was the determinant of overall effectiveness. The summary outlined the process for producing self-assessment reports by Programme Areas, Faculties and Corporate Services areas. Nelista Cuffy said that the description of the Student Experience in the Quality Manual (page 4) ought to include a reference to work experience. John Kirk concurred, as evidence was the key to positive inspection outcomes.

The meeting commended the Quality Manual to the Board.

NLM

Q/16/19	<p>Item 6 – Strategic Plan 2013/2016 – Progress against relevant Targets:</p> <p>Suzanne Overton-Edwards presented a report of progress against the strategic targets due for review by the Committee. Progress was generally in line with the plan. Further data on progress had been entered where available. However there would be reports to the Committee in June on student survey results, embedding EDI and mock examination results.</p> <p><i>The meeting received this report.</i></p>
Q/16/20	<p>Item 7 – Notes of the Performance Improvement Group:</p> <p><i>7.1 Meeting on 1 March 2016</i></p> <p>John Kirk presented the notes of the meeting of the Performance Improvement Group on 1 March 2016. The Group had been generally encouraged by the improvements in Mathematics. There had been some evidence of progress in Sports and Public Services. GEMEG remained a significant concern, especially as regards poor attendances at the limited classroom sessions provided. Naz Leivas-Mistry said that a challenging meeting had recently taken place with GEMEG staff. However the basis and timing of any decision to end the relationship would require very careful thought.</p> <p>Nelista Cuffy asked whether there was not a serious question about the selection of students and the expectations of those who were selected. John Kirk said that the students' expectations appeared to relate almost exclusively to football. GEMEG was possibly too small to be able to apply effectively the tough sanctions used in larger football colleges to those students who failed to meet the required academic standards, as GEMEG had to keep fielding teams from a relatively small pool for weekly fixtures.</p> <p><i>The Committee received the notes of the meeting of the Performance Improvement Group.</i></p>
Q/16/21	<p>Item 8 – Date and Time of Next Meeting:</p> <p>The date and time of the next meeting were confirmed as Thursday 9 June 2016 at 5.30 p.m. at the College.</p>
Q/16/22	<p>Item 9 – Any Other Business:</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>