

EXETER COLLEGE FURTHER EDUCATION CORPORATION

QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 5th December 2016 in the Board Room, Hele Road, Exeter College

Present

	Dave Underwood	Chair
	John Laramy	
	John Bunting	
	Chris Hoar	
<i>To item 5.1</i>	Elaine Hobson	
	Craig Marshall	
	Martin Owen	
	Emma Webber	
	Silas Welsh	

Apologies

Bindu Arjoon

Observers

Philip Bostock

In Attendance

	Barbara Sweeney	Clerk to the Corporation
	Rob Bosworth	Vice Principal, Schools, Partnerships and Curriculum
	Julie Skinner	Vice Principal, Standards and Student Experience
<i>Items 4 only</i>	Martina Esser	Quality Manager
<i>Item 5.3 only</i>	Jenny Leach	Assistant Principal

1. **Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest.** Action

The Chair welcomed colleagues to the meeting. He particularly welcomed Philip Bostock, as observer and Dalya Erdogan to her first meeting, as 19+ Student Governor.

Apologies were received.

There were no declarations of interest

2. **Minutes**

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 19th September 2016, as circulated, were agreed and signed by the Chair.

3. **Matters arising**

- 3.1 Quality and Resource Review Days (QRR)

At the invitation of the Chair, the Chair of Audit confirmed that he had attended a session of QRR, with Media and Performing Arts, and Maths and Science. The process was robust and constructive. A common issue was accommodation, reinforcing the importance of the property Masterplan.

The Chair encouraged Governors to attend future sessions and to contact the Clerk in the first instance.

The Committee noted the update.

Martina Esser, Quality Manager, joined the meeting for item 4.1 only.

4. Teaching and Learning

4.1 Student Induction Survey Outcomes

The comprehensive report was received and Martina confirmed that in response to the request from Heads of Faculties for better access to the survey outcomes, a PDF version would be uploaded onto the College portal.

Results showed an improvement on many lines with positive distance travelled. The completion rate was down slightly on last year, but still high at 84%. In future, Heads of Faculty would be more active in encouraging participation. However, overall the response rate was good for the sector, and made for a more valid and reliable survey.

Governors considered specific response including how learners made choices and who were the greatest influencers, accommodation needs, particularly social space and Learning and Resource Centres (LRCs), the value of open events and the impact of College Advisory Teams. It was noted that in some cases, because of sampling, those who responded might not have experienced a service on which they were being asked to make a judgement. The survey would benefit from a "not applicable" option to questions.

The Committee also sought clarification on how the sample was chosen; did it include part time learners as well as those who studied full time? The survey was distributed to tutors of the first year cohort. Part time learners who did not have a tutor were therefore not included. It was agreed that future surveys would include work based learners and apprentices. The report to the Committee in December 2017 would highlight the modifications to the current survey and sampling methods.

The Committee agreed to

Note the report.

5. **Quality Assurance**

5.1 College Self-Assessment Report (SAR) 2015/2016 and Quality Improvement Plan(QIP) 2016/2017

The report was received including the full SAR 2015 -16, the Executive Summary and the Quality Improvement Plan for 2016/17.

Julie Skinner, Vice Principal, Standards and Student Experience confirmed that the SAR followed the same format as last year, but with four grades to reflect the Ofsted Common Inspection Framework. The College was recommending an overall grade of outstanding, with grade 1 for each of the four areas: Outcomes for Learners, Teaching Learning and Assessment, Effectiveness of Leadership and Management and Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare.

Julie confirmed that each Faculty wrote its own SAR, which was then validated at the Quality and Resource Review Days, at which a provisional grade was agreed, to be ratified by the Board. The proposal was that ten Faculties be graded outstanding, two as good and one requiring improvement.

It was this Committee's responsibility to scrutinise the SAR and QIP and to recommend it to the Board. The Chair invited substantive comments from Governors, with recommended changes to text forwarded to the Clerk.

The Committee noted anomalies where the grade did not reflect the agreed rating. Some data and graphs were repeated, but this was because of highlighting particular issues within the Executive Summary, in some cases because of new data.

Governors considered 19+ provision. This was made up of a range of offers. The College was mindful that short courses could falsely inflate success and therefore provision focussed on long courses. Where apprenticeships were longer than one year, narrative to clarify the context would be helpful. There should be consistency when showing data via graphs and pie charts and data should be presented without colour so that there was no confusion that data was RAG rated.

The Committee considered the significance of the changes in English and Maths level 2 provision and the impact of resources on the effectiveness of narrowing the gap between different learner groups. Governors recommended greater emphasis on progression within the document. Indicators provided definitions of learner needs. However, the Committee was unsettled by the specificity of the learner needs definitions and the narrative needed great context.

The quality of teaching learning and assessment used bar charts to

illustrate teaching observations. The Student Governor cautioned that a simple yes/no response was too blunt to indicate the quality of a lesson. The Committee was assured that future assessment would be more holistic, with a range of metrics included. The small percentage showing grade 3 gave a disproportionate impression on bar charts. However small the proportion, this needed to be shown for completeness.

The positive contribution of the Student Representative Committee was commended and a recommendation made that the text on governance should be amended to clarify the intended meaning that greater diversity on the Board would enhance its role in challenging the College, and that the SAR should be explicit on the benefit of having nominated governors for Equality and Diversity, Safeguarding and Prevent.

Faculty Self Assessments provided a summary of all thirteen Faculties.

Subject to the recommended changes the Committee agreed to

Recommend the College Self-Assessment Report (SAR) 2015/16 to the Board for approval at its meeting on 9th December 2016

Vote: unanimous

- Quality Improvement Plan
The Quality Improvement Plan for 2016/17 was received and considered. There were 27 actions and several focussed on the new curriculum changes and the roles of the new Directors. No issues were new to Governors.

The Committee agreed to

Recommend the Quality Improvement Plan 2016/17 to the Board for approval at its meeting on 9th December 2016

- 5.2 Quality Improvement Plan(QIP) 2015/2016 Outcome
The report was received.

The Committee agreed to

Recommend the QIP out turn for 2015/16 to the Board at its meeting on 9th December 2016

The agenda was reordered to take item 5.4 ahead of 5.3

- 5.4 Balanced Scorecard including Targets for the College
The Balanced Scorecard was received and considered. Julie confirmed the

rationale for each metric in turn.

Governors considered the change from the metric to record percentage of learners progressing to Russell Group Universities to those who achieved high tariff scores of AAB. The assumption that all learners with high scores sought university entry was challenged. To continue with this metric if learners were choosing alternative destinations would distort data. Nevertheless, the metric provided stretch, albeit the outcomes might plateau in time because of alternative destinations. If the metric was designed to show university entry as a percentage of applications, then the text required amendment.

The target for English and Maths outcomes was considered. There were lower targets for 16-18 A-C Maths because students were now allocated to groups based on ability, with targets to achieve over two years for the low ability groups and for whom progression was the focus.

Although the importance of success rates as a metric had declined, it remained relevant and was set to increase for 19+ learners and apprentices. It remained static at the high level of 87% for 16-18 learners. Governors challenged this, given the curriculum changes to A levels. However, A levels were a component of a larger cohort of 16-18 year old learners and the targets were for all qualifications.

Finally, the targets for distance travelled were scrutinised. They remained unchanged for A2, which had achieved a strong improvement in 2015-16 and for which the improvement to the next level was a significant jump. Improvement in AS was set. For the first time a value added target was proposed for vocational provision using the ALPs system in the first instance. However, management information systems would need to be developed to support this with more customised metrics, which would take time to embed.

The Committee agreed to

Approve the proposed targets

Vote: unanimous

Jenny Leach, Assistant Principal, joined the meeting for item 5.3 only.

5.3 Higher Education Self Assessment Report (HE SAR)

The report was received and Jenny confirmed that there was a new Higher Education Funding Council England (HEFCE) operating model which required the Board to confirm that it received assurance on the quality of HE provision within an institution. The return for 2015-16 was due on 1st December 2016 but had been extended to 12 December 2016 to allow

this Committee to consider the report and if content, to recommend the resolution to the Board on 9th December 2016.

The circulated HE SAR provided assurance. The HE Quality Improvement Plan served as a high level Action Plan. The Committee requested a further update on progress towards the Action Plan at its June meeting. Minutes from meetings where HE was considered by the Committee and reported to the Board during the 2015-16 academic year were also received. These were at meetings held on 8th February 2016 and 6th June 2016.

Subject to one change to include Prevent in addition to Safeguarding as a key priority the Committee agreed to recommend to the Board at its meeting on 9th December 2016 the following resolution, for submission to HEFCE.

CT/JLe

•The governing body has received and discussed a report and accompanying action plan relating to the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and student outcomes. This included evidence from the provider's own periodic review processes, which fully involve students and include embedded external peer or professional review.

•The methodologies used as a basis to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes are, to the best of our knowledge, robust and appropriate.

•The standards of awards for which we are responsible have been appropriately maintained.

6. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

The following reports were received and noted:

6.1 Intensive Care update

The report was received and taken as read and Julie confirmed that four courses had been identified for support through the Intensive Care process. The Senior Curriculum Group met to support and oversee measures to realise improvement. One of the four courses had been withdrawn.

Outpatients was to maintain a watching brief on programmes formerly in Intensive Care or areas where blips were being monitored.

The Committee noted the report.

6.2 Safeguarding meeting – Minutes

The report was **received and noted**

6.3 EDBV meeting

The report was **received and noted.**

6.4 HR Update on Teaching Staff Qualifications

The report was **received and noted.** As a standing item the Committee noted that percentage of unqualified remained relatively constant and there was never 100% of staff qualified. The Committee was assured that this was because of the cycle of teacher recruitment and the scheduling of courses. However although not a legal requirement to train all staff, the College had committed to do so with a considerable budget to maintain the high quality teaching and learning.

6.5 Internal Inspection Reports: Foundation Studies: 14th -16th November 2016

The internal inspection of the Foundation Studies Faculty, which comprised circa 350 learners on a range of programmes, had been completed at the same time as the QRR process. The Faculty had achieved an outstanding result, with a current Ofsted Inspector undertaking the review. This confirmed the reliability of the Self-Assessment grading at QRR. Over 50% of lesson observations had been outstanding. Nevertheless, the review had identified some areas for improvement and action plans and a follow up meeting were scheduled.

6.6 Risk register

The register was **received and noted**

6.7 Items to take to the Board

The Committee agreed that in addition to the SAR and HE SAR report, the student induction survey should be included in the Executive Summary to be received by the Board.

6.8 Items for next meeting

The Committee was content that beside those items on the annual cycle of business a report on FE Weekly league tables should be included on the next agenda. There would be an update on the HE action plan to the June meeting.

7. **Dates of next meetings**

Monday	6	February	2017
Monday	27	March	2017
Monday	5	June	2017