Approved

EXETER COLLEGE FURTHER EDUCATION CORPORATION

QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 25th April 2016 in the Board Room, Hele Road, Exeter College

Present	Dave Underwood	Chair
	Bindu Arjoon	
	John Laramy	
	John Bunting	
	Elaine Hobson	
	Abbie Lawless	
	Craig Marshall	
	Martin Owen	
	Emma Webber	
Observers	Philip Bostock	
Apologies		
In Attendance	Barbara Sweeney	Clerk to the Corporation
	Malcolm Walsh	Assistant Principal
Item 4.1 only	Martina Esser	Martina Esser, Quality Manager
Item 5.2 only	Mel Jones	Mel Jones, Progression Team Leader
Item 4 and 5	Julie Skinner	Assistant Principal

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

   The Chair welcomed colleagues to the meeting, including those attending as observers. He particularly welcomed John Laramy, as the new Principal, and Malcolm Walsh, in his capacity of Assistant Principal.

   There were no apologies.

   There were no declarations of interest.

2. **Minutes**

   The minutes of the meeting held on 8th February 2016, as circulated, were agreed and signed by the Chair.

3. **Matters arising**

Quality and Resources Review Update

The update was received and the Principal confirmed that the reviews held in March 2016 had gone well. Accommodation was a recurrent theme. The Business Services Committee was aware of the issues and actively monitoring the situation.

The format of the meetings had been developed at a time when Faculties were not all good or outstanding. It was now appropriate to reconsider the format and to invite each Head of Faculty to make a presentation at future QRR sessions.

A Governor from Quality and Standards had attended a QRR session during the March meetings and assured the Committee that it was evident that Faculties had good grasp of issues and recommended that others attend.

4. **Quality Assurance**

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

4.1 On-course Student Survey

The report was received and Martina highlighted the key issues. Changes had been made to some questions and therefore is was not always possible to make accurate comparisons with previous responses and to assess the distance travelled. Feedback indicated that it would be appropriate to assess responses from Apprentices and HE learners separately. There had been a very creditable increase in the completion rate to 81%, therefore the data was robust. Martina confirmed that in Faculties where there were exceptional cases of low completion, she had met with Heads to assess the reasons in order to make future improvements.

The survey showed a 26% increase in those participating in extracurricular activities. This large increase was testament to the success of the work of the Student Experience Leader, which the Committee commended. There had also been an increase in those judging teaching and learning as outstanding, reflecting the College focus. Although results were anonymised, it was possible to drill down to act upon any comments on teaching and learning. Surveys, alongside other feedback, informed targets and would be used in the new holistic internal inspection grading.

The Committee asked how comments from the free text fields were acted upon. There were other formal mechanisms for learner feedback, particularly the Learner Voice, with which the outcomes from the Student Survey were triangulated. Issues were passed on to the appropriate individuals for action. It was also noted that given that the students were judging a single year only, distance travelled from previous surveys was not always appreciated by respondents.

Other specific comments were considered. However it was noted that the survey was very positive, and individual subjective comments should be considered in the context of overall trends. Whilst Learner Voice feedback provided more frequent opportunities to identify and address issues, the Student Survey confirmed the reliability of these feedback mechanisms.

The Committee agreed to

Note the report.

Julie Skinner, Assistant Principal, joined the meeting for item 4.2 and 5.1 only

4.2 Quality Strategy Update
- Qualification Success (Achievement) Rates

The report and presentation were received and considered. The item was in two parts, and the Committee was invited to consider the role of a Quality Strategy and what data Governors required to monitor quality effectively. The Clerk reminded the Committee that is was the responsibility of the Board to approve an institution's Quality Strategy.

The Committee was invited to consider whether a stand-alone Quality Strategy was the best vehicle for defining quality in the College. Although the document existed, it was not live and rarely consulted. Other, more meaningful documents which sat under it (such as the Quality Policy, Teaching and Learning Strategy and Quality Cycle) were engaged with far more and used as living quality documents. The current review of the Strategic Plan provided an opportunity for Governors to consider if it was more valuable to incorporate a Quality Strategy into the Strategic Plan. The Committee cautioned that the Strategic Plan needed to be high level, short and concise. Would this be possible if it included a detailed Quality Strategy? A proposed solution was to have a subsidiary document to the top level Strategic Plan which provided detail, as with the current short Quality Strategy, supported by the longer and better used Quality Policy.

The Committee noted success data received from the funding agencies. College outcomes were impressive and Governors should be proud. All lines were above the national average. There was now a much greater focus on progress/value added, progression, maths and English outcomes and achievement, which was the term now used for results formerly known as success rates. These four areas comprised the Ofsted priorities. Governors needed to agree how to track data to enable them to monitor quality effectively and to do this there needed to be agreement on how data should be presented.

A balanced score card was proposed, providing data by cohort, and based on the four Ofsted priorities. The Committee considered that progression

would be difficult and labour intensive to track. National proposals to measure progression through linking learning outcomes with earnings were too blunt and did not account for regional differences and initial, often more casual, job destinations post education. However the other metrics could be collated by MIS and presented live, although this would require additional resource.

Once the Committee had agreed what it wished to monitor, the best way to track the data could be determined. Since some outcomes were not known until the end of the academic year, it was proposed that metrics for tracking in-year should be agreed once the outturn was known. It was sensible to agree the desired outcome first then work back to identify appropriate indicators. For example, attendance and retention had always been a strong indicators of success. Although colleges could determine what they measured, there were national metrics, such as those received from the Funding Agencies, and it was likely that all colleges would choose the same, which would help with benchmarking. Over time Ofsted might define the required metrics, but at present it focussed on how results were achieved.

Following detailed discussion the Committee agreed that the proposed four metrics were appropriate. It would monitor in year and ensure progress towards the agreed outcomes. It was also important to be able to compare with others, and to benchmark to assess the College's position within the marketplace. There should be no additional data collected specifically for the Board, but agreed metrics would be the same as used by College staff.

The Committee

a) **Noted the report**
b) **Requested a further update at the June meeting**   BHS
c) **Agreed that the Quality Strategy should sit under the higher level Strategic Plan**
d) **Agreed to the Balance Score Card comprising the four Ofsted priorities**
e) **Agreed that metrics for monitoring should be agreed at a later date, once desired outcomes had been agreed.**

5. **Teaching and Learning**
5.1   Teaching and Learning Observations Update
Teaching Learning and Assessment Strategy Update
The mid-year update on Teaching and Learning observations was received. Julie updated the Committee on the number of observations completed, which had increased since the report was written. The Business and IT faculty (including Aplus) had just completed and inspection and been graded outstanding. The Committee commended this

result.

The number of observations now graded outstanding was 39%, with 94% good or outstanding, confirming the outcome of the Student Survey. The continued upward trend was effected by the drive to improve all observations to a grade 1. However, it would never be possible to eliminate a number of grade 4 inspections and the target was to remain under 7%.

The Committee asked what processes were in place if there were two consecutive grade 3 observations. Teachers were supported through peer observation, 1:1 meetings, and other support mechanisms. Of those helped, 80% improved within 6 weeks and the remainder decided not to stay in the College.

The Committee noted the report.

Mel Jones, Progression Team Leader joined the meeting for item 5.2 only

5.2 Progression:
- Internal, HE, Reach and Vocational
- AAB destinations

The report was received and Mel highlighted the key issues. The team had been restructured with the focus on providing a broad offer irrespective of the learners' current course or line of sight. It was no longer restricted to HE advice, but offered broad based 1:1 advice and guidance, employability sessions, group work sessions, HE information advice and guidance and advice on internal progression.

The number of contacts had increased significantly, due in part to more group sessions which were a more efficient use of time. Events included information advice and guidance at clearing, personal statement drop ins, a tutorial programme, introduction to industry insight days and student financial talks. Progression week had been extended to progression month, which incorporated mock interviews, career events and talks form universities.

Turning to the destinations pie chart for the year ending 2015, the majority were internal progression from level 1 to 2. UCAS events were planned earlier in the year to take part before the end of the summer term of the first year. Mel confirmed the number of applications to universities by January 2016, the deadline for the September 2016 entry. The Reach Academy was a success with grades improving year on year.

There were changes to the AAB profile. The fall in demographics for 18 year old students and the rise in the number taking BTEC and extended diplomas meant that Russell Group Universities were making lower offers.

Therefore comparisons with previous years were not helpful. Whilst hard to track AAB learners, it was possible to measure the numbers placed at Russell Group Universities. Mel confirmed that in 2015, 152 17-19 year olds were placed at Russell Universities. The Committee asked about the support for those not placed. Such students were seen mainly on A level results day and immediately after, during clearing. The improved service was looking to increase support to this group. There was an opportunity to promote internal progression to the HE programmes within the College.

The link with Business Solutions had been strengthened to support information advice and guidance sessions for apprentices. The Apprenticeship EXPO event had been a success and an EXPO plus careers event was planned. The Committee noted that apprenticeship progression from level 2 to 3 was an area for development. An apprenticeship escalator would be helpful. With apprentices spending most of their time in industry this was challenging, although there was signposting. The proposal was to focus on them during their one day per week in College.

The Committee asked what percentage of Oxbridge students had come through the Reach Academy. This would be confirmed at the nest   BHS
meeting. The Committee also sought assurance that learners with needs were being catered for. It was important not just to support high achievers. Was learner support helping students with learner needs to progress to their desired destinations?

The Committee noted the impact of the new team, and commended the aim to broaden the reach beyond those looking to progress to university and agreed to

Note the report

6.   **Minutes/ reports for information**
      The following reports were received and **noted**:
6.1   Safeguarding meeting –
6.2   QIP update
6.3   Retention Attendance and Punctuality Update
6.4   HR Update on Teaching Staff Qualifications
6.5   Risk register

7.   **Dates of Next meetings**
      Monday 6th   June   2016