

## CURRICULUM, QUALITY & STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING

Date	Wednesday 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2017	Time 5.30pm	<b>UNRESTRICTED FINAL</b>
Venue	The Executive Boardroom, New College Stamford		
Chair	Paul Wingfield		

**Membership:** Alex Carty, Lauren Cleathero, Alison Grant, Sarah Hobbs, Emma Sheppard, Allison Sunley (Vice Chair) and Paul Wingfield.

**In attendance:** Janet Meenaghan (Principal), Rachel Nicholls (Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality ("VPCQ")), Angela O'Reilly (Director of Quality), Matt Shough (Head of HE) (for items 3 & 4 only), Sarah Young (Director of Learning) (for item 5 only) and Sally Brook Shanahan (Clerk to the Corporation).

**Apologies:** Jordan Horsley. Alison Fox, Assistant Principal Partnerships & Skills, who is a regular attendee, had also given apologies for absence.

**Disclosure of Members Interests:** None beyond those already recorded in the Register of Interests.

Item	Actions
1. <b>Minutes of the Meeting of the Curriculum, Quality &amp; Standards Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016</b> The minutes of the meeting of the Curriculum, Quality & Standards Committee held on 2 <sup>nd</sup> November 2016 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.	
2. <b>Actions Table and Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016</b>  The Actions Table was received and the following additional points were made:  <b>From the Meeting held on 2nd November 2016</b> <u>Action No. 1 – Minute 4 – Page 2/3 – Student Outcomes 2015/16 – The Principal reported that the Assistant Principal Partnerships &amp; Skills had been managing the Action. Her drill down analysis showed 5 out of 12 apprentices in Motor Vehicle and 16 out of 28 in Construction achieved timely. The problems encountered emanated from legacy issues relating to assessors who it was confirmed are no longer with the College. Members were assured that the necessary actions have been agreed to manage timely completions and they agreed the action was closed.</u>  <u>Action No. 3 – Minute 6 – Page 5 – Curriculum Area Review Report ("CAR") and Schedules –</u> The Vice Principal, Curriculum & Quality confirmed "Health Checks" have been included on the CAR Schedule, a grid to show comparative grades has been prepared and all Health Checks for 2016/17 have been scheduled. The Action was closed.	

**From the Meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

Action No. 4 – Minute 7 – Page 6 – Curriculum Area Reviews – Members noted the current Action status update and it was clarified the text should refer to Heads of Department having been invited to Committee meetings, not Corporation Meetings as stated. Noting that further contributions will be identified as required, it was agreed the Action was closed.

Prompted by this Action, a discussion followed about the use of the pre-Corporation meeting slot which had been less utilised recently as it has reduced Corporation time. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality suggested the function of the slot was to deal with key issues and pressing matters. Allison Sunley suggested limiting the number of slides a presenter can use. Alison Grant felt if the slot was too short then Members would have less opportunity to drill down. She noted the pre-meeting slot before the next Corporation meeting would be used to discuss governance developments but agreed with Paul Wingfield's suggestion that towards the end of the year two of the Heads of Department who have been through the CAR process should be invited to the Corporation to inform Members about how it had been delivered and to give them a voice. Allison Sunley picked up on the point about key issues and said the slot would be valuable if it was used to pick up on points of concern for example if attendance fell below target or if Minimum Achievable Grades ("MAGs") were not on target. Alison Grant endorsed the use of the slots to address serious matters such as those given as examples whilst recognising this will not be necessary at every meeting. It was agreed that where Members identify key issues require discussion the relevant Head(s) of Department will be invited to attend at a pre-meeting slot to address Corporation Members.

Action No. 5 – Minute 8 – Page 6/7 – Quality Improvement Plan – Progress Update Report and Key Inspection Risks Report – Work Experience has been included in the Key Performance Indicators that are considered by the Committee and presented for scrutiny at all Corporation meetings. It was agreed the Action was closed.

**From the Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2015**

Action No. 5 – Minute 7 – Page 6 – Post Inspection Action Plan – It was confirmed all CPD outcomes are now routinely tracked and that the Post Inspection Action Plan has been signed off by the Support and Challenge Team. On that basis the Action was closed.

**3. Higher Education ("HE") Quality Assurance**

With the agreement of Members this item was moved forward on the agenda. Matt Shough introduced the paper which he explained followed on from his paper to the Corporation at its meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016 at which time it had been agreed a partial return should be submitted and that the matter should return to the Committee when the full return was ready for submission. The Annual Monitoring Report ("AMR") for Higher Education Programmes at the College was now complete and followed the new operating model for quality assurance published by HEFCE in March 2016.

The process whereby an AMR is completed for each HE programme to review the quality and identify enhancement opportunities for them before submission to the Heads of Department and the Head of Higher Education for approval was described to Members. Members noted the AMRs reviewed key metrics such as attendance,



retention and recruitment, and also responded to External Examiner reports. It was confirmed that following a process of analysis and reflection, an Enhancement Plan was produced for each programme. Thereafter, having reviewed the programme, AMRs and other key metrics, the Head of HE completed an overall college AMR, effectively the HE equivalent of the College FE SAR, which comprised the main mechanism for quality assurance used to drive forward enhancements in HE provision.

Members scrutinised the AMR by section, particularly the one relating Employability, and noted the Rolling Action Plan that was reviewed at Academic Board Meetings three times a year. Paul Wingfield's observation that Retention was an issue in at least two subjects prompted a discussion in which the actions in place to address this were endorsed. A discussion followed about resources for learning that was a matter commented upon by two external examiners in their reports and in an Animal Studies focus group. They included issues around the restocking of the Library and in relation to which Matt Shough confirmed he was working with the Head of the Library and Programme Leaders to ensure resources were available. This meant that every book on each required reading list will be purchased. However as not all recommended reading materials can be purchased for every programme guidance is being taken from students in their meetings with Programme Leaders so they can highlight their priorities.

It was acknowledged there had been some issues with IT during the year with most now being reported as resolved. In order to ensure students do not experience difficulties with access to eLearning materials it was confirmed the position continued to be carefully monitored. This prompted a wider discussion about the whole IT infrastructure during which the Principal agreed with Paul Wingfield when he questioned whether a whole new system was needed. The Principal explained how the system had evolved under various managers and that the essence of the problem was making the different systems talk to each other. Members discussed the risk and all agreed it was big and business critical but that at the end of the day it would be extremely expensive to replace and at the current time the spare capital to do so was not available. In mitigation, the Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality reassured Members that in response to problems being experienced when upgrades were implemented, weekly meetings continued to be held to discuss and find solutions to operational issues in view of the critical importance of systems such as the MIS. Sarah Hobbs asked the student Committee Members if the IT issues had impacted them and Lauren Cleathero confirmed that she had no current problems now that previous issues had been satisfactorily resolved.

In reply to the view expressed by Paul Wingfield that patching was more expensive in the long run, the Principal assured Members the College was doing the right things including implementing Cloud based systems although legacy issues remained a problem. She added that the IT Department continued to be under intense pressure and were working very hard against a background of recruitment difficulties in the region and the College's salaries not being competitive. Overall the Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality said she felt improvements were being made and that the worst was over.

In view of the seriousness of the matters discussed Paul Wingfield asked for an item about IT to be included on the agenda for the Committee's next meeting. He explained the starting point for the discussion would be to consider whether the College can deliver the curriculum with the current IT infrastructure and systems and that as part of the item he would ask students about the impact of IT on their learning. A suggestion

Clerk

<p>from Emma Sheppard that feedback from staff should also be included was also agreed. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality confirmed Andrew Clare, Vice Principal, Finance &amp; Resources, whose executive responsibilities included IT, will be invited to attend the meeting.</p> <p>In response to Matt Shough's invitation to ask questions about the AMR Alison Grant enquired about Attendance in the HE context as in her experience there had been no registers taken when she was an undergraduate. Matt Shough explained that universities were much more interested in Attendance now although not all necessarily gave it the same degree of importance. The strong belief at the College was that Attendance impacted on Non-Completion (the HEFCE terminology for Retention) and so notwithstanding the external issues encountered amongst some mature students that impacted upon their attendance, the figure was up and currently stood at 93% against 81% the previous year.</p> <p>Alison Grant also asked about how franchise partners were included within the AMR. Matt Shough explained they were included as though they were a department within the College. He went on to clarify that subcontractors were the subject of additional checks and that he was conducting a partner audit.</p> <p>Allison Sunley referred to the Sport &amp; Leisure programme that was the only one to have received criticism from the examiner. Matt Shough acknowledged there had been some issues which required improvements around some of the processes. However the current position was that recruitment to the programme was below expectation which meant it was unlikely it would run again beyond the current year.</p> <p>With the benefit of detailed scrutiny and in-depth discussion Members unanimously approved submission of the AMR.</p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>4. <b>HE Strategy</b></p> <p>Matt Shough introduced the paper and explained the HE Strategy had been finalised following the publication in 2016 of the Government's Green and White papers about HE Strategy in the UK. The Strategy had looked at external viewpoints including those of stakeholders and employers and set out six themes – Growth, Employability, Excellence, Innovation, Support and Governance. It was clarified that the latter theme included the Quality perspective. Members reviewed the Action Plan at the end of the document that outlined the measures being put in place by the College to implement the Strategy, noting they were broad brush and as such would be the subject of at least annual review over the four year Plan period to ensure they remained current and relevant.</p> <p>Replying to an invitation to comment, Paul Wingfield commended the succinct and well-presented Strategy. In relation to growth, Allison Sunley referred to the comment about engagement with UCAS and asked why the College had not done that already. Matt Shough explained the College could accept applications through UCAS already but that most HE students were local and enrolled on their programmes having progressed within the College. There was also a fee to be paid by applicants with UCAS and so he did not want to deter direct applications and the wider participation they encouraged. Nevertheless Matt Shough recognised the benefit of doing more work with UCAS to</p>	

	<p>publicise the College including through Fairs. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality commented on UCAS's preference for institutions not to have a direct offer but despite this the College had established good relations and worked well with the organisation. Sarah Hobbs sought and was provided with confirmation that the HE Strategy cross referenced with the overall College Curriculum Strategy.</p> <p>Following their discussion Members unanimously approved the HE Strategy.</p>	
	<p>Matt Shough left the meeting at 6.10pm and Sarah Young joined it.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>“A” Level Action Plan 2016/17 – Update</b>  Sarah Young said the aim of her Report was to provide an update on in-year performance and give a clear picture about progress with the actions and initiatives implemented under the auspices of the Committee to improve performance in the Academic Studies area. Paul Wingfield reported on his meeting with students in November during which he said he noted the positive impact of the improvements on them.</p> <p>Highlighting the particular areas of focus, Sarah Young said that achieving a full complement of staff had been a key one. Using the RAG ratings in the Quality Improvement Plan (“QIP”) for Academic Studies she and the Head of Department for Academic Studies had directed the focus of their attention which had resulted in positive impact. This included Attendance where the lowest performing subjects had seen a concentration of attention including down to individual student level. Allison Sunley commented on the interconnection between the issues and said that with stable staffing all will improve.</p> <p>In the course of Members’ detailed scrutiny of the QIP Allison Sunley drew attention to the significant achievement gaps between females and males that was reported on Unique Page Number (“UPN”) 69 and had a Red Risk Rating. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality reassured Members this was not the case across the College, and the Principal added she had encountered this in the past but the position changed from one year to the next. Both agreed with Members about the need to show all the work being done around the item. Consequently it was agreed the wording in the “Progress” column would be reviewed and adjusted accordingly to reflect what is being done.</p> <p>Paul Wingfield led a discussion about the progress identified in relation to intervention strategies, including down to individuals students. Members remarked particularly on the significant movement from Red to Green ratings on the Progress Meeting Tracker Sheet. Whilst helpful to see individual student progress as an example it was agreed that names will be omitted from the Tracker in future. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality stated the College was not yet out of the woods and still had work to do to resolve the very challenging staffing situation that had arisen at the start of the academic year and that had resulted in many complaints from staff and students having to be dealt with. The change to linear “A” Levels had also affected retention. However, as a result of the strict management now in place around the entry process improvements will be seen.</p> <p>Attention then turned to the “A” Level Staff Review and the discussion around the</p>	<p>DoL Sarah Young (via VPCQ)</p> <p>DoL Sarah Young (via VPCQ)</p>



	<p>available options that had taken place between Sarah Young and the Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality, the Vice-Principal, Finance &amp; Resources and the Head of Human Resources. Members' attention was drawn to the high levels of fees for the engagement on a permanent basis by the College of non-Teach FE agency staff. The circumstances have necessitated each individual being managed individually to try to reach a situation where they can be contracted to the College. The Full time to part-time ratio at 10%:90% was also a subject of discussion and with confirmation received from Sarah Young that she is working to strengthen the mix, including by combining subjects to create a substantive post.</p> <p>Allison Sunley enquired about the situation in relation to the Law tutor. Sarah Young confirmed she was engaging actively with her mentor and there was clarity of direction in her progress monitoring. Significant improvements, including in relation to the marking of work, had also been endorsed by students. Overall there were eighteen "at risk" students in the department, three of whom had three "at risk" subjects, all of which were being actively managed.</p> <p>Alison Grant referred back to earlier comments about the move to linear "A" Levels having a negative impact on Retention and questioned whether this was happening elsewhere, The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality said she expected it to be the case and offered to benchmark this when the data became available.</p> <p>Alex Carty referred to the judgment about the inconsistency in target setting with limited use of SMART targets from a student perspective. He noted his tutor had on occasions forgotten to set the targets and suggested a reminder could be issued via ProPortal. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality agreed to implement the idea.</p> <p>Allison Sunley asked Sarah Young about her gut feeling for the area and she replied that compared with the previous year she felt she had "got under the skin" and implemented a lot of new procedures which she said, frankly, were now all about impact and down to results. Paul Wingfield noted it was now the worrying time when it is not clear if the interventions have worked although their implementation is evident.</p> <p>Sarah Young commended the support from the Teaching &amp; Learning Coaches and the Director of Quality who in turn noted the College is now in a position where it is able to run intervention classes to support students in their academic studies.</p> <p>Members formally received the paper and thanked Sarah Young for the detailed supporting documents.</p>	<p>VPCQ</p> <p>VPCQ</p>
	<p>Sarah Young left the meeting at 6.27pm.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Inspection Preparation Update</b> The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality introduced the paper that briefed Members on the College's key Inspection risks and Inspection preparation. She confirmed the Key Inspection Action Plan that is the key operational working document to prepare for Inspection had been updated. It showed the College was well prepared and on track with the narrative being ramped up to reflect this. Members' attention was drawn to the balancing act that exists in order to ensure the College is timed on the curve to achieve both optimum preparedness and optimal excitement. The narrative from staff is indicative of their desire to bring on the Inspection.</p>	



	<p>Attention turned to the arrival of the National Achievement Rate Tables ("NARTs") with the Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality stating her expectation that the College will move up to the top half when they are published, which is expected to be in late February 2017.</p> <p>With the final Support and Challenge Visit now completed, the contents of the positive letter received from Ofsted following it were noted.</p> <p>A discussion followed about logistics and preparations for Inspection in which the Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality said the College is ready to go and that she and the Principal will be meeting with staff and forming an Inspection Preparation Team.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Key Performance Indicators 2016-17</b></p> <p>Members received the Performance Indicators which had been amended following the discussion at the Committee's previous meeting. In relation to Student Progress and their progress against MAG, it was noted this was rated Amber. However this was not a cause for concern as Students were not yet at the end of their courses.</p> <p>In response to a question about Work Experience being currently 23% against the Annual Plan, the Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality confirmed this was on track and that all students will have done some work related activity or will be completing the Passport Plus employability initiative.</p> <p>The Amber rating of the CAR Overall Effectiveness Grade was also the subject of comment but it was explained this was to be expected as the areas of the greatest concern had been examined first.</p> <p>Members commended the performance in relation to both Attendance and Retention particularly in the post-Christmas period when students sometimes fail to return to College. The Target of &gt;95% Attendance from 86% in the previous year was acknowledged to be a tough one with Members indicating they felt a figure in excess of 90% would be a good outcome. The Principal said their views were endorsed from feedback provided in the Support &amp; Challenge visit where it had been indicated a figure around 88% would be acceptable.</p> <p>The Student Governors endorsed the impact of the targets and the comments made and commended the positive impact of aspirational targets. Sarah Hobbs agreed and emphasised the need for high levels of attendance to ensure students are well prepared to move into the workplace. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality, concurred and observed there are never any comments from Ofsted about aspirations being too high.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Curriculum Area Review Report – Update</b></p> <p>The Director of Quality introduced the Report and confirmed five Curriculum Area Review ("CAR") Reports have been conducted in 2016/17 to date. The Heads of Departments in four of the areas have received written reports which had been moderated and validated with the fifth report due to be delivered and moderated in January 2017. The way in which the judgment is arrived at was explained including the use of walk-throughs, observations, focus groups and desk based analysis.</p> <p>The overall picture was confirmed to be of good improvement with particular strides</p>	

made in Animal Studies and Public Services. Where inconsistencies had been found these were being focussed upon and worked on so as to improve the overall student experience.

The Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality added that in all CARs digital learning had been graded 3. She explained this was not due to any unwillingness from teaching staff to engage but rather that the infrastructure is not reliable enough in view of the risks around this method of learning. Emma Sheppard spoke about the issues encountered by teaching staff although she said there have been improvements lately. Allison Sunley cautioned that staff may get out of the habit of using technology if it is not used regularly. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality acknowledged the issue and said she expected the Inspection Report will say the College needs to do more around technology. Paul Wingfield suggested staff should be encouraged to take risks in Inspection week as Ofsted will form their view based on what they see in the classroom and, at the very least, this should mean the use of technology being included in lesson plans. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality emphasised the problem was not to do with reliance on a particular piece of software but that there was work to do to embed the use of technology. In the event of challenge from Ofsted about this, the Principal said this would have to be acknowledged.

Members noted the five key areas which had been concentrated on in the CARS:

- Teaching, learning and assessment,
- Value Added,
- Monitoring of student progress,
- Digital Learning and
- English & Maths.

In addition two curriculum areas – “A” Levels and Motor Vehicle - had experienced a “Health Check”. A spreadsheet detailing the graded outcomes from the CARS was distributed to Members. In the course of a discussion that followed the difficulties encountered to improve in-year Value Added scores were discussed and the decision to implement mid-year reviews endorsed.

Members scrutinised the Appendix 1 to the paper which summarised the key findings from the reviews undertaken and moderated in the four curriculum areas to date. They noted the good improvement across them all which is critical for Inspection. After reminding Members she was new to the Committee, Sarah Hobbs asked if the scores are weighted. Noting the pre-eminence of data, the Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality confirmed outcomes shaped everything else and that the rest of the scores were weighted equally. The Director of Quality also emphasised the importance of teaching and learning. Paul Wingfield observed that, although not data, what Inspectors see of learners on their visit, will also be significant.

Allison Sunley referred to the level of staff sickness when Ofsted were last in College and the Principal reassured Members this was not an issue as there was a sickness bug going around at that time. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality voiced her conviction that staff wanted the College to be a Good one and they would rally round to see this happened. In support of this assertion, the Principal reported the Area Review advisers had met with Staff and Students during their visit process and had received





	<p>overwhelmingly positive feedback. Further, the Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality reminded Members about the new and strengthened processes in which the Heads of Departments were engaged and that with the benefit of greatly improved management reports and knowledge they would be able to talk to Inspectors with conviction. In summary Paul Wingfield said there had been many new and significant enhancements that were having an impact since the last Inspection and which showed how rapidly the College had moved forward.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Apprenticeship Strategy Action Plan</b> The Principal introduced the Action Plan that had been prepared by Alison Fox and said her assessment was that the RAG ratings that had been applied were harsh. The current ratings emphasised the need to get the Customer Relations Software in place and that the risk in relation to the creation of an environment where employers can support the College to deliver training could not be reduced from Red to Amber until the Employer Forums are up and running. The Principal said she was astounded by the progress made that included the recruitment of three staff who, together with the Assistant Principal, Partnerships &amp; Skills, had already hit the funding target. In the discussion that followed the Principal commended the calm and effective way in which the new team had tackled the challenge that had included making light work of the move to replace the unpopular eLearning portfolio with a new system. Paul Wingfield asked the Principal to convey the Committee's thanks to the Assistant Principal, Partnerships &amp; Skills. He summed up the general view that the RAG ratings required immediate reassessment and where, as outlined, progress was being made the Assistant Principal, Partnerships &amp; Skills should be asked to review those areas with a Red rating and reduce them to Amber to reflect that.</p>	<p>Principal (&amp; APPS)</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Teaching and Learning Report</b> The Director of Quality introduced the report and invited the Teaching Staff Governor for her observations. Emma Sheppard said her CAR was scheduled for the next week and she had not yet had the opportunity to speak with staff outside her area but generally people were saying they found the process, coupled with the non-graded observations, to be productive. Paul Wingfield asked Emma Sheppard to report back to the next meeting about her experience of the CAR. Emma left the meeting at 7.04pm.</p> <p>The Director of Quality referred Members to the three Appendices to the Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching and Learning and Assessment Observations Report</li> <li>• Learning Walks Report</li> <li>• Teaching and Learning Coaches Report</li> </ul> <p>For the benefit of the new Committee Member she noted by way of background that for the current academic year the College's had developed a new Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy which created the opportunity to move to a developmental observation model for teaching, learning and assessment. This included the broadening of the observation team to include key members of the management team and curriculum delivery staff who had an interest in this area, as well as track records of outstanding practice and the introduction of learning walks as an important supportive aspect the process.</p> <p>Observations were being undertaken across the College, linked to the CARs as well as focusing on individual staff who had been identified by Heads of Department as a cause for concern. Of the 27 observations carried out so far, 16 had been categorised as independent development, 10 supported development and 1 intensive development.</p>	<p>Emma Sheppard</p>



Members noted the enhanced information and overview of strengths and areas for improvement by each curriculum area based on observation records and findings included in the first appendix to the paper.

A total of 110 Learning walks had been carried out across College to date via a combination of CARs and HOD activity. Members again noted the overview by curriculum area of all learning walk activity contained in the second appendix to the paper. Reference was made to the "better if" category in the learning walks which was the feedback to staff following a 10-15 minute snapshot of their lesson.

Teaching and Learning Coaches were currently reported to be supporting 38 staff some of whom were new to the College as well as existing staff who have been identified as requiring support or intensive support. Members reviewed the third appendix to the paper that provided an overview of Teaching and Learning Coach work to date and noted that it included the impact on staff and the student experience.

Members noted CAR Health Checks had been carried out on curriculum areas from the previous academic year which presented an opportunity for in-year progress to be reviewed. It was confirmed all feedback is given face to face following observations and learning walks and Members concurred with the view that this is very important. In the course of a discussion that followed Paul Wingfield observed the strong emphasis on sharing expertise and quality in College and asked how staff had responded to this. The Director of Quality confirmed feedback is generally well received and captured in the Action Plan maintained for every individual member of the teaching staff. Paul Wingfield asked how common themes are shared across College and told by the the Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality this happened at the weekly meetings between the HoDs and Directors of Learning, and given an example of the use of questioning techniques. In addition it was confirmed such themes had also been highlighted in Staff Development Sessions. Allison Sunley asked for assurance this was being done via an audit trail and for anonymity in future reports. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality gave further examples including British Values, Embedding and the development of English & Maths and target setting of themes that had also been reinforced in the Sessions.

**Director of Quality**

**Director of Quality**

As this was the first Report since the introduction of the new developmental model it had been provided in greater detail to highlight the new process. In future the Vice-Principal, Curriculum & Quality confirmed guidance would be sought from the Committee Chair and Members about what they would like included. Immediate requests were that the "Objectives identified" in the third appendix about support from Teaching and Learning Coaches required re-wording to ensure the narrative constitutes an Objective. Paul Wingfield also asked for any common strands, including questioning which had already identified, to be included in future reports. Allison Sunley also asked for numeric details about the assistance being offered to staff in the three observation categories namely, independent, supported and intensive development.


Finally it was suggested that Allison Sunley should meet with the Director of Quality and



	two Teaching and Learning Coaches for a more in-depth review of the operation of the new developmental model.	Director of Quality
11.	<p><b>Student Voice Report</b></p> <p>The Report provided Members with an update on the work being undertaken to gather and develop the capture of the Student Voice. It was noted there are a number of sources being utilised to seek and clarify the views of students at the College. The report focussing on the activity undertaken by the Student Union/Council Committee and the Induction Survey that had been conducted between October and November 2016.using software questions and analysis provided by Survey Monkey.</p> <p>The Director of Quality reported the Induction Survey showed that student satisfaction and positivity about studying at the College in the main is good with 93% of students reporting that overall they felt New College Stamford is a good college.</p> <p>Attention focussed on the four questions which had a particularly poor level of positivity and had consequentially impacted on the overall results. These were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question 5 - Functional Skills or GCSEs in Maths and English would form part of my study programme</li> <li>• Question 6 - I was made aware of opportunities open to me after I complete my study programme</li> <li>• Question 8 - My timetable was made clear to me</li> <li>• Question10 - I was set challenging targets within the first 6 weeks</li> </ul> <p>Members noted the more detailed analysis of the student survey by question and department contained in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Members made a number of observations. These included Alison Grant commenting upon the low response level which meant the results only represented a small sample of students and expressing particular concern about the response to Question 17 "All students are treated fairly and with respect". She made the point that the 11% of students who disagreed with that statement amounted to 77 students. Alex Carty added that the 3.6% of students that equated to 25 individuals who disagreed with the statement "I feel safe at College" worried him. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality confirmed the individual students who had given that response had been followed up by the Welfare Team with over half saying they did not mean to tick that response. Of the others, some issues related to the difference they experienced between school and College, for example access through multiple entrance points and people not wearing ID badges. Whilst noting the helpful additional feedback, Alex Carty told Members that one student had told him they were unhappy about having been tracked back in this way.</p> <p>Allison Sunley left the meeting at 7.25pm</p> <p>Prompted by this comment, a discussion followed about the risks and advantages or otherwise of anonymising the survey. Members agreed that if it were anonymous then this prevented follow-up action. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality said this would be of particular concern where, for example, a question related to safety at</p>	

	<p>College, and render the Survey pointless.</p> <p>Lauren Cleathero suggested Students could complete Survey responses in tutorials as some would not otherwise do so. The Director of Quality said she wanted to reach a point where students wanted to fill them in. The Vice-Principal, Curriculum &amp; Quality endorsed this view and added that increased participation is an action that will be taken away. In order to facilitate that Paul Wingfield suggested the two Student Governors on the Committee should meet with the Director of Quality about how to take forward the points made including anonymity and whether a lack of it would have a deterrent effect as well as the detailed questions.</p> <p>Paul Wingfield commended the useful summary provided for Members and the good discussion.</p>	VPCQ
10.	<p><b>Any other urgent business</b> None.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Date of next Meeting</b> The next meeting of the Committee will be held on <b>Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017</b> at 5.30pm in the Executive Boardroom.</p>	

The meeting ended at 7.30 pm

Signed .....  ..... Chair

Date .....  .....