



## Quality Recovery Board

### Agenda

17 March 2015

1. **Apologies for absence** **5.30**
2. **Declarations of interest**
3. **Minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2015** **5.40**  
To approve the minutes of the last meeting  
Paper attached  
Allison Howe
4. **Matters arising from the minutes**
5. **Ofsted and the top ten priorities for improvement** **5.50**  
To agree the top priorities for improvement  
Paper attached  
Jo Lomax
6. **Apprenticeships** **6.10**  
To receive a routine report on apprenticeships  
Report attached  
Jo Lomax
7. **Student performance report** **6.15**  
To review progress of students at the College  
Report attached.  
Rob Rees
8. **Observation policy** **6.30**  
To receive a report on options for the College observation  
policy  
Report attached  
Rob Rees
9. **Curriculum plan for 15/16 and timeline for the  
Curriculum strategy** **6.40**  
Presentation  
Rob Rees
10. **Committee risk register** **6.50**
11. **Any other business** **6.55**
12. **Date of next meeting** **7.00**  
28 April 2015





## Quality Recovery Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2015

**Present:**

Kate Shoemith (Chair)  
Paul Archenoul  
Pennie Clarke-Bovell  
John Litchfield  
Jo Lomax  
David Wilson

**In attendance:**

Allison Howe  
Rob Rees

**Items were taken in as per the agenda**

**1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Elaine Hawkins, Hilary Moore and Maureen Salmon

**2. Declarations of interest**

There were none.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2015**

The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting subject to the removal of an erroneous line relating to the recent appointment of Governors.

**4. Matters arising from the minutes**

The Clerk updated the Committee on progress against the actions from the last meeting

It was noted that progression boards now took place every six weeks. English Review Boards were currently being completed.

Meeting date	Action no	Action	Officer responsible	Status
27 January 2015	1	Feedback from the student survey would be brought to the next meeting	RR	Survey will be completed by Easter. Will be reported to next Quality Recovery Board.

27 January 2015	2	Progress against six weekly targets to be added to the dashboard	JP	Complete
27 January 2015	3	Interim SAR on apprenticeships and action plan to be brought to the next meeting	JLo	On agenda
27 January 2015	4	Curriculum strategy to be approved by Corporation Board	IM/RR/JLo	To be discussed
27 January 2015	5	Paragraph 1.4.1 Developments in SE London to be removed from the Curriculum Strategy	RR	24 March 2015
27 January 2015	6	Interim Principal and Clerk to work on deadlines to ensure consistency of data is presented to the Committee	AH/JLo	Ongoing

The English and maths improvement structure currently in place consisted of a Head of English and Maths Development, a Head of English Recovery and a consultant, Alan Shaw, supporting Maths Recovery. The Principal Designate had stated that she would like a Maths Development Manager and an English Development Manager, but would like English and Maths kept in the curriculum area. Work needed to continue on the structure and delivery of English and Maths. This would be part of the organisational review. Governors were concerned about the change as they had seen the Head of English and Head of maths appointments as imperative. This would be kept under review by the Quality Recovery Board (ACTION 1)

The Interim Vice Principal Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience explained there were a lot of small group sizes, there were not enough English and maths teachers, so there was reliance on VTs. There were plans to reduce the number of teaching hours by bringing groups together, reducing the reliance on VTs. It was noted that the organisational review would be launched after Easter, and any necessary appointments would be made after this.

The Board stated that there was a need to keep the momentum up to improve results.

#### 5. Ofsted and the top ten priorities for improvement

The Interim Principal reminded the Quality Recovery Board that the Ofsted Report, which was due to be published the week before, had not yet been published. The report had been in Quality Control since 27 February 2015.

It was known there were two other Colleges that had received indicative grade 4s. Those reports had not been published to deadline either.

The College had seen a draft version of the report and had commented on factual accuracy, the Grade 4 result would mean that the College would be inspected again within 15 months therefore it was imperative that success rates improved.

The draft report noted that curriculum issues were moving forward. All of these areas were in the Post Inspection Action Plan which would be further progressed. There were some imperatives in order to get good success rates.

Following Ofsted the priorities were as follows:

- Attendance – Ofsted found a different picture to that of the College
- Punctuality – Ofsted found a different picture to that of the College
- Tutorials – Inconsistencies were identified by Ofsted
- ALS – Inconsistencies were identified by Ofsted
- Teaching Learning and Assessment – observations were being progressed
- Success rates – these were key and monitoring of progress was ongoing
- Maths
- English
- Apprenticeships – two papers were on the agenda on apprenticeships. All legacy learners were being worked through to completion
- Monitoring of provision – MOT meetings now take place 4 weekly. Sector meetings were still 6 weekly.

Governors were satisfied there were no new issues raised in the Ofsted report, therefore there was no requirement to produce a new PIAP.

There was a question as to when the Ofsted Report would be released with Government going into purdah. The FE Commissioner's report would be affected by this as it would come with a ministerial letter, however it was unlikely to affect Ofsted.

The Quality Recovery Board noted the content of the report and agreed the priorities.

## **6. Apprenticeships**

The Interim Principal presented that Interim SAR and Action Plan on apprenticeships. It was noted that the Ofsted draft report agreed the interim SAR Grade 3. It was noted that there was a lack of data in the report, as this would have replicated what was contained in the student performance report.

The Quality Recovery Board noted that the College had been issued with a 'Cause for Concern' notice following its failure to achieve minimum levels of performance in 2013/14. The College was negotiating with the

SFA for a contract that would enable the College to continue apprenticeship provision.

While there had been some recruitment of apprentices, it had been slower than originally anticipated.

This meant the College would be unable to grow provision. There would be funding for continuing learners of around £884,365.

It was noted that the contract was anticipated to be £1.2m for adult apprentices and £460k for 16-18 apprentices – this would require £747k in order to continue in year starts.

It was noted that apprentice success rates continued to improve 'in year' with overall success currently standing at 47.1%. The best case scenario would be 71.5% against a national rate of 68.9%.

The Quality Recovery Board reviewed the action plan and were pleased with progress being made.

A Governor asked what was the Principal's greatest worry in this area. The Principal answered the number of legacy learners and the number of out of funding learners who were having to go through functional skills which could hit success rates if they did not complete. This was a risk and should be added to the risk register (ACTION 2). Specialist tutors had been brought in to prepare apprentices for the exams.

The Quality Recovery Board asked how it could be assured about the data in Smart Assessor. MIS were looking at how to produce management information reports. This would be ready in September 2015 (ACTION 3).

It was noted that Health and Social Care and Early Years and STLS had been withdrawn from the Curriculum area which were the greatest risk, most of these learners were failing on functional skills.

It was noted that 250 apprentices were at risk of not completion, mainly due to functional skills.

Work had been done with employers to ensure that apprentices were released from the workplace to attend College. This had not been clear when apprenticeships had been sold under the previous management regime.

A Governor asked for the functional skills rates for apprentices to be pulled out in order that they could understand progress (ACTION 4).

The Quality Recovery Board noted the information in the paper and agreed that framework areas for apprentices which would be notified to the SFA.

## **7. Student Performance Report**

The Interim Vice Principal Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience presented the report which provided some narrative against the data dashboard.

Attendance and punctuality was monitored on a weekly basis. Attendance was up 4% on previous year. Areas struggling were construction, English and Maths FS, Music and General Education and Basic Skills. Much support had been put into these areas. In some areas there was a small improvement, but in the main attendance was being sustained but not improving.

In some areas, such as ESOL which was predominately adult, learners were working full time and doing their course. Those students were being supported outside of class and in classes other than their registered class, this was not measurable on official recording statistics, but progress was being made.

Punctuality was the same. There was a need for staff to be honest about the position otherwise it was not possible to get intervention in problem areas. Ofsted picked up on the way attendance was recorded. The main concern was about English and maths. There was no set formula for recording and reporting attendance. The College reported against attendance, authorised absence and the N code. This was being changed to reporting physical attendance, this was demonstrating bigger gaps of up to 12%.

The College had asked other colleges and had proposed a new attendance reporting methodology. The new methodology would show that attendance was down by 2% against the previous methodology, however the Quality Recovery Board were satisfied that this was a more honest picture. Governors approved that the new methodology be implemented (ACTION 5).

Retention was believed to be reported more honestly, and had been believed to be artificially high under the previous regime which explained the decrease against last year.

#### Courses with Causes for Concern

Access to Social Work had lost 4 (50%) of learners. It was believed this was largely due to government announcements about the withdrawal of social work degree government funding.

Myrrh had gone into administration. Myrrh had not been given a new contract. Attempts were being made to re-engage learners, only 24 learners had presented and would be supported to achieve. This was a risk to apprenticeship success.

Last year, apprenticeships were being reported against best case. There was now a colour coded confidence column added to the chart. The red areas were a concern as they had the largest number of learners.

Minutes of monitoring of target meetings had been attached for the Committee's attention. These were considered useful by the Committee and were asked to continue (ACTION 6). The Chair of the Quality Recovery Board expressed concern about the issues raised in the minutes and asked that managers were informed that the minutes were sent to the Quality Recovery Board (ACTION 7).

The Quality Recovery Board noted that a mock GCSE English exam had been attended by 90% of students, all papers were marked by an external examiner, the results showed a 90% success rate, with 50% of students achieving a grade of A\* - C. A mock GCSE maths exam is being held on 26 March 2015.

2000 students were studying entry level English and Maths. L1 Speaking and listening exams were currently taking place, all students were being encouraged to attend.

It was noted that 70% of attendance registers should be marked within the first thirty minutes of lessons starting and submitted, then it could be recalled within a certain period to mark late arrivals in. It was anticipated this would improve submission of attendance registers. This would then enable the College to contact absent students as early in the lesson as possible.

It was noted that 50% of observations had been done with 2 days notice as part of the mock Ofsted Inspection. 83% of those observations were good or better and 2% inadequate which demonstrated that there was an improvement against the 5 day notice observations.

The Quality Recovery Board noted the content of the report.

## **8. Observation policy**

The report was introduced by the Interim Vice Principal Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience.

A meeting had been held with the Principal Designate who was keen to separate QA and Development. The current Policy required the Curriculum Manager to observe the teacher, then support the teacher and re-observe the teacher.

There were three options in the paper, whereby the line manager took responsibility for the development of their teachers. This does not happen consistently at the moment.

The current profile was based on one hour's teaching out of an 864 (828) teaching contract was observed. This made the observation seem punitive. There was a need to measure the standard of teaching more than once a year. It was recommended that there should be 4 snapshots across the year. This could consist of two or three developmental observations which would identify development actions, that teachers could engage in their own development. There would additionally be an



externally graded observation that would consider the evidence developed across the year.

A Governor asked whether there was the resource for that. It was noted that the current policy was resource intensive. It was noted that a graded observation could happen at any time in the year, particularly if a developmental observation raised a cause of concern.

It was noted that there should be greater reflective practice in the College. This would also enable teachers to get used to being observed rather than it being an annual occurrence.

There Was a question as to whether staff with a good track record might not be observed annually. It was felt by Governors that the college was not in a position to not observe all staff.

A staff Governor stated that they would prefer option one.

The Interim Vice Principal Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience stated that his recommendation was option 2 which demonstrated a commitment to teacher development and improvement.

Option two was agreed. However the Executive were asked to ensure that the process was well communicated, and groundwork be completed prior to the policy going live (ACTION 8).

**9. Curriculum plan for 2015/16 and timeline for the Curriculum Strategy (CONFIDENTIAL ITEM)**

A presentation was given by the Interim Vice Principal Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience. The presentation was circulated to the Quality Recovery Board.

**10. Risk register**

The Clerk reminded the Committee that the Quality Risks were submitted to the Committee on recommendation of the Audit Committee.

A Governor mentioned that the Ofsted risk had now materialised into an issue and needed to be managed accordingly. There would of course be new risks arising from the Ofsted report when it was published.

- 11.** Risk of failure to achieve necessary success rates in apprenticeships to be added to the risk register, recognising that the drivers were different from the old risk.

**Any other business**

Graffiti at Deptford had been reported to Facilities

Loss of a security guard at Deptford had led to staff feeling vulnerable.

The Principal stated this was being dealt with

It was agreed that students who had met with the Quality Recovery Board earlier in the academic year would be invited to the beginning of the next meeting (ACTION 9).

**12. Date of next meeting**

**Action sheet**

<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>Action no</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Officer responsible</b>	<b>Status</b>
27 January 2015	1	Feedback from the student survey would be brought to the next meeting	RR	On agenda for 28 April 2015
27 January 2015	4	Curriculum strategy to be approved by Corporation Board	IM/RR/JLo	Due 19 May 2015
27 January 2015	5	Paragraph 1.4.1 Developments in SE London to be removed from the Curriculum Strategy	RR	Complete
27 January 2015	6	Interim Principal and Clerk to work on deadlines to ensure consistency of data is presented to the Committee	AH/JLo	Ongoing
18 March 2015	1	Requirement for Head of English and Head of Maths to be kept under review by Quality Recovery Board.	AH/KS/CK	This has been incorporated into Organisational Review.
18 March 2015	2	The number of legacy apprentices not completing should be a risk on the risk register	JLo	Due 31 March 2014
18 March 2015	3	Smart Assessor management reports to be introduced	RR	September 2015
18 March 2015	4	Functional Skills success rates to be reported separately for apprentices	RR	April 2015
18 March 2015	5	New attendance reporting methodology to be implemented.		
18 March 2015	6	MOT minutes to be circulated to Quality Recovery Board	RR	Ongoing
18 March 2015	7	Managers to be informed that the MOT minutes were sent to the Quality Recovery Board	JLo	31 March 2015
18 March 2015	8	Option 2 of the Observation Policy paper to be implemented.	RR	31 July 2015

		Communication and groundwork to be done beforehand		
18 March 2015	9	Students to be invited back to next meeting	AH	28 April 2015