

**Minutes of Norton Radstock College Quality Group Meeting
held on 7 June 2011 at 6pm**

Present:	Mr R Newbery (Chair)	RN
	Mrs S Arayan (Principal)	SA
	Mrs C Hounsell	CH
	Mr R Wynn-Jones	RWJ
In Attendance:	Mr P Skinner (Senior Manager, Standards)	PS
	Mr A Ormerod (Academic Director)	AO
	Mrs C Bamford (Clerk)	CB

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies received from David Evans and Lauren Patch.

2. Draft Minutes of meeting held on 15 February 2011 for approval

The meeting unanimously agreed to approve the Minutes.

3. Matters arising

The report was noted.

4. Discussion on role of Committee and Terms of Reference

PS tabled a discussion paper on the Quality Committee Terms of Reference. He explained that this had been prepared following a meeting with RN and SA where it was agreed that it would be helpful to have a defined 'purpose' to the Quality Committee. The proposed statement of purpose defines key functions of the Committee – to monitor, improve and promote and the scope of its work covering Teaching, Environment and Performance.

PS outlined these functions in a matrix and RN suggested that other sub-committees could consider a similar approach to refining their Terms of Reference. The purpose of the Terms of Reference of the Quality Committee was agreed as follows: "To monitor and improve the quality and performance of College provision and to promote the raising of standards to a level of excellence in College Teaching, Environment and Performance."

Members thought this was a useful document and worth developing. CH commented that it should be cross-referenced to the Strategic Plan so that there were no gaps in the approach.

PS also queried whether the name of the Committee should change. After discussion it was decided that the Committee should change its name to Quality & Standards or Quality, Improvement and Standards Committee.

RN to discuss with CD the proposed Committee Terms of Reference/name.

Action: RN Q6111

5. **Update on Heads of School restructuring for information**

SA confirmed that there was a new model of 5 senior curriculum leaders, instead of the current 10 Heads of Schools and explained that curriculum areas had been merged by the size and weighting of their courses.

SA explained that all Heads of Schools were in a position to apply for the posts and noted that it was felt that two Schools, Foundation Learning and Adult Learning, did not require management by a Head of School.

SA confirmed that interviews would be completed by 14 June and appointments /redundancies would take place by 1 August 2011. SA stated that she would inform Governors of the outcome.

SA informed members that Sandra Seldon had left the College.

SA explained that the next stage of the restructuring was for PH to look at Corporate Services and noted that savings had already been identified in this area by the sale of Ellsbridge House and move of staff to main site.

RN asked if we are getting where we need to in terms of cost. SA confirmed that many of the savings of the restructure will not show until next year.

6. **Update on Quality Improvement Plan for information**

PS explained that the Quality Improvement Plan comprised the actions set to address areas for improvement highlighted in the College Self Assessment Report and academic School SARs.

PS noted that the report had been put together following the request from the last Committee meeting that the presentation of the report be changed so that it could provide Governors with an indication of the stage of progress of the actions listed in percentage terms.

PS explained that some of the progress bar values on the report would be 0% until final measurement at the end of the year and these 0% values do have an affect therefore on the overall progress rate.

SA commented that the report would need to change to reflect the new curriculum structure when in place.

RWJ stated that he felt this report showed the % progress but did not provide detail of the success of the outcome achieved and that it was looking backwards rather than forward at future stages.

PS/AO explained that they undertake quarterly reviews with the Heads of Schools to interrogate the progress of actions listed .

Members felt that it was imperative to monitor actions to see the progress and also be aware of danger areas, perhaps by presenting as an exception report.

PS commented that he will help and provide support to future Heads of Schools so that they prioritise the actions set for the next self assessment by the impact on the learner. CH noted that they also need to be aware of the impact on the College and queried whether it was the impact on learner progression or achievement.

RN noted that a task group had been set up to look at the harmonisation of data/reports and that this could be investigated further within this group.

The report was noted.

7. **Integrated Quality Enhancement and Review report (HE) for information**

PS explained that Integrated Quality and Enhancement Review (IQER) is a peer review process divided into two stages, developmental engagement and summative review. The College had been through the developmental stage in January 2010 and more recently, in March 2011, the summative review. PS went through the report and noted that there were advisable and desirable outcomes but no essential outcomes needed. The overall judgements made by the review team were very positive.

RWJ congratulated PS and the College on the outcome of the review.

The report was noted.

8. **Update on Learning Observations February/March for information**

SA took the meeting through the Learning Observations undertaken in February and March and noted that a higher number of observations had taken place, February having 9 lessons graded as 'outstanding'.

RWJ queried the chart which shows lower level courses receiving lower grades. SA confirmed that this was a challenge for the future and more teacher training would be given to help teachers work with challenging student behaviour.

RWJ queried if there was a link between retention and quality of teaching. SA commented that this was probably the case but difficult to confirm.

The report was noted.

9. **Update on Themed observations for information**
February – Use of Resources
March – Every Child Matters

SA took the meeting through the reports. She noted that the reports had been compiled from the reports written by the Heads of Schools and that there had been considerable variation in the way resources in use had been reported and detailed.

There was also no common approach to the assessment of the Every Child Matters theme, 3 Schools used a student questionnaire approach whilst others provided a broad range of information.

SA commented that only 5 reports had detailed evidence relating to achieving economic well-being and that the tabled results indicate that the evidence in at least two areas of ECM is weak or not being recorded.

The reports were noted.

10. **Update on retention and progress for information**

AO went through changes to the retention report, explaining that columns detailing enrolments lost and students lost by age had been added. AO noted that each student can have more than one enrolment and that the student lost figure is identified by the main School. Currently the College has lost a total of 276 enrolments which relate to 231 students.

AO explained that a new table had been added to the report detailing the top 4 reasons for students to withdraw. This evidence is taken from the withdrawal form completed when a student leaves.

Members thought the new report was very useful. RWJ commented that he felt it would still be good to know about level of attendance so it can be monitored and would like this also included into the report (as previously reported). AO to amend the report to detail attendance figures.

Action: AO Q6112

RN queried the 53 19+ yrs students lost in Adult Learning. AO explained that many of these students were on courses spanning 2 academic years and actually left last year. Since then the Head of School is monitoring far more effectively but can't identify any common causes for students to leave.

11. **Verbal update on the development of value added/distance travelled systems for information**

SA explained that she and PS have been researching various approaches and seeking out good practice at other colleges. She commented that not all systems suit the college but they have pockets within the systems which

could be used. One possible system is Athena which is being investigated further.

SA stated that she had asked the Lifelong Learning Partnership whether it was possible to run a project on distance travelled systems and would let Governors know the outcome.

PS tabled a report produced by the Bath and North East Somerset Authority detailing value added and distance travelled for 16-18 Learners. This shows the College in an improving and good position in relation to other colleges/schools in the area. RN/RWJ felt that this report should be publicised and used for marketing purposes. CH commented that we need to be wary of upsetting local head teachers. RN asked that this report be circulated to all Governors.

Action: CB Q6113

12. **Any other business**

RWJ noted that the quality of partnership provision should be reviewed by the Quality Committee. Members agreed and decided this should be added to the next meeting agenda.

Action: CB Q6114

PS reported that there had been a Peer Review event at the College in May focusing on the College's Capacity to Improve. Colleagues from other colleges visited for a day and investigated how well recommendations made in the last Ofsted Report had been taken forward. PS would report on the key outcomes at the next meeting.

Action: PS Q6115

The meeting closed at 8.15pm