

# MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF LEICESTER COLLEGE CORPORATION:

## MEETING OF THE CURRICULUM STRATEGY AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2018



Present:	John Allen (Chair) Jim Bowditch	Danielle Gillett Verity Hancock
In Attendance:	Louise Hazel Shabir Ismail Kully Sandhu Tina Thorpe Claire Willis	Director of Governance and Policy Deputy Principal/CEO Vice Principal Adult and HE Vice Principal 14-19 Director of Quality Improvement

The Chair welcome Jim Bowditch and Shabir Ismail to the meeting.

### **1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

1.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Hannah Byrne, Laura Hadland, Mandeep Singh and Sadie Robertshawe.

2.2 Ruth Ingman was absent.

### **3 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING**

3.1 **The Minutes of the meeting on 18 June 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and approved.**

3.2 As a matter arising, the Vice Principal Adult and HE reported that ESOL retention and achievement had improved. The College was also coding learning aims differently and this combined with better retention had contributed to an improvement of 4.4% for adults taking ESOL.

3.3 As a further matter arising the Director of Quality Improvement gave an update on the Scorecard. This was now being rolled out to Trainer Assessors and Learning Coaches.

3.4 In response to **questions** as to whether it would be possible to see live data, it was confirmed that Governors would soon have access to live data through the Matrix.

- 3.5 Governors also **asked** whether the Futures contract had been successful. The Principal reported that it had although the College was still discussing the contract terms. She also reported that the Careers Team had won a Nursing Times award for a project providing careers advice to young people recovering from cancer, the first time a college had won this award.

#### **4 UPDATE ON SUPPORTED LEARNING**

- 4.1 The Vice Principal Adult and HE gave an update on Supported Learning. The following points were highlighted:
- 4.1.1 A consultant had first been commissioned to work with the team after the 2016 inspection and had continued to provide support since then.
  - 4.1.2 He had undertaken learning walks and had been impressed by how much practice had changed. This was reflected in the 2017 inspection outcome which had assessed the provision as Good. Further curriculum development would be taking place and College staff would also be contributing to the writing of a new Equals curriculum.
  - 4.1.3 A joint Local Area SEND inspection had taken place. This had identified that the service provided across the area was disjointed. As a result the focus was likely to be on EHCPs. This was welcomed as the College's experience was that the quality of EHCPs was variable. Improving transition would also be a key issue.
  - 4.1.4 There were currently 230 students receiving additional support; 211 had EHCPs and 122 were Supported Learning students. There were 74 High Costs students, 67 of whom were in Supported Learning. The College was seeing more students presenting with challenging behaviour. It would need to consider if and how to develop its expertise to meet the increasing demands associated with engaging NEETs including students with behavioural issues.
- 4.2 Governors asked a number of **questions** including:
- 4.2.1 **Whether the inspection had been graded.** It had not but it was very critical.
  - 4.2.2 **Whether PMLD included students up to the age of 21.** The ESFA would fund students up to the age of 25 when Social Services would take over responsibility.
  - 4.2.3 **The College would need to think carefully about how and whether it could accommodate more students with behavioural issues. How many extra students might be expected?** This was not yet known. There would need to be a clear business case and the College would need to ensure it was able to support them properly. Funding would be a consideration.
  - 4.2.4 **Where these students went currently.** Most would be NEET so it was difficult to know.
  - 4.2.5 **Whether the College would be required to take them.** If they had an EHCP, the LA would fund them and generally the College would try to accommodate them but in some cases, where it could not meet their needs, it would decline.

4.3 **Governors noted the presentation.**

## **5 ACHIEVEMENT RATES 2017/18 INCLUDING DIVERSITY INDICATORS**

5.1 The Director of Quality Improvement presented a report on the College's achievement rates 2017/18 including diversity indicators. The following points were highlighted.

5.1.1 The overall achievement rate had increased by 1.1% on 2016/17. The main reason was an increase in adult achievement; adults represented 73% of provision. ESOL had increased by 4.4% and Diplomas by 1.5%. Adult Functional Skills had improved although there was still an issue with Level 1 maths.

5.1.2 16-18 achievement had declined. The steepest decline was in Awards and Certificates although they represented the smallest number of students. This would be covered in more detail under item 6 on the agenda.

5.1.3 GCSEs had seen a slight decline in 19+ but they remained above the national rates with 29.7% for English and 18.2% for maths. Ofqual data for 17-19 year olds indicated that the College's results were significantly above national rates.

5.1.4 Comparative data (Mides) showed that students came to the College with lower prior achievement and left showing better progression.

5.1.5 Diversity indicators showed no major gaps other than by age.

5.1.6 Apprenticeship achievement was very disappointing and worse than forecast. It showed a decline in timely and overall and at Intermediate and Advanced levels. Results were well below national levels. The College had been aware that results were likely to be poor because of some very poorly performing frameworks and some apprentices on programme for far too long. A decision had been taken to cease the worse performing programmes.

5.2 **Governors commented that the College had done well on adult achievement asked whether there would be any immediate consequences of the poor apprenticeship achievement.** The results were below minimum standards. The Director of Quality Improvement had spoken to the Association of Colleges; they would provide national data to provide comparisons but had recommended the College contact the ESFA. The results could trigger an Ofsted monitoring visit. The Quality team was working with the Deputy Principal to see what action was needed. The team was aware of the seriousness of the issue and particularly the need to take action to improve timely outcomes.

5.3 **Governors commented that the results for apprenticeships were very disappointing and requested an early initial view on what action was needed.**

5.4 Governors **asked** a number of further questions including:

5.4.1 **Why predictions for apprenticeship achievement had not been**

- accurate.** There had been no centralised system which was used consistently; there were no clear KPIs.
- 5.4.2 **Whether a result of the review might be that more frameworks were dropped from the offer.** Frameworks were being phased out but there were still 14 below the minimum standards. Further analysis would be undertaken but there was a need to improve the offer as well as withdraw from poor performing courses.
- 5.4.3 **What needed to happen to provide more advanced warning of low achievement?** It would be important to get the interventions right and in place early.
- 5.4.4 **Whether any external support might be helpful.** Possibly but the College was aware of what needed to change. Some staff who were not doing a good job had now left the College and the £1.8 million of savings achieved last year included a number of staff in that area. The area was being reviewed by the Deputy Principal working closely with the Director of Quality Improvement and an action plan would be produced.
- 5.5 **Governors noted the report including the GCSE achievements against national rates. Governors also noted that underperforming qualifications would be identified as Requiring Improvement in the College Improvement Plan.**

## **6 16-18 ACHIEVEMENT**

- 6.1 The Director of Quality Improvement presented a report on 16-18 achievement rates. Key points highlighted included:
- 6.1.1 16-18 achievement had declined and was 4.4% below national rates. Prior to this there had been an increase in previous years although rates had still been below the national rates.
- 6.1.2 A key factor affecting achievement had been the decision to carry forward Engineering and Sports students who had had a bad experience in the previous year. If those students were excluded from results, the achievement rate would be 77.6%.
- 6.1.3 Level 2 Diploma rates had also affected overall 16-18 rate.
- 6.1.4 Achievement across six out of nine curriculum areas had declined. There were well understood reasons for the drop in each area. The College had predicted a slight drop but the outturn was slightly better than anticipated. Improving 16-18 achievement would be an area of focus; it represented 27% of provision.
- 6.1.5 Each curriculum area had written a Curriculum Improvement Plan and identified where improvements were needed and what action was required. These would be monitored through QA meetings. Developments to ProMonitor would also help as there was now a structure which enabled consistent progress checking and early intervention.
- 6.1.6 Changes to assessment had also impacted on achievement as had students moving into apprenticeships, which counted as a fail even though they represented positive destinations.

6.2 Governors **asked** a number of questions including:

- 6.2.1 **How national averages for Curriculum Areas were calculated.**  
These was gathered from detailed qualification type national data.
- 6.2.2 **Whether individual courses below national level were looked at.**  
Directors of Curriculum had RAG rated data down to course level and looked in detail at poorly performing courses.
- 6.2.3 **Who would be leading on curriculum intervention?** All areas had done an improvement plan which had been scrutinised in validation meetings. Vice Principals would oversee the implementation of the plans and these would also be monitored through QA meetings.
- 6.2.4 **Whether the College would produce a SAR; if so what grading would be given to 16-18 achievement?** There would be a SAR. 16-18 achievement would be assessed as Requires Improvement.
- 6.2.5 **How the results were perceived by staff.** All curriculum areas knew their data and all wanted to do better.
- 6.2.6 **If the College knew how to improve results, why were these things not done last year?** The contextual issues were an important factor. They were not expected to happen again. Curriculum Areas had been restructured to help address significant staffing issues particularly in Sport. There were also lessons to be learned from areas which had already introduced the synoptic assessment and these were being shared with other Curriculum Areas.
- 6.2.7 **Why the students had been carried over; was this due to funding?**  
This was felt to be the right thing to do since the students had had a bad experience in the previous year and the College wanted to give them another opportunity to achieve the qualifications. Funding was not the issue.

6.3 **Governors noted the paper, recognised the contextual issues affecting achievement and noted the monitoring process planned to support improvement.**

## **7 SUMMARY OF ISSUES FROM 2017/18 QA MEETINGS**

7.1 The Director of Quality Improvement presented a summary of issues arising from the 2017/18 Quality Assurance (QA) meetings. Key points highlighted included:

- 7.1.1 There had been 88 Quality Assurance meetings in 2017/18. The meetings had a set of standard items covering registers, attendance, retention, team time activities and training as well as other items from improvement plans.
- 7.1.2 It had been pleasing to see an increase in attendance and retention as a result of the scrutiny.
- 7.1.3 During 2017/18 there had also been greater scrutiny of qualification types and a focus on work experience.

7.2 Governors asked a number of **questions** including:

- 7.2.1 **Whether a similar number of meetings were planned for this year.**

There would be similar number; Additional Learning Support was now included. The calendar of meetings had been changed slightly but it was felt important to maintain the programme of QAs because they had been an important driver of compliance.

7.2.2 **Whether management issues were covered in QA meetings.** These were more likely to be covered in 1:1s; the focus of QAs was on data. Actions plans and the Scorecard provided tools for managers and Vice Principals to help manage delivery staff. Most 1:1s took place on a fortnightly basis.

7.2.3 **Whether PAMs taught.** They did.

7.2.4 **How teachers kept up to date with current industry practice.** This varied across the Curriculum Areas. In some areas, staff would also be working in industry as well as teaching. Some team time would provide industrial updating but the focus was on pedagogy. All teaching staff were required to undertake CPD and this was monitored.

7.3 **Governors noted the report and requested an update on performance management at the next meeting.**

## **8 QUALITY IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY**

8.1 The Director of Quality Improvement presented the draft Quality Improvement Strategy for approval. The following points were highlighted.

8.1.1 The strategy had four key themes: Pedagogy, CPD, Assessment and Digital.

8.1.2 Areas for development included building on Team Time activities to establish a consistently differentiated approach; targeting support and development and continuing to develop feedback and feed-forward along with the development of English and maths via Marked Work Scrutiny.

8.1.3 New areas were developing pedagogical practice including evidence based activity, sharing good practice and gathering more student feedback and engagement.

8.1.4 CPD would include more use of coaching and teaching triangles; in some parts of the College this was already happening but it would be applied more consistently.

8.1.5 Monitoring of assessment would include more effective use of ProMonitor which had been re-developed.

8.1.6 There would be a separate strategy for digital literacy. It would be important to increase the skills levels of classroom based staff which were variable. There would be minimum standards.

8.2 Governors asked a number of **questions** including:

8.2.1 **Whether there was a minimum standard in terms of IT skills required at recruitment.** This tended to be set out in job descriptions but some staff who had been with the College a long time might not have the same skill levels.

8.2.2 **Whether the KPIs to be monitored would be those set out in the Strategic Statement.** They would.

8.2.3 **Whether the strategy had been disseminated to staff.** It had been discussed by the FEQSI Committee and would now be shared through action plans. A new Innovation in Teaching, Learning and Assessment Group had also been convened.

8.3 **Governors approved the Quality Improvement Strategy and requested a report on progress in a year's time.**

## 9 **WORK PLACEMENTS**

9.1 The Vice Principal 14-19 gave an update on work placements. The following points were highlighted.

9.1.1 There had been 3,207 16-18 year old students enrolled onto a study programme of 450 hours or more in 2017/18 and of these 87% (2,778) had an employability experience. Excluding withdrawn students this rose to 99%.

9.1.2 Over 1,000 students completed either a World of Work programme, an Industrial Cadets programme or a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Maths (STEAM) programme in 2017/18. 1,766 students attended a work placement of between 8 and 400 hours with an employer. Very positive feedback had been received from employers and students.

9.1.3 The main challenges were around data collection.

9.1.4 The College had received CDF funding to further develop industrial placement which would be a key component of T levels. Additional co-ordinators had been recruited with backgrounds in the sectors they were linked to.

9.1.5 Planned number of students undertaking a placement/employability experience in 2018/19 were given. This included 1,316 Level 3 on work placements and 170 on Level 2/3 Industry placements. Industry placements were very popular with students. The College was still trying to recruit employers to provide the placements and had held events to bring in potential employers to promote the benefits of industry placements,

9.1.6 600 students were currently on placement. Numbers were monitored carefully each month. The ESFA was also tracking industry placements.

9.2 Governors asked a number of **questions** including:

9.2.1 **Whether the CDF funding would be spent.** It would. It was expected that funding would continue with an increased expectation about the number of placements next year.

9.2.2 **Whether there were any sectors where it was difficult to get employers to engage.** Yes but for those areas it was possible to place students in different sectors for example, construction companies could take non-construction students on marketing or administration placements.

9.3 **Governors noted the report.**

*Jim Bowditch left the meeting*

## **10 UPDATE ON PROGRESS/VALUE ADDED**

10.1 The Vice Principal 14-19 gave an update on progress and value added. The following points were highlighted.

- 10.1.1 The College had been using the AoC Mides reports to give annual updates on Progressing Learners and Value Added. The 2017/18 data would not be available until 2019. A report would be brought to the next meeting.
- 10.1.2 Work had taken place on measuring Progress and Value Added using ProMonitor. Each student had a Qualification on Entry (QoE) score based on GCSE grades. A target grade of Pass, Merit or Distinction was calculated for every student based on these scores.
- 10.1.3 There were three progress points across the year (December, February and April) when delivery teams measured the progress students were making towards their target grade and entered this on ProMonitor.
- 10.1.4 Teams also RAG rated their students at the progress points 'no risk' 'medium risk' and 'high risk' of failing.
- 10.1.5 Discussions would take place at the December, March and May QA meetings when reports will be available on students' progress showing if they were making less progress, the same progress or better progress than expected.

10.2 Governors asked a number of **questions** including:

- 10.2.1 **Whether this was new.** The consistent use of ProMonitor was new although tracking had taken place across the College previously but largely in paper based form.
- 10.2.2 **Whether this was for 16-18 only.** This was for all classroom based students. The same principles would be adopted for apprenticeships using Smart Assessor.

10.3 **Governors noted the report.**

## **11 COMMITTEE SELF ASSESSMENT**

11.1 The Director of Governance and Policy presented the Committee's self-assessment report for 2017/18. The following points were raised:

- 11.1.1 The self-assessment had identified a number of positive impacts and evidence to support that including achievement rates in specific areas and a positive Ofsted report.
- 11.1.2 Areas for development included a focus on apprenticeships, allowing more time for scrutiny and discussion in meetings, a move to real time data, and looking at the match of curriculum offer to local need.
- 11.1.3 These would be incorporated in the committee workplan.

11.2 **Governors noted the outcomes of the self-assessment process and the**



actions to be included in the Governance Improvement Action Plan and Committee workplan.

**12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 16 January 2019

**13 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

13.1 There was no other business.