

CORPORATION BOARD of UNITED COLLEGES GROUP
Minutes of a meeting of the Teaching, Learning and Skills Committee
Monday 3 June 2019 6.00 pm
6SW1, Paddington Green Campus

Members Present: Mary Elliott (Chair), Glenys Arthur, Matthew Green, Angela Drisdale-Gordon, Colin Smith, Keith Cowell.

In attendance: Stephen Davis (Group Principal), Ita Leavy, Sam Bramfitt, Lauren Waters, James Wilson, Grethe Woodward, Zoë Lawrence.

1	<p>Welcome and apologies for absence Apologies were received from Jan Knight, Ravina Jignesh, and Joshua Okakpu.</p>	
2	<p>Declarations of Interest in the agenda items No declarations were made.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of previous meeting <i>(Minutes were circulated in advance)</i> The minutes were approved and signed as an accurate record. Matters arising were complete or included elsewhere on the agenda.</p>	
4	<p>Strategic</p> <p>i. Teaching Learning and Assessment Strategy <i>(Paper was circulated in advance)</i> GW explained that although this document was titled as a strategy it was in effect a set of procedures to manage the quality of teaching and learning across the Group. She reminded members that as part of the Self-Assessment process in the Autumn term the quality of teaching and learning at CNWL had been judged to be RI (4). The procedure included 4 main strands which set out a staggered and developmental approach. The teaching trade unions had been consulted on its development. Teachers were judged to exceed, meet or not yet meet minimum standards. Members welcomed this paper and considered it to be clear and well expressed. Questions were raised as to how these procedures supported Ofsted’s new Education Inspection Framework (EIF). It was acknowledged that this had been prepared to support the existing Common Inspection Framework, and that it would need to be reviewed for the new Framework. However, it was considered to be a good basis on which to start from.</p> <p>ADG sought clarity on the frequency of lesson observations. GW confirmed that lesson observations were conducted twice a year. If a teacher exceeded expectations at the first observation, they were not observed for a second time that year. At ADG’s FE organisation lesson observations were only done every 2 years. GW was of the view that twice a year was not unusual. GW explained that the majority of observers were managers. Some trade union representatives and students had also been trained as lesson observers. The moderation of lesson observations was robust, and included the</p>	

involvement of an external consultant. There was confidence in the quality of those observing. Pro-observe had been used to record the majority of observations and feedback given. Although there had been some issues with its use initially at CNWL, it had provided the facility to identify any weaker observers (who showed lack of timeliness, focus and detail) so the observer accreditation was able to be removed. These observers would then receive further training or conduct joint observations. It was noted that the lesson observations were only part of the process, and it was the action plans that followed, with support from a menu of CPD options that added to the developmental process for teachers.

ii. Risk Register (relevant section)

(Risk Register was circulated in advance)

SD presented the risk register to the Committee and explained that a further column had been added to provide a commentary on why the risk had been included. It was noted that a small number of risks had been closed out and removed from the register. SD focused on the two main red risks. The first of these was changes to the leadership of curriculum personnel which would impact legacy and capacity. The second was the risk of losing Office for Students (OfS) accreditation for delivering HE, which would impact financially, the reputation and limit articulation routes for students. Additionally, SB was soon to be leaving the organisation which would reduce the level of expertise in this area. Other risks were noted as less severe but it was agreed that further work on development of the learner voice would be brought back to this Committee. Members noted the mitigating actions against the key risks.

iii. Achievement and Student Experience KPIs

(Paper was circulated in advance)

Student Experience KPIs were taken first which support strategic aim 2. The KPIs refer to the percentage of students with recorded work experience/ employment activities, progression and destinations, and attendance. On work experience 89.1% of eligible learners had been allocated work experience against a target of 90%. CS queried the target of 90% and the definition of eligible learners. The latter would be dependent on the study programme, and that the target should be in line with the funding requirements and be 100%. It was acknowledged that the target of 90% was incorrect. It was noted that destinations were a key element of the EIF and that these were sometimes problematic to capture at the end of year. It was hoped that the majority of intended destinations would be recorded during Progression Week through the exit interview. Consideration was being given to whether an external agency would be used to collect actual destination data.

Attendance was well below the target of 90% at 77%. This was similar to the previous year though the degree of decline had slowed slightly, and accuracy of reporting had improved. It was noted that issues with attendance included the degree to which students were accessing materials using e-learning technologies which meant that it was not necessary for them to travel to college. This level of activity was not being captured and there was a lack of correlation between attendance and achievement in

	<p>most cases. The change in how young people were learning was noted, together with the cost of travel. The award of unconditional offers from HE were also demotivating students to attend. CS noted that that despite interventions, attendance had not improved from 2017/18 and sought clarity on what had been done differently this year. It was considered that the emphasis on setting expectations during the first 6 weeks of term was crucial, together with understanding the factors why students don't attend. The impact of timetabling, engagement of learners and relationships were key elements to improving attendance. Members requested a report on attendance at the first meeting of the Autumn term to address what progress had been made.</p> <p>Student Achievement – These predictions had been derived from detailed target review meetings, and actual marks achieved by students to date unless the programme was exam based. Overall, predicted achievement was at 87.8%, 0.9% above the previous year and 1.9% above national rates (NR). An improvement for maths and English for 16-18 provision was predicted though this will be affected by the exam proponent. A decline in achievement however, was predicted for 19+ English and maths. Confidence was expressed in the predictions as they were taken from actual marks achieved and moderated. Members made the following comments on the figures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security and Retail variance should not be N/A, • The actual achievement of A levels on the KPIs and achievement projections for 2017/18 differed and should be consistent, • Maths high grade achievement rates should be red as the difference was in excess of 6%. <p>The retention rate was 91% which was only 2% below NR.</p> <p>Members queried the decline in the adult English and math success rate as this was unusual. Processes at Willesden and Wembley at the beginning of the year may have been disruptive resulting in teachers being more cautious in their predictions.</p> <p>The corrections to the predicted achievement and KPIs would be made and a revised version issued.</p>	
5	<p>Teaching, Learning and Skills</p> <p>i. Predicted Student Achievement <i>(Paper was circulated in advance)</i> See 4 iii above. These agenda items were linked.</p> <p>ii. Quality Improvement Plan – end of year review <i>(Paper was circulated in advance)</i> LW described progress to date on each element of the QIP. Most areas had been covered in detail elsewhere on the agenda. Value added (VA) and Prevent/British Values were exceptions to this. It was acknowledged that further work on VA was needed and there was likely to be a focus on A levels for this. At the moment it was too early to assess the impact of the work on Prevent/British Values which had been included in the tutoring programme and a range of other activities. (see item 6ii for student survey and learner voice).</p>	

iii. Teaching and Learning Outcomes from Strategy

(Paper was circulated in advance)

Members were directed to the table on page 3 of the report. It was noted that from the 296 teachers observed 20% (58) were below minimum standards. In the first observation window 20 staff were not seen (due to illness or exams for example). In the second observation window 224 staff were observed which included all staff below minimum standards, new staff, and those not seen in the first lesson observation (LO). It was noted how the teaching cohort changes within the academic year. Only two members of staff were not seen for the second lesson observation. At the end of the process more teachers exceeded or met standards, and fewer were below standard showing improvement from the first lesson observation to the second. ME asked if any teachers who met the standards in the first LO, dropped to below at the second. GW confirmed that this had not happened, though 11 teachers remained below standard. Of the 40 overall that are below standard 24 were still employed, 16 of these were hourly paid lecturers or agency staff. The KPI target was for 80% of teaching to meet or exceed standards. The target for the following year, to be consistent with Ofsted's learner experience judgements would be a target for 80% of teaching to exceed standards. CS asked how the areas of improvement identified by the process had been taken forward. These were included in teachers' individual action plans. GW said that the process this year had provided a good basis on which to build on for the following year. Members noted how quality of teaching could improve student engagement and attendance.

iv. A levels Update

(Paper was circulated in advance)

SB reminded members of the 5 areas of poor performance in relation to A levels which were listed in the paper. The Group's comparative performance for A levels was well below average. The curriculum planning process for A levels recently undertaken had resulted in a rationalisation of three English programmes. It was noted that the A level offer would be retained, but this need to be an offer that could be properly resourced. SB explained how students needed to choose 3 A levels to make up their programme time, and this often included a 'tag on' subject such as Sport or Drama which the student was sometimes not overly committed to. This was negatively impacting performance. MG thought it would be useful to understand what subjects students would have preferred and whether that could be offered. Changes had been made to the leadership and management of the A level curriculum area which has provided stability, and it was hoped some potential improvement in outcomes. ME referred to paper providing detailed analysis of the A level offer. This paper would be provided to all members for their information and further comment. ME welcomed the work that had taken place, but was of the view that this was an issue that needed further review and to remain as a standing item on the TLS agenda. KC brought to the Committee's note that a significant number of applications received by the College were for A levels and that the A level offer attracted students. However, many of these were then steered towards a more vocational route. To remove the A level offer may have a

	<p>detrimental effect overall to enrolment numbers. A combination of A levels and BTEC qualifications had been considered but this was difficult to deliver operationally and for timetabling, particularly now A levels were 2 year linear programmes without the AS level.</p> <p>v. Curriculum Plan 2019/20 <i>(Paper was circulated in advance)</i></p> <p>JW described the singular method that has been used to develop the curriculum plan for the Group. He directed members to Appendix 1 of the paper which set out the principle for the curriculum review. Curriculum would focus on being demand led, be aligned to employment or progression, be consistent with the national policy agenda, have strong links with the local community, create value for money, and be accessible. The first iteration of the plan still lacked some market intelligence. It was considered to complement the EIF particularly with regard to intent. Increases in student numbers were being planned through an increase in class sizes, rather than through new classes. It was expected that the planned increase in student numbers could be met at near zero additional cost.</p> <p>19+ curriculum planning was more complex due to the variation in funding methods and the AEB. There was no significant movement expected in this area currently. JW explained the hours and FTE allocations in Appendix 3 and that the planning had shown that sufficient resources were in place.</p> <p>Members welcomed the paper and how it had been clearly explained. ME asked how this fed into finance. The curriculum plan would form part of the 2 year plan which would be considered by the F&GP Committee. The lag funding for 16-18 would be used to manage any reduction in hours needed. A more detailed CPR review document projecting curriculum plans to 2024 would also be shared with members, together with a list of courses being provided.</p> <p>vi. HE OfS Action Plan <i>(Paper was circulated in advance)</i></p> <p>SB reminded members of the position concerning the Office for Students (OfS) accreditation, and the progress made against the action plan. It was noted that in addition to the Oversight Group that would be chaired by Tony Johnston, that an operational group to implement the action plan would also be established. The work on consumer protection was being outsourced. Issues were noted about branding in regard to UCAS applications as the Colleges were listed as United Colleges Group under the UCAS application process. Student loans were also made to the Group not the colleges. A QAA inspection of HE provision was planned for November 2019. An initial planning meeting for this had taken place at the end of May.</p>	
6	<p>Other</p> <p>i. Admissions Policy <i>(Paper was circulated in advance)</i></p>	

SD presented the Committee with a unified Admissions Policy covering 14-16, GFE and HE admissions. The policy set out existing practice and was undergoing an Equality Impact Assessment. This was a new policy and it would be necessary to evaluate how it worked in practice. It would be reviewed within two years. The Committee approved the policy.

ii. Student Surveys

The results of the FE Choices and QDP surveys (QDP CNWL only) were currently not available. ME said that she would welcome the opportunity to revisit the programme of student surveys conducted by the Group to reassess the most appropriate questions. This would be on the agenda for the Autumn term. It was requested that the survey results when available be circulated to the Committee in between meetings. It was hoped that this would be before the Summer break.

iii. Child Protection and Safeguarding Update

(Paper was circulated in advance)

IL spoke to this end of year summary report. Members noted the increase in the number of students presenting, and in particular those students reporting suicidal thoughts. In response to this, staff training was being provided to enable staff to be able to confidently have these difficult conversations. It was noted though, that some students were not willing to engage. Members noted the list of additional support activities included in the report, in particular the Chess 55 (suicide bus), and the reinstatement of the police officer. IL reported that screening of students had revealed an increase in the number of cannabis grinders found, though a reduction in knives. Many students had complex issues and it was therefore difficult to categorise the nature of their safeguarding concern. JK, Member with specific Safeguarding responsibilities, though absent, had emailed a query on the use of peer support. IL was supportive of this, though cautious of giving students too much responsibility. Many students did report concern about a friend, and such referrals were then followed up. MG reported the increase in anti-social behaviour in the ward which was often linked to the finer Summer weather. CCTV cameras were shortly to be fitted at Fleming Court and any relevant footage would be shared with the College to identify individuals. GA asked whether Chess 55 would be repeated? IL confirmed that this was likely depending on the funding available. CS asked if attendance at each of these initiatives was recorded to be able to assess the level of engagement and effectiveness. IL said that this was recorded where possible.

iv. Exclusions and Complaints Update

(Paper was circulated in advance)

Complaints – GW reported that since the previous meeting complaints had increased from 47 to 61, though this was projected to be lower at the end of the year than the previous year which had received 91 complaints. 11 of the complaints were still under investigation. In general, more complaints were received during the first term when students were least familiar with the college environments. In most instances the complaints were investigated at a local level which allowed for issues to be addressed

	<p>quickly. The main issues highlighted from complaints concerned customer service, behaviour of staff, and improvements to enrolment and information on fees. ADG queried if there was concern about the number of complaints relating to staff behaviour. GW said not as this was quite general. If it repeatedly identified a particular member of staff there would be concern. At the end of the year, more comparisons with the previous year would be completed. A single process of complaint recording would be in place from Sept 2019.</p> <p>Exclusions – Exclusions had increased to 19 students from 11 at the previous meeting in March. This was less than the previous year. Half of those excluded had been in possession of a weapon. This demonstrated that the screening was becoming more effective. A single disciplinary policy (which would become a Behaviour for Learning Policy) would be in place from Sept 2019, and would enable richer data on exclusions to be collected. The new policy would include a re-engagement process prior to exclusion where appropriate. MG sought advice on students who have a criminal record and how these were dealt with. It was noted that the enrolment form included a section on criminal records, though it was not a legal requirement for this to be disclosed. Students on some programmes needed a DBS such as those in healthcare working with vulnerable adults and children. There was often a lack of information following the student from secondary education into College, and in many instances useful information on the student was not provided. Where a criminal record was disclosed an individual risk assessment was undertaken. In some instances it was not possible to offer the student a place, as the priority of the duty of care to other students and staff was paramount.</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>ME thanked officials for the improvements to the papers received, that they were more concise and focused.</p> <p>As this would be LW and SB’s last TLS meeting, KC thanked them for their contributions and wished them well in their future endeavours.</p>	
7	<p>Dates of Future meetings</p> <p>TBC</p> <p>The meeting closed at 8.45 pm</p>	

Minutes taken by Zoë Lawrence 04/06/2019

SIGNED: **Date:**

Mary Elliott, Chair, Teaching Learning and Skills Committee

ACTIONS

Ref	Action	Owner	Status
4i	To review the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy to reflect Ofsted's new Education Inspection Framework	SD/GW	Complete
4ii	Further work on learner voice to be brought back to this committee.	SD	Complete
4iii	To amend the work experience KPI target to 100%	SD	Complete
4iii	For the committee to receive a report on attendance for the first meeting of the Autumn term.	SD	Complete
4iii	To make corrections to the achievement predictions and re-issue.	SD	Complete
5iv	To send the A level analysis to TLS members	ZL	Complete
5v	To send detailed curriculum plan to 2024 and a list of courses to TLS members for information.	SD/ZL	Complete
6ii	For the FE Choices and QDP student survey results to be shared with the Committee before the Summer break.	SD/GW	Complete
6ii	For a review of student surveys and questions to take place in the Autumn term for 2019/20	SD	Complete