

CORPORATION BOARD of RICHMOND UPON THAMES COLLEGE
Minutes of Corporation Meeting
29 March 2017 6 pm

Members Present: Barbara Gilgallon(Chair), Rob Pope, Ezra Smith, Robert Shaw, Robin Ghurbhurun, Michael Morley, Rob Pope, Andy Chew, Dayo Oduguwa, Paul Leonard, Neal Hook,

In attendance: Zoë Lawrence, John O’Shea, Eva Dixon, Eileen O’Gara

A	Procedural
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies for Absence Apologies were received from Shannon White-Reeves, Mark Payton, Sally Newton, Rosemary Scully, and Lucy Watson</p>
2	<p>Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items None were declared.</p> <p>Request for discussion of grey box items No requests were made.</p>
3	<p>Approve minutes of the Corporation Board 7 December 2016 These were approved as an accurate record.</p> <p>Matters arising A – BG would carry forward this action. B – No offers for a Governor to become a temporary vice-chair had been received. C – This had been actioned through committee meetings and was also to be discussed elsewhere on the agenda.</p>

B	Strategic Matters
4	<p>Presentation from Eileen O’Gara on Apprenticeships <i>(The College’s apprenticeship implementation plan was circulated in advance. Paper copies of the presentation were tabled at the meeting)</i></p> <p>EOG included in her presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background to the reform of apprenticeships • The definition of an apprenticeship • The RuTC apprenticeship frameworks/ qualifications being currently offered • Apprenticeship funding bands and how these would operate • The apprenticeship levy, who paid it and how the funding system would work • Processes for non-levy payers and what funds could be used for • The overall benefits for employers <p>Members welcomed this presentation as the new scheme would come into force from May 2017, and asked the following questions during the discussion:</p> <p>Q - As the end point assessments were now to be done externally, who would write the standards for these? A - Employers set the assessment frameworks and standards. It was the role of the College to prepare learners for the Gateway and end point assessment which were external and independent.</p>

Q – Were the assessment criteria for each qualification ready?

A – Some qualification assessment criteria were ready, but in most cases these were still in development. In some cases, a qualification was not mandatory to the training. This would depend on the industry. The employer would certify that the learner was safe to practice rather than be required to pass an exam. It could be that this approach made it more difficult to transfer the requirements to different industries. Qualifications were recommended but these would be at a cost to the employer.

Q – How were the new arrangements different to the existing ones?

A – The most significant change was that the approach to securing apprenticeship courses at RUTC had become that of a contracting basis where it was now necessary to negotiate prices for courses within the wider market place, but at the same time ensuring that delivery was cost viable for the college.

Q – Which apprenticeships were more or less attractive in terms of income for the college to provide?

A - The College was planning to run the engineering apprenticeship from September 2017 which would provide a good income for the College. Business Admin was less financially attractive though the skills learnt were more transferable. Customer service was also a good offer.

Members acknowledged that this was a significant cultural shift for the FE sector as it introduced the commercialisation of education at this level in which it was necessary to develop contractual relationships with employers. Employers were able to use the levy to train their own employees themselves which was an interesting loop hole in the policy.

Q – Price negotiation was important but quality must also be part of contracts?

A – Yes. RuTC were keen to ensure a quality offer for the price.

Q – Could RuTC be an assessor body for other organisations?

A – Yes – this was possible, but it was anticipated that this would be some time in the future. The College would likely need to have attained an Ofsted ‘good’ rating to be a credible assessor. This was something that the College would look at more closely at a later time once the new processes had bedded in. At the moment there was constant change in how it was to be implemented, which was likely to make the process very difficult for the first few years.

Q – What was the motivation to separate the end point assessment from the training body?

A – it was thought that this was done to ensure that the assessment was independent. A knock on effect of this would be the need to factor assessment failure into the cost modelling and recognise this risk to budget planning.

Q – Apprenticeships were not planned around term times and the academic year. How would the college manage this?

A – The curriculum would need to be unitised allowing learners to do units in different orders depending on when they started the course to allow flexibility. This could potentially be quite complex.

Members reviewed the apprenticeship implementation plan and were content that the relevant curriculum and finance items would be appraised by the relevant committees going forward. There was also a RAG rated version of the implementation plan which was reviewed regularly by CLT.

5	<p>Principal's Report <i>(This was circulated in advance)</i> RG welcomed any questions in respect to his report:</p> <p>Q – What were the next steps for the change programme now the consultation period had ended? A – The consultation had only just ended. The process was now to work through responses. It was anticipated that the reductions would be made to curriculum staff through voluntary redundancy; there were a few interviews to take place for a small number of ring fenced business support / tutor roles; but it would be possible to avoid any compulsory redundancies.</p>
6	<p>Risk Register <i>(A version of the risk register was tabled at the meeting)</i> Following feedback from the audit committee and from the recent Risk Management and Governance audit, work was in progress to revise the college risk register. ED explained that new columns had been included to provide examples of risks so that the measure of risk could be more consistent; plus, a new mitigating controls column. Risk descriptions were also being clarified.</p> <p>ED sought agreement for the relevant sections of the risk register to be reviewed at the relevant committee and for the Clerk to hold the current version. The Audit Committee would then be responsible for the risk register overall.</p> <p>Members welcomed the improvements to the risk register and agreed that risk reporting needed to be conducted in a uniform way. Responsibilities for risk may also need to be properly reflected in the committees' ToR.</p> <p>ED welcomed members further comment on the risk register and for these to be passed to the Clerk.</p>

C	Committee and Governance Matters
7	<p>Governance, Search and Remuneration Committee <i>(Minutes of the GSR meeting of 7 March were circulated in advance)</i> BG confirmed that she would continue to be Corporation Chair for a further term until the end of July 2017. It was expected that 2017/18 would be a critical year for the college when its next Ofsted inspection was likely and as such it was important that the chair was in post and familiar with their responsibilities.</p> <p>BG reported that Lesley-Jane Eales-Reynolds, Lucy Watson and Rebecca Courtaux had recently resigned from the Corporation membership. In response to these vacancies, the GSR would like to recommend to the Corporation for approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the appointment of Dr David Cope, Director of Strategy and External Affairs at Kew Gardens to be a full independent member of the Corporation; • the appointment of Dayo Oduguwa as full independent member of the Corporation (currently a co-opted member)

	<p>David Cope's interest in being a governor had been brought to the attention of the GSR Committee. Appointment processes were undertaken including an interview with BG and RP. Copies of David's application form were available from the Clerk.</p> <p>BG also sought approval of the Corporation to the appointment of Neal Hook as Academic Staff Governor, and Cait Orton as Business Support Staff Governor. The election of the student governors was due to conclude that week and as such the new student governors would be appointed to the Corporation.</p> <p>These appointments were approved by the Corporation.</p>
8	<p>Finance and Resources Committee <i>(Minutes of the F&R meeting of 22 March and the Subcontractors Fees and Charges Policy was circulated in advance)</i></p> <p>This policy had been approved by the F&R Committee at its meeting on 22 March and as such were recommending it to the Corporation. The Policy demonstrated best use of existing resources, quality, and due diligence had been undertaken. The college had confidence in the contractors, two of which the college had contracted with previously.</p> <p>The Subcontractors Fees and Charges Policy was approved by the Corporation.</p>

D	For information / other
9	<p>Any other business RTS Accommodation/lease <i>(draft lease agreements and relevant documents had been circulated in advance)</i></p> <p>RG reported that the space to the left of the college reception, D corridor and part of the quad would be leased to Richmond Upon Thames School for a fixed period until 10 August 2018. Site works to decant and prepare the accommodation would take place from 27 June 2017 to 18 Aug 2017 after which the college's enrolment would start.</p> <p>Members commented that the references to VAT in the draft lease were contradictory and sought clarification on whether the college was due to pay the VAT. The extent of legal fees incurred in the drawing up of the lease was also queried. RG said that he would confirm the position on VAT following the meeting. The college had incurred limited legal costs in seeking advice to check the lease agreements which had been prepared by the Council's lawyers at their expense.</p> <p>It was expected that the new school building would be available from Aug 2018 for the school to move into. The vacated site would be able to be used by the college for a short time following this prior to the planned demolition of the existing college site depending on how rebuild plans were progressing at that time. The potential buyers of the site, which would redevelop it into residential housing were aware of the plans for the accommodation of the school and there were no issues with this currently. Members queried the position concerning the affordable housing as part of this residential land sale. RG reported that this had been</p>

	resolved through negotiations with relevant parties. RG reported that additional charges would be made to the school for use of some separate facilities as listed in the lease agreement and school dinners. Separate phone lines would also be installed.
	<p>Future Corporation Meetings</p> <p>Saturday 10 June – Corporation Workshop (Merits Restaurant)</p> <p>Wednesday 5 July 2016 6pm</p> <p>The meeting closed at 7.45pm.</p>

SIGNED: **Date:**

Barbara Gilgallon
Corporation Chair

Actions

Agenda Item	Task	Responsible	Position
7 Dec mtg	A governor to be nominated to attend student representation meetings	BG	
6	Members to provide any comments on the Risk Register to the Clerk	Members / Clerk	
9	RG to provide members with clarification on the VAT position in relation to the lease agreement with RTS	RG	Complete