

CORPORATION BOARD of RICHMOND UPON THAMES COLLEGE
Minutes of Curriculum Standards and Quality Committee Meeting
17 November 2015 at 5.30pm

Members Present: Barbara Gilgallon (Chair), Cathy Bird, Sally Newton, Gareth Watts, Darren Keenan, Rob Pope (arrived 6.10pm)

In attendance: Clare Thornes (Clerk), John O'Shea, Jeff Lindsay

A	PROCEDURAL
1	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies were received and accepted from Robin Ghurbhurun and Sheila Nuttall.</p>
2	<p>(i) Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items – none.</p> <p>(ii) Requests for discussion of 'Grey box items' (for information only) – none.</p>
3	<p>Approve Minutes of the Curriculum Quality and Standards Committee Meeting held on 12 May 2015</p> <p>i. The Minutes were agreed to be an accurate record and approved.</p> <p>ii. Matters arising: 14-16 Links – JOS said that he is working with Kingston College and the Local Authority on timetabling.</p> <p>Action: JOS to provide update on 14-16 links to the next CQS meeting.</p>

B	STRATEGIC / QUALITY ISSUES
4	<p>College Self-Assessment Report ('SAR') <i>(Draft 3 of the SAR was tabled at the meeting).</i></p> <p>The committee felt that the SAR is honest, thorough, detailed and very well written. It gave confidence that issues have been explored and interrogated, and clearly also gave confidence to the Ofsted Inspectors.</p> <p>The length and depth of the SAR has varied over the last few years. Ofsted do not prescribe the format, save that it should be aligned with the inspection framework. The current SAR is more analytical than previous years' versions.</p> <p>Agreed: to recommend the SAR to the Corporation.</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>College Quality Improvement Plan ('QIP') <i>(the latest version of the QIP was tabled at the meeting)</i></p> <p>This QIP is a high level 'overview' document, and does not go into detail of actions. Members expressed disappointment that they could not see from the document how the improvements are going to be achieved. The document would be better described as a list of strategic intentions.</p> <p>There is overlap in many areas – for example, the drive for improved attendance, and increased use of ProMonitor by staff – are mentioned several times. It was noted that this is because these factors are integral to the key improvement, which is to increase in Success Rates.</p> <p>JOS and JL explained that 13 Area QIPS will underlie the College QIP, and are more detailed. They invited the CQS Committee to request the Area QIPS, and reports on the impact achieved, for future meetings.</p> <p><i>Q: Is there a separate Ofsted action plan?</i> Yes, but it is basically the same as the College QIP with a few tweaks.</p> <p><i>Q: How are concerns over staff underperformance being addressed? There has historically been a particular issue with agency staff.</i> Yes, and the issue remains, though it is actually relatively small. The number of staff on informal capability will be reported to the F&R Committee.</p> <p><i>Q: Are ALPS and/or ALIS going to be reintroduced?</i> [ALPS = A Level Performance System; ALIS = A Level Information System] Currently, College does its own Level 3 value-added calculations, based on government data. Subscriptions to ALPS and ALIS were stopped a few years ago for financial reasons. The subscription to ALPS is about to be reinstated.</p> <p>Once College re-subscribes to ALPS, it will be entitled to two sets of data a year (i) per student predicted grades, based on student entry qualifications, and (ii) VA data based on actual results. ALPS also provides advice on CPD and how data can be used throughout the year with staff and students, to enable to obtain best value from the data.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>College Risk Register</p> <p>An extract of the College Risk Register had been circulated in advance. It includes all risks assigned to the CQS committee, and will be circulated to every meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that overview of the risks enables the committee to check that it is setting appropriate Agendas.</p> <p>Agreed: After a brief discussion, it was agreed that in the future, the CQS Extract should include all risks where the Gross Risk is High (regardless of the Residual Risk), and any risks where the Residual Risk is Medium.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>CQS Committee Self-Assessment For information only.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the Terms of Reference and Committee self-assessment process will be revisited in early 2016, with a view to consistency of approach across all committees.</p>

--	--

C	TEACHING AND LEARNING
8	<p>College KPIs (The KPIs had been circulated in advance)</p> <p><i>Q: How are the target figures calculated (for example, for KPI F 'AS Level 16-18 (all ages)', the target is 75%, compared to an Actual Result for 2014/15 of 66.8%, and national average for 2014/15 of 80.3%)</i></p> <p>The target figure is derived from benchmarks, predicted grades and the national average. The aim is to be realistic. An improvement of, say 15% in AS, would not be realistic or achievable.</p> <p>JOS drew members' attention to the improvement seen already this year in attendance and retention. In November 2014, they were 84% and 98% respectively. For November 2015, the figures are 89.7% and 99.8%.</p>
9	<p>Student Outcomes / Value Added (A report was tabled at the meeting – it had been previously circulated by email)</p> <p>It was noted that for both AS and A Level results, the VA is significantly Below Average. Although the results for vocational results are slightly better, they are still also largely Below Average. JL noted that he had carried out a VA analysis for Ofsted of the 2014/15 results, and this had shown a small improvement.</p> <p><i>Q: For 2014/15, how can it be explained that VA is improved, when the SR is down?</i> This needs further analysis, but the drop in SR for AS Level is not statistically significant. Once ALPS is reinstalled, it will enable better understanding of the data.</p> <p>The Staff governor added some context around the drop in A Level SR. The average target grade for an RuTC student is now a 'D'; an actual result two grades below the target means that a student is viewed as unsuccessful. Previously, RuTC students may have been predicted a grade 'B' – a drop of two grades would lead to a 'D', which would be still be regarded as successful. He noted that, for staff, it is just as satisfying to help a student to achieve the 'D' as it was formerly to help a student achieve a 'B'. However, it is difficult to fight the perception that staff and students are not doing as well as previously.</p>
10	<p>Confidential Item</p> <p>i. Predicted Grades – please see Confidential Minute</p> <p>i. AS KPIs</p> <p>Members proposed some KPIs, relating to AS teaching, to be added to the College KPIs.</p> <p style="background-color: yellow;">Action: meeting to be scheduled to fine-tune the KPIs</p>
11	<p>Areas for T&L Intervention</p>

	For information only – noted.
12	<p>Data</p> <p>Some governors are already using MIS Live. However, they cannot access ProMonitor and MarkBook. Danny Volovsek to be asked to give a live demonstration of these tools, with real data, at the Corporation Board meeting on 2nd December.</p> <p>Action: CT to speak to Danny Volovsek</p>

D	THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE
13	<p>Student Surveys</p> <p>The student survey on enrolment and induction closed on Friday (13th Nov). The initial analysis suggests rather negative results; similar to those of the equivalent survey in 2014. The data will be fully analysed and disseminated to teaching teams later this term.</p> <p>Jeff Lindsay and Clare Dignum interviewed 60 students about their initial experiences of college. The interviews provided an overwhelmingly positive impression, which is in contrast to the computer-input student survey. A summary of figures on ‘Happy Sheets’ was tabled, which corroborated the positive impression formed from the face-to-face interviews.</p> <p>Work needs to be done on the student survey process to examine why different methods of survey produced such contrasting results. Perhaps students need clearer instructions on how to fill out surveys, or teachers and tutors should guide students through the process.</p>
14	<p>Complaints</p> <p>For information only and noted.</p>
15	<p>Internal progression</p> <p>JOS stated that for 2014/15, Level 3 progression – at 65.3% - was disappointing. In 2011/12, the figure stood at 83.5%. However, the percentage of students progressing from Level 3 should improve with the tightening of entry requirements. It would be good to see improvement in the progression from Level 1-2 and Level 2-3.</p>
16	<p>Leaver’s Destinations</p> <p>For information only – noted.</p>

E	OTHER
17	<p>Any other business</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Governor Link Scheme</u>. The Chair would like to reintroduce Governor Links. Initially, this would entail CQS governors being linked to Curriculum Directors. Subsequently the scheme could be extended to include governors not on the CQS Committee. The Chair noted that the purpose is

	<p>to inform governors, not to interrogate staff.</p> <p>Action: Draft a protocol for proposed Governor Link scheme, for discussion with JOS and CDs</p> <p>2. <u>Additional CQS meeting</u>. In 2014/15 there were four CQS meetings, with a second meeting held in the spring term to focus on performance. It was agreed that an additional meeting would be added to the spring 2015 calendar. The existing meeting on 10th February would be allocated to looking at data from the third assessment point (w/c 8th February), with possible attendance by curriculum directors.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to set a date for additional spring term CQS meeting</p>
10	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Wednesday 10th February 2016 [Additional spring term date to be determined] Wednesday 11th May 2016</p> <p>The meeting closed at 7.30pm.</p>

SIGNED: **Date:**

Actions

Ref	Agenda Item	Task	Responsible
A	3(ii)	JOS to provide update on 14-16 links to the next CQS meeting.	JOS
B	10	Arrange meeting to fine-tune the AS KPIs	CT
C	12	Ask Danny Volovsek to present ProMonitor and Markbook to Corporation Board 2 nd December	CT
D	17	Add second spring term meeting to CQS calendar	CT
E	10	Check why method of bursary payment changed, and whether there is any scope to return to weekly payments	JOS