

## East Coast College Corporation

### MINUTES of the meeting of the Standards Committee held at 5 pm on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2018 in the Conference room Great Yarmouth

<b>Present:</b>	Gwen Parsons (Chair) Tina Ellis (TE) Albert Cadmore (AC) Rob Evans (RE)) Debbie Pring (DP) Judy Nichols (JN) and Karen Knight (KK)	
<b>In attendance:</b>	Stella Raphael-Reeve Deputy Principal (SRR) Rachel Bunn Assistant Principal (RB) Kerry Payne Assistant Principal Higher Education and Access (KP) Nicki Lane Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support (NL) for items 6 and 10 and Wendy Stanger Director of Governance (WS)	
<b>S/18/3/1</b>	<b>Apologies and welcome</b>	
	Apologies were received from Stuart Rimmer (SR) Peter Lavender (PL) Michaela Kent (MK) and attendee Paul Padda Assistant Principal(PP)	
<b>S/18/3/2</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
	There were no declaration of interest.	
<b>S/18/3/3</b>	<b>To approve the Minutes of the designate meeting of the 20 February 2018 and any other matters raised previously not otherwise included in the Agenda</b>	
	The minutes were signed as a true record.	
	S/18/2/05 Governors challenged if the CPD for those teachers assessed as requires improvement had been carried out and how the impact of CPD was measured. The Deputy Principal advised that the CPD had been held and that workshops had also been held on what makes a good lesson outstanding. The impact of CPD would be observed through the learning walks and in the student survey feedback.	
<b>S/18/3/4</b>	<b>To review the post-meeting action log</b>	
	The action log was reviewed and noted.	
	S/17/10/11 Governors reiterated that the review of HE fees needed to be modelled as any changes in fee levels could have a detrimental effect on the business plan. Finance and General Purposes to consider modelling of various fee levels and the effect on the Business Plan.	
	S/17/12/08 Contribution rates will be considered during the curriculum planning and budget setting.	
<b>S/18/3/5</b>	<b>HE Update</b>	
	The Assistant Principal Higher Education and Access (APHEA) presented the report and circulated an updated QIP. This had been updated following yesterday's Academic Committee.	
	Governors challenged whether the attrition rate had improved. The APHEA advised that it was lower than previous years continuing the trend of improvement, though Universal Credit had had a negative effect.	
	Governors challenged the reason for the improved attrition rate. The APHEA advised that this was due to the better induction programme and the Universities changes to the assessment system.	

SE

SE/SR  
R

Governors commented that it was important to retain students given that we had not met our business plan target for recruitment. The APHEA advised that the Universities target had been met but this was not consistent with the Business Plan. As part of the curriculum planning process a realistic 3 year projection for HE had been produced and this was being fed into the budgeting process.

Governors challenged the reason for the large difference between recruitment at the campuses. The APHEA advised that the Great Yarmouth Campus had previously had more curriculum development; this work was now taking place with the courses offered at the Lowestoft Campus. Improvements had also been made at the Lowestoft Campus to the facilities.

Governors challenged if the degree apprenticeships could have a detrimental effect on the HE offer. The APHEA advised that the Business Management degree apprenticeship currently being developed in is in an area not covered by the HE offer. This apprenticeship is due to be validated in June.

Governors challenged how it was assured that the quality of the teaching and learning was good and that the student received a good experience. The APHEA advised that the quality was reviewed through Peer Observations, student surveys, Course representatives and students groups. These all fed into the QIP that addressed any issues that required improvement. One issue that could affect the quality was the inability to recruit suitably qualified staff. Governors discussed alternative ways to recruit staff, such as use of adverts in industry standard magazines and national job shows.

Governors challenged what work was being carried out with Lowestoft Sixth. The APHEA advised that a visit had been carried out pre-Christmas and that after Easter a member of the HE team would be based on site on a set day. The Principal had also identified those students that had not yet identified a positive destination and the HE team would be contacting them and inviting them to FE to HE lunches.

Governors challenged if the HE Champions had been successful. The APHEA advised that it was too early to assess if they had made an impact. It was raised that there was a need to target students at an earlier stage.

Governors raised that our own staff may be an untapped market for the HE offer and that staff needed to be made aware of what the Colleges' HE offer covered.

**Governors noted the report and agreed the following actions:**

- **Next report to include a report on the quality of the teaching and learning including Peer Observation report and an**
- **Update on changes to HEFECE and the Office for Students.**

KP

**S/18/3/6 Safeguarding**

The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support (APSW) presented the term 2 update.

Governors challenged why there had been an increase in referrals. The APSWS advised that this was mainly due to now having a Safeguarding Co-Ordinator on each campus which has raised the profile of the service and enabled the Co-Ordinator to spend more time with staff and students.

Governors challenged the reason for the Prevent referral reduction. The APSWS advised that this was due to a better understanding of when referrals should be made.

Governors challenged the reason for the increase in mental health referrals. The APSWS advised that it was a reflection of the reduction in mental health services with the resultant longer waiting lists. We are increasingly supporting students with specialist or targeted support and due to this are likely to refer more than once. Education has been recognised as a key area for mental health support and Mental Health Champions are being introduced. Support was also being offered to the students by students from the HE Counselling course.

Governors challenged what additional support was offered during the times of stress like exams. The APSWS advised that at these times additional support is offered and parents of 16/17 year old students are texted to advise them of the exam dates so that they can request additional support for their child.

Governors challenged what 'missing from education' meant. The APSWS advised that this is where they have not withdrawn from the course but have not attended and we do not know where they are. This has been added at the request of the Norfolk Safeguarding team.

Governors challenged what additional support was offered to Looked After Children. The APSWS advised that prior to enrolment the team worked with the students and social workers to help ensure that they were prepared for college.

Governors discussed whether the curriculum offer was appropriate for those with additional support needs and whether consideration could be given to offering a modular curriculum so that awards could be achieved even if the full course was not completed. It was also suggested that, for courses where tutors were harder to recruit, their support role could be covered by a tutor from a different area. This would need to be commenced at the start of the course so that relationships could be built.

Governors commented that the service offered was good and that the services had been merged well with a cross college approach. The Link Governor for Safeguarding advised that he had recently held a link meeting with the team and had been impressed with all the work and support that was offered. The changes to the categories of referrals were appropriate and the data produced meant that internal benchmarking moving forward would be consistent and appropriate.

**Governors agreed the following action:**

- **Next update to reflect on the mitigation in the risk register and whether it had reduced the risk.**

**S/18/3/7**

**Recruitment and Retention**

The Deputy Principal presented the report. Active applicants were 1318. The applicant analysis by course included students that had made multiple applications. For current students forecasting achievements using 'BRAG' rating has been introduced for each student. Each Tutor is rating their students as:  
Green – Will pass  
Amber – Will pass with extra help  
Red – Will not pass.  
Support will be focused on those rated as amber.

<p>Governors challenged if offers were conditional. The Assistant Principal advised that the offers were made by subject area as a result of the taster days and with the level of study decided at enrolment taking into account GCSE results.</p> <p>Governors challenged what additional recruitment activity was taking place. The Deputy Principal advised that the new key areas at risk were being analysed to see what alternative provision could be provided. A new Marketing Manager was commencing on 16/4, a 2 page spread was due shortly in the paper and school visits were ongoing. One school was allowing the college to have its own room at the school where taster sessions and interviews would be held. It was hoped to roll this out to other schools. The Assistant Principal advised that a careers' market place was to be held at Lowestoft Campus with transport provided from the Great Yarmouth campus. This would include taster sessions.</p> <p>Governors noted the improved retention and challenged why it had improved. The Deputy Principal advised that tight controls had been put in place with all at risk students monitored and supported. Intensive care reviews had also reviewed retention in detail and there were now only 6 courses still under intensive care.</p> <p>Governors challenged what the current predicted outturn retention would be. The Deputy Principal advised that this was 82.6% which was increase of 5%. Governors commented that there was also a need to measure progress and the added value that students had achieved.</p> <p><b>Governors noted the report and agreed the following actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Progress and added value report to the next Standards Committee.</b></li> <li>• <b>Retention in year report to include the actual national rate rather than the difference to ECC rate.</b></li> <li>• <b>Clarification to be provided between the Mides In-Year retention analysis and the College's retention figure.</b></li> </ul> <p>DP and RB left the meeting.</p>	<p><b>SRR</b></p>	
<p><b>S/18/3/8</b></p>	<p><b>SCIF Bid Update and Programme of Work</b></p>	
<p>The Deputy Principal presented the report that set out the programme of work. The bid was successful in round 2 as this was later than expected the funding has been extended to October half term. The work will be supported by Grimsby College, who are rated Outstanding. Each project will have its own action plan. The Curriculum Managers are due to visit Grimsby shortly to commence the project.</p> <p>Governors congratulated the College on being awarded the funding, the bid was very good and would help to achieve a culture of high expectations.</p> <p><b>Governors noted the report and agreed the following actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ambitious expectations to be changed to a culture of high expectations and</b></li> <li>• <b>Action plans for the projects to be shared with Governors.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>SRR</b></p>	
<p><b>S/18/3/9</b></p>	<p><b>OFSTED Support &amp; Challenge and preparation for OFSTED</b></p>	
<p>The Deputy Principal presented the report which detailed actions taken by the College against each area raised by the support and challenge visit.</p> <p>Governors challenged what evidence there was there that CPD had improved. The Deputy Principal advised that a programme of CPD had been arranged that was linked to the actions points raised in the learning walks. Subsequent to the CPD the number of action points raised had reduced.</p>		

<p>Governors challenged that the report contained lots of positive actions but there was a need for governors to have evidence that improvements had been made.</p> <p><b>Governors noted the report and agreed the following actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Each of the Ofsted Heading to have included the measures and data reports that would evidence improvement.</b></li> </ul>	<b>SRR</b>	
<b>S/18/3/10</b>	<b>Student Survey – In Year</b>	
<p>(This report was taken after item 6)</p> <p>The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support (APSW) and Deputy Principal presented the Survey results. 3 student surveys are carried out annually. This survey had a response rate of 95% compared to the induction survey of 69%. The end of year survey takes place in May. These surveys are supplemented by the other learner voice activity. Results from the survey showed that the College was in the top quartile for ‘the teaching on my course is good’. The biggest areas of concern were regarding use of Moodle and IT skills</p> <p>Governors challenged how the survey results were addressed in the College. The APSWS advised that each team member in support services receive the survey results for their area to address. If there were any course specific issues these were dealt with by the course tutor. The SCIF bid will help to address the biggest areas of concern as there will be support to improve the digital learning expertise.</p> <p>Governors challenged what action was being taken to address students’ awareness of HE and Apprenticeships. The APSWS advised that this was mainly in levels 1 and 2 and focussed work will increase with all groups in term 3 in relation to destinations and progression.</p> <p>Governors challenged the reasons why students felt unsafe. The APSWS advised that this was generally to do with issues outside college. Additional activities were already taken place to address this.</p> <p>Governors challenged what work was taking place to ensure radicalisation and British values were understood. The APSWS advised that British values had been mapped to the college values and were on display in the classrooms. Additional tutorials on building positive communities were to be held and a refresh of understanding on radicalisation and extremism.</p> <p>Governors challenged if there was an issue with right wing activity. The APSWS advised that there were some issues and the relevant groups and websites had been banned.</p>		
<b>S/18/3/11</b>	<b>Curriculum Planning</b>	
<p>The Deputy Principal presented the report. The proposed changes to the Curriculum have not yet been confirmed and will be considered further in round 3 of the curriculum planning process. Governors previously agreed that the curriculum offer needed to be revised based on affordability of deliverable quality and viability. The market share analysis included with the papers will, along with application and recruitment numbers, support the decisions and changes to the curriculum.</p> <p>Governors challenged if there was any reputational risk in reducing the curriculum. The Deputy Principal advised that the changes proposed were mainly consolidation and centralising provision on one site to ensure healthy group sizes. All students would be signposted to relevant alternative provision.</p>		

<p>Governors commented that there was a need to address the perceived transport difficulties if curriculum was only offered at one campus and consideration needed to be given to providing transport.</p> <p>Governors challenged if it was feasible to base all work based learning on one site. The Deputy Principal clarified that this was per subject and would have to take into account employer location. The risk currently to work based learning was recruitment of assessors and alternatives were being looked at to address this issue.</p> <p><b>Governors resolved to note the report.</b></p>		
<b>S/18/3/12</b>	<b>Agenda planning</b>	
<p>Curriculum Planning  SCIF Update and action plans  OFSTED Evidence report  Level 3 progress to date</p>		
<b>S/18/3/13</b>	<b>Review of Meeting</b>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confidential Items. Curriculum planning implications for staff.</li> <li>2. Risk Management: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment: HE Fee review.</li> <li>3. Equality &amp; Diversity: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment. Need to consider effect of curriculum changes. E&amp;D to be considered when proposals for Nursery received.</li> <li>4. Health &amp; Safety: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment: None</li> <li>5. Media: any issues discussed to inform local media – Need to get more positive messages out to local media re Students’ work and celebrate their successes.</li> <li>6. How did the meeting go – Good detailed discussion  General discussion held about how the Standards Committee could be more efficient and focused. Ideas included each Governor being responsible for 1 of the reports, splitting the Standards Committee into sub-groups, having additional meetings and theming each Standards Committee. The Director of Governance advised that the role and remit of the Standards Committee would be considered during the merger with Lowestoft Sixth Form.</li> </ol>	
<b>S/18/3/14</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
	12 June 5pm	