

## East Coast College Corporation

### MINUTES of the meeting of the Standards Committee held at 9am on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2020 Video Conference

<b>Present:</b>	Peter Lavender Chair (PL) Rob Evans (RE) Albert Cadmore (AC) Tina Ellis (TE) Roger Cracknell (RC) Gemma Head (GH) and Stuart Rimmer - Principal (SR)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Paul Padda Vice Principal (PP) Wendy Stanger Director of Governance (WS) and Nikki Lane Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support (NL)
<b>S/20/10/1</b>	<b>Apologies and Membership</b>
	Apologies were received from Debbie Pring (DP) and Andrew Timberlake (AT)
<b>S/20/10/2</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>
	There were no declarations of interest.
<b>S/20/10/3</b>	<b>To approve the Minutes of the meeting of the 30 6 20 and any other matters raised previously not otherwise included in the Agenda</b>
	The minutes were agreed as a true record.
<b>S/20/10/4</b>	<b>Rolling Action Log</b>
	<p>The action log was reviewed.</p> <p>12 11 19 S/19/11/6 - The Director of Governance advised that the only open action was Governor Learning Walks and these would need to be reviewed in light of Covid. She advised that some Colleges were carrying out virtual learning walks.</p> <p>Governors noted that observations were not a neutral act and change the social dynamics in the room.</p> <p>The Principal advised that the Unions had asked for a review of all types of observations and Governor Walkthroughs should be covered in this review.</p>
<b>S/20/10/5</b>	<b>Draft SAR and QIP</b>
	<p>The Deputy Principal presented the draft SAR and QIP. This was draft and may be amended following the SAR validation meetings. The format has been changed so that it reflected the learner journey as well as the EIF with the year split into pre and post Covid. Full Cost delivery has been included but HE excluded as they have their own quality review mechanism. Decisions had been taken based on proportionality and the overall assessment for the College was a good. Actions required to improve had been detailed in the QIP.</p> <p>Governors commented that it was a very honest and thorough assessment. Using the learner journey as a structure the SAR highlighted issues that needed to change to ensure a good learner experience.</p> <p>Governors discussed how inductions could be improved. The Deputy Principal advised that too often inductions were rushed and time wasn't taken to ensure that the learner had the skills to learn. There was a need to ensure that the gold induction standards were used by all including EPYP, adult learners and apprentices. If students didn't get the study skills they needed at the start it had a detrimental effect on the whole of their learner journey. This year '10 minute takeovers' were being used to quality check what was happening and the gold induction standards had been relaunched.</p> <p>Governors challenged how recruitment had worked virtually. The Deputy Principal advised that this had worked well and this year had seen far less withdrawals and movement out of subject areas. Interviews had been set up quicker and accessed virtually. Through improving school liaison and keeping schools advised of what we</p>

were doing schools had been better enabled to advise their students. Recruitment for 2021 had commenced and this included an improved school presentation and video presentation.

Governors discussed the programme of 'full cost' recovery provision and queried why this had been assessed as a grade 3. The Deputy Principal advised that this covered maritime and commercial and the quality of the provision was not good enough. Recruitment in these areas had been significantly affected by Covid and there was a need to look at both growing and diversifying the market and the offer.

Governors discussed the apprenticeship provision in detail and whether it should be assessed as a 3 or a 4. The following points were raised:

- Apprenticeships were graded a 3 by Ofsted – had the service improved or dropped subsequently?
- Would grading apprenticeships as 4 be useful to focus the urgent need to improve, or would it be seen as too harsh?
- Covid shouldn't be seen as an excuse but may be a reason for slow progress
- We need to ascertain what's wrong, what's the plan to address it, and to ensure that the appropriate leadership and management was in place – it would appear that root causes were not being tackled quickly enough
- Was there a need to ensure that accountability was all in one place? - The provision was currently serviced by curriculum areas and vocational trainers
- The external world is now tougher and in a competitive market we need a quality offer
- Employer's experience needs improving and communication improved between the employer, the apprentice and the College
- Could 'secret shoppers' be used to test the system?
- Should we continue to provide provision if it's not of sufficient quality?
- Fudging of issues needed to stop and clear actions put in place for improvements

The Deputy Principal advised that apprenticeships were part of the new 'support to improve' system where the provision and support areas met to help improve and ensure that there were no blockages to that improvement.

Governors concluded that apprentices should be proposed as a 4 due to:

- Poor initial assessment and starting point for apprentices which then had a detrimental effect on milestones and progression
- No clear ownership of the entire apprenticeship journey and how it was quality assured
- Disconnect between vocational trainers and reluctance to accept teaching and learning as part of their role
- A lack of long term planning

It was recognised that improvement required the support of multiple areas of the College. This assessment would be reviewed at the Apprenticeships' SAR Validation.

Governors commented that as a College there was a need to assess:

- Do we know what we want people to do?
- Do they have the skills to do it?
- If need upskilling – upskill them and then check if that's worked
- Are they complying with what we want them to do? And
- What's our response if they don't comply?

	<p>The Deputy Principal advised that the managing of underperformance has been highlighted as an issue in the SAR and this required strong leadership to ensure that action was taken. Governors challenged whether provision should continue when the same grade 3/4 assessment is made annually and the same reasons provided.</p> <p>Governors challenged if the College's digital learning required improving. The Deputy Principal advised that it had been highlighted by Covid that the College's approach to digital learning needed improving and this was to be led by a new post of Digital Manager. The College was also being supported to improve in this area by Grimsby College.</p> <p>Governors discussed if the current curriculum offer needed review given that Covid had changed the landscape and impacted on learners and employers. The Deputy Principal commented that there was a need to consider community and employer needs and revise the curriculum in light of these.</p> <p>Governors challenged if the College had the competence and capacity to achieve outstanding. The Deputy Principal advised that some changes were needed in roles to ensure compliance and monitor quality. The College didn't have enough outstanding thinking to be able to deliver first time and manager's skills sets needed improving. Management development was being put in place such as ETF Training for Middle Managers and Stepping into Leadership Programme with Dudley College.</p> <p>Governors commented that we needed to be tough on ourselves and on our assessment to achieve outstanding. Currently we needed to consolidate the good across the College and improve those that were falling below good.</p> <p><b>Governors agreed the following action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QIP to be reviewed to ensure that it was clear on the root causes in relation to apprenticeships.</li> <li>• SAR to be finalised after the SAR Validations for November's Corporation.</li> </ul>	<p>PP PP</p>
<p>S/20/10/6</p>	<p>Quality Update</p>	
	<p>The Deputy Principal presented the update. Enrolment targets had been met across the majority of income streams. Learners had been pleased to return to learn on campus and behaviour and compliance with Covid rules and bubbles had been good. Attendance had been lower than previous years and this had been affected adversely by Covid.</p> <p>The Committee congratulated the College on the excellent A Level results, which were in the top 1% nationally and noted that progression to University had increased.</p> <p>Governors challenged if apprenticeship recruitment had been lower due to Covid. The Deputy Principal advised that it had reduced but not to the extent expected and demand was still there.</p> <p>Governors challenged how non-completers had effected success rates. The Deputy Principal advised that there was circa 300 learners who were not able to complete their qualification due to covid and had therefore not been included. These were being supported to complete this year. Apprenticeships achievements have declined and this was due to withdrawals from apprentices that started their qualifications a number of years ago, many who were already out of time (plumbing and electrical). The College made to decision to withdraw these now as the learners made little progress in the last academic year.</p>	

<p>Governors challenged why the construction curriculum areas were underperforming. The Deputy Principal advised that these has been effected by not having appropriate staffing including assessors. Staff had now been recruited from the trades and were being developed as teachers. A new scheme had been introduced to help with this development which included shadowing and a reduced teaching load. They would also need to complete the assessor qualification before they could assess.</p> <p>Governors discussed the quality assurance processes. Managing under performance needed to improve and all needed to recognise the damage that ineffective teaching could cause. Strong intervention was needed with tough but fair individual coaching.</p> <p>Governors discussed the performance of maths and English and how this could be improved and it was agreed that this would be looked at in detail with the new curriculum manager for maths and English at December's Standards meeting.</p> <p><b>Governors agreed the following action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Quality assurance update report to December's Standards meeting.</b></li> <li>• <b>Review of Maths and English at December's Standards meeting.</b></li> </ul>		<p>PP PP/HC</p>
<b>S/20/10/7</b>	<b>Safeguarding and Prevent Update</b>	
<p>The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support presented the update which was as at September 20. December's Standards meeting would receive term 1s report. The sharp rise in referrals in Great Yarmouth was due to schools referring at an early stage. The College had achieved Tick Young Carers Award for Education and had secured two UEA Developmental Psychology student placements 20/21 to offer mentoring support for students at risk of not engaging.</p> <p>Governors challenged what the main area for referral was. The Assistant Principal advised this was mental health and this wasn't unexpected given the effect of Covid. Suicidal intent and attempts are at risk of an upward trend compared to a decrease in 19/20 and this links to what partners are experiencing.</p> <p>Governors challenged how the UEA placements were working and if other mentoring support was being considered. The Assistant Principal advised that the placements were working well and each had a student caseload to mentor. In addition they were mapping provision to ensure that no partners had been missed and working on a loneliness project. The UEA had already been approached to extend the project and a project with retired professionals to act as mentors was also being looked into.</p> <p>Governors challenged how the safeguarding team were preparing for another potential lock down. The Assistant Principal advised that a vulnerable list was in place and each person on it had an allocated person to check on them. The College is also working with its partners and keeping them informed on actions taken. Communication with apprentices needs improving and this would be a concern if we went into lockdown.</p> <p>The Committee thanked the Assistant Principal for a comprehensive report.</p>		
<b>S/20/10/7.1</b>	<b>Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy and Procedure</b>	
<p>The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support presented the reviewed policy and procedure. This had been updated to be reflective of Keeping Children Safe in Education September 2020 and for areas such as contextual safeguarding, Extra-familiar abuse and FGM.</p>		

	<p>Governors challenged how it was ensured that staff were aware of the changes. The Assistant Principal advised that a video update had been recorded <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q9Q9kJHuHw0&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q9Q9kJHuHw0&amp;feature=youtu.be</a> and shared with all staff through the professional learning day and on smartlog. The safeguarding team also meet with all teams in term 1 to update them on safeguarding including policy changes.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved to recommend the revised Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy and Procedure to Corporation for adoption</b></p>	
<p><b>S/20/10/8</b></p>	<p><b>Annual Complaints Report</b></p>	
	<p>The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support presented the annual complaints report. This set out complaints received, level of complaint and area, together with resolution timescale and lessons learnt. The majority of complaints related to provision and were in the low level category.</p> <p>Governors challenged what area had the highest level of complaints and what this related to. The Assistant Principal advised that this was Apprenticeships with complaints focussed on the construction area and were due to the quality of teaching and historical issues with internal quality assurance, which has delayed certification. The Principal advised that complaints also escalated where communication broke down or the apprentice and the employer were not kept informed.</p> <p>The Committee concluded that the annual report was useful and agreed that in future years it should include compliments too so as to give a balanced view.</p>	
<p><b>S/20/10/9</b></p>	<p><b>Student Union Constitution</b></p>	
	<p>The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support presented the revised constitution which had been updated to reflect the Student Sabbatical position. This would be a part time position elected by students with the Sabbatical elections to take place on 12/11. There were 3 candidates from different areas from within the College.</p> <p>Governors commented that the position of student sabbatical was a very exciting development and rare for a FE College and when appointed needed to be covered in our marketing.</p> <p>The Director of Governance advised that the sabbatical would also be the Student Governor. Support and training was being provided through Unloc and AOC East to ensure that the Sabbatical understood the role and were developed in it.</p> <p>Governors challenged why the position had been restricted to a level 3 and above. The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support advised that this was based on guidance from NUS as it had been found that below level 3 the student was not work ready. All other student union positions would be open to any level.</p> <p>Governors agreed a minor editorial change in the Financial Regulations 4.9 to include the word 'reasonable' before 'expenses'.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved to approve:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Student Union Constitution 20/21.</b></li> </ul>	

<b>S/20/10/10</b>	<b>Policies Reviewed with no major changes</b>	
<b>S/20/10/10.1</b>	<b>Careers Strategy 20/21</b>	
<b>S/20/10/10.2</b>	<b>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy and Single Equality Scheme</b>	
<p>The Assistant Principal Student Wellbeing and Support presented the policies and advised that there had been no major changes in this review.</p> <p>The Principal advised that there was a need to review the impact assessments used.</p> <p><b>The Committee resolved to approve:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the <b>Careers Strategy 20/21</b> and</li> <li>• the <b>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy and Single Equality Scheme</b></li> </ul>		
<b>S/20/10/11</b>	<b>Risk Register</b>	
<p>SR and RE left the meeting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the risk register been reviewed The Committee noted that the risk register has been reviewed and that the newly introduced summary page was a helpful addition.</li> <li>2. Is the Committee content that the risks are relevant and are being updated The committee commented that the current risks are relevant and suggested that the quality issues around maritime should be considered for inclusion.</li> <li>3. Is the Committee content that the risks are being mitigated The Committee noted that the agenda items at the meeting detailed risk mitigation being taken.</li> <li>4. Where a red risk, is the Committee assured that appropriate action is being taken Red risk – Apprentices. The actions there were being taken to improve and mitigate this risk had been covered in detail in agenda item 5 SAR and QIP and item 7 Quality Update</li> <li>5. Where does the Committee have significant concerns. The quality of apprenticeship provision is a significant concern. The reports considered at the meeting had detailed how this was being addressed and robust and timely action was required to achieve improvements.</li> </ol> <p>GH left the meeting</p>		
<b>S/20/10/12</b>	<b>Committee's Self-Assessment</b>	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the Committee's self-assessment which had been considered by the Governance Remuneration and Search Committee as part of the Governance SAR. She advised that the issues raised were being addressed. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment of additional Governors.</li> <li>• All SAR validations to have 2 Governors in attendance.</li> <li>• Additional training on the dashboard to be arranged.</li> <li>• Senior team encouraged to write succinct reports that set out the issues, risks and actions required and</li> <li>• Development of the learner voice.</li> </ul>		

<b>S/20/10/13</b>	<b>Agenda planning</b>	
Maths and English December Quality Assurance Update - December		
<b>S/20/10/14</b>	<b>Review of Meeting</b>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confidential Items: none</li> <li>2. Risk Management: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment: quality of maritime provision</li> <li>3. Equality &amp; Diversity: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment: none</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: Student sabbatical appointment</li> <li>6. How did the meeting go: An important meeting with really helpful debate on quality improvement with all attendees contributing.</li> </ol>	
<b>Dates of Next Meetings</b>		
	8/12/20 23/3/21 29/6/21	