

East Coast College Corporation

MINUTES of the meeting of the Quality and Standards Committee held at 9am on Tuesday 4 October 2022 on video conference

Present:	Peter Lavender Chair (PL) Roland Kaye (RK) Andrew Timberlake (AT) and Stuart Rimmer (CEO/Principal) (SR)	
In attendance:	Paul Padda (Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience) (PP) Wendy Stanger (Director of Governance) (WS) and for items 1 – 7 Holly Chase Assistant Principal (HC)	
S/22/10/1	Apologies and Membership	
	Apologies were received from Tina Ellis (TE) and Kirk Lower (KL). The Chair apologised for the meeting which had to be moved to a video conference for logistical reasons.	
S/22/10/2	Declarations of Interest	
	There were no declarations of interest.	
S/22/10/3	To approve the Minutes of the meeting of the 28 6 22 and any other matters raised previously not otherwise included in the Agenda	
	The minutes of 28 6 22 were agreed as a true record.	
S/22/10/4	Rolling Action Log	
	The action log was reviewed and a discussion held on improving the Governors' knowledge of the College through both formal and informal visits and links. Holding meetings virtually had led to a disconnect with the College and this needed to be addressed.	
	Governors agreed the following action:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Team to draw up a schedule of opportunities for Governor interaction with staff and students. 	
	SR	
S/22/10/5	To review Annual Draft SAR and recommend it to the Corporation	
S/22/10/5.1	To review the Quality Improvement Plan	
	<p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience presented the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and advised that following the curriculum area SAR validations there was a need to reassess the grading. There were areas that were solid good to outstanding and these had a clear picture and analysis of their teaching, learning and achievement, knew their impact and intent, were achieving good achievement rates and positive progressions. However, proportionally there was too much provision that did not have this.</p> <p>The CEO advised that the Senior Management Group had reassessed the grades both at curriculum area and overall and were looking at moderating a few of the grades down.</p> <p>Governors agreed that there needed to be a cautious approach that looked at the proportionality of the curriculum portfolio in assessing the grade. Rapid improvement had to be seen in year and there should be re-assessment of performance in year.</p> <p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience advised that a programme of internal and external deep dives was to be put in place commencing this term. They would consider intent, impact and implementation to secure rapid improvement.</p> <p>Governors discussed apprenticeships. This had been subject to review and audit and now needed time to embed the changes. The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner</p>	

<p>Experience advised that Engineering, which was one of the largest areas for apprenticeships, would be subject to a deep dive after term one and this would include assessment of the impact the changes had made. AT joined the meeting</p> <p>Governors discussed that there needed to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement in Curriculum Managers' critical thinking and forensic analysis of their area's performance, and demonstration of clear curriculum intent. This development needed to be supported by the College. • Training for managers so that they were able to produce succinct reports with clear evidence to support a judgement. • A review of the SAR paperwork used to ensure that it was fit for purpose and aided the self-assessment. • Continual self-assessment rather than an annual process. • The SAR's focus needed to be on the quality of education, ie teaching and learning, assessment and achievement (success) that demonstrated student-centred independent learning. • Sharing of good practise in the SAR reporting between the curriculum managers. • Improvement in employer engagement and understanding of the market. • A real analysis of progression and destinations and how the College had impacted on this. <p>The Director of Governance advised that the Governance Self-Assessment was to be reviewed in light of the College's self-assessment grading.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassessment of College self-assessment after term one. • Termly update of the Ofsted position statement. • Review of the SAR paperwork to ensure that it was fit for purpose. <p>The Committee agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed grading was appropriate and recommended it to Corporation for approval <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted that there would be a full review of the self-assessment and gradings at the October Board. 		PP PP PP
S/22/10/6	Quality Update	
<p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience presented the Quality Update which covered the first few weeks of delivery and the quality assurance processes that were to be used. The Research into Education Development (RED) groups were to be run by the Advanced Teacher Practitioners (ATPs) to ensure consistency of approach. The Course MOTs were formerly known as Intensive Care.</p> <p>Governors discussed the quality assurance processes for apprenticeships and it was noted that the Support to Improve process was a collegiate approach that included back office support as well as quality assurance. The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience advised that for apprenticeships quality was also assessed through the progress boards which consider timeliness and quality of experience per apprentice.</p>		
S/22/10/7	Evaluation of Turing	
<p>The Assistant Principal presented the evaluation of the scheme, lessons learnt and the Turing Projects for 22/23. The report assessed the success of the project's objectives with evidence for that assessment. The projects had a huge impact on those staff and student who had taken part as well as their peers and family.</p>		

<p>Governors asked about the main lessons learnt from the Turing Projects in 21/22. The Assistant Principal advised that this was,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Students benefited most when there was a structured approach as in the Animal care Project, and when the students were actively working on tasks; 2. A panel selection process was used for student selection and this should be used for staff too; and 3. That the projects needed to be seen as projects and not 'trips'. <p>Governors commented that the presentation they had received at the last Committee on Turing had been inspiring and had clearly demonstrated the benefit of the scheme to the students.</p> <p>Governors agreed that enrichment needed to be built into all the curriculum and that self assessments had been weak in this area. It needed to be seen as core rather than an 'add-on'.</p> <p>The CEO and the Committee thanked the Assistant Principal for all her hard work and enthusiasm without which funding would not have been secured for 21/22 or 22/23. She should be rightly proud of her achievements and the difference this had made to the student and staff experience.</p>		
S/22/10/8	Safeguarding and Prevent Update	
S/22/10/8.1	Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy and Procedure for recommendation to Board	
<p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience presented the update for the term and the Policy and Procedure that had been updated for Keeping Children Safe in Education 2022.</p> <p>Governors discussed the level of referrals and the reasons for increases. It was agreed that support needs were likely to increase due to the cost of living crisis and there was a need to explore alternative methods of support. The CEO advised that the number of learners that qualified for a bursary currently stood at 1300 compared to 700 in the last year. Referrals were being seen for more complex needs due to real trauma and the College had a network of support that they worked with.</p> <p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience advised that school liaison and sharing of information had improved which meant that the College was aware of students' needs at an early stage.</p> <p>Governors discussed that there needed to be a balance of support and responsibility from the student so that they developed their resilience. This resilience could be developed through the student inductions, enrichment activities, and through teaching and learning, creating independent learners. The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience commented that what appeared a trivial issue may not be so to the individual</p> <p>Governors commented that an annual report was also required which considered impact and included benchmarking of referrals year on year internally and where available externally.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Safeguarding and PREVENT Report for 21/22 required with an analysis on impact and benchmarking of referrals. To be presented to the next meeting and the following Corporation. <p>The Committee agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recommend the safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy and Procedure 22.23 to Corporation for adoption. 		PO

S/22/10/9	Annual Complaints and Compliments Report	
<p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience presented the report which provided an annual summary of complaints and compliments.</p> <p>Governors noted that the level of complaint correlated against the curriculum areas' overall performance and that the case studies had been a useful addition.</p>		
S/22/10/10	Annual Committee Report to the Board	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the report.</p> <p>Governors agreed that this needed to be amended following the College SAR assessment.</p> <p>The Committee agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • subject to the proposed SAR amendments, the Annual Committee Report's submission to Corporation 		
S/22/10/11	Quality Manual for Approval	
<p>The Deputy Principal, Curriculum, Quality and Learner Experience presented the manual. The main change was Intensive Care being replaced with Course MOTs.</p> <p>Governors commented that it was a comprehensive and substantial document. The CEO commented that if every process was followed success was guaranteed.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve the Quality Manual. 		
S/22/10/12	Risk Register	
<p>1. Has the risk register been reviewed The register had been reviewed but required further revision following the SAR and grading.</p> <p>2. Is the Committee content that the risks are relevant and are being updated The Committee agreed that when the SAR assessments were finalised that a further update was required.</p> <p>3. Is the Committee content that the risks are being mitigated? The Committee agreed that the risks were being mitigated through the quality assurance processes but that there was a need to ensure that these were being consistently applied. The additional deep dive reviews and SAR reassessment needed to be included in the mitigation.</p> <p>4. Where a red risk, is the Committee assured that appropriate action is being taken Red risks were around apprenticeship and student performance and these had been a focus of the meeting.</p> <p>5. Where does the Committee have significant concerns. Apprenticeships and potential Ofsted inspection were a significant concern as was demonstrated by the SAR outcome.</p>		
S/22/10/13	Agenda planning	
<p>SAR to Board for discussion.</p> <p>Committee agreed January meeting reports could be delayed beyond the 7 days as it so close to the start of the new term.</p>		

S/22/10/14	Review of Meeting	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confidential Items: none 2. Risk Management: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment: to be assessed at next review: SAR 3. Equality & Diversity: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment: Need to consider inclusive practises 4. Health & Safety: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment: None 5. Sustainability: needs to be assessed at self-assessment 6. Media: any issues discussed to inform local media: The Turing publicity was very positive. 7. How did the meeting go – good detailed discussion 	