



Quality & Standards Committee

Monday 4th December 2017

Minutes

Present: Lynn Blades (Chair)
Ben Charles
Daisy Corder
Amanda Forshaw
Marco Macchitella

In Attendance: Ian Hooper
John Rubinstein
Peter Thompson

1.	Governance
2.	Minutes of Previous Meetings
3.	Matters Arising
4.	Results Analysis 2016-17
5.	Analysis of UCAS Outcomes
6.	Quality Improvement Plan
7.	Teaching & Learning
8.	Student Satisfaction Survey Results
9.	Risk Management
10.	AOB
11.	Dates of Next Meetings

<i>Minute</i>	<i>Action, Decision or Recommendation</i>	<i>A/D/R</i>
2.1	<i>Beth Yap to ensure that minutes are signed by the Chair</i>	<i>A</i>
2.2	<i>Beth Yap to upload approved minutes to website.</i>	<i>A</i>
3.4	<i>John Rubinstein to provide feedback from meeting with the Maple Group regarding value-added.</i>	<i>A</i>
6.	<i>Peter Thompson to provide a narrative and some data against each target in future updates of the quality improvement plan.</i>	<i>A</i>
11.	<i>John Rubinstein/Ian Hooper to present information regarding staff composition (gender and ethnic profiles) in comparison with student composition.</i>	<i>A</i>

1. Governance

1.1 Apologies for Absence

Annick Jenkin and Beth Yap.

1.2 Declaration of Interest

None.

1.3 Terms of Reference

As a matter of good practice, all committees review their terms of reference at the first meeting of the academic year.

It was agreed to approve the terms of reference of the Quality & Standards Committee with no changes.

1.4 Meeting Times

It was agreed that the meetings of the Quality & Standards Committee would continue to start at 6:00pm.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

<p>2.1 The minutes of the meeting of 19th June 2017 were approved and would be signed by the Chair.</p>	<p>BY to ensure minutes are signed.</p>
<p>2.2 As no minute was deemed to be confidential, these could be uploaded to the College website in their entirety.</p>	<p>BY to upload to web</p>
<p>3. Matters Arising</p>	
<p>3.4 John Rubinstein informed the Committee that no value-added data was currently available for the Maple Group. However a meeting to discuss this is due to take place in the spring.</p>	<p>JR to feedback on maple group meeting</p>
<p>4. Results Analysis 2016-17</p>	
<p>Ian Hooper presented an analysis of the 2016-17 examination results, key highlights included:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raw results have improved: high grades have increased by 2.6% and A*s by 1.2%, which is the highest rate in the College’s history for A*. • However there is further work to do to increase A* and A grades. • ALPS suggests that there is little ‘poor’ teaching across the College, which is measured by the progress made by students. However there is insufficient ‘outstanding’ teaching. • There are no sustained patterns of under-achievement by ethnicity. • Ian suggested that the data shows that there remains an issue of insufficient ‘top end challenge’, as there is low value-added amongst this group, especially girls in STEM subjects. 	
<p>Governors discussed subject achievement data, informed by a table supplied by Ian showing results and Value-added by subject. The discussion centred on further maths, with useful contributions from student governor Daisy Corder.</p>	
<p>The Committee also discussed the consistency of SAR grades with Peter Thompson reminding governors that SAR grades were not just about ‘student outcomes’.</p>	
<p>Governors discussed under-achievement by students with high G-scores, especially girls, and wanted more information about what the College is doing to deal with this. Daisy suggested that girls in some STEM subjects needed to be extra confident because they are in a minority.</p>	
<p>5. Analysis of UCAS Outcomes</p>	
<p>John Rubinstein presented the Committee with the 2017 UCAS summary, explaining that this showed a record number of students had progressed to ‘high tariff’ universities and that 60% of students in 2017 obtained places at their first choice (firm) offer.</p>	
<p>Woodhouse students are aiming for the most competitive universities, which is not the case at all schools and colleges. Whilst 60% is the highest since 2014, governors felt that the College should be looking to raise this proportion</p>	
<p>6. Quality Improvement Plan</p>	

Peter Thompson presented the Committee with the College's quality improvement plan.

The quality improvement plan includes more numerical targets than in the past (e.g. high grades, A* rates and ALPS grades both by subject and aggregated across the College), a change that was broadly welcomed by governors.

However the Committee questioned the derivation of some of the targets and queried whether they were realistic and achievable (such as biology, where the high grade target is 20% higher).

It was agreed that at future meetings this year, Peter would provide a narrative and some data against each target to show progress.

PT to provide narrative/data.

7. Teaching & Learning

Peter Thompson presented a detailed paper summarising strengths and areas for improvement in teaching and learning.

Governors discussed gender issues and the importance of not letting boys dominate discussions in STEM subjects. Governors also queried whether the report contained too much emphasis on teaching and not enough on learning.

8. Student Satisfaction Survey Results

Ian presented the most recent student survey responses, with 5 years' worth of data to compare trends.

Overall there have been some improvements in student responses, such as 'teaching has been good' and 'I have received good support from my tutor'.

However some questions have seen a decline, especially 'I would recommend the College' and 'The College listens to student views', and these were discussed by governors with valuable input from the Student Governor.

The Committee noted that attitudes to group tutorials have improved by over ten percentage points, a sharp rise, but remain poor. Group tutorials were described by the Student Governor as 'often useless'. However governors felt that group tutorials are a good place to discuss current affairs and to facilitate student presentations to help develop skills in a non-academic context.

9. Risk Management

The Committee considered the risk management plan, noting the risks for which it has responsibility. In particular, the Principal drew attention to the risk of the College losing its 'outstanding' status explaining that a reduction in Ofsted grade remains likely, not least because the College is self-assessing as 'Good'.

10. Any Other Business

The Committee requested data on staff composition (gender and ethnic profiles) in comparison with student composition.

JR/IH to provide composition information

11. Dates of Next Meetings

11 th December 2017	BOARD
8 th January 2018	Annual Strategy & Training Event
19 th February 2018	Quality & Standards Committee
19 th March 2018	BOARD
18 th June 2018	Quality & Standards Committee
9 th July 2018	BOARD

The meeting concluded at 8:10pm