

## Quality & Standards Committee

Monday 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018

### Minutes

**Present:** Lynn Blades (Chair)  
Beth Edwards  
Sunzidah Khan  
Marco Macchitella

**In Attendance:** Ian Hooper  
Milton McIntosh  
John Rubinstein  
Peter Thompson  
Beth Yap

1.	Governance
2.	Minutes of Previous Meetings
3.	Matters Arising
4.	Self-Assessment Report
5.	In-year Student Progress
6.	Value-Added: ALPS
7.	Teaching & Learning
8.	Student Satisfaction Survey Results
9.	Teaching & Learning
10.	Risk Management
11.	AOB
12.	Dates of Next Meetings

<i>Minute</i>	<i>Action, Decision or Recommendation</i>	<i>A/D/R</i>
1.3	<i>To defer the appointment of the Vice Chair to the next meeting of the Committee.</i>	<i>A</i>
4.0	<i>Ian Hooper to monitor a group of female students as a case study during their time at Woodhouse.</i>	<i>A</i>

#### 1. Governance

##### 1.1 Apologies for Absence

Amanda Forshaw and Helen Pettifor.

##### 1.2 Declaration of Interest

None.

##### 1.3 Appointment of Vice Chair

The Chair explained that, following the resignation of several governors, Milton McIntosh and Helen Pettifor would be joining the Quality & Standards Committee. In addition to this, the Chair of Governors is also speaking to another potential governor. Therefore it was agreed to defer the appointment of the Vice Chair to the next meeting of the Committee.

Defer appointment to next meeting.

#### 2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting of 4<sup>th</sup> December 2017 were approved and would be signed by the Chair.

2.2 As no minute was deemed to be confidential, these could be uploaded to the College website in their entirety.

### 3. Matters Arising

None.

### 4. Self-Assessment Report (SAR)

Ian Hooper presented the College's most recent self-assessment report, highlighting some key points:

- The College has self-assessed as grade 2 'good'. The College has not graded itself as outstanding because the progress made by students could be further improved.
- The College has a number of strengths, such as governance, high achievement rates and student retention.
- The College has changed its value-added measure to ALPS this year, which increases accountability and allows for better in-year monitoring.
- Outstanding teaching is not as common as the College would like, with most teaching being good.
- The College has identified the few teachers whose work is not yet 'good' and is supporting their improvement with ASTs, joint lesson planning and sharing good practice.
- The aim is for the College to be 'neutral' in its value-added this year, with teaching staff taking more ownership of their results and identifying how these can be improved further.
- The next cross-College staff development day will focus on literacy and oracy. This should be a primary focus for all staff, regardless of their subject.
- The discipline system has now embedded well across the College.
- With the introduction of linear A Levels, subject retention may fall as students drop their fourth subject or make a later change than would have been possible previously.

In response to a question from governors, Ian explained that the heads of department write their own SARs, which are assessed and challenged by the heads of faculty. They in turn report to Peter Thompson as Director of Curriculum. Overall, the College has a good self-assessing culture.

In response to another question from governors, Peter Thompson explained that the College does not have the resources to film outstanding lessons but another peer observation week is planned to allow teachers to observe colleagues' lessons 'in the flesh'.

In response to a question from governors, John Rubinstein explained that the College continues to target under-achieving girls and Ian has interviewed a sample of this group to better understand the psychology behind this issue and what further support could be given. The Committee suggested that the College choose a number of students who fit this profile and monitor their progress during their time at Woodhouse.

In addition to this, the Head of CPD has presented all the findings from her 49 lesson observations to teachers, which has given the College much to think about.

IH to monitor girls progress in science and maths.

The student governors explained that students are very motivated by the Markbook feature on the Dashboard, which shows progress over time. However, partly because of different assessment requirements, this is not used in the same way across all subjects. The Committee agreed that this is useful and should be used by all departments. It should possibly involve a self-reflection tool for students, in order to help them use this type of feedback to help them progress.

John explained that many girls felt that they were not always able to ask questions during class and more needs to be done to develop good relationships with students so they feel more comfortable. Governors agreed that further work is needed on general teacher/student relationships at the beginning of the year.

On the issue of independent study, the student governors explained that teachers often stress the importance of the need for at least 5 hours of independent study every week. However, in some cases, the encouraging and monitoring of this work dropped off after a few months. The Committee agreed that teachers should be promoting and monitoring independent study throughout the year.

Governors expressed disappointment that some students reported a low level of challenge during lessons. In response to this and a question from governors, Ian explained that an important aspect of increasing the proportion of outstanding teaching will be ensuring teachers recognise the full range of students within each class and gear the learning activities accordingly. If teachers focus on content rather than encouraging the students to carry out tasks, the class is pitched at one level. Peter added that more is being done to challenge students with teachers providing a variety of tasks in the classroom, some of which are post-A level standard. Governors questioned whether issues around challenge and the lack of outstanding teaching are due to a need for more or different preparation and planning. Ian confirmed that this may be the case.

The Committee agreed the need to increase personalised learning within the classroom but questioned how realistic it is for teachers to plan every lesson for each student. Peter explained that teachers meet regularly to discuss teaching & learning and that whilst staff may not have a fully written lesson plan for every class, collaborative planning of lessons and modules helps cover a wider range of needs.

Governors questioned why some departments have lowered their high-grade (A\*-B) targets from last year. Peter explained that the majority of the departments have set a target to achieve 68% high grades, which was the College's overall result last year, and have also taken into account the ability of the students this year to make targets realistic.

In response to a challenge from governors, Peter explained that there are national benchmarks for subject results and the College considers these when setting its targets. The national average for high grades is 54% compared to the College's 68%.

Ian informed the Committee that the SAR is sent to Ofsted for review.

## **5. In-year Student Progress**

John Rubinstein presented the Committee with the results of the January mock grades explaining that overall these are better than last year's results. These should increase further by the summer meaning an overall improvement in results.

Governors questioned whether the monitoring grades were too optimistic. John explained that the mock grades are usually a wake-up call for students meaning that there is often significant improve afterwards.

## **6. Value-Added: ALPS**

Ian Hooper presented the Committee with ALPS, the system now being used by the College to measure and monitor value-added.

Ian highlighted that ALPS:

- sets minimum floor targets for students.
- works on the basis of inputs vs. outputs (GCSE grades vs. A Level grades).
- scores value-added from 1 (hot) to 9 (cold). The College is currently a low level 5 but aims to be at least a strong level 4. This would put the College within the top 40% of schools nationally.
- allows all departments to determine their own value-added score and gauge where they are rated nationally.
- allows staff to see how many students need to improve their grades in order to shift the overall value-added score.

In response to a question raised at the last meeting, Ian highlighted how Woodhouse compares to the Maple Group in terms of value-added. Ian explained that students join the College with a score of 6.8, compared to 6.5 at the Maple Group. However the College's overall value-added score is 5 compared to 4 at the Maple Group. Like the Maple Group, the College has very few 'blue' areas, where ALPS identifies teaching as poor.

Ian went on to explain how the College uses ALPS with current students in order to improve progress. Ian explained that staff are able to enter the monitoring or mock grades in order to calculate the current value-added score.

The ALPS system allows teachers to calculate 'what ifs', which shows how the value-added score would change if the results of an individual student were to improve. This then allows staff to concentrate their efforts on the right students.

## **7. Quality Improvement Plan**

Peter Thompson presented a paper detailing the A Level targets for each department along with the current position.

Peter highlighted that the monitoring grade is based on the students' current work and other available evidence, such as the latest mock exam results.

Governors asked whether the Senior Leadership Team were concerned about the results. Peter confirmed that this is difficult to judge, as there were no monitoring results last year so the College can only compare mock results, which have improved. The main concern is around the accuracy of staff predictions.

## **8. Student Satisfaction Survey Results**

The Committee discussed the results of the student satisfaction survey at its last meeting and requested that the Senior Leadership Team dig deeper into the responses. Ian explained that the results of the surveys were given to a group of students and they were encouraged to highlight any areas of concern.

*I have had helpful feedback on my progress.* (Consistently around 80% over the past 3 years.) Student responses:

- Feedback is usually given as a group and not to individuals.
- The importance of mock exams are regularly emphasised by staff leading up to them. However, in some cases only around 20 minutes was spent discussing the mock exam outcomes afterwards.
- More thorough and detailed feedback is helpful.
- Peer marking is not helpful according to some students.

Governors questioned why students might not feel that peer marking is helpful. The student governors confirmed that peer marking would be more helpful if it was done outside of lessons, as there is often not enough time to process this during lessons. In addition to this the student explained that peer marking would be more helpful if it was backed up by teacher marking, as sometimes this can be inaccurate.

Ian explained that there was much negative feedback around 90 minute lessons so a survey was sent to all students with a number of alternative options. However 50% of students opted for the current system and alternatives were less popular.

Students also identified teachers where the quality of teaching could be improved but these were teachers that the Senior Leadership Team is already aware of.

Many students felt that more engaging and fun lessons are needed across the College. Ian acknowledged that the College may have become too focused on content and syllabus and more balance is needed.

*I find group tutorials helpful.* (A slight increase from last year but remains around 40%). The Senior Leadership Team is currently looking at the timetable to see if group tutorials can be reworked.

## **9. Teaching & Learning**

Peter Thompson presented the Committee with an update on teaching & learning across the College, explaining that this is a result of the learning walks which have been undertaken by himself and Bethan Mor, the Head of CPD. The

aim is to produce a report for all faculties outlining the strengths and areas for improvement. The main aim is to highlight the importance of challenging all students across the College.

Governors questioned whether a thorough snapshot could be taken of a lesson in 10 minutes. Peter explained that this mirrors Ofsted inspections where a sense of the lesson can be grasped within 10 minutes. This time is also used to ask the students questions.

**10. Risk Management**

The Committee considered the risk management plan, noting the risks for which it has responsibility.

**11. Any Other Business**

Ian Hooper shared data on staff composition (gender and ethnic profiles) in comparison with student composition with the Chair.

**12. Dates of Next Meetings**

19 <sup>th</sup> March 2018	BOARD
18 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	Quality & Standards Committee
9 <sup>th</sup> July 2018	BOARD

The meeting concluded at 8:10pm