

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY 21 JANUARY 2015

GATESHEAD COLLEGE

Report: Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 1 December
2014

Author: Clerk

Action: Approve

Status: Open

Present: Judith Doyle (Principal)
David Mitchell (Chair)
Nick Hurn
Chris Toon

In attendance: John Gray
Glyn Stenson
Zac Aldridge
Angela O'Reilly
Kevin Marston
Paul Unwin
Helen Hepple
Kevin Smith
Andrew Robson
Gillian Forrester
Samantha Pritchard (acting Clerk)

T/11 Welcome/Apologies

David Mitchell (the Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Ivan Jepson, Mark Taylor, Catherine Dennis and Tim Poolan.

The Chair invited members to declare any interests on any item on the Agenda.

Nick Hurn (NH) declared that Maths and Science teaching at the College is carried out by staff from Cardinal Hume where he is Head.

Members noted that should the direction or debate on any item result in a potential conflict of interest, this should be indicated during the meeting. Members were also reminded to advise the Clerk of any changes to be made to declarations of interest.

It was suggested by Chris Toon (CT) that staff members who were presenting reports to the committee attend only for that part of the meeting at which they were presenting their reports and responding to questions and the committee agreed to this approach.

T/12 Minutes of the last meeting held on Thursday 16 October 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 16 October were accepted as an accurate record save that the following corrections were made:

Agenda No: 2

- Reference to Cardinal “Hulme” was amended to Cardinal Hume.
- Malcolm Fraser would be attending the College on 25 November 2014 (not October).
- T/4: reference to “English and the Built Environment” should refer to “Engineering and the Built Environment”.

T/13 Matters Arising

It was noted that Malcolm Fraser of Ofsted had carried out a brief but constructive visit.

This part of the discussion ‘is closed to the public’

CT is working with Gillian Forrester (GF) and the Unions regarding establishing a link governor programme. The programme should be able to be launched in the new year.

CT noted that the DFE has been slow in giving formal measures with regard to using Key Stage 2 – 5 data.

T/14 Self-Assessment Report 2013-2014

Background, overview and context of the Self-Assessment Report

Judith Doyle (JD) introduced the 2013-14 SAR which represents the last academic year’s activity at the College. It identifies areas of improvement at the end of the 2014 Summer term which are being implemented within the current 2014-15 academic year. The structure of the Report reflects Ofsted’s priorities. In this framework, the most important thing is evidence on which the outcomes are based. It goes through a moderation process where authors are challenged on the validity of their claims and then the Report is further revised. Each author was also challenged by JD before final grades were agreed.

Alongside the SAR is the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) which monitors areas for improvement and celebrates excellent areas.

The proposed grades in the SAR are subject to Teaching and Learning Committee’s comments before ratification at the Board meeting next week.

JD noted that the evidence also included feedback from Ofsted to show where the College has improved.

Subject Sector Area Reports

SSA 5 Construction, Planning and the Built Environment

Glyn Stenson (GS) (Head of Group (interim) Engineering and the Built Environment) presented the Report to the Committee. GS noted that this area is very much “on the up”. GS predicted that this SSA would be a firm Grade 2 overall when Ofsted next visit. GS can see growth in the future as new business is coming through.

Discussion and Challenge

This part of the discussion ‘is closed to the public’

Agenda No: 2

The Chair asked how can the Overall grade be 2 when Outcomes for Learners are graded 3?

Chris Toon (CT) confirmed that he had seen this at other Colleges. Even though learners had not achieved the full qualification, they had nevertheless achieved a technical certificate.

GS confirmed that the College can clearly evidence that they have opened up the College on Saturdays and Sundays to help learners achieve their qualifications. It was recognised that when the programmes were designed, the College had not fully appreciated the complexity of obtaining NVQ evidence where there were a complexity of organisations involved. JD commented that there had been a remarkable improvement in 16 – 18 long level success rates since Ofsted's visit. She felt it was right to recognise the impact on learners, but that in the current academic year this was now a strong area.

GS confirmed that he had spoken to staff after the last Ofsted and that following training and other measures, staff felt much more confident about the process.

The Chair highlighted that the Governors did not want staff to solely focus on Ofsted, but wanted day in, day out, quality teaching and learner outcomes.

GS felt it was important to celebrate the enhanced curriculum and preparation studies for work that the College had in place.

GF confirmed that SSA 5 had been effected significantly by historic data and that the area was completely different now and a really positive, confident team was in place.

The Committee approved the following grades:

- 1. Overall: Grade 2**
- 2. Outcomes for Learners: Grade 3**
- 3. Teaching, Learning and Assessment: Grade 2**
- 4. Leadership and Management: Grade 2**

GS left the room and Zac Aldridge joined discussions.

Apprenticeships

Zac Aldridge (ZA) (Head of Group Advanced Manufacturing and Logistics) (ZA) presented his Report to the Committee. He confirmed that success rates were above average for timely and overall success in general.

Discussion and Challenge

A member asked whether it was the norm for white British learners to perform better than minority learners. CT confirmed that in general Asian groups perform better than white males and black males perform the worst, but that there was no good national data to confirm this trend. The Chair confirmed that it was hard to measure as areas were so broad and covered many different programmes, but that the Governors still need to keep an eye on this data. Andrew Robson (AR) felt it was necessary to drill down to programme-related data to be able to explain any discrepancies.

Agenda No: 2

ZA explained that where employers were not involved in programmes it can affect the attendance and success rates of learners. The College allocates a mentor to every apprentice and offers additional support on functional skills. The College also needed to improve on learner voice, but functional skills are really strong through focus on out of hours sessions. Leadership and management have done a lot of CPD and the College is implementing E-Portfolios which will enhance learning. There is currently a focus on programmes with low success rates in Teaching and Learning.

The Chair commented that apprenticeships represented a large and diverse area of the Colleges work. He was pleased to see continued strength in functional skills and liked the enhanced curriculum opportunities. He was further pleased to see that the College had identified that more needed to be done to represent learner voice.

JD confirmed that ZA has responsibility for all apprenticeship provision. Those with good skills are supporting those who need support and it was hoped that the benefits of this would be seen by the end of this year.

CT confirmed that over 90% of learners were on provision that had results 5% above the national average and that therefore the College could be confident in these results.

The Committee approved the following grades:

- 1. Overall: Grade 2**
- 2. Outcome for Learners: Grade 2**
- 3. Quality of teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 2**
- 4. Effective leadership and management: Grade 2**

ZA left the room and Angela O'Reilly joined the discussion.

SSA 8 Travel & Tourism

Angela O'Reilly (Head of Group Services, Industries and Retail) (AO) presented her Report to the Committee.

She confirmed that the majority of learners were female, white, British and 16-18. Two years ago this curriculum area was Graded at Grade 4. It has since made significant progress to Grade 1.

AO reported that this area had made an impact by looking at roles and responsibilities in terms of the welfare of learners. There had been a relentless focus on teaching, learning and assessment. She felt that the key was for learners to enjoy what they are doing. The lead practitioner fed back good feedback and key areas of improvement and there were weekly meetings regarding at risk learners, therefore staff were able to respond and act quickly to issues. By way of example, bespoke timetables have been put together where learners are struggling and learning walks have been integral.

The leadership have ensured that staff had extensive feedback and that there is a focus on improvement in English and Maths. This area has had excellent feedback from external assessors. There is a clear focus on embedding English and Maths and equality and diversity. Work has been done on ownership and analysis of data. Previously figures were not robust enough and staff did not take responsibility for the

Agenda No: 2

data. Staff can now see where they sit within the data and where they have contributed and can recognise the part they have to play in improving results.

This area has also looked at developing stakeholders. This has not been easy as it is mostly academic classroom based work. They are doing work with Newcastle Gateshead Initiative and their learners have been invited to the opening of student accommodation above Tesco, guiding students to rooms etc. Hays Travel and Thompsons are also doing talks which are linked to assessments of units so that learners can see the value in what they are learning. The aim is to ensure that learners are going on to higher education where possible.

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair was pleased to see evidence of staff drawing on learner voice but felt it was worrying if students were not engaging in English and Maths given their importance. AO confirmed that there had been a better uptake on skills this year. The clear message was that English and Maths are a core part of the study programme. Staff are also following up on any non-attendance on a daily basis.

The Chair noted that the grade had jumped from Grade 3 to Grade 1 and asked whether AO was confident the College could justify this. AO felt very confident in the grade provided. Staff had been conscientious. They had bought into and owned the process. External consultants feedback was that this was a Grade 2 or Grade 1 area.

A member asked how, if outcomes and teaching and learning was Grade 1, how leadership and management could be Grade 2? AO responded that this was due to improvements required in English and Maths.

A member asked how far off Grade 1 AO felt this area was? AO confirmed that it was not far off but the English and Maths had to be integral before a Grade 1 could be awarded.

CT noted that for him this was about consistency over time. It was at 70% two years ago and is nearly at 100% now therefore we can see that the interventions have worked. JD agreed and felt that AO and her staff should be commended. It was an outstanding set of data especially taking into consideration the volume of students in this area.

GF noted that the shift in leadership had directly affected the teaching and learning and overall outcomes for learners.

The Committee recommended the following grades:

- 1. Overall: Grade 1**
- 2. Outcomes for Learners: Grade 1**
- 3. Quality of teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 1**
- 4. Effectiveness of leadership and management: Grade 2**

AO left the room and Kevin Marston joined the discussion

SSA 6 Information and Communication Technology

Kevin Marston (KM) (Head of Group Business and Technology) presented his Report to the Committee. It was noted that whilst there had been significant improvements on teaching, learning and assessment, there was still further improvement to be made. KM was introducing a series of performance matrix which would form part of a regular review of areas of responsibility.

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair commented that SSA 6 presented a mixed picture. There was obviously some good areas of improvement but also some dips. Was KM confident that he had identified the dips in performance? KM confirmed that he was confident that the dips related to long level 3 and in particular two courses that needed to be improved. There also needed to be timely monitoring of learners in place.

The Chair commented that Grade 4 for functional skills was a worry and asked whether KM was sure that all measures possible were in place? KM confirmed that there had been a lack of attendance and that this had caused a functional skills issue. He was receiving updates on a weekly basis.

A member asked what measures had been put in place. KM confirmed that there had been a performance review of staff, there had been standing KPI's and changing KPI's in relation to attendance, at risk learners and the wider context.

A member asked how attendance had been addressed. KM had been looking at learning walks and communicating and interviews with course leaders.

A member asked what the College was doing to get the right students at admission stage. KM confirmed that they had introduced a more rigorous enrolment process, particularly for long level 3, as well as introducing free writing requirements during the induction process.

A member asked what happened if a student was not on the right course. KM confirmed that they would then sign post that learner to other courses.

This part of the discussion 'is closed to the public'

The Chair asked whether there had been any performance improvement plans in relation to staff. KM confirmed that one staff member was subject to a formal disciplinary and that two staff members were on performance improvement plans out of 20 staff. He felt that it was important to put in place measures that were not demotivating.

A member asked what the weaknesses of this area were. KM felt that there was not one deciding issue and that weaknesses were peppered across all areas of this provision.

GF confirmed that there had historically been issues with IT workshop teachers who hadn't been willing/able to make the transfer to a new way of learning. KM confirmed that he had done a lot of work to raise the profile of teaching and learning in this area and recognised that it can be delivered in a very stale way. Tutors don't always look for wider opportunities.

Agenda No: 2

The Chair asked where this area could expect to be in 12 months. KM confirmed he expected Grade 2 across the board.

JD expressed her concern with regard to this provision and emphasised that there needed to be clear improvements next year.

CT noted that it would be interesting to keep an eye on this area as qualifications are changing e.g. gaming and coding.

A member asked if there was anything that the Governing body/management team could do to help. KM confirmed that he was getting a lot of support in developing new strategies and he didn't think that there was anything more that was necessary at this stage.

AR thought it was important to look at how leadership inspired their teams to be more creative and less mechanistic in this area.

Action: The Chair asked for a progress report to be submitted to the Committee next term and that this area be kept on their radar.

The Committee accepted the following recommendations:

- 1. Overall Grade: 3**
- 2. Outcome for Learners: Grade 3**
- 3. Quality of Teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 3**
- 4. Effectiveness of leadership and management: Grade 3**

KM left the room and, following an agreed change to the agenda, Helen Hepple joined the discussion.

SSA 1 Health & Care

Helen Hepple (HH) (Head of Group Sport and Development) presented her Report to the Committee. She reported that there had been significant improvements in this area and that there was very good pastoral support and assessment and that data was analysed effectively at all levels and had been subject to rigorous review. There have been rapid intervention for learners at risk and teaching, learning and assessment was a standard agenda item at all meetings.

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair commented that there had been a lot of success and high levels of achievement in this area which reflects the increase from Grade 3 to Grade 2, however he asked for an explanation in relation to those figures in red in the report. HH confirmed that 19+ is an area for development in particular in relation to part time provision. There was poor retention and there was a need to monitor work based learning and timely success rates.

AR confirmed that traditionally 19+ long level 3 HE access had had low success rates.

Agenda No: 2

CT felt that the areas in red were a bit harsh and these are not far off the norm for this area of work. Notwithstanding that they impact on the overall grade, they relate to a small amount of students.

JD commented that the outcomes for learners at the 16-18 level were excellent. She felt there had been spectacular improvements in this area having focused on retention and supporting learners with complex needs.

CT felt that they had done a good job of setting high standards in this area following a restructuring of the team.

A member asked how far away this area was from a Grade 1. HH confirmed that a lot had been done around the learner journey to make sure that they were on the right programme from the beginning and noted that advice and guidance at an early stage was key. It was also noted that there were a lot of jobs in this sector.

A member asked about attendance. HH confirmed that 89% attendance was achieved through ensuring that learners were on the right programme and identifying at risk learners and stepping in at an early stage.

CT noted that if you have good teaching and learning this is likely to encourage high attendance.

JD noted this was also down to highly effective leadership. GS felt that learners in this area often had complex family backgrounds and more often were caring for others and so there was a high risk of losing learners due to issues outside of the College's control.

The College accepted the recommendations as follows:

- 1. Overall Grade: 2**
- 2. Outcome for learners: Grade 2**
- 3. Quality of Teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 2**
- 4. Effectiveness of leadership and management Grade 2.**

HH left the room and Paul Unwin joined the discussion.

A Levels

Paul Urwin (PU) (Head of Group, Creative and Cultural) presented his Report to the Committee. He felt that the critical issue was in relation to the difference in outcomes between A Level and AS. A Level's are generally good whereas AS Levels are inconsistent. The AS provision is roughly twice the size of A Level and that scale has resulted in the Grade 3. Teaching and Learning is generally strong at 80% good or better. However, due to inconsistencies he felt that it had to be graded as grade 3 (requires improvement).

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair noted that this area remains static at Grade 3 which suggests that insufficient progress had been made to warrant an increase. The Governors had often wondered whether A Level provision was right for the College although he noted that

Agenda No: 2

there were some areas that were good. What steps was the College taking to improve this area?

PU commented that the priority was in assessment. Notwithstanding that this continues to be a Grade 3, it is a stronger Grade 3 than last year. A lot of work has been done to ensure regular assessment and to provide meaningful feedback to students that reflects the requirements of the awarding body especially in Sociology and History. To improve outcomes for learners we look at how regularly homework is given, looking at the work produced and seeing what developments need to be made.

A member asked about internal verification and whether the College had thought about working with others as partners? PU agreed that this was a sensible suggestion and would whole heartedly support collaboration as a route to improvements. A lot of subjects are delivered by single teachers who don't have other teachers to reflect with, he would therefore be keen to action this suggestion.

CT confirmed that this was a key action. It was noted that if provision continued to require improvement that the offer would become so small it would not be able to attract learners.

JD noted that the one thing that was obvious was the difference between A and AS Level results. The same staff often teach AS and A Level. How do we account for the differences?

PU felt that AS Levels were impacted by mental health issues of students – they often degraded so much that they couldn't take exams or they left the College or attended a reduced programme. If students got through to A Levels, it would demonstrate that they had been able to deal with their workload and other issues. He is looking at how to support learners early on where they have mental health issues by putting in place individual plans. He recognised that there was a need to be able to rapidly respond to issues arising such as self-harming, suicide and homelessness. He felt that whilst this was a significant point it was not the whole story. He felt that about one third of those learners who failed to succeed were learners who suffered from some form of mental health issue.

A member asked what the entry requirements were for this provision. PU confirmed 5 A* to C Grades including English and Maths to join but that there were separate criteria to achieve for different programmes.

CT felt that it was not always possible to identify whether GCSE results actually reflect learners ability.

A member noted that recruitment was down this year and asked whether this was because of competition from sixth forms. PU confirmed that it was generally a smaller year group but that also there was competition from other providers. The College's press/PR is relatively strong and students and parents speak highly of the College.

The Chair asked whether it was mostly A Level only provision. PU confirmed that most students were taking AS/A Levels and a small minority (about a third) took a B-Tech alongside. PU felt that taking four AS Levels was good preparation for exams and that AS results were a good guide to academic performance at A Level.

Agenda No: 2

A member commented that it is likely at his school that they will be offering three A Levels going forward as a more demanding approach. PU had a fear that this would put learners off as they may not get through to their final year.

A member felt that when you do AS followed by A Level learners don't necessarily do as well as they think they will because they have already achieved to some degree and do not realise the step change required.

PU noted that this area would be subject to a degree of political change and that if Labour were to win the election in May it is likely that they would recouple AS with A2 if they win.

The Chair commented that this underlined the point that there will be significant challenges in the future. He asked whether any support would make a difference? PU confirmed that his team had a good understanding of the strength and weaknesses and a clear idea of what they needed to do to improve and were working harder to meet expectations. He didn't think any more resources were required and that there was no "magic bullet". The one thing he did think would help would be sorting out access for NHs teachers to access the Colleges IT systems. CT confirmed that he was making progress in this regard and that the safeguards that had been introduced in their internal systems needed to be slightly more flexible here.

GF confirmed that in terms of moving matters forward, the College is looking at a project in January where we take a more collaborative and sharing approach to get a better understanding of where improvements are needed.

The Committee approved the following recommendations:

- 1. Overall Grade: 3**
- 2. Outcome for Learners: Grade 3**
- 3. Quality of Teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 3**
- 4. Effectiveness of leadership and management: Grade 3**

PU left the room and Kevin Smith joined the discussion.

SSA 9 Arts

Kevin Smith (KS) (Head of Group Creative and Cultural) presented his Report to the Committee. He confirmed that last year's results had been broadly around national rates but that matters had moved on this year particularly with regard to 16-18 year olds where we have seen significant improvements. The Ofsted inspection earlier in the year gave clear pointers and confidence in what we are doing.

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair noted that overall Grade had increased from a Grade 3 to a Grade 2, and that this reflected Ofsted's comments. He felt this was very a positive outcome for learners at 16-18 but asked for further commentary on long level 3 adult provision. KS confirmed that long level 3 19+ tend to be less successful on two year programmes. First of all there was no discrete 19+ provision which is not necessarily the right approach. Secondly, not all 19+ learners are using this qualification as their next stepping stone. They are using it to get into employment rather than higher education.

Agenda No: 2

We are looking at a range of Access to HE programmes. We need to reflect whether we continue to infill 19+ learners into 16-18 programmes or otherwise.

The Chair asked whether it was the curriculum or the environment that was effecting results. KS felt it was both. The College is looking at developing different tutorial programmes for 19+ learners as treating them as if they were same as 16-18 learners is not the right approach. However, it would be difficult to bring together as a whole group and therefore they probably needed to be a range of individual solutions.

The Chair noted that there had been a significant improvement in teaching and learning and this was a positive story.

JD noted that the grade presented was in relation to the last academic year and that in fact this area had improved further since then. She was very confident that this was a Grade 2 area and that it had aspirations to be more. She noted that SSA 9 was particularly significant due to the number of learners and therefore its impact on the College overall was significant.

The Governors approved the following recommendations:

- 1. Overall: Grade 2**
- 2. Outcome for learners: Grade 2**
- 3. Quality of Teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 2**
- 4. Effectiveness of leadership and management: Grade 2**

KS left the room.

Other SSAs

The Chair noted that there were areas of the SAR where there had been no presentation but that the Committee was still expected to make a recommendation to the Board. He asked for confirmation that everyone was happy with the other proposals in the SAR. Everyone agreed and it was noted that SSA 15 (Business and Administration) was still to be confirmed but was likely to be a Grade 2 to reflect data from partners. JD noted that this area had gone through the same rigorous process as others so there was no reason to doubt the grades but that this was being monitored closely.

Action:

It was agreed that A Levels, and IT and Business would be reviewed by the Committee again in January 2015.

Outcomes for Learners

Andrew Robson (AR) (Strategy Manager Quality and Performance) presented to the Committee in relation to outcomes for learners. He explained that this is now broken down by type of programme rather than type of learner.

He confirmed that we are seeing an improving trend in headline data and that functional skills is now included in that data. There is an upward trend in all areas.

Agenda No: 2

Where there is an aspect of underperformance, it is becoming more localised, focused and we have a better understanding of it. Underpinning this is where there is new provision, and there are positive trends in the data moving forwards. The highlight is long level 3 16-18 provision which is 86.4%. This has been key as it was previously criticised by Ofsted. It is now within the top 25% of Colleges and an excellent improvement.

There has been outstanding levels of success in work based learning. The higher Grades (B-Tech and A Level) improvements are moving forward in particular in relation to value added in A Level provision. There is 92% positive outcome for destination data for 2012/13 and there are no significant achievement gaps across learners which compares favourably to national rates.

Discussions and Challenge

The Chair commented that it was helpful to present the statistics in two formats – both with and without functional skills. It was good to demonstrate trends that were improving. He noted that Ofsted had said the College was a Grade 3 and asked for comments as to why we now graded ourselves as Grade 2.

AR confirmed that they had had a good year in outcomes for learners. When one looks at the data for long level 3 16-18, this area of the College's provision has transformed us into a top 25% College. The move has been substantial.

CT reconfirmed that this was about consistency across the provision and decent progression in getting people work ready.

JD confirmed that more than 50% of the vocational provision is long level 3.

The Chair noted that the College is performing above the national rate and where it is not there are fewer learners on those courses but they are also improving at a quicker rate than the national rate.

CT reported to the Committee that in the induction process a survey of learners had said that 90% were enjoying English and Maths which was a really motivating statistic.

JD confirmed that the College was focusing relentlessly on areas for improvement and not being complacent.

The Committee approved the following recommendation:

Overall Outcomes for learners: Grade 2.

Teaching, Learning & Assessment/Leadership and Management

Gillian Forrester (GF) (Strategy Manager Teaching, Learning and Assessment) presented to the Committee on teaching, learning and assessment.

She explained that a new vision had been set for teaching learning and assessment when JD became Principal. The College was tackling underperformance in classrooms which had made a huge difference and Ofsted had confirmed that this was the right strategy. At the moment the impact has not yet been seen completely across the College in particular due to long level 3 performance however progress had been relentless. There was an increased rigour in the manner of reporting so that teachers understood what outstanding teaching and learning looks like. Additional work has

Agenda No: 2

been carried out on stretch and challenge, an area identified by Ofsted for improvement. 93% of learners said their learning experience at Gateshead College was good or outstanding and high standards of behaviour were being maintained along with improvement of success rates and support for learners. There was more work to be done in Maths and English but nevertheless the College had 22 outstanding Grades to date since September. Leadership and management across the College is accepting accountability for outcomes and this has made a huge difference.

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair asked about the instances of Grade 4 assessments. GF confirmed that there were three and that one of those members of staff is leaving the College.

The Chair questioned whether English and Maths was still at Grade 3? GF recognised that this was a huge challenge as the number of learners had “gone through the roof”.

CT explained that the College was not hearing evidence in the SSAs that they were supporting English and Maths therefore CT was going out to provide training to teachers next term.

GF confirmed that at the national conference on teaching and learning it had been acknowledged that all Colleges were facing the same issue with Maths and English due to the change in approach. However, students at Gateshead College were now recognising that this was part of the journey towards employment.

JD reminded members that the SAR was an assessment up to the end of the 2013/14 academic year. In the current academic year the College was already seeing changes but there was nevertheless a recognition amongst staff that this improvement needed to continue.

CT confirmed that he was going to visit York College (an outstanding College) to see how they are dealing with English and Maths.

The Chair noted that Ofsted had graded the College at Grade 3 and that the College was now grading itself as Grade 2 and asked what the key difference was. GF said that Ofsted had said they were close to a Grade 2 but that the Grade 3 was awarded due to a lack of stretch and challenge. The College is seeing improvements and success rates and the impact of staff understanding the difference between a personalised journey and stretch and challenge in the classroom.

The Committee approved the following recommendation:

Overall teaching, learning and assessment: Grade 2

Overall leadership and management: Grade 2

Overall Effectiveness

Chris Toon (Deputy Principal Curriculum and Quality) (CT) presented to the Committee in relation to overall effectiveness. He explained that staff understand that our aim is to get our learners into work. It was noted that there was a fantastic board with amazing relationships with local employers. Performance management had been honed under the stewardship of Mark Thompson and he felt that aspects of leadership and management and equality and diversity was a Grade 1.

Agenda No: 2

Discussion and Challenge

The Chair commented that this told a good story and thanked the team for their work on the Report. He recognised that it was often difficult to capture all aspects of the Colleges performance.

The Committee approved the following recommendation:

Overall effectiveness: Grade 2

Summing Up

The Chair asked how best to disseminate the progress that the College had made.

This part of the discussion 'is closed to the public'

A member suggested that the Board write to departments to say well done from the Governing Body for the progress made.

CT suggested that the SAR be published on the Portal and a summarised version be produced for staff and Governors. The Chair felt that the Governors could put an appropriate message in that summarised document.

T/15 Any Other business

There was no further business other than to note that A Level, IT and business (SSA 15 and SSA 6) will be on the agenda for the meeting of this Committee in January 2015.

T/16 Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting will be held on Wednesday 21 January 2015 at 4.30pm