



GREENHEAD COLLEGE CORPORATION
Minutes of the Quality and Standards Committee Meeting
Held on Monday 9th September 2019 at 4.30pm in the Principal's Office

Present: Richard Armstrong* (Acting Chair), Simon Lett* (Principal), Jane Rylah*,
Craig Shannon*
* *Governors*

In attendance: Mo Bunter (Deputy Principal), Mark Mitchell (Assistant Principal), Tom
Rowley (Assistant Principal), Hilary Thomson (Clerk to the
Corporation/Committees)

Meeting began: 16:30

Meeting closed: 18:30

Quorum: 3 Governors

Attendance: 66%

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Stuart Hillary*, Steve Armitage, Kate Abel (Assistant Principal) and Usman Anwar (Assistant Principal). Mo Bunter stated that she would have to leave at 6:00pm to attend another meeting.

2. Items for discussion under Any Other Urgent Business

Committee members were invited to identify any additional items for discussion under any other urgent business at agenda item 11 below. No additional items were identified.

3. Declaration of Pecuniary / Prejudicial Interest

Committee members were invited to declare any direct, indirect, pecuniary, personal or prejudicial interest relating to any item on the agenda for the meeting or likely to be discussed. No declarations were made.

4. Minutes of previous meeting (17/06/19)

4.1 To approve minutes of previous meeting

Committee members considered the previously circulated minutes of the Quality and Standards Committee meeting held on 17th June 2019. No amendments were noted.

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting of the Quality and Standards Committee held on 17th June 2019 were approved as a correct record of proceedings and were authorised for publication.

4.2 To consider matters arising

The following matters arising were noted:

Item 6 (Feedback on A1 Progress Assessments)

Q: Why was an offer made on a GCSE average score of 5.8?

A: One student was admitted with 2 x grade 6 rather than 3 x grade 6 but was still required to meet subject specific requirements

Item 7 (SLT Operational Update)

- Following consultation, no College timetable changes were being made as a result of change in train times as rail timetable was likely to change again.
- No amendments were requested to revised performance management process as a result of union consultation and discussion with Heads of Department

Item 10 (Proposed meeting dates and committee work schedule for 2019/20) - SLT had reviewed the recently received Six Dimensions report but had not yet discussed with Heads of Department. This would be discussed with Governors alongside Governors' pages from Alps report.

5. Setting of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for 2019/20

Committee members considered the previously circulated paper 'Key Performance Indicators for 2019-20 - Quality and Standards Committee'. The Principal (SLE) reviewed 2018/19 performance against KPIs and explained rationale for proposed KPIs for 2019/20.

- Table showed KPIs and actual figures for 4 years (2015/16 - 2018/19) plus proposed KPIs for 2019/20
- Pass rate – KPI achieved (98.9%) and above national bench mark (97.5%). Proposed KPI for 2019-20: 99.0%-99.5%
- High grades – KPI not achieved (62.4%) and lower than previous year but well above national figure (51.1%) which also dropped sharply from previous year. Proposed KPI for 2019-20 63.5%-64.5%
- Retained and assessed rate – KPI exceeded (94.9%) but no national benchmark. Proposed KPI for 2019-20: 95.0%-95.5% with a longer term aspiration of ensuring all students who sit their exam achieve at least a pass grade.
- Retention rate – KPI achieved (94.9%) and exceeded national rate (92.5%). Ambitious KPI for 2019-20 of 95.0%-95.5% proposed
- Attendance – KPI achieved (94.4%) and improvement over previous year (94.0%) No national figure available but Ofsted generally describe outstanding attendance as 94%-95%. Proposed KPI for 2019-20 and in line with Strategic Plan 94.5%-95.0%
- Value added grade - KPI not yet achieved, pending reviews of marking. First Alps report indicates grade 4 for the quality indicator grade, alongside grade 3 for both the 1-year and 3-year T-score. However, score of 0.97 is just 0.01 off what would be required for grade 3. The Strategic Plan cites the attainment of grade 2 for the 1-year measure and the 3-year T-Score and have been retained as the proposed KPI for 2019-20. However, the KPI for the 1-year measure has been expressed as a score spanning grades 3 and 2 in Alps.
- Student satisfaction – KPI achieved (92.5% T&L, 89.7% student satisfaction) The student satisfaction target was to achieve 95%, having achieved 93% the year before. However, Assistant Principals established that student satisfaction was 89.4% in 2018, not 93%, achievement of 89.7% beats the previous year's figure. The proposed KPI for student satisfaction for 2019-20

has been amended to show the achievement of a score within a specific range: between 92.5-93.5% for T&L and 90.0-92.0% for overall student satisfaction, and will be closely monitored.

- Staff absence – KPI achieved (support 3.7% against a target of 4.0%, Teaching 2.0% against a target of 2.0%, overall 2.8% against a target of 3.0%). The same KPIs were proposed for 2019-20 in line with the Strategic Plan.
- Number of formal complaints – KPI not achieved as 4 complaints were received against a target of <2 complaints but all were resolved swiftly without escalation to next level. Proposed KPI for 2019-20 remained at <2.

Proposed KPIs for 2019-20

Pass rate %:	Between 99.0 - 99.5
High grades %	Between 63.5 – 64.5
Retained and Assessed rate %:	Between 95.0 – 95.5
Retention Rate %:	Between 95.0 – 95.5
Attendance %:	Between 94.5 – 95.0
Value Added grade:	0.98 – 1.01 ie grade 3-2 (including grade 2 for 3-year T-score)
Student satisfaction %:	92.5-93.5 T&L 90.0-92.0 Student satisfaction
Human resources %	Support absence <4.00 Teaching absence <2.00 Overall <3.00
Number of formal complaints:	<2

Q: Why were draft KPIs set as range rather than discrete figure?

A: Previous to last year, KPIs were set as specific figures but following discussion last year, it was agreed that a range showed ambition to achieve even higher

Q: Is there any convention regarding how KPIs are set out?

A: No

Comment: Value added is challenging KPI. What are implications of setting a KPI well above what was actually achieved?

Response: The KPI refers to score and grade spanning grade 2 and 3. Two of the subjects where dips occurred were linear for the first time this year. Some subjects have been Alps 4 for several years. There is some underperformance which needs to be addressed.

Comment: The way in which student satisfaction is calculated should be fully documented to avoid any ambiguity

Response: Previous ways of working were compartmentalised but discussion has led to a shared approach between curriculum and pastoral so should not see the same discrepancies

Comment: Proposed KPIs have resulted from management discussion and show considerable stretch. Are these setting up for failure with consequent demotivation?

Response: We want to be an outward facing organisation which strives to improve and always want to exceed national benchmarks to be outstanding

Comment: Some KPIs are based on inputs at beginning of process and some are based on outputs at the end. Are there any internal KPIs in the middle of the

process which would allow tracking of students through the process and allow Governors to know if things are on track mid-year, for example in-year Alps score from Alps Connect?

Response: Key assessment points do this. Governors are updated at each Corporation meeting on attendance and retention but there is no appropriate quantifiable high level KPI. Link visits would give an opportunity for Governors to receive information about interventions for those students not on track.

The Committee agreed to recommend approval of the above KPIs for 2019/20 to Corporation (7/10/19)

6. College Performance 2019 and Analysis

Committee members considered the previously circulated performance data (college and subject level) and Deputy Principal (MBU) and Assistant Principals (TRO and MMI) provided additional explanation and responded to questions. The following points were noted:

- Over the last 4 years, the cohort size had increased by 10% and exam entries had increased by 11% which impacted on teacher workloads
- The percentage of students with GCSE score 6.4+ was down by 2.2%. The middle band (GCSE score 5.5 – 6.4) had increased by 18%. It was important to ensure that strategies fit the cohort
- The value added grade of 4 was disappointing but the score was only 0.01 off what would be required for a grade 3. Some outcomes of remark requests were still awaited which could impact on the final score / grade.

MMI and TRO provided further detail regarding subject level performance highlighting subject areas which had performed well, those which had remained stable and those where improvement was required. The following points were noted:

- 9 subjects achieved grade 1-3 (Art, Business Studies, Drama and Theatre Studies, Economics, English Language and Literature, English Language, Geology, Physical Education, Physics)
- Many departments improved their score and grade despite a challenging year with full linearity
- Possible reasons for underperformance in Further Maths (grade 7) and Religious Studies (grade 6) were identified and measures to be taken discussed
- Further analysis would be undertaken as the year progresses
- Committee members would have the opportunity to look at individual subjects in more detail at the SAR review meeting (25th November 2019)

Q: Did those subjects identified as flatlining last year show improvement?

A: Yes, all achieved increased scores. The Quality Improvement Plan listed those subjects with interventions last year.

7. Update on Enrolment 2019/20

The Principal reported as follows:

- 2568 students had been officially enrolled
- The number of students currently on roll was 2522 meaning that 46 students had left in the first week

- Dropout rate was always highest in the first week and main reason given was the scale of the College with several students returning to their previous school's sixth form
- The funding model was based on 2500 students at census day (42 days into the academic year) so it was important to retain as many students as possible
- Interviews and late enrolments were still underway with efforts being made to steer additional students towards under-recruited subjects
- Further enrolment data would be available at the next Corporation meeting (7/10/19)

Q: Was dropout similar to previous years' experience?

A: Highest rate of dropout was always in first week

8. Safeguarding Update

The following points were noted:

- 17 new staff started this term. All DBS checks were completed. Safeguarding and Prevent training (face to face) would be completed this term.
- New lanyards displaying British Values had been issued to all staff and students at start of this term. (staff: green; A1 students: yellow; A2 students: orange)
- New system of locker registration via Moodle had been introduced for all students at the start of the current academic year
- Letters requesting safeguarding information for all new students would be sent out to schools in late September / early October
- New safeguarding team was in place for this academic year: **UAN, KAB, JCL, DBE, ASH MBR and CBE**. The website had been updated and new posters displayed around college and in every classroom.
- Safeguarding Working Group meeting was to be scheduled for early October.

MBR left the meeting

9. Parent Voice

An A1 parental questionnaire had been circulated by email (June 2019). A summary of responses was tabled. The following points were noted:

- This was based on the Ofsted parental survey
- Response had been good (451 responses received)
- 92% of parents would recommend the college to another parent
- Ofsted had now amended its parental questionnaire in light of the new Ofsted framework

Questions / comments were invited:

Comment: High percentage of 'Don't know' responses indicates a communication issue which needs to be addressed, for example, 62% of parents did not know if the college dealt effectively with bullying. Bullying could be covered more explicitly in the tutorial system.

Q: Was this a different set of questions from last year's A1 parental questionnaire?

A: Yes, this year's was based on Ofsted questionnaire

Comment: This made it difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions

10. Self-Assessment Report and Inspection Update

Deputy Principal (MBR) outlined the departmental SAR / QUIP process whereby SLT met with Heads of Department who then wrote their SAR / QUIP. SLT were currently drafting the College SAR / QUIP which mirrored the new Ofsted framework. A software package, College iP, had been purchased to streamline the process.

Committee members were reminded that the next meeting of the Quality and Standards Committee would be the SAR validation meeting. The original date set for SAR validation (28/11/19) had had to be changed due to a clash with the National Curriculum Conference at which the College had been invited to present. SAR Validation was now scheduled for 25th November 2019 at 1:30pm and would be led by Deputy Principal (MBU) with support from other Senior Leadership Team members. Richard Ronksley (Principal at Rochdale Sixth Form College) would attend in the capacity of 'critical friend'. The Assistant Principals would also participate. All Governors were welcome to attend. An executive summary identifying overall strengths and areas for development at College level would be presented before a detailed review of individual departmental SARs was undertaken.

Deputy Principal (MBU) reported on Ofsted readiness as follows:

- Ofsted outstanding exemption had been removed but no additional capacity was being given to allow inspection of more colleges
- The College was prepared for an Ofsted inspection but further fine tuning was ongoing
- SLT was populating R drive with key documents in preparation for an inspection

11. Any Other Business

No additional items were identified at agenda item 2 above for discussion under any other business at this point in the agenda.

12. Confidentiality

None of the items discussed was deemed to be confidential.

13. Date of next meeting

SAR Validation - half day session with buffet lunch - date to be confirmed.

Signed off by Richard Armstrong, Chair, at Quality & Standards Committee 10/2/20