

GREENHEAD COLLEGE CORPORATION
Minutes of the Quality & Standards Committee meeting held at College
Monday 13 September 2021, 4.30pm

Govs present: Craig Shannon; Daniel Bellanfante; James Reevell; Richard Armstrong (Chair); Simon Lett (Principal); Stuart Irving

In attendance: Mark Mitchell; Mo Bunter; Tom Rowley (from 4.54pm); Usman Anwar; Ian Leedham (Clerk)

Apologies: Kasim Sheikh

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Welcome, apols	RAR welcomed participants. KSH apology as above.	
2. Declarations	No declarations of pecuniary/prejudicial interest.	
3. Minutes 21/6/21	Minutes 21/6/21, previously circulated, agreed by Committee & signed-off by Chair; Clerk to file. No matters arising not covered on agenda.	Clerk
4. Chair position update	Agreed RAR to continue as Chair and to review further after the next meeting (8/11/21).	Clerk re agenda
5. Strategy planning including preparatory work for Govs' Strategy Day 1/12/21	Preparatory work ongoing in respect of key strategic matters including curriculum, timetable, IT strategy, student numbers. JBL leading on finance & estates side, Mo on curriculum-related side. S.L.T. to meet 6/10 for strategy away-day; Governor involvement prior to this; Q&S and F&E/A&R meetings brought forward by a week (to 8/11, 15/11) to enable considerations to feed into Govs' Strategy Development Day 1/12.	
6. Site security	SLE introduced consultant's report, previously circulated, yet to be reviewed by S.L.T. CSH asked whether report is a final report, in light of blank sections, typos, poorly written, etc – it is a final report. Report generally positive picture, with main areas for development being specific CCTV issues and policy & procedures around workplace violence. Site security team has been enhanced (2 staff members up to 3) giving good coverage of site. Agreed SLE to take report/paper to next Finance & Estates meeting 11/10/21 and update this Committee at its next meeting 8/11/21.	SLE x 2; Clerk re agenda x 2

7. New Build Risk Register: Q&S risks	<p>7.1 Committee considered Q&S-related risks included within updated Risk Register (incorporating further curriculum-related points), previously circulated, with further updates incorporated in version going to Audit & Risk Cttee next week 20/9/21. Project Management audit will subsequently feed into further revisions,. Main risks for Q&S oversight are 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.1, especially:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. timescale slippage (CSH asked for update on this for benefit of all present: SLE pointed out Galliford Try keen to get started ASAP with building work potentially starting Jan 2022) 2. implications of MUGA removal. <p>7.2 Upcoming Galliford Try meetings, including this Thu 16/9, will enable these risks & mitigations to be updated further. RAR asked that this item be kept on agenda for next meeting 8/11/21.</p>	Clerk re agenda
8. IT robustness & back-up plans [<i>TRO arrived 4.54pm</i>]	<p>8.1 Committee considered paper produced by Paddy Diamond, previously circulated, and introduced by Mo. IT issues generally short-lived, with specific exceptions, and action plan in place to improve going forward.</p> <p>8.2 Committee questions & discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CSH asked whether S.L.T. to keep watching brief on this and RAR asked about timescales for R-Drive to SharePoint transition – will be S.L.T. oversight, reinforced by links to Paddy's performance management 2. CSH asked whether there are or should be any KPI's on IT performance (number of incidents, importance, resolutions, etc) – Mo to consider & report back 3. Mo to thank Paddy on behalf of Committee. 	Mo Mo
9. A-Level grades update	<p>9.1 TAGs analysis introduced by SLE, including A*-B grades increase, U grades, appeals update, on basis of paper & related spreadsheet, both previously circulated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. difficult to compare across colleges owing to significant variation in how TAGs were determined 2. some grade inflation but less than nationally 3. U grades as expected given concerns already known to college (typically a catalogue of issues), action plans in place, good implementation of relevant policies 4. results day was calm & quiet, compared with 2020 5. appeals (where STEM subjects & especially Biology, mainly in respect of B-grades, featured large): 83 stage 1 appeals (administrative procedural check), of which 28 proceeded to stage 2 appeal; 90% of stage 2 appeal results back to date, none of which have been upheld (one grade was increased on basis of college proposing this); awaiting remaining 10% of appeals outcomes 6. conclusion is that college specified and implemented a 	

robust TAGs process, with integrity – including learning from last year, e.g. being more explicit & transparent about how grades are derived and giving students more opportunities to show what they can do/achieve via their basket of evidence

7. SLE would favour more prescriptive central steer/guidance should TAGs run again next year, which of course is a possibility.

9.2 **SIR & subsequently CSH probed** around the dilemma inherent between (1) desirability of the above robust, integrity driven approach vs (2) students potentially losing out to peers elsewhere who benefitted from more generous grades derivation on average. SLE & S.L.T. colleagues, plus JRE as Staff Gov, reiterated validity & integrity of approach taken, pointing to e.g. good proportions of students achieving their preferred destinations, and RAR emphasised that serious discussions were held regarding appropriate levels of generosity in deriving grades.

9.3 **RAR asked when SFCA TAGs analysis (Nick Allen) will be available** – Mo pointed out likely to be Spring 2022.

9.4 Related discussion of implications for current approach to working towards 2022 TAGs/exams, prompted by **RAR question** – Mo pointed that there is deliberately no TAGs/exams messaging yet and that first assessment point is being delayed to second half October reflecting challenges faced by students over previous 18 months and need to give them appropriate space.

9.5 On question of U grades, Committee welcomed the analysis provided (min 9.1.3 relates). **RAR asked whether there are any lessons around supporting students at an earlier stage.** TRO, reiterating points made by SLE (min 9.1.3), emphasised that each Assistant Principal is currently picking up students where there are concerns and making sure appropriate support is in place, building confidence and regularly reviewing to see how things are going. Returning to the results, Mo pointed out that college was honest in giving U grades (whereas some other colleges had simply passed everyone) and that there were no appeals against U grades. **RAR asked whether students can choose to re-start the year** – yes, college open to this and re-starts have taken place.

9.6 Analysis of UCAS predicted grades (an optimistic view of what could be achieved) and comparisons with TAGs (a much more realistic view of actual performance), introduced by SLE, reflecting paper & related spreadsheet, both previously circulated. Subject by subject analysis undertaken and this is proving useful. Pressure point is significant number of Biology students appealing against B-grades (min 9.1.5 relates) in situations where their UCAS

	<p>predicted grade was A. CSH asked whether this year's analysis will be shared with subjects in order that implications for improved practice can be considered – it will. SLE proposes same analysis next year, i.e. UCAS predicted grades vs exam results or else TAGs. (Usman updated Committee on likely changes to UCAS predicted grades going forward).</p>	
10. Student intake Sep 2021 update	<p>10.1 Mo updated on intake data and Committee discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. as of 8/9, enrolled 1,517 A1's (37% from Partner Schools, 63% non-partner, versus typical 40-60 ratio) & 1,310 A2's expected to return, total 2,827 2. reduction of 5 by 10/9 (2 A1's dropped out, 3 A2's not returned), giving total of 2,822 students 3. Mo has undertaken analysis by school (for schools with larger numbers), analysing uptake factors – SIR question related to this, which Mo addressed 4. also Mo analysis of subject growth/decline, notably where this is unexpected (e.g. in response to RAR question, Maths numbers down from 150 to 110, Physics down from 268 to 214, Biology up from 512 to 575, Psychology up from 329 to 421, Art up from 97 to 116, English Language up from 90 to 101); Committee discussed potential reasons for some of these changes 5. S.L.T. to further review these numbers on 29/9, where there will be a much better picture of drop-outs 6. Mo is keen to boost proportion of students offered place accepting that place and taking it up, especially for Partner Schools – TRO pointed out that Departments are keen to partner in this endeavour 7. SIR asked contextual question about total number of Sixth Form students in Kirklees – Mo to obtain data from Kirklees Council. <p>10.2 SLE & S.L.T. colleagues emphasised that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. extent of growth goes well beyond that envisaged in current Strategic Plan (which is predicated on incremental growth to 2,700 students by 2025) 2. College feels extremely busy especially at changeover times and in facilities such as G1 workspace & library 3. some subjects e.g. Art, English have some very big class sizes (up to 26 vs previous max spec of 24) 4. ability to flex between subjects less than previous years. <p>10.3 This begs questions around how to deal with c.2,800 now, whether to seek to stay at this level or reduce down to 2,700 in upcoming years, how new build will impact on this, whether in future to promote some subjects more/less (recognising that current QUIPs put onus on subjects to continue to be proactive in seeking new students). RAR added question of what is a sensible number on current site (developed as per new build with e.g. same number of laboratories as opposed to more)?</p>	Mo

	<p>10.4 Implications for further additional staffing being considered. Current budget predicated on standstill numbers as opposed to current +200 – SLE to take proposals to Finance & Estates Committee 11/10/21. Also further timetabling innovations under consideration.</p>	SLE; Clerk re agenda
11. A1 end of year survey results 2020/21	<p>MMI introduced A1 end-year survey results 2020/21, referring to a previously circulated paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. anonymous with exception of 'I don't feel safe' question 2. subject-level and class-level data sit behind headlines presented, enabling drill-down into greater detail 3. results already being acted upon – MMI gave examples, e.g. for Computer Science 4. MMI will triangulate evidence here with ALPS scores, helping to inform subject-level QUIPs, especially for those subjects that need a push 5. DBE asked about interrogating reasons for dissatisfaction with view to developing action plans, including 'easy wins', and made point that students need background contextual information to inform how they approach the survey 6. CSH urged caution in interpreting 'agree' responses, given that this is well known to be the default response 7. CSH suggested both response rate and comparative measures e.g. change against last year to be included in subsequent reports – MMI/TRO to action. 	MMI/TRO
12. Curriculum KPIs & plans	<p>12.1 Committee considered curriculum KPIs 2021/22 – SLE's proposal to carry forward last year's KPIs 2020/21, endorsed by RAR, agreed by Committee.</p> <p>12.2 Curriculum development & quality improvement plans (TRO) deferred to next Q&S 8/11/21</p>	TRO; Clerk re agenda
13. Ofsted planning	<p>Mo verbal update:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ofsted will resume full inspections from w/b 20 Sep 2. work ongoing to ensure better alignment between purpose & principles, SARs (to be completed by 30 Sep), QUIPs (all QUIPs to be signed off by half-term), staff performance management (min 15 relates) 3. work ongoing re staff training, Govs' training (including Safeguarding Update) & QA arrangements 4. SEND: reiterated that SIR is SEND Lead Gov; noted that Govs' development session 4/10/21 prior to Corporation will focus on SEND update 5. SAR validation at next meeting of this Committee (min 19 relates). 	

14. Verbal updates	<p>14.1 Safeguarding update (Usman):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPOMS Y11-A1 file transfers ongoing; Usman following up outstanding information in more personalised way safeguarding & Prevent staff training ongoing safeguarding key messages reiterated to students Usman Designated Safeguarding Lead refresher training later this week. <p>14.2 SEND update (Mo):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Y11-A1 SEND / High Needs transition process went well good SEND outcomes being demonstrated summary of some staffing & operational details Mo to arrange SIR (SEND Lead Gov) meeting with Claire Berry, Head of Additional Learning Support. <p>14.3 Teaching & learning update (TRO): update on new staffing (including 12 new teachers), induction, new arrangements for early career teachers, teacher professional development including developing skills & expertise at all stages of career path (TRO to feed back further in due course).</p> <p>14.4 COVID risks & mitigation (SLE):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SLE to continue to report Covid data in his weekly updates; testing data to follow at Corporation 4/10/21 vaccinations update: 203 doses given at on site pop-up clinic 10/9; repeat session 17/9 to meet unmet demand small proportion of students wearing face coverings; much higher proportion of staff doing so. 	Mo TRO SLE; Clerk re agenda
15. New P.D.P. arrangements	Mo updated on new staff performance management (P.D.P.) arrangements, ensuring links with strategic priorities and QUIP targets.	
16. Policies	No policies to review on this occasion.	
17. AoB	None.	
18. Confidentiality	No confidential minutes or papers identified.	
19. Date next meeting	Next Q&S Mon 8/11/21, 1.00pm, to include S.L.T. presentation on interim strategic plans and SAR validation (<i>note this meeting is a week earlier than previously billed</i>).	Govs note

Minutes prepared by Ian Leedham (Clerk to the Corporation) on 25/9/21

Signed off by Richard Armstrong, Chair, at Quality & Standards Committee 8/11/21