gc Greenhead College
Be exceptional

GREENHEAD COLLEGE CORPORATION
Minutes of the Quality & Standards Committee meeting held at College
SAR validation & curriculum strategy
Monday 8 November 2021, 1.45pm

Govs present:	**Craig Shannon; Daniel Bellanfante; James Reevell; Kasim Sheikh; Richard Armstrong (Chair); Simon Lett (Principal)**
In attendance:	**Kate Abel; Mark Mitchell; Mo Bunter; Tom Rowley (from 2.29pm); Ian Leedham (Clerk)**
Apologies:	**Usman Anwar**

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Welcome, apologies	RAR welcomed participants and reiterated the two main items of business, namely college-level Self-Assessment Report (S.A.R.) validation and interim strategic plans. UAN apologies received (illness). Notified TRO to arrive late.	
2. Declarations	No declarations of pecuniary/prejudicial interest.	
3. Minutes 13/9/21	**3.1** Minutes 13/9/21, previously circulated, agreed by Committee & signed-off by Chair; Clerk to file. **3.2** Matters arising: 1. 13/9/21 min 9.6, UCAS/TAGs grades comparisons: (1) CSH reflected on analysis presented and argued that, going forward, analysis of UCAS predicted grades vs exam results/TAGs needs to be conducted at individual student level (% of students receiving same grade as predicted, % receiving one grade higher, etc) rather than in blocks; (2) responding to RAR's related follow-up question, SLE will keep Committee informed of excessive variations 2. 13/9/21 min 9.1.5, appeals: (1) appeals process has now ended; 37 stage 2 appeals (KSH question on basis of these: mostly STEM, extenuating circumstances linked to Covid & otherwise) of which 35 dismissed, one partially upheld with no grade change, one grade increased on basis of college proposing this; (2) RAR updated on current process-related appeal to Governors that he is taking forward, following a previous lengthy response to the appellant by SLE.	Clerk SLE
4. S.A.R. validation	**4.1** Mo summarised S.A.R. and its development: structured on basis of Ofsted Education Inspection Framework (and prompting discussion with Ofsted in future inspection);	

	developed by herself and wider S.L.T., with input from external colleague (Julie Peaks, Deputy Principal, Wyke SFC Hull), who agreed with judgements. Overall self-assessment judgement is Grade 1, Outstanding. Improvement points, e.g. to ensure consistency of outcomes across all cohorts/groups, go into Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP).	
	4.2 Variety of drafting points made by Committee and to be picked up by Mo:	Mo…
	1. RAR argued that executive summary should explicitly include links back to supporting evidence; say precisely why we think it is outstanding	
	2. could cross-reference page numbers for evidence links (SLE)	
	3. DBE argued for inclusion of web-links to key policies/material	
	4. <mark>CSH questioned basis of strategic priorities listed</mark>, in absence of links back to Strategic Plan (which itself will be updated following Govs' Strategy Day 1/12) – Mo to add	Mo
	5. need to include criteria for designating department as requiring improvement (RAR) and make journey travelled / progress made more explicit (SLE)	
	6. need to include CAG/TAG data alongside 2019 exam data in respect of subjects requiring improvement etc (RAR)	
	7. more needed on processes in place to identify where further analysis and interventions are needed, how this has been progressed, and how effective this proved to be, which is Governors' principal focus (CSH)	
	8. TRO emphasised that further detail is in each department's S.A.R. & QuIP and in overall College QuIP – this point should be made in overall S.A.R. – also S.A.R.s, QuIPs & Quality Calendar document to be made available to Governors via their SharePoint/Teams page (Mo to action)	Mo
	9. consideration of high achievers in Quality of Education section needs to be cross-referenced in Personal Development section too (RAR)	
	10. two sets of duplicate points (RAR) – KAB noted & she/Mo will edit	KAB/Mo
	11. make reference to Outstanding Financial Health (SLE)	
	12. the additional information and analysis considered in this meeting will be helpful in adding granularity to the S.A.R. document (KSH).	
	4.3 MMI summarised **Quality of Education** aspects, including how departments & subjects have progressed from a variety of 2019 baseline positions e.g. in terms of ALPS grades. Particular focus on groups of under-performing students and strategies to improve under-performance. Examples of positive interventions given; for instance in relation to Maths:	

1. visit to Farnborough College to learn more about their targeted support for students
2. bespoke training led by Craig Barton regarding tackling female & Pakistani-heritage under-performance – this training identified problem-solving techniques as a key focus, this was implemented, with resulting evidence of improved ALPS results for females
3. changes to delivery to achieve improved continuity, spot earlier where interventions needed, support study skills, and provide targeted support sessions in groups and individually (DBE question on interventions related)
4. Further Maths work packs changed to better reflect types of assessment questions being used in new syllabus.

Similar examples given in relation to Religious Studies; one additional example being putting Grade A essay examples onto Moodle as exemplars for students – ALPS results similarly improved.

4.4 MMI reported quality assurance process ongoing with 6 subjects, developing new strategies where needed. Also encouraging HoDs to work together to further improve practice. MMI responded to KSH & DBE questions about staff receptiveness – generally good, with some very receptive especially where smarter working can be demonstrated.

4.5 RAR/CSH question on how Link Governors can best assess how underperforming subjects are improving, validating evidence on the ground. Agreed to keep Link Gov focus on subjects with a range of performance levels (rather than e.g. specialising in underperforming subjects) and to guide Govs on what they should be looking for (S.L.T. can feed subject-specific information, including departmental S.A.R., QuIP & ALPS Connect data, to relevant Link Gov).

4.6 Discussion of balance being struck between broad & balanced curriculum and results, in response to RAR question about same. Examples given of the balance in practice.

4.7 TRO painted broadly similar picture (to that of MMI in min 4.3 et seq) in respect of Law, Politics, English Literature etc.

4.8 KAB summarised **Pastoral** aspects (behaviour, attitudes, punctuality), including Student Re-engagement Policy, student safety & how concerns followed up, communication & reinforcement of behaviour expectations including for A.L.S./High Needs students.

4.9 Staff wellbeing focus – responding to CSH question on data sources & processes, KAB described regular, ongoing staff survey approach with actions resulting – RAR argued

Mo/SLE

	for greater regularity of staff surveys with follow-through on key actions clearly documented. **4.10** KAB summarised **Personal Development** aspects, including enrichment, careers guidance, the 'Step Into' and widening participation programmes specifically, resilience interventions (including 'Grit' tutorial), and safeguarding training and joint working as key strengths. Personal development areas for improvement include monitoring & use of Individual Learning Plans, enrichment opportunities for students not going to University, enhancing C.P.D. for A.L.S. team. **4.11** Two Governor <mark>questions</mark>: 1. <mark>RAR requested a regular report, e.g. annually, on widening participation</mark> – Mo to do 2. <mark>CSH asked about how students have approached enrichment since Covid restrictions lifted</mark> – KAB pointed to low-level maturity & behavioural issues in this context. **4.12** Mo introduced **Leadership & Management** aspects & Committee discussed: 1. Mo requested copy of Governance S.A.R. given its overlap with overall College S.A.R. – RAR to supply 2. ongoing focus is on systematic, consistent practice and processes 3. <mark>CSH, RAR & TRO asked about inclusion of additional governance points</mark> including: (1) updating of Standing Orders, Scheme of Delegation etc – this is to be added to Corporation 6/12 agenda – RAR to provide draft sentence on this for Mo to include in S.A.R. (CSH); (2) regular review of Corporation composition, identifying and filling expertise gaps, with example of new Governor with capital development expertise (CSH point) – RAR to provide draft sentence for Mo; (3) strategic planning process including strengthening other areas of college infrastructure beyond DfE new build scheme (RAR); (4) add reference to equality, diversity & inclusion work – TRO to provide draft sentence for Mo. **4.13** Next steps: 1. Mo to update S.A.R. on basis of above points 2. Mo to send documentation – as per above, plus finalised S.A.R. & QuIP, each with executive summary sheet – to Clerk to include in Govs' SharePoint/Teams folder 3. Govs invited to send any further feedback to Mo.	Mo RAR Clerk re agenda RAR RAR TRO Mo Mo Govs
5. Interim strategic plans	**5.1** SLE/Mo presented and Committee discussed S.L.T.'s interim strategic plans in run-up to Govs' Strategy Day 1/12. This included consideration of four previously circulated notes: timeline to 1/12 Strategy Day; student admissions strategy; costed curriculum summary sheet; timetable rationale.	

5.2 S.L.T. proposes to manage 2,791 current student population down to 2,700 over coming years to 2027/28, given that College too busy/stretched with 2,791; not yet clear how new build will impact on this. In support of this managed reduction (and associated management of staffing), college developing more targeted approach to admissions.

5.3 Governor questions & discussion points included:
1. JRE questioned the student retention rate being used in S.L.T.'s numbers' calculations – Mo addressed, arguing that reasonable best assumptions being used
2. RAR argued that 16-18 population growth needs to be explicitly considered, as a key contextual factor, necessitating harder choices in terms of admissions
3. CSH argued that the varying intake trajectory over the coming years begs significant questions about how Partner Schools and Non-Partner Schools are dealt with and raised concerns about potential two-tier system of admissions criteria & intake – in response, Mo argued that the gap could be reduced by the new admissions criteria – wider debate about mission & vision and ethical dimensions here (KSH, amongst others, concerned about College potentially becoming too selective)
4. CSH further argued that a more visionary strategy is needed than the one presented here – are we developing the curriculum offer we want, supported by the necessary IT
5. RAR pointed out that applying total (whole-College) costs to the costed curriculum would mean less difference between the costs of subjects; also should think in terms of some subjects generating less surplus than others as opposed to loss-leaders.

5.4 SLE pointed out that in the context of population pressures, S.L.T. considered the option of going beyond 2,800 students with a split site – but didn't opt for this because the current model works well in practice and so should not be fundamentally changed. In response, CSH argued that other models work well too, e.g. the recent Covid remote delivery model, which raises question of whether remote delivery could be used more in order to relieve some of the constraints & pressures. S.L.T. feels that students need a face-to-face model and so is not keen to use an element of IT remote delivery as a way of increasing capacity.

5.5 In this context, subsequent debate about suitability & merits of a university-style *blended curriculum delivery model* involving remote lectures/lessons delivered to larger numbers of students, with seminars and tutorials being delivered face to face as currently. CSH & RAR argued a

	blended model along these lines is a key lever to pull in enhancing capacity & delivery. KSH argued that there is a fundamental distinction between extent to which 16-18 students, as opposed to university students, have independent learner skills. Given its importance, this debate will be picked up at the 1/12 Governors' Strategy Day discussions.	RAR/SLE re agenda
	5.6 Related discussion about implications for the 1/12 Strategy Day programme, to ensure Governors can do justice to the above and other important issues. Decided that Mo's curriculum-related session will come first, with John Blake's finance-estates session(s) following on. Following Governor discussion, proposals will be taken to Corporation 6/12.	RAR/SLE re agenda
	5.7 The meeting ended at this point (just prior to 5pm), owing to the time necessarily devoted to items 4 and 5.	
6. Subsequent agenda items	**6.1** Subsequent substantive agenda items, as follows, to be rolled forward to the next Q&S meeting on 10/1/22: 1. curriculum development & quality improvement plans (TRO, CORP 12/7/21, min 5.7) 2. site security update (Q&S 13/9/21, min 6 & F&E 11/10/21) 3. New Build Risk Register, Q&S risks 4. Ofsted planning update 5. anything additional regarding safeguarding, SEND, teaching & learning, COVID risks & mitigation.	Clerk re agenda…
	6.2 Remaining agenda items: 1. policies to review: none on this occasion 2. any other business: none 3. confidentiality: no confidential aspects identified 4. date of next Q&S meeting: Mon 10 Jan 2022, 4.30pm.	Govs note

Minutes prepared by Ian Leedham (Clerk to the Corporation) on 23/11/21

Approved & signed by Richard Armstrong, Chair, on 10/1/22