

## QUALITY and STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### Minutes of a Meeting 2.00pm Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2012 Gordon Canning Room

**Present:** Mr David Crawford (DC) (Chair)  
Mr David Barnett (DB)  
Ms Pippa Halling (PH)  
Mr John Perry (JP)  
Mr Luke Rake (LR)  
Professor Ron Ritchie (RR)  
Mrs Rosie Scott-Ward (RSW)  
Dr Stephen Waite (SW)  
Mr Malcolm Wharton (MW)

**In Attendance:**

**Apologies:** Mr Miles Murphy

**Minutes:** Mr Rob Lee

		<b>ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION DATE</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies</b>  Apologies were received from Mr M Murphy.		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declaration of Interest – Paper QS02/02/12</b>  The Clerk advised that member's interests would be taken as those disclosed in the Register of Members Interests. There were no declarations of members interests for agenda items.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes of the Last Meeting – Paper QS03/02/12</b>  Minutes of the meeting held on the 23 <sup>rd</sup> November 2011 were agreed to be a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.		
<b>4.</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>  <b>4.1. (4.2, 5.1.) Communication with students.</b>  The Clerk advised that this had only been discussed briefly at the Equality and Diversity Committee and handed back to the College Management for proposal and decision. MW advised that it had been quite normal practice for lecturers to correspond with students by way of the student's personal		

		ACTION	ACTION DATE
	<p>e-mail but a recent audit by an external advisor had highlighted this as a safeguarding issue when communicating with students under the age of 18.</p> <p><b>4.2. (4.3, 5.2) Completion of UWE student survey.</b></p> <p><i>Discussion had not taken place and decision on need to complete UWE student survey is carried forward to next meeting.</i></p> <p><i>It was also agreed that we would send a copy, for information of our College student survey to UWE.</i></p> <p><b>4.3. (11.0) Update on Ofsted consultations on Common Inspection Framework.</b></p> <p>MW advised that as an outstanding college under the current framework we were not expected to be inspected as long as our data did not show any areas of concern. However the new Head of Ofsted has suggested that where a college graded as outstanding did not have an outstanding grade for teaching and learning then they should be inspected. We did not receive an outstanding grade for teaching and learning so if this was agreed at the end of the consultation period then we should expect to be inspected over the next two years. LR advised that we had already taken action by appointing two lead practitioners to work with staff and revamped the lesson observation scheme. DC questioned whether there was enough clarity in what makes an outstanding teacher. LR believed there was an issue for Ofsted over classroom teaching as opposed to vocational teaching.</p>	<p>SW/RR</p> <p>SW</p>	<p>20/06/12</p> <p>Immediate</p>
5.	<p><b>Note FE Performance Targets for 2011/2012. Paper QS05/02/12</b></p> <p>LR confirmed that the targets had been agreed after the last meeting, approved by the College Executive and now forms part of the Governor KPI's. In response to MW LR advised that at this time it was not possible to say if the target for teacher observations would lead to an outstanding grade but this will be monitored.</p> <p><i>The FE Academic Performance Targets for 2011/2012 were formally approved.</i></p>	LR	Immediate
6.	<p><b>Discuss and agree actions from Student Induction Survey.</b></p> <p><b>6.1. HE Student Induction Survey. Paper QS06.1/02/12</b></p> <p><b>SW advised that overall, reported student satisfaction with the induction process, college facilities and teaching at the start of the academic year has improved. The extent of improvement varies between subject areas and individual programmes. SW explained that some results for some programmes, particularly those in the animal science area, BA Hons Equine Business Management and FdSc Sports Coaching show some decreases for certain set of questions. Where performance has decreased, the issues identified have been considered at a programme and subject level and appropriate actions put in place as part of Departmental Action Plans. SW outlined the results from the individual areas with all areas showing an overall improvement on the previous year and only 6 out of 42 of the individual questions showed a decrease in satisfaction. In response to RR RSW explained that the area of</b></p>		

		ACTION	ACTION DATE																																																																																																
<p>timetabling had caused some confusion with students and this went towards explaining the decrease in satisfaction on knowing when work is assessed and assignments due. MW noted that Teaching and Learning had particularly strong results and SW advised that results had been broken down to individual programmes to enable greater understanding of the results. RR felt that this was very positive data. The ratings by category over the last five years are:-</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>07/08</th> <th>08/09</th> <th>09/10</th> <th>10/11</th> <th>11/12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Before started at College</td> <td>55</td> <td>55</td> <td>49</td> <td>55</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Welcome and Enrolment</td> <td>62</td> <td>62</td> <td>54</td> <td>58</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teaching and Learning</td> <td>74</td> <td>75</td> <td>70</td> <td>76</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Organisation</td> <td>66</td> <td>65</td> <td>65</td> <td>71</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>57</td> <td>60</td> <td>48</td> <td>57</td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enrichment</td> <td>55</td> <td>55</td> <td>34</td> <td>46</td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Facilities and Services</td> <td>56</td> <td>57</td> <td>47</td> <td>50</td> <td>62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>6.2. FE Student Induction Survey. Paper QS06.2/02/12</p> <p>LR advised that the survey shows that students are generally satisfied with the provision they received based upon their induction and early college experience and there has been general improvement in student satisfaction in the last year. Most issues are around the centralised services but LR advised that it was very encouraging to see the extremely high satisfaction rate of teaching and learning. RR felt that there were some slight negative issues when students first contacted the College and LR advised that we were able to look at individual comments and these would help towards actions to overcome some of the weaker areas. The ratings by category over the last five years are:-</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>07/08</th> <th>08/09</th> <th>09/10</th> <th>10/11</th> <th>11/12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Before started at College</td> <td>71</td> <td>70</td> <td>77</td> <td>70</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Welcome and Enrolment</td> <td>72</td> <td>71</td> <td>80</td> <td>73</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teaching and Learning</td> <td>83</td> <td>82</td> <td>84</td> <td>79</td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Organisation</td> <td>81</td> <td>80</td> <td>82</td> <td>79</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>70</td> <td>71</td> <td>76</td> <td>73</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enrichment</td> <td>59</td> <td>58</td> <td>62</td> <td>58</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Facilities and Services</td> <td>62</td> <td>60</td> <td>65</td> <td>62</td> <td>62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	Before started at College	55	55	49	55	62	Welcome and Enrolment	62	62	54	58	67	Teaching and Learning	74	75	70	76	77	Organisation	66	65	65	71	74	Support	57	60	48	57	58	Enrichment	55	55	34	46	56	Facilities and Services	56	57	47	50	62		07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	Before started at College	71	70	77	70	70	Welcome and Enrolment	72	71	80	73	74	Teaching and Learning	83	82	84	79	83	Organisation	81	80	82	79	88	Support	70	71	76	73	74	Enrichment	59	58	62	58	64	Facilities and Services	62	60	65	62	62		
	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12																																																																																														
Before started at College	55	55	49	55	62																																																																																														
Welcome and Enrolment	62	62	54	58	67																																																																																														
Teaching and Learning	74	75	70	76	77																																																																																														
Organisation	66	65	65	71	74																																																																																														
Support	57	60	48	57	58																																																																																														
Enrichment	55	55	34	46	56																																																																																														
Facilities and Services	56	57	47	50	62																																																																																														
	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12																																																																																														
Before started at College	71	70	77	70	70																																																																																														
Welcome and Enrolment	72	71	80	73	74																																																																																														
Teaching and Learning	83	82	84	79	83																																																																																														
Organisation	81	80	82	79	88																																																																																														
Support	70	71	76	73	74																																																																																														
Enrichment	59	58	62	58	64																																																																																														
Facilities and Services	62	60	65	62	62																																																																																														

		ACTION	ACTION DATE
	<p><b>In response to DC LR explained that one of the major reasons why teaching and learning has shown an improvement is that the problems in some of the key groups such as Rugby have been rectified. DC noted there was decreasing satisfaction in the area of friendliness and helpfulness of support staff and asked how this will be rectified. MW advised that there had been some changes in personnel within student services staff which he felt would improve the situation but we must always consider that some members of the support staff were there to maintain discipline and at times this was not appreciated by some students.</b></p>		
7.	<p><b>Review FE performance data for 2010/2011.</b></p> <p><b>7.1. League Tables. Paper QS07.1/02/12</b></p> <p>LR advised that results have declined slightly at level 3, but are still well ahead of both the national average and where we were two years ago. Last year we were 5<sup>th</sup> nationally on points per entry, this year we are 11<sup>th</sup>, of 386 colleges. In response to RR LR advised that even though we have slipped back we are still in the top 3% of all colleges, an outstanding performance. We are still best in this geographical area by a long way and best land-based overall on this measure. Also on points per student we have gone down slightly on last year and outlined the reasons why this had happened. MW queried whether the colleges on the comparative table gave a complete picture as they are the old agricultural colleges and we should be looking to compare ourselves with good sport and A Level Colleges. In response to DC MW advised that we do not collect data at this time on where else students would be applying.</p> <p><i><b>It was agreed that the comparative table should include elite sport and A level institutions.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>It was agreed that we would start to collect data on where else students are applying.</b></i></p> <p><b>7.2. Employer Responsive Success Rates. Paper QS07.2/02/12</b></p> <p>LR advised that that we have relatively small numbers of students in this area. LR stated that our provision exceeds benchmark for both generic success rate and timely completion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Overall success rate is 83.7% against a national benchmark of 76.4%, and timely completion rates are 73.6% against a national benchmark of 65.3%.</li> </ul> <p>LR explained that there has been a reduction in these figures from last year's high, but they this is partly due to natural variance and also small cohort size disproportionately affecting changes in percentage.</p> <p><b>7.3. Success Rate Summaries. Paper QS07.3/02/12</b></p> <p>LR advised that this report covers the bulk of what we do and shows some outstanding results. The overall success rates against our provider group and national benchmarks are: -</p>	<p>LR</p> <p>LR</p>	<p>13/02/13</p> <p>Immediate</p>

						ACTION	ACTION DATE
	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	All Providers	National		
All Long	79.8%	80.8%	87.0%	80.6%	79.8%		
All Short	93.7%	92.2%	93.8%	91.7%	85.6%		
Total	86.8%	87.5%	91.2%	89.1%	81.8%		
<p>LR advised that there are 54 grades and we exceed the benchmark in 52 of them. In response to DC MW explained that Ofsted look at classroom based teaching but it evident from these results that we have an outstanding group of teachers.</p> <p><b>7.4. Minimum Levels of Performance. Paper QS07.4/02/12</b></p> <p>LR advised that our total provision falling below Minimum Levels of Performance (MLP) in 2010/11 was 0% on long course, which forms the bulk of our provision, and 12.2% on our very short provision. This compares favourably with the previous year's data which was 1% and 13.5% respectively. LR advised that whilst the latter is unsatisfactory it forms only a very small element of total FTE provision. As a proportion of total FTE in 2010/2011, 0.03% fell below the MLP thresholds.</p> <p><b>7.5. Retention and Profile by Student Characteristics. Paper QS07.5/02/12</b></p> <p>LR advised that the Report shows how Hartpury retains students and the message is that we retain students very well. The figures show that we perform extremely well in this benchmarking exercise with most areas being both above national benchmarks and also of a level that is statistically significant. The headlines are: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ We retain our students more effectively than other providers.</li> <li>❖ We retain are students significantly better than other land based college sector.</li> <li>❖ EMA claimants are retained by us better than non EMA claimants but both are significantly better than the benchmark of all other providers.</li> <li>❖ A similar picture as above when measured against land based providers.</li> <li>❖ We retain female students better than male but both are well above the benchmark of all other providers.</li> <li>❖ Retention of LLDD students is over 6% higher than similar group of learners from all other providers.</li> </ul> <p>RR thought this data was very encouraging and LR confirmed that it had also been discussed at the Equality and Standards Meeting.</p> <p><b>7.6. Value Added Analysis. Paper QS07.6/02/12</b></p> <p>LR advised that value added across the College is generally strong and referred Members to the two reports, one on A Levels and one concerning BTEC. LR advised that A Level data is neutral with students achieving what was expected and LR felt that given their Academy demands this was a good performance. In response to DC LR advised that that those students involved in sports do better than those who are not. DC asked if there was not some disappointment in not achieving better value added and LR felt that the students achieved what they expected but also had the Hartpury experience. LR advised that in only one A Level area, Mathematics, does</p>							

		ACTION	ACTION DATE
	<p>value added approach being statistically significantly positive. In response to RR LR confirmed that the students were largely the same as taking Physics which was one of the two areas, together with PE, that were approaching a significant level of negative performance. Reasons for this were discussed and LR explained the action that was taking place. LR advised that BTEC value added results were very good with statistically positive performances in several areas and this mirrored the league table data discussed earlier.</p>		
8.	<p><b>Review HE Quality Monitoring Data. Paper QS08/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that the majority of data presented is derived from the UWE 'data warehouse' and relates primarily to the performance of students on degree programmes for the academic year 2010/11. Data, produced by Hartpury College Academic Systems Office, is presented where this provides information on the performance of foundation degree students and the current academic year.</p> <p><b>8.1. Performance to KPI's 2010/2011. Paper QS08.1/02/12</b></p> <p><b>SW referred Members to the graphs showing the Colleges performance against UWE set KPI's and the average performance of UWE departments. SW outlined the performance:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <b>The College exceeded UWE set KPI's for student withdrawals, tariff points on entry, graduate destinations and National Student Survey overall student satisfaction.</b></li> <li>❖ <b>Targets were not achieved on average module pass rate and good honours.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>RSW explained that tariff point on entry data now includes National Diploma BTEC qualifications. MW explained that this helps achieve the higher tariff level where A Levels alone would not achieve this. In response to RR SW advised that UWE had been informed of the error in the NSS graph. SW advised that progress was being made on average pass rate and good honours and in response to RR SW stated in relation to achieving good honours that students may not prepare well enough and therefore do not meet our expectations and also he believed there was a confidence factor of staff in marking.</b></p> <p><b>8.2. Enrolments and Withdrawals 2010/2011. Paper QS08.2/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that the report shows academic withdrawals for 2010/2011 against 2009/2010 for Masters and Foundation Degree programmes. SW advised:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <b>That Foundation Degree retention has improved 3% over 9/10 from 70% to 73% and that this compares favourably with the national norm of around 50%.</b></li> </ul> <p>In response to MW relating to poor retention on several programmes SW explained that there had been some staff related issues which are being resolved and RSW was confident that we will now see improvements.</p>		

		ACTION	ACTION DATE															
	<p><b>8.3. Enrolments and Withdrawals 2011/2012. Paper QS08.3/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that this report gives enrolment and withdrawals by programme and level during this current academic year to 25<sup>th</sup> January 2012. The data shows: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ There is a 1.6% withdrawal rate during the autumn term.</li> <li>❖ With the exception of BSc Equine Dental Science, all programmes show a substantial improvement from 2009/2010</li> </ul> <p>SW, however, stated that the report was premature as the data was prior to the first assessment and that withdrawal rates for 2009/10 were inflated by the impact of changes to UWE regulations. In response to DB SW confirmed that students who do not progress from year 1 to 2 and 2 to 3 do not show at this time but will be reported at the end of the year. RSW also advised that it does not show internal transfers.</p> <p><b>8.4. Performance to KPI Average Pass Rate 2010/2011. Paper QS08.4/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that this data relates to first attempt module pass rates for degree programmes only. SW explained that while pass rates continue to increase, they still lag behind the UWE average.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="183 1064 1165 1254"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2007/8</th> <th>2008/9</th> <th>2009/10</th> <th>2010/11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>UWE Average</td> <td>83.1%</td> <td>83.3%</td> <td>84.9%</td> <td>85.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hartpury</td> <td>74.2%</td> <td>74.6%</td> <td>78.5%</td> <td>78.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The College has set an initial target of 80% first attempt pass rate. SW explained that pass rates below 80% trigger discussion of the module performance at Field Examination Boards and place a requirement on teaching teams to investigate possible reasons for poor performance and put appropriate measures in place.</p> <p><b>8.5. Module Performance by Field and Level 2010/2011. Paper QS08.5/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that this report presents data on first and second attempt module pass rates by subject area and level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The overall first attempt module pass rate is 82%, with approximately 61% of referred students successfully passing at their second attempt. This gives a combined pass rate of approximately 85%.</li> </ul> <p>In response to MW SW confirmed that this is an area that needs to improve.</p>		2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	UWE Average	83.1%	83.3%	84.9%	85.4%	Hartpury	74.2%	74.6%	78.5%	78.7%		
	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11														
UWE Average	83.1%	83.3%	84.9%	85.4%														
Hartpury	74.2%	74.6%	78.5%	78.7%														

		ACTION	ACTION DATE																																																																																																												
	<p><b>8.6. Performance to KPI Graduate Destinations 2010/2011. Paper QS08.6/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that this is an area that has shown significant improvement and advised that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The proportion of students obtaining graduate level employment has increased considerably from 43.4 to 55.3%.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="183 510 1165 840"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2007/8</th> <th>2008/9</th> <th>2009/10</th> <th>2010/11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>UWE Average</td> <td>67.2%</td> <td>61.1%</td> <td>62.2%</td> <td>66.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hartpury</td> <td>51.9%</td> <td>39.9%</td> <td>43.4%</td> <td>55.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nottingham Trent</td> <td>66.0%</td> <td>64.0%</td> <td>49.0%</td> <td>54.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plymouth</td> <td>44.0%</td> <td>34.0%</td> <td>48.0%</td> <td>54.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SW explained there were some anomalies that affected us such as veterinary nursing was not recognised as graduate employment. RSW advised that 96.1% of our students were in employment or taking further training after six months. MW noted our good performance against similar institutions. RR felt that both Hartpury and UWE should be congratulated on this performance.</p> <p><b>8.7. Undergraduate Good Honours 2010/2011. Paper QS08.7/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that this set of data gives results on students receiving first and 2:1 degrees by programme, gender and UWE Department. Currently only 46% of our students obtain a “good degree” and this compares poorly with UWE and national norms.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="183 1411 1165 1848"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">2007/8</th> <th colspan="2">2008/9</th> <th colspan="2">2009/10</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Female %</th> <th>Male %</th> <th>Female %</th> <th>Male %</th> <th>Female %</th> <th>Male %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BBS</td> <td>64</td> <td>53</td> <td>67</td> <td>52</td> <td>60</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BIT</td> <td>72</td> <td>75</td> <td>67</td> <td>70</td> <td>84</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BNE</td> <td>69</td> <td>55</td> <td>68</td> <td>60</td> <td>64</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EDU</td> <td>80</td> <td>77</td> <td>80</td> <td>78</td> <td>79</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>HAR</b></td> <td><b>50</b></td> <td><b>31</b></td> <td><b>53</b></td> <td><b>30</b></td> <td><b>53</b></td> <td><b>35</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HLSS</td> <td>68</td> <td>59</td> <td>65</td> <td>53</td> <td>67</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HSC</td> <td>58</td> <td>74</td> <td>60</td> <td>55</td> <td>57</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LAW</td> <td>45</td> <td>47</td> <td>49</td> <td>48</td> <td>63</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SCA</td> <td>74</td> <td>62</td> <td>73</td> <td>67</td> <td>67</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SOLS</td> <td>82</td> <td>65</td> <td>76</td> <td>61</td> <td>80</td> <td>67</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SW outlined the actions that were being taken to improve the results. SW also wanted it noted the performance of females over males and advised that this was an area that was very rarely discussed.</p>		2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	UWE Average	67.2%	61.1%	62.2%	66.3%	Hartpury	51.9%	39.9%	43.4%	55.3%	Nottingham Trent	66.0%	64.0%	49.0%	54.0%	Plymouth	44.0%	34.0%	48.0%	54.0%		2007/8		2008/9		2009/10		Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	BBS	64	53	67	52	60	51	BIT	72	75	67	70	84	70	BNE	69	55	68	60	64	53	EDU	80	77	80	78	79	75	<b>HAR</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>35</b>	HLSS	68	59	65	53	67	64	HSC	58	74	60	55	57	42	LAW	45	47	49	48	63	47	SCA	74	62	73	67	67	70	SOLS	82	65	76	61	80	67		
	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11																																																																																																											
UWE Average	67.2%	61.1%	62.2%	66.3%																																																																																																											
Hartpury	51.9%	39.9%	43.4%	55.3%																																																																																																											
Nottingham Trent	66.0%	64.0%	49.0%	54.0%																																																																																																											
Plymouth	44.0%	34.0%	48.0%	54.0%																																																																																																											
	2007/8		2008/9		2009/10																																																																																																										
	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %																																																																																																									
BBS	64	53	67	52	60	51																																																																																																									
BIT	72	75	67	70	84	70																																																																																																									
BNE	69	55	68	60	64	53																																																																																																									
EDU	80	77	80	78	79	75																																																																																																									
<b>HAR</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>35</b>																																																																																																									
HLSS	68	59	65	53	67	64																																																																																																									
HSC	58	74	60	55	57	42																																																																																																									
LAW	45	47	49	48	63	47																																																																																																									
SCA	74	62	73	67	67	70																																																																																																									
SOLS	82	65	76	61	80	67																																																																																																									

		<b>ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION DATE</b>
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Note QAA Summative Review. Paper QS09/02/12</b></p> <p>SW advised that the full report had now been published and was on the QAA web site. Results had previously been discussed and the Action Plan was attached. RR queried whether it had gone to Academic Board and SW advised that a copy of the Report would have gone to UWE.</p> <p><i><b>The Principal stated that it was an outstanding Report and wished to congratulate the HE Team.</b></i></p>	<b>SW</b>	<b>Immediate</b>
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Note Minutes of Student Representative Forum. Paper QS10/02/12</b></p> <p>The Clerk issued a further set of minutes of Student Representative Forum that took place on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2012 at which RSW was present and this will be numbered QS10.1/02/12. DC noted that there was a concern raised again from the students relating to car parking and those students who only attended College on one day per week. RSW had now had a chance to explain to the students that a charge of £50 spread over 36 weeks was much cheaper than they would be charged in a city centre car park. MW advised it would be very difficult to charge students on the day as machines would have to be installed and also we were under pressure from planners to reduce the cars coming to the campus and they expected us to charge for parking, DC also noted that the students were still concerned about the lack of lighting in the Sports Academy Car Park. MW advised that students should not park in this location but it was the bus collection point. RSW advised that there had been a timetable issue as students taking the early bus to attend 8.30am lectures had nowhere to go on campus as the Library was closed. This has now been resolved as the HE Centre is open from 7.00am. RSW advised that if we stay with 8.30am lectures then we will look at modifying the bus timetable. RSW advised that she had attended the January meeting of the Forum and this had been very beneficial as she was able to explain to the student's reasons for some of the areas for which they had concerns. MW believed that a senior member of staff should be able to attend parts of these meeting and this would enable students to get quicker response on some of their concerns but this had always been refused.</p> <p><i><b>The lighting of the Sports Academy Car Park will be reviewed.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>A request for a senior member of staff to attend part of the Student Representative Forum Meetings will be made.</b></i></p>	<b>MW</b> <b>PH</b>	<b>Immediate</b> <b>Immediate</b>
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>There was no other business</p>		
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Dates of future meetings-all commence at 2.00pm</b></p> <p>Wednesday 20th June 2012  Wednesday 14th November 2012  Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2013  Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2013  Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> November 2013</p>		

**Mr David Crawford**  
**Chair Quality and Standards Committee**

**20<sup>th</sup> June 2012**