

## QUALITY and STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### Minutes of a Meeting 2.00pm Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2011 Gordon Canning Room

**Present:** Mr David Crawford (DC)(Chair)  
Mr David Barnett (DB)  
Mr Simon Bray (SB)  
Mr John Perry (JP)  
Mr Luke Rake (LR)  
Professor Ron Ritchie (RR)  
Mrs Rosie Scott-Ward (RSW)  
Dr Stephen Waite (SW)

**Apologies:** Mr Richard Robertshaw  
Mr Malcolm Wharton  
Mr Charles Willoughby

**Minutes:** Mr Rob Lee

		<b>ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION DATE</b>
<b>1. Apologies</b>	Apologies were received from Mr R Robertshaw, Mr M Wharton and Mr C Willoughby.  The Chair welcomed Professor R Ritchie and Mr S Bray to their first meeting.		
<b>2. Declaration of Interest – Paper QS02/06/11</b>	Mr Barnett declared an interest in Agenda item 5.1 as he had been involved in writing one of the reports. It was agreed that Mr Barnett could be involved in the discussions on this matter but no subsequent vote.  The Clerk advised that member’s interests would be taken as those disclosed in the Register of Members Interests. There were no other declarations of members’ interests for agenda items.		
<b>3. Minutes of the Last Meeting – Paper QS03/06/11</b>	Minutes of the meeting held on the 1 <sup>st</sup> February 2011 were agreed to be a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p><b>4. Matters Arising</b></p> <p><b>4.1 (5.0) Analysis of complaints of theft. Paper QS04.1/06/11</b></p> <p>The Clerk advised that further analysis of complaints from students of theft had been made as it accounted for over 20% of all complaints. All categories had increased but 50% of complaints were regarding the theft of food from communal fridges in student residences. In response to RR the Clerk advised that all complaints were investigated and responses of findings relayed back to complainant. SB advised that security currently outsourced was being brought back in-house which would give greater ownership. There would also be a greater emphasis placed on the subject of security of possessions during induction.</p> <p><b>4.2 (4.3, 16.1) IT Reception.</b></p> <p>SB confirmed that there had been some progress in hard wiring residential blocks but the exercise had not been completed.</p> <p><b>4.3 (9A) FE Student Induction Survey.</b></p> <p>LR confirmed that the survey was completed by first year students only and therefore the completion rate was very high.</p>		
<p><b>5. Discuss and agree action from On Programme Student Survey.</b></p> <p><b>5.1 Further Education Paper QS05.1/06/11</b></p> <p><b>LR advised that the survey was completed by all students and in comparison to data from corresponding period last year the results were disappointing. There continues to be an overall slight negative trend within student satisfaction. As a result LR had met with student groups personally during May and their anecdotal responses were far more positive than the survey suggested. LR outlined the scoring system and identified the courses and reasons for some of the dissatisfaction. There had been some staffing problems and residential students were generally less satisfied than non residential students. Equine and Rugby, which have a high number of residential students, have a lower level of satisfaction. Their concerns were usually more social than academic. LR also advised that there was also a trend showing that the more academic courses, such as A Levels, had a lower rate of satisfaction, and students on a level 1 course tended to be more satisfied. Within each curriculum area there was a wide range of satisfaction within the individual courses. LR, whilst not wishing to dismiss the negative trend, advised that retention and achievement remained outstanding and if students were truly dissatisfied they would leave. The individual results were discussed and DC noted that one of the areas where satisfaction had gone back the most against last year was relating to computer facilities and this was not the first survey that had pointed to some dissatisfaction in this area. LR advised that the least satisfied students were those that used computer facilities at the farm where the facilities were poor. However this would be overcome by the opening of the new Academic Centre at Home Farm from the beginning of the next academic year. LR advised that the College IT strategy was to invest in Wi-Fi and therefore budget was limited for purchase of computer equipment. RR queried how students were aware of the College strategy. LR outlined</b></p>		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>communication with students which was primarily on academic matters and via student representatives who receive a formal response from the Autumn meeting with senior staff, which includes strategic measures. RSW advised that posters around the campus were used to communicate with HE students. RR advised that there was also a negative trend in assessment feedback and asked whether FE and HE share best practice. LR and SW explained the current areas of communication and agreed they were aiming to explore greater sharing between the two areas. The Clerk advised that the area of communication with students had been discussed by the Equality and Diversity Committee and a report was awaited from the Marketing Department. DC noted there was a negative trend on the condition of the toilets and thought that this was often an important factor in influencing a student's opinion about an institution. SB advised that some areas, particularly the toilets in the Refectory and Home Farm, needed some work. RR advised that the data was very helpful but more disappointing than he had expected. Student Services was showing a negative trend over the last 3 years. LR and SW explained that the individual comments from students were fed down to the departments and this is incorporated into departmental action planning and the SAR process. SB advised that customer service training had been identified for this department and there were to be some staff changes. In response to DC DB believed that the question on careers advice was badly worded and needed review.</p>		
<p><i>When the Report on options for communication with students is available it will be distributed to Members of this Committee.</i></p>	Clerk	Immediate
<p><i>The questions on the survey will be reviewed annually.</i></p>	LR/SW	Immediate
<p><b>5.2 Higher Education Paper QS05.2/06/11</b></p> <p>SW advised that the results of the survey generally showed an improving trend although there was a concern over the large increase in dissatisfaction of students towards questions 8 and 9 relating to assessment feedback. SW advised, however, that if these results were transferred to the National Student Survey he would be satisfied with the result. In response to RR SW explained that the previous year the College had been involved in a similar UWE survey as well as this one but this year it had been agreed to concentrate on this one only. In response to RR SW confirmed that students could complete the UWE survey if they wished and RR felt that potential low numbers of students completing would lead to potentially extraordinary results and therefore clarification was required. SW referred Members to the report analysing student comments into broad categories. The most comments were on general experience, timetabling and against 3 particular modules. Actions had been put in place relating to the modules. RSW advised that timetabling was critical to the student experience and lectures are scheduled between 8.30am and 8.00pm. RR was surprised at the spread of these times and LR explained that FE was on a fixed day, due to transport requirements, of 9.00am to 4.00pm and FE lectures had to be scheduled during this period. LR and SW outlined the improvements being made to the process and if this did not make significant improvements then a more radical approach may be required. RSW also advised that the Library was an issue. SB believed that the Library and the adjacent Refectory were very dated and RSW advised that local competitor facilities were very impressive.</p>		

		<b>ACTION</b>	<b>ACTION DATE</b>
	<p><b>RSW confirmed that the new HE Centre would contain computer facilities.</b></p> <p><b>Clarification on completion of the UWE Student Survey was required.</b></p> <p><b>5.3 Course League Table Paper QS05.3/06/11</b></p> <p><b>LR advised that the League Table matches to the discussions that have already taken place. RR said that there was a huge spread and wondered how you could promote to learners and was there cross fertilisation across courses. LR discussed FE staff CPD processes and how 'silo-breaking' occurs through joint work such as the internal verification process, HAL. RSW advised that we use results at programme level which eventually feeds into departmental action plans. RR noted that as discussed earlier A Levels was one of the courses with least satisfied students. LR replied that many of the students came from private sector education and were resident, which as explained earlier, is a category of students that were generally less satisfied for social reasons. LR also believed that the Sports Academy has an influence on student satisfaction in A level as there were a number of A Level students that were unable to get into their team of choice.</b></p>	<b>SW</b>	<b>Immediate</b>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Note College feedback to student views from Course Representative Meeting with College Executive. Paper QS06/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR advised that College Executives had meetings on two occasions per year with course representatives and explained the process whereby the students received feedback on the matters they had raised at the meetings. In response to RR LR advised that the feedback was not available on VLE as this would be less effective than the preferred face-to-face meetings. However, the HE method of using generic PowerPoint for students was attractive and would be taken forward. In response to RR SW advised that it was a very powerful form of communication where students write an alternative prospectus and RSW confirmed that this form of communication was used by some of our competitors.</p>		
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Discuss Report on Review of Employer Engagement. Paper QS07/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR advised that discussions had been taking place for some time over how we deal with employer engagement and a formal review started in November of last year. LR advised that it was clear that our current policy of one size fits all does not work efficiently. LR outlined the results of the review. The idea of each curriculum area having a vocational panel twice per year is not the most effective way of gathering information and we should have a more flexible engagement strategy. In response to DC LR advised that our communication with employers is already reviewed through Quality Review process and Self Assessment Review so there is monitoring in place.</p> <p><b>It was agreed that commentary on our employer engagement will be brought to each meeting.</b></p>	<b>LR/SW</b>	<b>23/11/11</b>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Note Employer Responsive Performance Report. Paper QS08/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR referred Members to Ofsted Report on our Employer Responsive</p>		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>Performance which had been an area of concern. DC noted that there had been massive improvements in our performance over the last 4 years and LR agreed and advised that many quality improvements had been put in place since the last report.</p> <p><b><i>The Report from Ofsted on our Employer Responsive Performance was noted.</i></b></p>		
<p><b>9. Review Course Data.</b></p> <p><b>9.1. Performance to FE Academic Targets. Paper QS09.1/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR referred Members to the report outlining the College performance against the FE Academic Targets. LR advised that these were a Governor KPI and as there were some results not yet included there could be minor changes. All targets are likely to be exceeded and all bar one area, Adult Learners Long Level 2, showed improvement year on year. LR advised that we were still waiting for a number of results from football coaching courses and this may rise to a more positive level. In response to DC LR agreed that it will be very difficult to set higher targets and gave as an example that every student taking Animal Care National Diploma courses had achieved a distinction the equivalent of 3 A's at A level. DB suggested that it may be possible to arrange a cost benefit analysis to show where budgets would be better placed. RSW believed that we should invest in the whole student experience. RR believed that we should look at the student surveys data that will give us early warnings as to where improvements can be made.</p> <p><b><i>The final report outlining FE Academic Performance will be brought to the next meeting.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Proposed targets for FE Academic Performance will be brought to the next meeting for approval.</i></b></p> <p><b>9.2. Full-Time FE In-Year Retention. Paper QS09.2/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR advised that at 95% the in year retention was outstanding although it had dropped slightly from the previous year when it was at 95.7%. LR confirmed that data is investigated by course on a monthly basis.</p> <p><b>9.3. FE Learner Attendance. Paper QS09.3/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR advised that attendance for the period to the end of May 2011 was running at 95%. In response to DC LR explained how the measure was calculated. In response to RR LR advised that there was currently a technical problem in calculating attendance at equine duties which will be resolved for the 2011-12 academic year.</p> <p><b>9.4. He Enrolments and Withdrawals 2010/2011. Paper QS09.4/06/11</b></p> <p>SW presented the Report on withdrawals calculated after first set of examination boards. Retention was currently running at 92% and was expected to be 84% at the end of the academic year. This would exceed the UWE KPI of 77% and RSW believed that this was an excellent performance considering the change to UWE regulations on</p>	<p>LR</p> <p>LR</p>	<p>23/11/11</p> <p>23/11/11</p>

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p><b>compulsory student withdrawals. In response to DC SW confirmed that courses with poor retention rates were investigated but that low student numbers on some courses was the reason. In response to DC SW explained that Virtual Awards was a process where a student could gain some credits even though all core modules had been failed.</b></p> <p><b>9.5. Semester 1 Module Performance 2010/2011. Paper QS09.5/06/11.</b></p> <p>SW advised that this report had been requested by the Equality and Diversity Committee who had seen a report that suggested that male students were performing far worse than female students. SW presented Semester 1 Module Performance which did show that male performance was not as good as female performance and even more so in sport. This was a sector problem not a College problem and the figures were not as poor as those that had been presented to E&amp;D Committee where it seems some data was missing.</p>		
<p><b>10. Note Edexcel Quality Review and Development Report. Paper QS10/06/11.</b></p> <p>LR advised that Edexcel reviewed our evaluation process on an annual basis. The report was excellent advising that all quality objectives had been met.</p> <p><b><i>The Edexcel Quality Review was noted.</i></b></p>		
<p><b>11. Any Other Business</b></p> <p>There was no other business.</p>		
<p><b>12. Dates of Future Meetings all to be held at 2.00pm</b></p> <p>Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2011  Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2012  Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2012  Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> November 2012</p>		

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

**23<sup>rd</sup> November 2011**