

QUALITY, ENHANCEMENT and STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Meeting 2.00pm Monday 13th November 2017 Gordon Canning Room

Present: Mr David Crawford (DC)(Chair)
Mr Alejandro Arguelles-Bullon (AAB)
Mr Russell Marchant (RM)
Mr Chris Moody (CM)
Professor Ron Ritchie (RR)
Professor Ian Robinson (IR)
Mrs Rosie Scott-Ward (RSW)
Dr John Selby (JS)
Ms Claire Whitworth (CW)

In Attendance: Mr Edward Keene (EK)

Apologies: Dr Beri Hare
Ms Hannah Knaggs

Minutes: Mr Rob Lee

		ACTION	ACTION DATE
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were received from Dr B Hare and Ms H Knaggs.</p>		
2.	<p>Declaration of Interest. Paper QES02/11/17.</p> <p>The Clerk advised that members' interests would be taken as those disclosed in the Register of Members Interests. There were no declarations of members interests for agenda items.</p>		
3.	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting. Declaration of Interest. Paper QES03/11/17.</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting held on the 25th June 2017 were agreed to be a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.</p>		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>4. Matters Arising</p> <p>4.1. (4.1, 5.4) Follow-up on governance issues from TDAP Report was an agenda item at the July 2017 Board Meeting.</p> <p>4.2. (5.4) Process of how Teaching and Learning is assessed. Paper QES04.2/11/17.</p> <p>CW advised that more information was requested at the last meeting on the process for assessing teaching and learning and this paper provides an extract from the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy that details the process. RR questioned how we take account of progression over time and CW advised that this paper outlines the process not the judgement which is judged on a student's work and outcomes considering current working grade against target grade. In response to DC CW advised that lecturers had adapted to the new process very well and RM agreed as some had been unhappy at the start with no notice assessments but now were fully involved with the process.</p> <p>4.3. (5.10) Report on Digital Strategy.</p> <p>RM advised that we are in a period of change and after conducting a review we are now looking for a Director of Digital Strategy and we may need other experience in this area. Once this person is appointed we will review our strategy and present to the governors at Strategic Planning Day.</p> <p>4.4. (6.2) HE KPIs will be agreed at Agenda Item 6.2.</p>		
<p>5. FE Reports.</p> <p>5.1. Discuss and recommend for approval the Self-Assessment Report 2016/2017. Paper QES05.1/11/17.</p> <p>CW advised that following a number of significant changes made last year to the 2015/2016 Self-Assessment Report (SAR) the format and content has further evolved. The SAR this year largely reflects further changes to the educational landscape, feedback from the Landex SAR validation events (last year and this year), the Landex Peer Review and assessment of sector best practice undertaken throughout the year. CW advised that whilst we believe we have made significant progress in the movement towards outstanding, we are self-assessing ourselves overall as Good. CW outlined the key changes that had taken place this year in producing the SAR as well as key data changes which includes benchmarking against like institutions. CW confirmed that an external Landex validation of the SAR and Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) had taken place and this Report was included in the papers. CW advised that this had been invaluable in</p>		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>shaping the final report and this led to us self-assessing ourselves as Good not Outstanding. CW referred Members to the self-assessed grades at the start of the Report. RR questioned the Grade 1 allocated to Quality of Teaching and Learning for the overall grade with our outcome in A Levels and believed that current outcomes would not evidence this Grade. CW believed that we have evidenced that classroom delivery in A Levels has significantly improved although this has not yet had the impact we want on outcomes. CM also believed that the results in A Levels did not demonstrate a grade of Good for the Effectiveness of Leadership and Management and further challenged the grade of Quality of Teaching and Learning as Good when the outcome Requires Improvement. CW believed that the actions for A Levels that have been put in place will have positive outcomes but CM responded that we are looking at 2016/2017 and the plan maybe good but as yet there is no evidence of improved outcomes. IR agreed that he has made his link governor visit to A Level Department and was impressed with the team who understood where the problems are but they are on a journey. IR questioned the logic of two good grades (the rest being assessed as outstanding) for the Quality of Teaching and Learning gives an overall Grade 1 but only one grade of Good (the rest being outstanding) for Leadership and Management gives a Grade 2. CW advised that all the other grades need to be Grade 1 for the Effectiveness of Leadership and Management to be Grade 1 and as this was not the case it was Grade 2. CM stated that Ofsted will challenge where they feel there may be inflated results and we must ensure we can evidence this accurately in the self-assessment. RM agreed that we were overall Good but needed to look at some of the individual department grades. DC summarised that Members agree with the overall grade of Good but we need to reflect on some of the department grades before presenting the final report to Corporation. JS believed that we are on a journey and some of the key strengths outlined on page 3 may be overstated the way they are written. IR referred Members to page 10 outlining how we have addressed areas for improvement from the previous Ofsted visit and felt that they could be re-sequenced to cluster in areas that were similar. JS referred Members to pages 92 through to 95 and assumed that the grades were amber or red when not marked green and this was sending a signal that we may want to think about.</p> <p><i>The Self-Assessment Report 2016/2017 should be amended in line with the above discussion and presented to the next meeting of the Corporation for approval.</i></p> <p>5.2. Discuss Risk Area Report on A Level Performance. Paper QES05.2/11/17.</p> <p>CW advised that this Report highlights the 2016/2017 performance, 2017/2018 interim progress and further actions for this year. CW</p>	<p>CW</p>	<p>07/11/17</p>

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>confirmed that A Level results were as predicted and retention was not strong with the main reasons for withdrawal being exclusion, health concerns, personal and students struggling living away from home. CW advised that on the 2016/2017 results Biology, Chemistry and Maths remain the areas of most concern. CW outlined the current progress against target grades against first and second year subjects. DC questioned the use of limited, some and reasonable progress and would like specific parameters in future reports. In response to IR over MIS data concerns CW advised that we are still keeping our own spread sheets and the data is robust. In response to JS CW advised that it was an error missing out the performance of Sociology at AS Level in 2016/2017. In response to CM CW advised that Environmental Studies and Physics remain as the only areas with one specialist teacher due to low student numbers. CM suggested that we may need to look at whether these areas can be delivered by another local institution. RR questioned the predicted data for Biology which shows a mammoth improvement and CW outlined the actions that had been taken but all the grades have a caveat as it was early in the year.</p> <p>5.3. Discuss Risk Area Report on Maths and English. Paper QES05.3/11/17.</p> <p>CW advised that English and Maths pass rates have presented significant challenges over the last two years but there has been significant improvement. Maths pass rate grades A*-C was 30.6% against a national average of 22.9% and English was 44% grades 9-4 against a national average of 35.4%. CW outlined the areas for key focus for the coming year. CM congratulated CW on this performance but advised that in presentation terms we should have mentioned the results for Functional Skills as we did for Maths and English.</p> <p>5.4. Discuss outcomes from Enrolment and Induction Survey. Paper QES05.4/11/17.</p> <p>CW advised that as part of the formal FE Student Voice process, a student satisfaction induction survey is always conducted within the first six weeks of term to ascertain student perception of enrolment and their Hartpury experience to date. CW further advised that for the first time, we also ran the Ofsted student satisfaction survey alongside our internal survey, the results to date of which are also included in the report in the accompanying additional document. CW believed that both sets of survey results were very positive with a number of improvements since last year. CW explained that the main areas of focus for improvement now are the enrolment process and improved communications to students prior to arriving. In response to JS CW advised that the number of responses dropped this year as the survey was focused on new students whereas last year returning students also completed the survey. RR believed this to be an</p>		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>excellent set of results but questioned what was being done relating to the low score for A Levels for the quality of information prior to starting. CW advised that the reasons were not clear so a focus group, which includes students, has been set up. DC thought it strange that 9% of students were not aware that their work is assessed regularly.</p> <p>5.5. Agree KPI Targets for 2017/2018. Paper QES05.5/11/17.</p> <p>CW advised that the overall KPI results have not changed since those issued at the last Corporation Meeting but the individual department data was now included. CW advised, however that this set of data includes the proposed 2017/2018 KPI Targets. In response to CM CW advised that the recent levels of performance and the most recent National Rates have been considered when setting the KPI Target.</p> <p><i>The KPI Targets for 2017/2018 were approved.</i></p> <p>5.6. Note Annual Cycle of FE Reporting. Paper QES05.6/11/17.</p> <p>CW questioned whether a summary of External Verifiers Reports needs to go to this Committee. RR believed that Ofsted would expect this to be monitored. JS agreed and believed that you would want this to routinely go to a committee in the College, if not this Committee, and if there was an issue to be reported to us. RR agreed that there must be some mechanism that would flag potential problems.</p> <p><i>It was agreed that a summary of External Verifier Reports would continue to come to this Committee.</i></p>		
<p>6. HE Reports</p> <p>6.1. Report from Associate Faculty Board. Paper QES06.1/11/17.</p> <p>RSW advised that the Associate Faculty Board will be renamed the Academic Board for the 2017-18 academic year, now we have achieved TDAP. RSW outlined the discussions that had taken place at the September meeting of Associate Faculty Board. There had been extensive discussion on the proposed Postgraduate Research relationship with UWE. RSW hoped that the Agreement will come to the December Corporation Meeting for approval. The first two projects have been approved with the first students enrolling in January 2018. In response to RR RSW advised that we have capacity for a further four students. In response to RR RSW confirmed that this will be a UWE validated Degree. In response to IR on National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes RSW advised that individual programme level data is being considered but the performance of Veterinary Nursing was a concern. RSW outlined the actions being taken on the NSS outcomes and advised a report will go to</p>		

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>the next meeting of the Academic Board and then come to this Committee. Also in response to IR RSW advised that one of the problems with Veterinary Nursing has been the high turnover of staff which has caused uncertainty.</p> <p>6.2. Agree KPIs and Targets for 2018/2019. Paper QES06.2/11/17.</p> <p>RSW advised that the KPIs expanded significantly last year and this has led to a review. RSW confirmed that the HE sector is placing increasing importance on the use of performance indicators. RSW proposed therefore that there will be KPI targets split between QuEst and the Corporation with five monitored in year and eight annually with the addition of ten high level performance indicators which will primarily be monitored by QuEst. RSW advised that as a result there will be a KPI sheet which goes to each Corporation Meeting and a second that goes to each QuEst. RSW advised that some of the data had been missing when the papers had been sent out so she re-issued the relevant sheets with more complete data and showing the proposed KPIs for Corporation and QuEst. Relating to the QuEst Performance Indicators and Targets RR questioned why some targets for 2017/2018 were less than had actually been achieved the previous year. RSW advised that there was some concern over the accuracy of the data used the previous year and it was agreed that where this is the case some explanatory narrative should be included. RSW advised that Tariff on Entry had not been included as this would be monitored by Academic Board. IR suggested that value added could be a performance indicator which includes tariff on entry. RSW advised that it should also be split by undergraduate entry. Relating to the Corporation KPIs JS suggested that Module Achievement should be a performance target monitored by QuEst only and not reported to Corporation. JS also believed that there should be targets for postgraduate applications and enrolments as this was part of the strategic direction of the College. IR questioned whether the large increase in the target for FE to HE enrolments was possible and RSW believed that it was if we achieved university title and the construction of the student village in Gloucester Docks.</p> <p><i>The Key Performance Indicators will be amended in line with the above discussion.</i></p> <p>6.3. Approve Assurance Statements about quality and standards from accountable officers for 2017/2018. Paper QES02/11/17.</p> <p>RSW advised that the Corporation has to approve an Annual Quality Assurance Statement but the deadline of the 1st December does not facilitate this and the Corporation has therefore given delegated responsibility to QuEst. RSW advised that the Quality Assurance overview for 2016/2017 is not reliant on a single report but outcomes</p>	<p>RSW</p>	<p>07/12/17 07/03/18</p>

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>from a number of reports. RSW believed that this Report provided by the Academic Board gives the Governing Body sufficient evidence to be able to provide HEFCE with full assurance. IR advised that he was not comfortable not having a synoptic report but was confident we have seen the appropriate data and RSW agreed that the format would be reviewed and brought to the next meeting. RR believed that there should be more clarity in the action on monitoring PGT and PGR students and they should be treated differently and not incorporated with undergraduates and this needed re-wording. JS suggested that the committee structure on page 4 needed a glossary explaining the initials that were being used.</p> <p><i>The Report was approved with the above amendments and assurance can be sent to HEFCE by the 1st December 2017 and sent to the next meeting of the Corporation for final approval.</i></p> <p><i>A revised format for this Report will be discussed at the next meeting.</i></p>	<p>RSW</p> <p>RSW</p>	<p>01/12/17 07/12/17</p> <p>07/03/18</p>
<p>7. Cross College</p> <p>7.1. Review analysis of Complaints 2016/2017. Paper QES07.1/11/17.</p> <p>RSW advised that this analysis is not the complete picture as it only looks at complaints through the official complaints process and not below that level and also does not include academic complaints through UWE. RR believed that we should not be looking at a general report on complaints but an executive summary referenced to improving quality. CM thought that it was odd that the largest single complaint was relating to attitude and this reported students and staff together.</p> <p><i>It was agreed that the content and format of this Report will be reviewed.</i></p> <p>7.2. Student Voice. Paper QES02/11/17.</p> <p>In the absence of Hannah Knaggs RM presented the Report from the Students' Union and advised that the officers have been very proactive at the start of the year in supporting the College at events such as HE and FE enrolment. HE and FE representatives have been appointed and the first HE SU Forum has taken place. AAB advised that he has attended the training for FE representatives held by the SU when the roles of the Students' Union and student representatives were discussed. Future events which the SU would be involved with were noted and JS requested information on the activities planned for Equality and Diversity Week in January 2018.</p> <p><i>Circulate information on Equality and Diversity Week activities.</i></p>	<p>RM</p> <p>Clerk</p>	<p>15/11/18</p> <p>When Available</p>

	ACTION	ACTION DATE
<p>8. Any Other Business</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>		
<p>9. Dates of future meetings-all commence at 2.00pm. New dates in red</p> <p>Wednesday 7th March 2018 Wednesday 27th June 2018 Thursday 15th November 2018</p> <p>Thursday 7th March 2019 Tuesday 25th June 2019 Thursday 21st November 2019</p>		

Mr David Crawford
Chair Quality Enhancement and Standards Committee

7th March 2018