

# MOULTON COLLEGE

## QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Academic Standards Committee Meeting Held on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2011

**Present:** Mr J Gaggini (in the Chair), Mr C Barney, Mrs J Charlton-Jones, Mr R Clements, Mr A Ellis, Mrs K Mackaness, Mr G Patrick, Mr M Thomson

**In Attendance:** Mr R Chapman, Mrs S Field, Ms L Johnson, Miss S O'Connor, Mr M Wilkinson

**11/10 Apologies for absence (agenda item 1)**

Apologies were received from Mr P Heygate and Mr R Thompson.

**11/11 Minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010 (agenda item 2, paper A)**

The minutes were accepted as a true and correct record.

**11/12 Matters Arising (agenda item 3)**

There were no matters arising.

**11/13 Business Support Self-assessment Report (agenda item 4, paper B)**

This was the first time that business support areas had carried out a self-assessment exercise. The summary of the key strengths and areas for improvement were outlined and discussed. Some of these had been incorporated into the main college SAR. The process had demonstrated the increasing need for effective communications between the different college functions. Following discussion, *the report was noted*.

**11/14 College Self-assessment Report and Quality Improvement Plan (agenda item 5, paper C)**

The whole college SAR was discussed. The grade for Quality of Provision had declined from 1 to 2. This was based on the profile of faculty grades which included some grade 2 and one grade 3. It was difficult to justify a grade 1 due to the underlying data. The grade 2 for Leadership and Management had been influenced by the 3 year decline in success rates although all but one of these were still above the benchmark. The college had undergone a period of rapid growth and needed to adapt to ensure it continued to improve. Target setting mechanisms for individual students had not been sufficiently robust to ensure they stayed on track. The achievement gap between some ethnic minority groups and the College norm had not been recognised soon enough so that remedial action could be planned in year. Tracking processes needed to improve to ensure managers could monitor these items. The grade for Capacity to Improve had remained at 1 as the college felt that it had recognised these weaknesses and put in place plans for improvement.

The Construction Faculty SAR had contained a number of grades at 3. The areas for improvement reflected what was required to rectify the situation. The faculty contained the majority of apprentices in the college. Students transferring from full-time courses to apprenticeships adversely affected success rates but the college

regarded this as positive progression. Due to a change in the way results would be calculated in future this would not be a problem next year. There had been a decline in recruitment and it was recognised that it was important for the curriculum to remain responsive to the changing needs of employers. The provision was currently being revised to include modern methods of construction. Maths and English had been embedded into all courses. The initial screening of the 2011 intake showed quite low levels of prior attainment, particularly in maths. It was explained at interview what was required and that ability in maths and reading were essential for success in the construction industry. It was noted that the College offered significant amounts of added value in its programmes which had been maintained against a trend in other colleges to reduce the weekly contact time and course content.

The college had graded itself as 2 for Equality and Diversity. There was a changing expectation on public bodies as a result of the 2010 Equality Act. Colleges were now required to actively advance equality, not just promote it. The Board had recently approved an Equality Statement. Students were now being actively engaged with equality matters and had been set an exercise during induction to draw up a poster showing what the Equality Statement meant to them. It was hoped that actions like this would allow the grade to be restored to 1 next year. Following discussion, *the SAR and its Quality Improvement Plan were approved for recommendation to the Board.*

**11/15 Committee Self-Assessment Report 2010-11 (agenda item 6, paper D)**

Proposed changes to the report were discussed. The frequency of meetings to allow the committee to properly monitor quality was discussed. It may be necessary to increase the number of meetings. Training for Governors to allow them to effectively interrogate the reports they received was discussed. One of the terms of reference was to advise the Board of Governors on the effectiveness of the College's procedures for monitoring quality and standards. The committee did not currently discuss the Quality Policy and Procedures. It was important not to stray into management areas. Following discussion, *the Committee graded its work as 2 and it was agreed that a review by internal auditors of the quality procedures would be suggested to the college management. It was further agreed that a self-study pack based on questions which could be asked about the current year SAR would be provided prior to the next meeting.*

**11/16 Date of next meeting (agenda item 7)**

The next meeting would provisionally be held on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 at 4.00pm.

**11/17 Any other business**

There was no other business.