

**REASEHEATH COLLEGE BOARD**  
**QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 11 March 2019 at 10.30am**  
**Committee Room, Reaseheath Hall**

Present            Marcus Clinton (principal) MC  
Jane Cowell (associate, independent) JC  
Mike Gorton (associate, independent) MG  
Anne McKay (staff) AM  
David Pearson (independent) DP  
Richard Ratcliffe (independent) RR  
Paige Reedman (student) PR (*items 1 – 7.1 inclusive*)  
Alastair Taylor (independent) (chair) AT  
Charlie Woodcock (independent) CW

Attending        Peter Green (governor designate) PG  
Kian Bentall (student)  
Matthew Gower (assistant principal) MGower  
Sarah Houghton (assistant principal) SH  
Paul Spearritt (assistant principal) PS  
Sharon Yates (assistant principal) SY  
Wendy Watson (quality manager) WW  
Holly Conner (curriculum area manager) HH  
Jamie Parker (curriculum area manager) JP  
Nick Blakemore (curriculum area manager) NB  
Jackie Schillinger (clerk) JS

Item	Content
<b>1.</b>	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
1.1	The Chair AT welcomed all to the meeting. There were no apologies from committee members. AT welcomed Paige Reedman to the meeting and noted that Paige has taken over from Megan Marriott as student governor (FE). Attendee Dave Kynaston, the Vice Principal had given his apologies for this meeting.
1.2	<b>RESOLVED: The meeting confirmed Paige Reedman as a member of the committee.</b>
1.3	The meeting was declared quorate.
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>
2.1	The declaration of interests form was circulated. There were no interests declared as giving rise to a conflict of interest in relation to the agenda items for the meeting.

<p><b>3.</b></p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p>	<p><b>MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair. DP commented on the high quality of the minutes, as they show a good level of granularity of discussion and questioning.</p> <p>Under matters arising, the rolling action log was reviewed and the following highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PG noted the request from the last meeting that the number of student exclusions be highlighted in safeguarding reporting going forwards had not been captured on the action log – <i>it was agreed this be picked up in the actions this time.</i></li> <li>• PG asked about progress in producing the position statements. MG and MC confirmed that these are being drafted and will be available soon. In the meantime, it was agreed to provide a copy of the college self-assessment report (SAR) executive summary that has been drafted and will be ready next week. <i>Action: Email executive summary SAR to governors when available.</i></li> <li>• JC confirmed that she will liaise with MG to arrange the night shift in student services.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p><b>STUDENT EXPERIENCE FOCUS</b></p> <p>Level 2 Food Technology student Kian Bentall (KB) and Food Curriculum Area Manager Nick Blakemore (NB) joined the meeting to share an example of the student experience on a Reaseheath programme. NB explained that the Food Technology programme had some issues with staff turnover in the first year and the student satisfaction with the course needed improvement. He explained that this year, stable staffing has been achieved and there have been a number of changes to the modules to improve the student experience. One change has been to introduce more industry relevant content. KB told the meeting about the ‘New Product Development’ module that has been introduced to the programme this year. He explained that this involved working with the college catering manager and external partner Harlech Foods, in developing new products for sale in the college catering outlets. This project involved product research, customer research and pricing development, product development and testing, taste tests with customers and a final assessment of the products. The executive team at college were involved in tasting and providing feedback on the products and those executive members in the meeting commented on the high standards of the products and the knowledge shown by the students. NB confirmed that the outcome of the module is fully assessed and the products will be going on sale via the college catering outlets.</p> <p>AT thanked KB and NB for sharing this case study and he invited questions from members of the committee. JC asked if KB had found this module more enjoyable because it was more like real life. KB said that this was the first time he had done something like this and he found it really good as well as challenging because it felt like something he might be doing in the proper industry. He said that it helped him to understand what it would be like to do this kind of work. AT asked how KB felt about the weaknesses in the course at the start and how the improvements had worked. KB said that the students on the course went with it because even through there were changes in teaching staff, which was inconvenient, the department made sure that there were always substitutes and they managed to make it good, so he felt that they had been kept on track. AT asked if the students were unhappy with something, would they be listened to. KB agreed that they would be, he noted that with some of the enrichment elements of the course, the students gave some negative feedback and things were changed and are now much better. AM asked if KB felt that the course was preparing him for work. KB agreed it was and commented on the substantial amount of work experience on the course, as well as the employability content to the course, which involves a lot of the softer skills needed to do well in a proper workplace.</p>

4.3	AT thanked all for the discussion and he suggested that next time it would be good to hear an Engineering case study about the student experience progressing from a level 2 to a level 3 National Qualifications Framework (NQF). <i>Action: next meeting case study.</i>
5.1	<p data-bbox="240 233 789 264"><b>5. COLLEGE STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER AND KPIS</b></p> <p data-bbox="240 306 1492 512">The Principal, MC, presented the college strategic risk register and highlighted those areas particularly relevant to FE and Apprenticeship delivery. The specialist staffing challenges in some areas of college provision and the continuing rise in mental health support needs were the focus of discussion. The meeting noted that performance data was solid overall and there were no significant areas of concern flagged on the risk register based on current performance data. In questions and discussion, the following areas were highlighted:</p> <p data-bbox="240 522 380 554">On staffing:</p> <ul data-bbox="289 564 1492 1404" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="289 564 1492 732">• AT commented that the specialist staffing element of staffing perhaps should be flagged as red rather than amber. He also asked how the committee could be more involved in overseeing how this risk is managed. MC explained that the risk is being managed by the executive team through the business planning process this is currently underway and that the actions from this process will be reported back to the governors in the next couple of months;</li> <li data-bbox="289 743 1492 911">• JC asked how the issue of differential pay will be managed and whether there is a recognition across college of the economic realities of the specialist staffing issue. MC confirmed that he sees this recognition and the feedback from the staff conference shows that staff realise this is a key issue for the college. MC explained that it will be important to ensure good communication to staff through the business planning process;</li> <li data-bbox="289 921 1492 1089">• MG asked how close the executive team is to an action plan to move this issue forward. MC explained the current actions that had been taken, but which have not fundamentally changed the issue. He confirmed that the business planning process will provide actions that will be factored into the budget for next year and that there will be some priority actions that will need to be taken for September;</li> <li data-bbox="289 1100 1492 1163">• CW provided his feedback from introducing market supplements at the University of Chester and the pros and cons of their approach;</li> <li data-bbox="289 1173 1492 1404">• DP suggested that a test and challenge meeting next term on the actions coming out of the business planning process might be useful. The Clerk, JS, suggested that this could happen in the Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting in June, as HR strategy is within its Terms of Reference remit, but that Quality and Standards Committee members could also be invited to this meeting. All agreed that this would be a good idea and that the specialist staffing element to staffing should be highlighted as a red risk on the risk register; <i>Action: FCP meeting agenda for June</i></li> </ul> <p data-bbox="240 1415 456 1446">On mental health:</p> <ul data-bbox="289 1457 1492 1919" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="289 1457 1492 1625">• MGower explained that the college is doing a good job on providing a good service to support students with mental health issues, but that the pressures continue. He explained the plans to move the wellbeing team to a dedicated centre on campus, which will provide a more conducive environment for the service, the joint work with the University of Chester and the development of the wellbeing team resource;</li> <li data-bbox="289 1635 1492 1835">• DP thanked the staff for going the extra mile to keep the service going. He emphasised that the college needs to look at the wider system to ensure that the external bodies such as Cheshire East and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) fully understand the pressures the college is under, as well as ensuring that the college links in to the NHS plan and the education green paper. He also emphasised the need to support staff dealing with these issues with supervision, support and debriefing;</li> <li data-bbox="289 1845 1492 1919">• CW noted that the impact of the Auger Report into Higher Education and the Office for Students could add further pressures on level 4 and 5 provision because there will be an expectation of</li> </ul>

	<p>parity of support for residential and non-residential students. He explained that the development of the self-assessment and referral app by the university, working with the college, is in response to these developments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student governor PR noted that the under 18 students have positive feedback for the wellbeing team, but that some students cannot get access to it as much as they would like because of the pressure of volume of need and she can see that there are strains on the team to meet demand;</li> <li>• AM asked whether the college is doing enough on prevention if it is doing so much firefighting; MGower explained the BeReady developments and the planned link to the to the BeWell site, as well as the initiatives on the self-help app with the University of Chester. JC added that the work within the curriculum is also important in building resilience. She also wondered if initiatives such as using more volunteers and looking at how HE students can contribute in relation to the lower level, resilience type issues amongst FE students;</li> <li>• MG wondered if the increase in pressure will continue at the same pace, as there may be some element of an increase in profile and acceptability of asking for help for mental health issues;</li> <li>• Student governor, PR commented that there is a lot of help from the wellbeing team and also via talking to the safeguarding team.</li> </ul> <p>5.2 The meeting received the strategic risk register report, with thanks, and looked forward to the further test and challenge on the specialist staffing action plan next term. In relation to the discussion on mental health, AT noted that the planned development of the wellbeing hub, the development of the resilience building initiatives as part of the BeReady offer and the levering in of external support to help with the pressures will all be important in continuing to manage this risk, which management and the committee were right to keep highlighted as a priority area.</p> <p>5.3 Assistant Principal, SH, gave her update presentation on the management of the risks in moving to the new qualifications in FE. She noted that this had been agreed at the last meeting, as the committee wished to receive an update on how the college is doing. Her presentation gave a positive picture of the benefits to the students and the college of moving to the new framework, as well as the challenges and the learning points from the pilots that had taken place. Overall, she said that she could give the committee a good level of assurance that the risks to quality and outcomes are being well managed. Questions and comments followed. AT thanked SH for her excellent presentation and said that he felt assured that the risk is being well managed, with careful, staged implementation and good learning and sharing between different departments. PG agreed and noted that the change to the delivery model to a more holistic model is a substantial task for the college. SH gave some examples of where this has already worked well and noted that the staff themselves are coming up with the ideas and solutions to move delivery to the new model, which is very encouraging. JC asked about the implications for entry criteria for moving from level 2 to level 3 NQF and a transition year. SH confirmed that there is currently a debate about this. Student governor, PR had made this move and she gave her feedback that she had found it fine and easy to keep on track with where you are. AT thanked all members for the discussion and the meeting received the qualification update report, providing a good level of assurance, with thanks.</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p>	<p><b>COLLEGE PERFORMANCE MONITORING</b></p> <p>Assistant Principal, MGower, presented his report on college performance 2017-18, including the Department for Education (DfE) performance measures and comparison benchmarking data. He picked out the key points and he also highlighted the improvement in the academic value added score from last year, which now puts this well within tolerances and out of the notice to improve this aspect of provision, with official confirmation of this expected shortly. He confirmed the overall strong picture on FE performance in 2017-18. He provided benchmarking against the other Cheshire colleges and the similar larger land-based colleges. He was pleased to confirm that against these other colleges, Reaseheath is generally ranking first or second on its performance data, which is a strong position to be</p>

in. PG asked how the college was evidencing its destination data. MGower confirmed that Ofsted is not placing very much emphasis on the external national destination data as it is not particularly useful data. Instead, Ofsted will look at the college's own data and so it is important this is robustly evidenced. He confirmed that an external company is carrying this survey out for the college and the report will come to the committee once available. AT thanked MGower for his report, which he said gave strong assurance on performance for 2017-18. He noted that the areas for improvement focus, such as English, feature on the agenda and will be considered later in the meeting.

6.2 MGower presented his report on college performance in-year 2018-19. He presented the term 1 updates. In particular, he highlighted the positive data on attendance, including in English and maths, which compares very well to national averages. He explained that retention is RAG rated amber as it was down slightly on the previous year, but since the report was authored, it has risen a little again and is now looking slightly up on the previous year. He noted that 19+ provision is looking to be a little down on performance currently but that the areas have been identified and work is being carried out with the course managers to address these areas. It was noted that business studies showed a data anomaly on the report. MGower also noted the evidence of progress on the study programmes and BeReady against KPIs. Overall, he presented a solid picture on in-year performance. AT asked whether the picture on applications being down on this time last year is only a timing issue and SH confirmed this is the case, with no concerns on application numbers. AT asked whether is any concern on application spread, in terms of reducing the balance of land-based provision, and the Ofsted approach to 'intent', as he noticed that agriculture and horticulture applications were lower. SY noted the shift in provision in some areas, notably horticulture, from FE to apprenticeships. PG agreed that this aspect needed to be kept an eye on as half of the increase in applications this year is in animal management and vet nursing. SH explained that the approach to animal management applications is to convert more at level 3, which is still manageable for the college in terms of resource, although it does create a stretch on practicals. She confirmed that she and MC are discussing how the capacity of the animal management centre can be improved. AT thanked MGower for his report, received by the committee, and noted that it provided a good picture overall on current in-year performance.

6.3 MGower presented the college quality improvement plan (QIP) 2018-19 monitoring report, showing the position after term 1 and progress against KPIs and requested any questions on the report. PG asked how the college overall QIP report correlates to the information in the individual QIPs, such as the English QIP for example, reported in this meeting. PG said that he felt that the overall QIP is perhaps not making some of the variations/concerns in individual areas as visible as they ought to be. He noted that the RAG rating looks a bit different between the college QIP and the English QIP. PS commented that in terms of Engineering, the performance data is not too much of a concern, but the Engineering QIP goes into more depth on a number of actions needed and so this difference of level of reporting impacts on the RAG rating of the different reports. AT agreed with PG that he felt the college overall QIP could make the individual variations more visible to safeguard against masking areas of concern/improvement. MG suggested another interpretation could be that whilst the individual in depth QIPs show there are difficulties that are being addressed in areas, the overall QIP shows that that the college is still producing good outcomes. The committee received the college QIP and AT suggested that it be looked at with a view to RAG rating the individual bullet points and to consider how it can better show the full picture. *Action: MGower.* At its last meeting the committee had requested exception reporting on English and maths, Apprenticeships and Engineering in order to test assurance levels on the impact of improvement actions in these areas. This followed.

6.4 English and maths performance focus: Curriculum Area Manager, HC presented her paper to the meeting, which answered the following questions:  
What are the three key areas for development?  
What progress is being made?  
How do you evaluate the impact of the actions?

	<p>Are you content that the improvements are sustainable? What difficulties are you experiencing and how are you overcoming these?</p>
6.5	<p>AT thanked HC for the paper, which highlighted the key areas of improvement as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improve 9-4 achievement rate and overall GCSE FS EL 1 and L1 English achievement</li> <li>- improve attendance</li> <li>- improve cross college engagement with development maths skills which support GCSE/FS outcomes.</li> </ul>
6.6	<p>AT asked HC where she felt the department was now. HC said that she is happy with where the maths provision is although there is always improvement, and that in English there is a lot going on, with attendance much improved, better, more structure lesson formats and more support for the newer teachers. She said that she has visited other colleges and gained good practice ideas on English and that the teaching observations that have been carried out have been strong, with positive learning walks feedback. MC confirmed that he had observed some lessons, which had been of a good standard. PG expressed his view that the report was very thorough and gave a good picture of where the department is. He wondered if HC had thought about the impact of the recent announcement of policy changes on GCSE/functional skills. HC confirmed that she and the team are looking into this very recent announcement and it will be important to carefully plan for the use of functional skills level 2 for the right students. AM warned that level 2 functional skills is not an easy option and all agreed that it will require a careful and considered approach. MC asked HC if she felt that the English results will improve in 2018-19. HC replied that she expects them to improve, but not by as much as she would like, but that the direction of travel suggests that the following year will then show a more significant improvement. PS added that the mock exam results will give a better picture, due to be taken shortly. AT thanked HC and PS for the very helpful reporting and the committee received the report, taking a good level of assurance that improvement actions are showing impact.</p>
6.7	<p><u>Apprenticeships performance focus</u>: Assistant Principal, SY, presented her paper to the meeting. She provided the context to the performance data, explaining that due to the changes in the funding and delivery of Apprenticeships since May 2017, Apprenticeships have been risk rated as Red due to the potential income and reputational impact should performance decline. This report is risk rated Amber to indicate the current level of risk of this potential impact, based on the recruitment and performance data as at period 5. During 2016/17 and 2017/18 the college has seen a slight decline in Apprenticeship Overall and Timely Achievement Rates. However, these still compare well to the sector, with 2017/18 Overall and Timely Achievement Rates: OAR 74% against a National Average of 67% TAR 61% against a National Average of 60%.</p>
6.8	<p>AT thanked SY for her paper and SY explained that the three key area to improve are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full implementation and effective use of the PICs and One File systems</li> <li>- Ensuring fully effective delivery and evidence of the 20% off the job requirement</li> <li>- Improving effectiveness of the work on attitudes and behaviours with learners.</li> </ul>
6.9	<p>PG commented that he thought the red RAG rating of many elements to the report was perhaps overstated and these actions were in progress and so perhaps were amber at present rather than red. SY noted that the priority focus of the red rating helps drive the team to make improvements but she could see that many are making good progress. PG asked about the risk level to Reaseheath Training in relation to end point assessments. SY noted the risks in relation to Horticulture and Dairy Technology in particular, in relation to timely achievement. However, she noted that the government have acknowledged the problems and have indicated that they will take a pragmatic view on timely achievement data this year. SY also confirmed that she has made representations through AoC and is pushing back with end point assessment organisations where necessary. AM asked about the staffing situation and SY confirmed that she is working with HR and the team on the action plan to secure</p>

staffing. AT thanked ST and received the reporting, for assurance on progress. He requested that the format follow that of the English and maths and the Engineering reports next time, for consistency.

*Action: SY*

6.10 Engineering performance focus: Curriculum Area Manager, JP presented his paper to the meeting, which answered the following questions:

What are the three key areas for development?

What progress is being made?

How do you evaluate the impact of the actions?

Are you content that the improvements are sustainable?

What difficulties are you experiencing and how are you overcoming these?

6.11 AT thanked JP for the paper, which highlighted the key areas of improvement as:

- Improve overall achievement rates, with a specific focus on L2 Light Vehicle Maintenance and Land Based Technology programmes and in maths and English.
- Improve achievement rates for learners undertaking maths and English, along with the departmental engagement and culture towards the development of literacy and numeracy skills.
- Improve the quality of teaching and learning through more robust lesson planning, improvements in differentiated teaching strategies and through recruitment of specialist staff.

6.12 JP commented that he could provide assurance that the department is progressing in the right direction regarding the performance data and especially in English and maths, where he felt there has been a positive culture change. HC agreed with this. In relation to the two courses under particular scrutiny, he confirmed that there is positive movement, with retention higher than previous years and much better work-placement support and Information Advice and Guidance (IAG) to ensure that the right students are on the right programmes. PG commented that he has a governor link visit with JP in Engineering shortly, where he will be looking at the QIP, which will help governors to triangulate evidence of positive direction and improvement. JC asked that the committee's appreciation of the culture change in the department by the staff taking on this challenge be shared with the department staff so that they know that the governors note and value this improvement. *Action: Share governor feedback with department – JS.* JP highlighted that real improvements in teaching and learning are still needed. He confirmed this is impacted by the difficulties in securing sufficient specialist staffing. He said that the staffing situation on the FE side is improving but there is still a need for technical upskilling, which is taking place. However, the apprenticeship side is struggling to recruit and retain the right quality specialist staff. DP noted that the specialist staffing risk has been highlighted to the committee and the board and he noted that there will be a review next term of the action plan to tackle this. AT commented that the acid test on Engineering will be at the end of this year and the self-assessment report in October, which the committee would hope to see showing the impact of the improvement actions discussed today. AT thanked JP and PS for the Engineering focus report, which the committee received for information and assurance.

6.13 Quality health check and action plan reporting: Quality Manager, WW, presented her report on the quality health checks that have taken place so far this year, for information and assurance. Questions followed. JC asked about the college subsidiary company DART and its recent quality health check report. WW explained that the very recent health check has raised some issues that are being addressed, but that the outcomes in terms of achievement rates are not a concern. PG confirmed that there is some work to do on ensuring that DART is ready for an inspection and this will be further reported through to the DART Limited Board and the governing body, for oversight. AT, on behalf of the committee thanked WW for her very helpful report, received for information and assurance.

*Paige Reedman leaves the meeting.*

<p><b>7.</b></p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p>	<p><b>NEW OFSTED COMMON INSPECTION FRAMEWORK</b></p> <p><i>NB: item 7.1 was taken before item 6.1 in the meeting, as MGower had to leave the meeting early, but it is shown here in agenda order.</i></p> <p>MGower provided the committee with an overview of the new Ofsted inspection framework, the Education Inspection Framework (EIF). Overall, the key areas of Ofsted focus on intent, implementation and impact suggested that the new framework is a real opportunity for the college. He noted that the college needs to ensure it is on top of the apprenticeship provision and the recent changes to the delivery model, as this will be a real focus for Ofsted. There was discussion on the indication from Ofsted that data is no longer king and that it will be looking at impact more in terms of the opportunities created for students, recognising that impact might not be fully evidenced until longer down the line. JC cautioned against thinking that data will not still be central to Ofsted decisions, in that this is not a very helpful message to staff. She felt that the approach had only changed slightly in that data will not close the door on a good grade by itself, but it must still be central to college strategy and preparation. AM agreed that it seemed that Ofsted was going to use a number of forms of evidence to triangulate its overall outcome. MG also noted that he felt it would be hard for Ofsted to measure impact without looking at data outcomes. JC also wondered how high needs will be effectively measured. MGower confirmed that the college has a very good grasp of where its high needs students are within the curriculum as well as in the Foundation department and so he was confident that the college could access this evidence at inspection. AT thanked MGower for his helpful update presentation, received by the committee.</p> <p>Level 2 study programmes – employability and suitability: SH presented her paper on how the college is meeting/responding to the Ofsted research report on level 2 study programmes, published on 21 November 2018. The committee had requested a report in order to gain assurance on the college’s position against Ofsted expectations in this area of provision. Members had read the report and SH provided her view that the college is in a positive position, especially as it is a specialist land-based provider. However, she felt that the provision could better suit students who are not sure what they want to do by being a little less specific in some areas to enable more choice in progression routes for these students. Overall, she made a number of recommendations for the college to take forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a college wide strategy to ensure that students are put onto the right course to ensure they develop their entire skills set, not just achieve the core aim – this includes reinstating level 1 programmes across curriculum areas. (Already in progress)</li> <li>- Review the curriculum and study programmes on offer through QCDC to ensure that students are able to make informed decisions about their career opportunities and progression – multi disciplinary programmes across a range of areas at level 1 &amp; 2 should be considered. (Already in progress)</li> <li>- Consider a more tailored BeReady programme for level 2 students to address the recommendations outlined in the Ofsted report.</li> <li>- Develop a better understanding of new apprenticeship standards and map the skills required across both apprenticeships and full time provision within curriculum areas. The intention being to better support student development and parity of preparedness for progression onto the right route (either apprenticeship, employment or full time study). (Already in progress)</li> <li>- Consider how to evaluate all elements of the study programme to ensure that they have maximum impact on the student’s wider development.</li> <li>- Consider a formalised approach to staff development to ensure that they are able to access relevant industry experience themselves.</li> </ul> <p>AT thanked SH for her excellent report, providing good assurance on the college’s level 2 provision and assurance that there is understanding at executive level of what is needed to further improve this in line</p>
---	---



	with Ofsted expectations. PG also thanked SH for her report, which he felt provided a very clear and helpful picture of where the college is and what more is needed. He asked about the timeline for implementing the recommendations. SH confirmed that some would be in place for September, with others part of a longer 2-year plan. JC thanked SH for her report and said that it was very helpful. She said that whilst she was comfortable with the need for more time focused on personal development, IAG, English and maths and progression focus in the curriculum, it must not be forgotten that these students have come here to do a technical, hands-on programme and so these other aspects must be effectively embedded within the technical content. SH fully agreed and confirmed that this will inform implementation planning. The committee received the report for assurance, looked forward to re-visiting the subject in strategic planning and thanked SH for her hard work.
<b>8.</b>	<b>REPORTS FOR INFORMATION/ASSURANCE</b>
8.1	The following reports were received for information and assurance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching and learning summary report</li> <li>• Complaints monitoring FE and apprenticeships</li> <li>• FE Academic Board Minutes</li> </ul>
8.2	AT thanked WW for her reporting under this agenda item. He recommended that once a year the committee look in detail at the teaching and learning summary report. <i>Action: Annual teaching and learning report presentation for discussion – WW/AM – JS for agenda.</i> PG requested that the complaints report could indicate the outcome/follow up actions that have occurred as a result of the complaint. <i>Action - WW.</i> PG noted that a governor from the committee to pick up the link with the quality department would be useful. <i>Action: Link arrangement refreshed with Quality department - JS.</i>
<b>9.</b>	<b>MATTERS TO REPORT TO THE BOARD OR OTHER COMMITTEE</b>
9.1	The following matters to be reported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referral of test and challenge of specialist staffing action plan for summer term FGP meeting, with Q&amp;S invited</li> <li>- College performance 2017-18 Self-assessment summary and position statements will be provided to governors</li> <li>- Good assurance currently on in year performance, with a need to keep monitoring to year end</li> <li>- Focus on English and maths, Apprenticeships and Engineering provided assurance on progress and impact of improvement actions. College Overall QIP to be reviewed to ensure it RAG-rates variations clearly.</li> <li>- Good assurance on level 2 provision and new qualifications implementation</li> <li>- Good assurance on understanding and preparation for the new Ofsted EIF</li> <li>- Student focus added valuable dimension and assurance to the meeting</li> <li>- Action to refresh link governor arrangement with Quality department</li> </ul>
<b>10.</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>
10.1	There was no other business reported to the meeting.
<b>11.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>
	The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Monday 24 June 2019 at 10.30am

The meeting closed at 1.35pm

Signed:

Dated: