



Minutes of TRC Corporation Quality and Standards Committee Meeting held on Monday 26th November 2012 at 4.45pm

Present

Mr J C Wainwright (JCW)(Chairman); Miss V Allen (VA); Dr R J G Bloomer (RJGB); Mrs J Bolton (JB);
Mr J F B Clark (JFBC); Mr D Fitzgerald (DF); Dr P R Williams (RW)

In attendance

Mr T Dowling (TD) VP Teaching and Learning
Mr N Candy (NC) Acting Clerk to the Corporation

Actions

1 Apologies for absence

Cllr C Barron (CB); Dr M A Khan (AK); Mrs J Powell (JP); Mr D Suter (DS)

(Meeting quorate)

JCW agreed to chair the meeting in DF's absence and welcomed VA to her first meeting of the Q&S Committee following her recent nomination as a Staff Governor.

2 Declaration of interests

No interests were declared in respect of agenda items; however, members reserved the right to declare an interest at any stage of the meeting.

3 Minutes dated 15th October 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th October 2012 were approved without amendment.

4 Matters Arising

4.1 [p1 Min 6] Q&S Cttee Annual Cycle of Business

NC referred to the paper distributed prior to the meeting, commenting that it reflected the amendments agreed at the meeting held on 15th October 2012.

The committee approved the paper as presented.

With regard to the action points detailed in the minutes dated 15th October 2012, RW commented that nothing had replaced the 'Framework for Excellence'[item 6]

and the written update on bullet points 2-4 of Ofsted Recommendations paper [item 7] were included in the Post Inspection Action Plan [agenda item 7 (ii)]. RJGB raised a point under item 7 p3 regarding the teachers appraisal scheme. RW replied that a new scheme was due for implementation on 3rd December 2012, supported by new Capability Procedures which had been approved by the Chairs of the Resources, Audit and Q&S Committees.

5 2012 Inspection report

JFBC commented that there was nothing new in the report. It reflected the concern of governors, particularly in respect of the inconsistency of performance between departments. RW commented that, in his view, the inspection had been conducted too early and not enough meaningful data had been available to influence the outcome. Value added data in particular had been misleading in that it was actually positive rather than negative; however it was not now possible to change the comments within the report. RJGB raised a point in respect of Equality & Diversity in Science and Mathematics [p5]; TD replied that there had been an issue in one subject which had been identified. In general members were keen to consider the Post Inspection Action Plan [agenda item 7 (ii)] and to move forward.

Members noted the report as presented.

6 2012 Value added report

[DF arrived during this item; JCW continued as Chair]

RW referred to the papers distributed prior to the meeting, and commented on specific aspects of them. This information had not been available to the inspectors due to the timing of the inspection. VA was positive at AS level with more subjects above the line. A Level VA was 50/50 above the line. In reply to a query from JB, RW commented that in general subjects below the line were the ones expected to be there. There was considerable discussion as to whether or not aspirations are too low and too defensive. JCW queried if Governors and SMT are working together effectively to achieve higher performances. RW replied that hitting average results was sometimes an achievement in itself. A number of comments were made within the discussion including the erratic nature of subject performances [DF], reference to 'excellence' within the college mission statement [JFBC], whether students are too easy to teach [DF/VA], issues with entry requirements [DF], social issues in Rotherham affecting teaching [VA], choice of subjects and motivation to full capacity [JB], relentlessness of staff with students [TD], formal complaints to Ofsted [DF], challenge of factual accuracy [RW], the need to work with intensity towards the next inspection [JFBC]. RJGB commented that it was not appropriate to 'tinker with Ofsted' but the inspection report should be accepted and steps taken to rectify the situation.

7 Quality Improvement Plans [QIP]

(i) 2011 / 12

RW referred to the paper distributed prior to the meeting, commenting that it was chiefly historical. He referred to items highlighted in bold type which reflected the end of year position. RJGB remarked on the lack of 'meaty targets'.

(ii) 2012 / 13 [Post Inspection Action Plan – PIAP]

(VA left during this item)

There was considerable discussion around the papers which had been distributed prior to the meeting. RW referred to the targets on the front of the QIP 2012/13 which will need to be tested in light of the quality of the cohorts. He felt that the targets were quite challenging. JB asked if staff were 'owning' targets; RW replied that they are getting personal targets. VA commented that, in her opinion, rigorous targets are being put in place with a 'traffic light system' scorecard. Considerable discussion centred around a number of issues including the need to iron out inconsistencies, lesson observations in grade 4 departments [to be completed before Christmas], sufficient resources in place for SMT to achieve progress [it was stressed that requests for support must be made to the Corporation if necessary – the Chair had already made an offer to provide resources as necessary], the use of consultants {TD commented that an Ofsted inspector will be used for a staff training exercise on 20th January 2013}. The PIAP will be incorporated into the 2012/13 QIP and updated as necessary.

8 Staff Survey

All the papers distributed prior to the meeting were discussed as a whole. The survey had been overtaken by events. Members discussed the low level of response and the effect of low morale. It was felt that the new performance management, supported by new capability procedures, might improve morale.

9 SAR

RW referred to the paper distributed prior to the meeting, commenting that it had been superseded by the inspection. He referred to specific subjects. Performance of leadership is now being graded as well as that of teachers.

The SAR was accepted and recommended to the full Corporation for approval, subject to the amendment detailed above.

10 Retention data

RW referred to the paper distributed prior to the meeting, commenting that drop out was lower than last year. It was too early to draw meaningful conclusions from the data but the signs were encouraging. It was noted that attendance rates were high [a point highlighted in the recent Ofsted inspection].
No significant issues were raised

The committee noted the paper as presented.

11 Learner Voice

TD commented on a recent exercise in which senior managers had informally discussed issues with approximately 80 students. The results had been fed back to Heads of Departments and positive aspects shared between departments.

12 Any other business

12.1 [Additional item]

RJGB raised a number of issues about how the committee will be informed of progress; RW replied that the results of the January modules [due out in March] will provide the first indication of progress. RJGB also raised the issue of appraisal outcomes; RW replied that a report based upon a ‘traffic light system’ can be provided identifying the number of teachers in each category.

12.2 [Additional item]

JFBC asked if any adverse publicity had arisen following publication of the Ofsted report; RW replied that he had been asked for comments by the local press, but nothing had appeared in the papers.

13 Date of next meeting

TBC

NC

Signed.....*D Fitzgerald*.....

Date.....*3rd February 2013*.....

ACTIONS – Q&S Committee Meeting 26th November 2012

Item	Action to be taken	By whom	By when