

The Henley College Corporation

**MINUTES of the Meeting of the Corporation Committee**

**held on Monday 21st May 2015**

**Members present:** Jayne Davis (Principal)

Stephen Forward

Keith Heron

Rick Holroyd

Peter Le Conte

Jasminder Love (Chair)

Ian McGaw

Tony Sanderson

Nic Saunders

Mia Tritton

Robyn Vitty

Jacqui Williams

Simon White

Jeni Wood

**In attendance** Julian Brinsford – Quality Manager/Head of School of Study

Simon Cuthbert - Deputy Principal

Beryl Richardson – Director of HR & Professional Development

Claire Harris – Corporation Secretary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Minute** | | **Action by:** |
| **6.1 14/15** | **Opening of meeting** | |  |
|  | The meeting opened at 6.01 pm. | |  |
| **6.2 14/15** | **Apologies for absence** | |  |
|  | Apologies for absence were received from Louise Adams, Mohammed Khaliel, Tony Sanderson and Nic Saunders. All other committee members were present. Apologies were also received from the Director of Finance, Sue Bishop. | |  |
| **6.3 14/15** | **Declaration of interests** | |  |
|  | No interests were declared. | |  |
| **6.4 14/15** | **Minutes of the meeting of 23rd March 2015** | |  |
|  | The records to show that Sam Juthani had sent apologies for the meeting of 23rd March.  Page 7, paragraph 2, change “proposed bus shelter” to “proposed smoking shelter”.  *There were no other changes and so the committee agreed that the minutes were an accurate record of the meeting of 23rd March 2015 and the minutes were signed by the Chair.* | |  |
| **6.5 14/15** | **MATTERS ARISING** | |  |
|  | 5.6 Student Leadership presentation The students had given examples of some enrichment activities that had ceased including rowing. This enrichment activity is only available in the first term. Next year students will be able to sign up at the Fresher’s Fair.  5.7 Principal’s Report, Processes and procedures JDav reported that the SAR timetable will be reviewed, as part of the new SAR programme to be installed.  5.9 Committee Reports; Employment Policy Committee – Staff Absence BRic reported that an update on staff absence will be made to the next meeting of Employment Policy, taking place on 4th June, 2015.  5.9 Request to all Chairs JL thanked all Chairs that had submitted Chair’s reports.  5.10 Governors’ Conference JL thanked all those who had sent dates of their availability, however, it had proved too difficult to set a mutually convenient date. It was suggested to hold a “Chairs’ Annual Meeting” (to be held on 18th June 2015) instead, whereby every Chair would receive a mini-update on Q and I and finances, which could subsequently be rolled out to their prospective committees by the individual Chair. The committees would then feedback any improvements to create maximum impact. These suggestions should be given to the Corporation Secretary who will be asked to organise an Away-Day conference in the Autumn.  JL also asked that Governors make time to attend a separate meeting to discuss the Corporation Strategy, stating that it would take no more time than the three sessions spent with the previous Corporation Secretary.  Governors were asked for a show of hands on whether they would prefer to attend a daytime, evening or Saturday session. 12 voted for daytime, 12 voted for evening. One Governor could not attend daytime at all. A meeting to be arranged for the Autumn term. | | **Corporation Secretary**  **Corporation Secretary** |
| **6.6 14/15** | **CORPORATION BOARD AND COMMITTEE SCHEDULE** | |  |
|  | The Corporation Secretary circulated a draft version of the schedule of committee meetings for 2015/16. Governors were asked to review the schedule and forward any comments to the Corporation Secretary. | |  |
| **6.7 14/15** | **REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE, STANDING AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMITTEE SELF-ASSESSMENT** | |  |
|  |  | |  |
|  | JL reported that the Instrument and Articles (governing documents) were very old and about to be updated. The Standing Agenda items need to be responsive to the ‘I and As’, and as such, should be reviewed fully once the ‘I and As’ have been updated.  JL also informed the committee that she was looking to change Students, Strategy and Curriculum to Q and I, which was the advice currently being given across the sector.  Governors were asked to make any suggestions to be included in the amendments of the Standing Agenda Items and Terms of Reference to forward them for consideration. The Corporation Secretary will bring updated versions back to committee further down the line. | |  |
| **6.8 14/15** | **REPORT ON PROGRESS AGAINST STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES – QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2014/15** | |  |
|  | JL suggested that as the report was detailed and had not been circulated in advance, that Governors review the report outside of the meeting and prepare three ‘powerful’ questions they have for and send these to the Corporation Secretary for the next meeting of the Corporation.  SCut spoke to the report, drawing attention to various items throughout. The document was in draft form, as some outcomes will not be known until August. The final progress will be reviewed in November 2015.  **Outcomes for Learners** – there are many more and frequent checks in the classroom and meetings with middle management. SCut felt that significant progress was being made in this area. Progress checking, marking and monitoring are all showing improvement. BRic and the observation team have been observing poorer performing areas and the Pro-monitor programme has been adopted. This means students, parents and managers can see the results. (JDav thanked the IT team for implementing the programme quickly). These steps have been good for showing where intervention is needed, early on.  JWi commented that this would be helpful for comparison data in 18 months-time.  SCut felt this would also help inform the Advanced Level Performance System (ALPS) that predicts what students will attain between their GCSE results and A-level results. The system measures individuals, the subject and teacher.  SF asked if all teachers sees students’ predicted grades. SF also commented that he hoped this would engender a better relationship with his son’s tutor.  JDav was asked to respond and commented that in the student survey, students are reporting having a good relationship with their tutors. However, JDav reported that the tutor system was under review and to be remodelled.  JWi had made an attempt to contact her son’s tutor and felt there is a need to force the tutors to work with parents.  JL commented that the College was starting afresh with the new Principal. SCut commented that lots of students do want more curriculum support rather than tutor time.  SCut was hoping to bring in the system to utilise against tests as students go along, not just on end exam results.  EDI – subject areas with low performance areas are being identified and Programme Leaders are involved in reviewing progress.  Functional skills is an area that is performing significantly better this year, in conjunction with Henley Training Company. A new exam board has been appointed that can give results in six days, so re-sits can be arranged if necessary.  There is one good Careers Advisor, but students are asking for an extended careers service.  An Apprenticeship Fair was run and was well attended. There is need for work experience for vocational students – this is still a weak area.  **Teaching, Learning and Assessment** – the College is moving away from giving grades as part of the Observation process and SLT has been meeting informally with the Union representatives, to discuss drop-in observations. Ofsted will view whether feedback engaged with students – does their work improve as a consequence?  **Leadership and Management** – there is a separate Marketing Committee which has been focussed on increasing student applications.  Three-Year financial forecast – this is currently a difficult challenge (to address the forecast shortfall in income for 2015/16).  The Process Improvement Group (PIG) has met and made significant progress in improving the efficiency of operation on the two sites.  The shortfall in private study and social space for students is being dealt with. This was identified by Ofsted as a problem five years ago. (See agenda item 6.18 for more detail). Learners are being involved in all the processes to improve the learner experience on the two sites and a “You Said – We Did” list is being compiled.  PLC asked for clarification on what PIG was. JDav explained that it is a cross-section of college staff, who vote on what members think is the priority for what requires:   * A new process all together * To go to SLT for guidance * Is okay, but needs tweaking   These proposals go to Operations and then SLT.  RH commented that this was a very democratic process and embeds change as people have bought into it.  The impact of tutorial systems has a long way to go still, but a complete re-vamp of the process is being looked at.  KH commented that a “You Said – We Did” campaign had been implemented at Reading University. Some examples of this have not gone well. JDav assured Governors that it would only be used as a tool for projects such as researching different text books  As part of the marketing campaign, postcode analysis of areas where students haven’t applied has taken place. The College is aiming to highlight curriculum choices other competitors do not offer to those areas.  JL invited JWi, LA and SF as parents to comment and RH.  SF felt that it was easy to lose sight of what was being done well and suggested a COW – Carry on Well Team to complement PIG.  Comments from other Governors were invited – particularly members of the Ofsted Team. JL then requested the item be put forward to the agenda in June. Parents Governors were asked to prepare feedback and were welcome to get together.  SW asked if the QIP was a one-off or living document and JDav confirmed it would be constantly worked on.  SJ noted that under Leadership and Management, there was nothing specific to the Corporation. SCut would value a self-assessment of the governing body and JL confirmed this would be looked at in June.  JDav reported that QIP is operational by nature. However, she would look at where the Corporation fits in and suggested a diagram on the front. SW felt it needed to link to the Governing Strategy Plan. RH felt this would help with the narrative to Ofsted and should be embedded in Leadership and Management or signposted somewhere in the document. PLC also felt this would help defend the skills of Governors, if it was shown that they were linked to the Strategic Plan.  JL again asked that Governors send questions and comments ahead to the Corporation Secretary, before the next meeting in June. This section requires further questions and reviews of progress.  JL noted that the discussion had lasted 40 minutes and had been vigorous Governor engagement. | | **All Corporation**  **All Governors/**  **Corp Sec/SLT** |
| **6.9 14/15** | **ENROLMENTS AND FUNDING AGAINST PLAN – APPLICATIONS AND ACCEPTANCES UPDATE**  JDav tabled an updated version of the report contained within the committee papers. A graph demonstrated applications, acceptances and final enrolments, for the years 2012 to 2015. There had been no marketing last year, which the college was rectifying now.  RH asked how the figures pan out for the year. JDav said the graph for each years was based on 9th May figures. Applications slow down at this time of year, but over 200 offers had not yet been accepted.  SW asked what the offers to acceptances numbers were. JDav reported that 12 students had been rejected.  SF asked what the difference was in 2014. JDav reported that there had been a ‘marketing drop’ in the Autumn of 2014, but this had not been followed up and the admissions process was slow. RVit is now running a very creative campaign and is trying to capture brand new students.  Section 4 of the report listed examples of marketing activities taking place over the summer. A New Students Evening is being held, with lots or reminders to offer-holders, with good luck letters and bookmarks of previous students going to relevant feeder schools.  Over half-term applicants will be telephoned, who haven’t confirmed their place, making the process more personal. JL reported that she had offered to help with this, if any other Governors were interested.  JL reported that there was great excitement in the college about the marketing taking place. It felt markedly different from this time last year. Thanks were due to PLC and RVit who have been taking an active part in these activities.  JDav reported that successful recruitment of the position of Head of Marketing and Schools Enrolment had taken place, with RVit being offered the position. Another post of Head of Admissions and Enrolment was to be filled.  JDav had been to Icknield School, spoken to the Head Teacher and left lots of information about the College.  RH congratulated RVit on carrying out tremendous work, which was really fresh. The influence that students have, for example when they come to address schools, should never be underestimated. RH also asked if there was any possibility of Year 12 students undertaking any mentoring.  JDav continued to report that flyers will be sent out highlighting the subjects Henley College offers and postcards will be going to all school pupils, whether they have had an offer or not. | |  |
| **6.10** | **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT ON MAJOR COLLEGE CHANGES**  Consistency and Excellence – the first seven months. | |  |
|  | JL asked that the Ofsted team keep a copy of the report in their files.  **Processes and Procedures** – JDav was trying to get across the idea of incremental improvements and raising expectations. This had been dealt with within whole staff meetings recently.  JDav was also hoping to start a Parent Forum, but hadn’t met with JWi yet.  Marketing, external links and reputation – the smoking shelter will be in place from the 1st September, which will remove the students (and staff) off the pavements.  Students had attended the Henley Town Team meeting, with very powerful results, including free entry to the River and Rowing Museum being offered and other collaborative work taking place. Relationships had been forged, such as a student offering to help HBUG with their social media.  Work to improve sports links was taking place, with the aim of getting more elite sport in college such as rowing.  The Sixth Form Colleges Association had been met with.  MT asked whether the Walkabout for Governors would be held again. JL reported it would be put on the Corporation Secretary’s list of things to do.  RH asked about the Programme Leader Roles and Responsibilities. JDav felt it was a role that hadn’t been working very well, which was why the Quality Calendar had been introduced. This set our clear expectations within a time frame, making responsibilities clearer. RH felt this was a very interesting process that can have a snowball effect.  The new Finance Director is starting on 1st July and the handover is already in place.  The 3-Year Financial Plan is at the next stage before it goes before the next Finance Committee in June. A contingency plan has been developed by the Principal and Director of Finance.  KH raised the issue of the range of subjects available and whether these could be cut to concentrate on a smaller number.  JDav did not have plans to reduce too much, but reported that there were elements of the curriculum that were being looked at. | | **Corp Sec** |
|  |  | |  |
| **6.11 14/15** | **IN-YEAR COLLEGE DASHBOARD** | |  |
|  | JL asked as with 6.8, for Governors to review the information tabled, and prepare and send any questions to the Corporation Secretary for the next meeting.  JDav explained that the purpose of the dashboard was to give Governors a snapshot of the College.  It starts with key areas of current strengths. Good ‘value-added’ and high retention and achievement.  Current areas for improvement included the forecasted budget deficit, inconsistency, teaching and learning and stretch and challenge in the classroom.  Retention in A2 is slightly below the national benchmark (1.1%). JDav felt it was a difficult time of year, when students tend to give up. The A2 students were currently less happy than the rest of the cohorts.  SF asked why the college was lower against the benchmark. JDav felt that it was not currently a trend, but was looking into the issue anyway.  College attendance target is 95%, which is the national target for compulsory education. Attendance has improved from last year. GCSE attendance has improved – these are students who have been forced to re-sit and the numbers compare well nationally.  Parent and Student Satisfaction Survey –assignment feedback and careers advice did not score well with parents.  It had been noted in the Ofsted meeting that the student satisfaction on the way college deals with bullying, needed re-wording, as the majority of respondents had neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, showing a skewed result.  SF mentioned that he had not been able to complete the survey. JWi added that the reminder email hadn’t included the link to the survey.  The Key Financial Indicators show the difference between funded and actual figures. There will be less funding for next year, even if there are more students.  Curriculum intervention strategies vary. Some mocks have shown better results than last year. Constant reviewing will take place.  JL asked Governors to keep the dashboard in their Ofsted file. | **All Govs/Corp Sec** | |
| **6.12 14/15** | **REVIEW OF CHANGES TO THE COLLEGE’S DISCIPLINARY POLICY** | |  |
|  | JL explained that whilst this was an internal process, it was worth recording for clarification purposes, as follows:   * All exclusions go through SCut * Appeals go to the Principal, and then if not resolved * To the Governing Body (Ian McGaw), and then if not resolved ultimately can go to Ombudsman | |  |
| **6.13 14/15** | **STUDENT PROGRESS TRACKING** | |  |
|  | JBri and SCut had produced a Quality Calendar, which clearly sets out expectations and responsibilities for student progress tracking. The calendar enables a consistent approach to be adopted across the College.  Programme Leaders are expected to carry out a quality check and report progress back. They must identify problems, what they have done about it, or if they need help.  An example of a real case with an under-performing student was given, with details of how the Programme Leader, Tutor and parents had been involved.  JDav added that the records are kept centrally, and can be looked at any time. SCut clarified that the calendar makes Programme Leaders aware of when they should be performing certain tasks. | |  |
| **6.14**  **14/15** | **LESSON OBSERVATIONS**  BRic introduced her report by noting that year on year, Governors had been receiving lesson observation data. The weakness in the process had been that teachers would know when they were being observed.  The observation team has now been changed to include BRic and two other observers. BRic reported that in recent observations none had been graded as ‘Requires Improvement’ – all lessons were at Grade 2 or above. In 2014, there were four members of staff that required improvement. Three left and the other had improved in quality. The process will not be complete until the end of June, after which there will be an analysis of 120 staff. This will help inform how staff are appraised.  SJ commented that there had been a decrease in outstanding lessons, but BRic clarified that anyone receiving a Grade 1 was not observed the following year. 20-23% were Grade 1 teachers.  SW asked how this worked with Ofsted observations. BRic explained that as Governors, they know the College does not observed lessons that were at the ‘requires improvement’ level.  JWi asked if all teachers, including those who did receive a Grade 1 could be included in a pie chart.  BRic continued, to report that changes were being phased in, to achieve greater objectivity. These included:   * Not identifying the lesson to be observed – giving a five-day window instead * Removing the grade. In its place identifying key strengths, weaker areas and targeting three areas for improvement. * These will be checked mid-year and at the end of the year.   JL commented that removing the grade came from the sector.  SF clarified that no staff need improvement. BRic commented that ‘requires improvement’ is an Ofsted grading. The grades are: Outstanding, Good, Requires Improvement. All teachers are given areas to improve upon.  RH commented that it was a very sensible way to proceed. However, he was still concerned that there was a correlation between teaching and the learning outcome. Ofsted do look at the progress of learners.  JL asked how student progress was recorded. JDav said the process doesn’t show day-to-day teaching. BRic added that it identifies 1-3 areas that require change. RH then asked how the *quality* of marking was judged if Pro-monitor is a tick in the box.  BRic explained that as part of the lesson observations, students are consulted with and asked questions of a qualitative nature and perceptions were taken. The quality checks are undertaken by Programme Leaders.  RH felt this was good as Ofsted is interested in the quality of feedback. SCut added that training on marking had been run and JBri commented that student satisfaction on marking was at 87%.  SF asked if there is any external input ie external quality review. SCut noted that in Hampshire there is a peer review process. | | **Director of HR & Prof Development** |
| **6.15 14/15**  **6.16 14/15**  **6.17 14/15** | **RESPONSE TO OMBUDSMAN REPORT**  BRic explained that a complaint was received by the College in 2014, which had been dealt with the Ombudsman. A summary report was attached. The Ombudsman had made recommendations to the College, which BRic had taken forward, as the Designated Safeguarding Person at that time.  Changes that had been made in response, included an Anti-Bullying policy being introduced and raising awareness within the staff. Changes had been made to the student contract and student handbook and controlling the use of mobile phones had been tightened up.  The last recommendation from the Ombudsman, was that the Corporation review the role of the Ombudsman. Corporation Secretary to circulate previous role.  **EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION REPORT**  All students were asked to complete an annual equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) survey in February. Following the survey, Safety had been put at number one for the first time. There is probably a correlation between the Tutor’s role and students not having an understanding of all the things in place to support them.  BRic added that some detail had not been included, to avoid specific students being identified.  JL asked if the Governor with responsibility for EDI had seen the report and feedback any comments. As he had not, it was requested that MK would be asked to feedback his comments to the June committee.  BRic then reported that things were moving on with regard to the EDI Ambassadors, including LGB Ambassadors and Amnesty Ambassadors.  BRic was thanked for her work in this area and offered to forward thanks to Sue Deaville, the staff member responsible.  PLC drew attention to Question 7, which appeared to have been answered in duplicate. BRic commented that some answers were obscure or indeed double-answered. This will happen when dealing with 16-18 year olds.  **GOVERNANCE AND SEARCH**  JL reported that as mentioned earlier in the meeting, the Instrument and Articles need to be updated. The legal firm of Eversheds, which provides the College with governance and employment advice, had been contacted to quote for the work.  JL asked Governors to approve the decision to proceed with the work. The quote received to undertake a wide review of the standard document was in the region of £2500 (plus vat). A two-hour session on how to incorporate other strategic and commercial options would be available for an additional £750. This session would take place with Governors and possibilities and models would be discussed. JL commented that once updated, this would be the legal document from which all else would flow.  SJ commented that it was a lot of money and asked if it needed to be done. JWo noted that there was no other contractor to compare to. JL explained that the current documentation was very out of date and not fit-for-purpose. Eversheds is considered to be the leader in this specialist field and is referred to by SFCA and AOSEC.  The recommendation to proceed with updating the Instrument and Articles was then proposed by Keith Heron and seconded by Jacqui Williams. Corporation Secretary to contact to arrange dates. | | **Corp Sec**  **MK to feedback**  **Corp Sec** |
| **6.18 14/15**  **6.19 14/15**    **6.20 14/15**  **6.21 14/15** | **ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY REVIEW**  JDav reported on the plans to make structural changes to the Rotherfield site. The proposal had been considered by the Accommodation Strategy Committee already and was being brought for information to the Corporation, as the proposed works would be quite significant.  The lack of student space at the Rotherfield site was a long-standing issue. The plan was to convert the Staff Room, increase social space and turn the kitchen around. Study space will be available in the converted room out of break times. There will be charging opportunities and hot food provision not currently available on the site. Overall the revised space should be a good selling point for the College and enhance the entrance.  Students were being asked how they would like it decorated and the works should take place over the summer.  Staff were consulted and had offered the space. The old Principal’s office would be converted into the new Staff Room.  PLC added that the caterers were keen to refurbish the kitchen. RH asked if the college gets a kickback from the caterers for any increase in funding. JDav confirmed this was not the case. The caterers will be responsible for any refurbishment to the kitchen.  JWo asked if the Hot Frog could be accommodated there. JDav confirmed this would not be possible, as there were other caterers in place and there would be insufficient room.  RH felt the scheme would enhance the student experience.  **CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**  Confidential items are noted separately.  **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**  **Neighbourhood Action Plan**  JL suggested that the new Finance Director, Louise Adams, herself and any other governors interested would be welcome to join a New Build Committee, whose focus it would be on progressing this strategy. JL would like to bring in an external member with specialist knowledge, such as a Surveyor. SW suggested he may have a contact.  BRic suggested that it might be worth waiting until the new Director of Finance starts, as he has been part of a successful (£70 million) project. He might have ideas on the composition of the group. JL said this was a good idea, but wanted to keep the drive of the project going in the meantime.  JWo noted that the College is not currently included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The College now has another bite at the cherry, particularly as Henley will be expected to accommodate further housing.  JL agreed and reported that at a meeting with the Leader of South Oxfordshire District Council, he had suggested that Henley would have to increase its housing supply.  JWi reported that she had been involved in the Wokingham Cricket Ground sale and achieved a new cricket ground as part of the sale.  PLC SW and MT all offered their availability if the committee required it.  It was agreed the committee would report directly to the Corporation.  **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**   * Corporation Meeting Ofsted Training Thursday 18th June at 6.00 pm * Draft date of Thursday 8th October 2015, at 6.00 pm – tbc. | |  |
| **6.22 14/15** | **MEETING CLOSURE** | |  |
|  | The meeting closed at 9.30 pm | |  |

MINUTES of the meeting held on 21ST May 2015 were agreed and accepted as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair

………………………………....……………..

on ………………………………………….