



The Henley College Corporation

**MINUTES of the Meeting of the Corporation Committee
held on Thursday 28 January 2016 at 18.00**

<p>Members present: Jasminder Love (JL) Louise Adams (LA) John Aspinall (JA) Caroline Atkinson (CA) Tony Bellis (TB) Jayne Davis (JD) Stephen Forward (SF) Keith Heron (KH) Rick Holroyd (RH) Sam Juthani (SJ) Mohammed Khaliel (MK) Peter Le Conte (PLC) Eva Rickett (ER) Mia Tritton (MT) Martin Unsworth (MU) Robyn Vitty (RV) Simon White (SW) Jeni Wood (JW)</p> <p>In attendance: Julian Brinsford (JB) Simon Cuthbert (SC) Beryl Richardson (BR) Kulbir Sethi (KS) Jacky Gearey (JG)</p> <p>Apologies: Tom Godfrey (TG)</p>	<p>Chair Independent Member/Vice Chair Independent Member Parent Governor Parent Governor Principal Independent Member Independent Member Partnership School Head Independent Member Independent Member Parent Governor Independent Member (Teaching Staff) (Support Staff) Independent Member/Vice Chair Independent Member</p> <p>(Quality Manager/Head of School of Study) (Deputy Principal) (Director HR & PD) (Director of Finance) Corporation Secretary</p> <p>Independent Member</p>
--	--

Agenda Item	Minutes	Action by
3.1	Opening of meeting The meeting opened at 18.25 and welcomed the 4 new governors	
3.2	Apologies for Absence Apologies were received from Tom Godfrey	
3.3	Declaration of Interests Personal interests as parents were declared by Caroline Atkinson, Tony Bellis, Eva Rickett, Mohammed Khaliel, Rick Holroyd and Louise Adams. No other interests were declared.	



The Henley College Corporation

3.4	<p>Minutes of the Meeting of 10 December 2015 SC highlighted the fact that the Confidential Minutes referred to had been seconded by Simon White and not himself. Corporation Secretary to correct this.</p> <p>There were no other matters arising.</p> <p>Action: The Committee agreed that the minutes were an accurate record of the meeting of 10 December 2015 and the minutes were signed by the Chair. Proposed:Louise Adams Seconded: Jeni Wood</p>	Corporation Secretary
3.5	<p>Matters Arising from the Minutes (including review of actions) All other action points from the previous minutes were confirmed as complete. Page 4 – JD said that a grant agency was in fact looking at the research application process.</p>	
3.6	<p>Welcome to New Governors The Chair welcomed John Aspinall, the new Independent governor and the three new parent governors: Caroline Atkinson, Tony Bellis and Eva Rickett and asked the parent governors to briefly introduce themselves.</p>	
3.7	<p>Adopt New Governors The Chair said that the panel had interviewed Ms Bulteel on the preceding Monday 25th January as the second of the two independent governors that the Corporation was looking for. Ms Bulteel lives locally, feels passionately about education and has very pertinent e-learning experience in this field. Both the Chair and the interview panel thought she was a particularly good fit because of her background in e learning and she had extensive knowledge of apprenticeships and that this could be beneficial for the College. She is a qualified Surveyor, and last practised around 15 years ago and set up an e-learning course for Surveyors. She is part of a college in Reading and has links with the university. The Chair highly recommended her appointment as did LA and JD. The Corporation was asked to vote on her appointment.</p> <p>Action: The election of Nikki Bulteel as the new Independent Governor was approved by unanimous agreement Proposed: Jeni Wood Seconded: Peter Le Conte</p>	
3.8	<p>Presentation from Student Leadership Group – update on President's resignation. JD informed the Corporation that due to exams the students presentation would be re-scheduled to another day.</p>	
3.9	<p>Area Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair and JD explained what had happened at the first external steering group held at Abingdon & Witney College on the 21 January 2015. The panel consisted of: Sir David Collins, representatives from both the Education Funding Association (EFA) and the Skills Funding Agency (SFA), a member of the Civil Service, three LA Local Authority representatives, and three representatives from the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), the latter gave an informative presentation. The main message concentrated on: STEMs (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths), retail and food. Of the nine colleges present, eight owed in total £47 million with only one college – The Henley College – not owing anything. The Chair emphasised that it was a data giving day rather than anything else. The next meeting to be held on 24th February at BCA and will concentrate on the curriculum, the emphasis for THC will be to meet the demands of the LEPs, this is STEM. 	



The Henley College Corporation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair said that after this meeting she had been approached by Kevin McDaniel, Head of Schools and Education Services, The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead who was very keen for THC to potentially provide A level provision for them. Robin Cops, the Chair of Bracknell and Wokingham College also approached JL our Chair about joining with THC and BCA as a possible third party as another option. The Chair informed the Corporation that as a result she had asked for a critical read from the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SJ to look at their finances; PLC to look at website and marketing LA to look at results. <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SJ to look at Bracknell and Wokingham College finances; PLC to look at Bracknell and Wokingham College website and marketing LA to look at Bracknell and Wokingham College academic results. <p>Tony Bellis said that he knew the Bracknell Principal very well, if this could be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although not present at this meeting with Lloyds bank at BCA, the Chair said that the outcome was that Lloyds bank in Henley had said that THC money ought to be ring fenced and should not be used to pay off BCA debt. SF asked questions about this ring fencing of THC money – JD said it was early days to discuss this. JD staff steering group meet this week, MU and RV were both in the group and that 12 staff members had come to it. MU said that there was major concern from the staff concerning their contracts and whether there will be jobs for them. RV agreed and said they were trying to get an essence of fair representation in the group from both teaching and non-teaching staff and with a range of comments regarding what might happen. Both emphasised that the lines of communication were open. The Chair said that this would all be discussed in detail at the next area review internal Corporation meeting on 22 February 2016. SJ asked that the College strongly encourage more of its staff to participate in this Steering Group. JA asked about the area review external steering group meeting and JD said that she had been sent presentations on this and that this would be forwarded onto the corporation for information. <p>Action: Corp Secretary to send out the three presentations that had been issued by the Area Review External Steering Group No 2.</p>	<p>SJ PLC LA</p> <p>Corporation Secretary</p>
3.10	<p>Curriculum Self-Assessment Reviews (SAR)</p> <p>The Chair emphasised the vision and mission statement which was on display throughout the meeting, highlighting that the Corporation's decisions and focus is to concentrate on this. The Chair further explained to the new governors what the SAR process was about, that the governors have subjects allocated to them and they talk to the programme leaders, find out how their respective subject areas are going, that they are to explore their subject areas, ask questions and then write up what they have found. These reports are then sent to JD who précis this down into a tabulated summary – please see Appendix 3.10 for full details. The Chair said that for the next academic year 2016 – 2017 a template would be made to standardise the reports. JD said that she had extracted the essence of the reports and went through the summary explaining that this was for the last academic year 2014-2015. A couple of the reports were late for various reasons so JD could not include them in the summary however the report authors would speak after.</p>	



The Henley College Corporation

<p>JD said that she would look at the quality improvement plan in the light of these reports and that any negatives will be addressed. The summary of the SAR reports showed the following:</p> <p>Common theme across most if not all areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Varying results across curriculum areas; • Attendance at workshops not always good and attracting the right students; • Some examination board issues at AS level – many remarks (across the nation as a whole and not just THC); • Learner voice (what students' thoughts about teaching, learning etc) could be more extensive and feed more into teaching, learning and assessment; • Gender domination in some subjects (though a national picture for example - Art was more popular with females whilst engineering was more male dominated); • Attendance was generally good; and • New programme leaders are having a positive impact. <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no change from previous year; • Variable results some poor value added scores; and • Some individuals resourcing issues. <p>JD then opened the floor for any questions on her report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LA asked about intervention and the workshops provided because of the diversity of grades issued by staff. SC explained that swipe cards had been introduced to track students' attendance at these workshops. LA said if students do not like teachers then perhaps they would decide not to attend. The Chair asked if anyone had asked students why they were not going to these workshops. SC said these workshops are not compulsory and so it would be difficult to enforce attendance. RH asked when these workshops were taking place because if at a lunchtime or after school, then this might account for low attendance. A lively discussion ensued whereby JB asked if these workshops were to be put into the timetable would that mean that some students would miss core subjects. RH said that from his experience in his school that they used assembly or tutorial times and core PE time – so no academic time was lost. The Chair asked about where the workshops were held and it was confirmed they were available at both sites. <p>Action: The Chair to review with JD the provision of workshops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SF – how did the programme link tutorial system work as some students might want to talk to a tutor rather than the programme leader? The programme leader thought that tutor links were not strong. JD said that a pro-monitor system was being used which will help identify students that are not attending working shops. • KH – asked about the optimum length of a lesson due to knowledge retention and whether it should be shortened. JD said that students should be able to pay attention for 1.25hrs assuming that the teaching style is varied and there are activities. RH agreed with this statement from his experience. SC told that the Corporation that they must remember that the College is running A levels across two sites and this for some students may mean travel time form site to site, often this is of no relevance to schools on one site. Therefore if the lesson timings were changed then the student would lose even more time due to the travel and that it was all a compromise in the end. • JW referred to the tutorials offered by EFL, saying that students do not always attend sifting the fact that to come in for only a couple of tutorials on a Wednesday wastes time and money. JD confirmed that regarding authorised absences, this is still viewed 	<p>Chair/JD</p>
--	------------------------



The Henley College Corporation

as an absence and that teachers feel that it does affect the students score. JD said that tutors and lead tutors are monitoring this. MU said if the College was doing tutorials on a Wednesday, students could also do enrichment as well. JD said that the tutors should be encouraging them to do this.

- SF said that program leaders had said that the entry requirements to do the science course seemed to be lower. JD said that this was not the case and that there was no reason for poor results as the grades were above the requirement to do course. SF did not accept this response and both SC and JD said that the higher grade students are getting the grades. If there are some lower grade students this has no bearing on the final overall result and that they did not accept SF's comment. JD said that students who go into intervention may be due to the transition from GCSE to A level but that was to do with the ability to do independent work and not as a result of lower entry requirements.
- LA – environmental studies – said that this subject is attracting more humanities students who do not seem to realise that it is very much a science based subject and that they are being accepted onto the course when they have not got the required grades. JD said that this was being stopped.
- The Chair gave a brief breakdown of the academic enrichment area, expressing her concern on STEM and the following points raised:
 1. Students to be identified at enrolment stage and put into academic enrichment groups;
 2. Some lessons dedicated to each of the following: STEM, humanities and art;
 3. Opportunity to offer any student some form of academic enrichment.
- The Chair asked if parents were consulted about university fees and was worried that the issue of finance might be influencing students about university choice because of possible debt. The Chair asked if the College was getting the correct information out to the students/parents. JD said she would look at what information is given out for new parent evenings.
- RH asked a general question regarding how confident do the senior staff feel about the level of improvement, issues including attendance, poor scores at As influencing on A levels, position on remarks and, was there a concern that the main issues for underachievement was being pinned on SLT or other issues, and should they be looking at teaching from all SAR reports? JD said that she looked at the SARs, stating that intervention was brought in to dig down into the real issues. She confirmed that she met with the team monitoring the students and that the staff were now focused on ALPs score and passed comment that there was more commitment than perhaps the SARs would seem to indicate. JD further confirmed that they are checking mark books and attendance records.
- JD said that the Sport PE SAR did not reflect the true hard work and improvements that have been made and that perhaps as the report had been generated by a new governor this might be the reason for the slightly adverse comments.
- SF asked what was incentive for teachers to become program leaders and JA mentioned that one program leader has stepped down due to stress – how does the College balance these issues? JD said that the College did a risk assessment by looking at the job as a whole. The member of staff mentioned that had stepped down did so for other reasons and was happier in the change.
- JW – dance area – were there going to be new facilities? JD said they were looking at it.



The Henley College Corporation

3.11	<p>Stakeholder Surveys (a) Student Cross college survey 2014 – 2015 and (b) How's it going? Autumn 2015</p> <p>JB went through the surveys in detail – please see Appendix 3.11 (a) and (b) for questions and response rates.</p> <p>The top rated questions by response were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback on work helps me improve 2. I feel safe at College 3. I have been told what to expect for the course <p>The questions with the lowest responses were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I use the communal areas regularly 2. The canteen has a good range of healthy options 3. I know how to make an appointment for Upgrade <p>JB confirmed that the Parental survey was in the process of being done and would be going forward to the SLT meeting 3 February 2016.</p> <p>The following points were raised by the Corporation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MK asked when the surveys were conducted. JB replied saying normally it was towards the end of the spring term - February 2015 and further confirmed that these two surveys will be repeated again later on in the year. 2. SC confirmed that there is information on Upgrade regarding additional learning support for students with learning issues regarding and that if a student has difficulties these have usually been identified before arriving at the College. SC confirmed that there is a leaflet and that tutors go through a presentation for students on this and that this was on LearnZone. 3. LA said that many students do go to the careers office and they seem to know what they wanted to do and that parents receive loads of information concerning this which was really good. 4. ER raised the question about the number of students who filled out surveys and thought that the results of the surveys were not a true reflection of the students – she cited students that were dyslexic and therefore would not complete such surveys. JB said that they send our reminders to the students and when they did the number of responses had increased. 5. SF asked out how this survey was carried out – JB confirmed that it was via an external Package on a computer. 6. PLC asked about the responses to the question regarding whether the College was successful in tackling bullying and harassment. JB said that he needed to talk to students about this and to check the students' perception of this question and what it means. LA said that there was very little bullying and if students have no experience of such this could be seen as the reason for a low response rate. MT said that the result on bullying was the same as last year and that there appears to be a contradiction if students say they feel safe at College and then response rate for tackling bullying is low. JD thought that the students did not understand the question. SJ highlighted this with a word of caution that an inconsistency regarding had to be taken in regard of any online activity outside of the College and that students may not be making this connection and that governors to be aware of this possibility. 7. Regarding EDI SC said that he thought that the College was not good at showing at how good they are in dealing with EDI and MK reiterated that and said that questions in the survey had been done pre-statute on Prevent so this must be taken into account. 8. Regarding the number of responses collected – there was a lively debate about how to obtain this information with KH saying that at university supervision of questionnaires 	
------	--	--



The Henley College Corporation

	<p>provides good response rates. JB replied that paper questionnaires required input of data which was very time consuming and required staff to input the data. RH mentioned the use of smart phones plus it could be supervised. JD said it was a good idea to pursue.</p> <p>Action: A better method of reaching all students to complete surveys is to be sought for example smart phones</p> <p>JD then mentioned that the College was recognised as a Leader in Diversity and was recognised for its excellence in equality, diversity and inclusion. BR then said that the College had gone from a "satisfactory" for an EDI Ofsted to now be ranked as 50th out of the top 100 (including unions and large companies). RH said that the College could capitalise on this and think about the concept of selling the College's acknowledged expertise in this, possibly as an e-learning Prevent package, this would not only sell the College and its reputation but could be a possible revenue stream for the future. The Chair expressed thanks to BR for all the hard work she and her team had done on the EDI process on behalf of the Corporation.</p>	<p>JB</p>
<p>3.12</p>	<p>Corporation Self-Assessment Review update The Chair told the Corporation that last July all governors had completed a self-assessment report covering the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each governor's contribution to the College and self-assessment 2. Assessment of Chair 3. Assessment of the Board <p>The Chair confirmed that following the previous set of assessments for 2014/15, she was sorting out the induction pack/training, and this was a priority. The new skills assessment form had been designed to provide the best information about governor skills, and this could be shared with other board members as part of an understanding who is on the board. As a beginning, there had been specific training requests from the self-assessments and so the Chair has arranged the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is the College funded? (KS and SJ to undertake) 2. How to read a set of accounts, 3. Business Development <p>These three finance orientated training sessions will be spread out over the year.</p>	<p>KS/SJ</p>
<p>3.13</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>1. Faces of Henley LA mentioned that JD was mentioned in the 100 Faces of Henley a book designed to capture in photographs the spirit and diversity of the community in Henley-on-Thames. All proceeds from the sale of this book are donated to The Face of Henley charity which uses its funds to support those experiencing tragedy or hardship within the Henley community.</p> <p>2. Instruments & Articles (I & As) SW explained why the current I & As had been reviewed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simplification - taking a lot of operational/day-to-day management stuff out of the I&As because they were already addressed in the Standing Orders or did not need to be tightly defined so that the Corporation has more flexibility; 2. Removal - of defunct clauses, primarily around the transitional arrangements when the Corporation moved to a legal structure before and which are now no longer relevant; and 	



The Henley College Corporation

	<p>3. Re-crafting/modernizing - the purpose of the Corporation with a succinct statement that the Corporation is "the supreme governing body".</p> <p>The aim was to ensure that I & As were to comply with current law and the current working practices of the Corporation. SW confirmed that there were no expressed restrictions on any mergers if the College was to consider that option. SW further explained that the I & As had been through an exhaustive checking process of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working group (consisting of SW (lawyer), the Chair, Principal and Corporation Secretary; 2. Governance and Search committee; 3. Eversheds, the law firm that specializes in the Education sector; 4. Working Group; and then for final comment 5. Governance and Search committee. <p>The committee had then agreed to put forward the revised I & As for approval at this meeting.</p> <p>Before the Corporation could ratify and approve the new I & As the Corporation as a whole had to review the document, any questions would then be addressed to SW and/or the Corporation Secretary next week and that a remote decision would be made to accept the amendments at a date to be advised in an email to all Corporation members.</p> <p>Action: Corporation Secretary to send out the new draft I & As to the Board for comment and a remote decision on the acceptance of these I & As to be made.</p> <p>3. Strategic Plan The Strategic Plan was given out at the previous meeting on 10 December 2015 and JD had asked for any comments before the final submission to the Corporation that evening, she confirmed that comments from Board members had been and incorporated into the document being presented. The Chair confirmed that she had received some very positive feedback on this and everyone agreed that it was a very professional in appearance.</p> <p>Action: The Corporation unanimously approved the new Strategic Plan Proposed: Louise Adams Seconded: Simon White</p>	<p>Corporation Secretary</p>
3.14	<p>Confidential Items There were no confidential items.</p>	
3.15	<p>Date and Time of Next Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporation Meeting – Monday 21 March 2016 training input at 18.00 • Corporation Meeting (Provisional Training) – 28 April 2016 - induction training 18.00 • Corporation Meeting – 27 June 2016 at 18.00 • 	
3.16	<p>Close of Meeting The meeting closed at 20.30</p>	
	<p>MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday 28 January 2016 were agreed and accepted as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair</p> <p>..... on</p> <p>Proposed Seconded</p>	