



The Henley College Corporation

**MINUTES of the Meeting of the Quality, Standards and Planning Committee  
held on Monday 22 February at 19.00**

<b>Members present:</b>		
<b>Jasminder Love</b>	<b>(JL)</b>	<b>Chair</b>
Louise Adams	(LA)	Independent
Jayne Davis	(JD)	Principal/Ex Officio Member
Rick Holroyd	(RH)	Independent
Keith Heron	(KH)	Independent
Sam Juthani	(SJ)	Independent
Peter Le Conte	(PLC)	Independent
Simon White	(SW)	Independent
<b>By Invitation:</b>		
Tristan Arnison	(TA)	Head of School of Study – Isis
Julian Brinsford	(JB)	Head of School of Study – Thame and Quality Manager
Simon Cuthbert	(SC)	Deputy Principal
Lynn Jenkins	(LJ)	Head of School of Study – Kennet
Beryl Richardson	(BR)	Director HR & Professional Development
<b>In attendance:</b>		
Jacky Gearey	(JG)	Corporation Secretary

Agenda Item	Minutes	Action by
3.1	<p><b>Opening of meeting</b> The meeting opened at 20.10. The Chair apologised for the very late start to this meeting due to the overrun of a preceding meeting, because of this the following items were postponed and will be discussed at the next meeting 19 May 2016:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item 3.6 - College In-Year Dashboard Feb 2016</li> <li>2. Item 3.7 - Teaching and Learning Report</li> <li>3. Item 3.9 - Discuss the provision of a SAR template</li> <li>4. Item 3.11 - Safeguarding and Prevent Report</li> </ol>	
3.2	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b> There were no apologies.</p>	
3.3	<p><b>Declaration of Interests</b> LA and RH declared their interests otherwise no other interests were declared.</p>	
3.4	<p><b>Minutes of Previous Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of Meeting of 9 November 2015</li> </ul> <p>The committee unanimously approved the minutes from 9 November 2015.</p> <p>Proposed: Simon White                      Seconded: Sam Juthani</p>	



## The Henley College Corporation

---

3.5	<p><b>Matters Arising from the Minutes (including review of actions)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 8 at top JD supposed to send RH assessment – but will completed for next meeting</li> </ul> <p>There were no other matters arising from the minutes.</p>	
3.6	<p><b>College In-Year Dashboard Feb 2016 – postponed</b></p>	
3.7	<p><b>Teaching and Learning Report – postpone</b></p>	
3.8	<p><b>Update on Intervention Strategy</b></p> <p><b>Media Studies</b></p> <p>The Principal gave a verbal report on the A level Media Studies commenting specifically on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>two teachers have the main impact, Principal had attend team meetings, met everyone and spoken to programme leaders and looked at the needs of the individual students. The promonitor feedback on teaching and learning had been very positive.</li> <li>There was improved communications between staff and students – students in the past did not know where they were in the scheme of things but now were told what they had to do to improve.</li> <li>Staff were now using promonitor and the students can now see where they are plus they can see it on feedback sheets, Students now have one to one sessions. The target grade is plus one grade higher and so the students are aiming higher thereby getting rid of the attitude of just aiming for grades they need.</li> <li>Feedback has also improved and the impact of this is that coursework grades have improved this year, mock grades A2 (AS not know yet) see report form Jayne value added</li> <li>Impact has been possible. Staff communications still needs to improve and more planning is required. There was a small issue about software – swift intervention with parents what happened and where they were.</li> <li>Area for improvement is being centred on the worst performers. The Principal is concerned about coasters and wants to ensure that they do not slip through the net, therefore the next area for review is going to concentrate on that. The Principal said that she was generally convinced that the cluster of C and D grades should go up to Bs and Cs.</li> <li>RH asked if after A2 mocks results are teachers required to give an achievement grade and if they are, he asked for the predicted grades. The Principal said that predicted grades were for UCAS applications.</li> <li>The predictor of value added been designed by IT department. SJ asked if there was any resistance to changes that College has implemented and the Principal replied that if intervention is done well then there is no pushback.</li> </ul> <p><b>AS and A2 Geology</b></p> <p>LJ said that this was a very small group consisting of 6 doing AS and 11 doing A2. LJ reported that mock results are now finalised for this subject which achieved an ALPS score of 8 last year (and the two previous years). The College has consistently achieved low ALPs grade for this subject. Although the teacher is outstanding it is not her specialist subject. The previous teacher whose specialist subject this was had been able to more easily identify the problem areas, one of which was the language/terminology used in Geology.</p>	



## The Henley College Corporation

---

The Chair asked how the students learnt the terminology and she replied that there was now a key terms weekly test and a revision booklet for each topic had been produced having recognised that this was a problem area. RH said that he was very pleased to hear about the method of teaching terminology and that this method frequently works well irrespective of the teacher.

Like the Principal LJ had met with everyone and looked at individual needs. A new initiative had been to go out to external events encouraging the students to do more study and less reliance on "winging it".

This year the 11 A2 students achieved a mock value added of 7, a 1 point improvement on this time last year. This year 36.36% students achieved grades A\*-B, an improvement of 15% on last year, whilst 72.72% of the class achieved A\*-C grade, up 12% on last year. Unfortunately 2 students in the A2 group achieved a U grade which means that the pass rate for this subject was only 81.81%.

LJ confirmed that intervention actions for this subject are ongoing and that the 5 students in this group who did not achieve their TG in the mock have been invited to attend workshops and their parents have been invited in for Parental Consultation.

LJ reported that of the 6 students are currently enrolled on AS Geology all except 1 student had achieved A-E grade. The mock results for A2 are an improvement on this time last year and may indicate that intervention measures agreed in September 2015 are having a positive impact. RH asked if there were any extenuating circumstances for these results to which LJ said no.

LA asked what is the teaching method LJ was going to employ going forward? LJ confirmed that they were going back to the original teacher but who might identify other problem areas. KH asked what would be the cost of bringing in a specialist teacher. KH asked how were the lessons scheduled – SC said 3 lessons totalling 1hr 25 mins for AS and three for A2 split over 5 days and further said that a full time teacher would normally do 16 hours a week and not the 6 hours that is required at the College. It was not viable to try and bring in a specialist (and more importantly very difficult to find someone) for what would be 3 hours for AS and 3 hours for A2 per week. JD said that they were looking at whether they keep the subject especially as there is little interest in it.

The Chair thanked LJ for her report and her work.

### **Environment Studies**

TA spoke about Environmental Studies and then Philosophy

A primary focus has been on preparing students for dealing with the more esoteric and unfamiliar examples used in exam papers and applying theory to new and unfamiliar content as students have tended to be thrown by the unusual questions in exams. Liaison with the Chief examiner last year did not prove as helpful as anticipated but it did highlight issues with differing use of terminology across Environment Studies and Geography which has been a further focus for this year.

AS mock results were not available TA could not comment. Despite only one U grade, the A2 mock results suggest all students, except one, are achieving below their target minimum grade, but this includes a student whose Promonitor mark book average is significantly better.



## The Henley College Corporation

---

	<p>The teacher, who is herself an ES examiner, has marked the students in line with the final exam guidelines and wants the students to have a clear sense of the further work they need to do rather than instilling a false sense of confidence.</p> <p>Seven of the students are within a grade of their target, six are within two grades and two are more than two grades out. One student did not sit the mock due to health issues. The ALPS grade boundaries last year suggest that the majority of students need to be within <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> of a grade of their target grade in order to achieve an ALPS grade 5 (which reflects the poor performance nationally of ES students). An ALPS grade 5 is still a realistic target, taking into account the often depressed nature of mock results, but the reasons for poor performance need careful review with the students.</p> <p>The teacher has completed a written analysis of each student's performance and produced a projected final grade for each student based on her overall assessment of their progress. On this analysis, there are four students she would deem currently at significant risk of underperformance in the summer. It should be noted that this class contains 5 students with mental health or safeguarding issues. The teacher is devising revision timetables for each student and they will be required to present evidence of revision for each topic.</p> <p>TA said that the teachers had tried moving away from relying on text books and introducing different examples to vary the teaching thereby enabling the students to become more familiar with the unexpected. LA said that one difficulty was that the subject is more akin to science and not geography and that humanities students often do not consider this when opting to take the subject. RH said that this should be reflected across the country, TA said that the College is below the national bench mark and it does suggest that there are wider issues at play. RH asked if there is another factor bearing in mind the high calibre teaching staff and the exact nature of the issues are still difficult to identify. There was a hope that in encouraging student flexibility this might be a possible way forward as there was a sense that the staff are becoming disheartened and that this could be a drag factor. RH asked if this course that is going to be continued. JD replied that like Geology it will be reviewed. SJ suggested that perhaps the wrong teachers are teaching the subject or was the subject too unstable to continue as trying to establish the reason for the poor results was very difficult. LA then asked about the STEMS agenda and JD said in the short term it might be better to stop doing the subject.</p> <p>SW asked if there is a top down process at looking at these challenging subjects. JD replied that all structures are in place but that the exam boards have become more volatile. SC said that there are loads of changes coming in and that these might even make it worse. LA asked if the Principal had put a timescale on how long the College will carry on these subjects. JD said that at the next QSP she would be recommending what to do.</p> <p><b>Philosophy:</b> The four inset sessions that the teacher has attended have been exceptionally helpful in highlighting issues with the new style exams and clarifying new questioning and marking approaches with a significant shift to a more proscriptive, A01 based approach rather than the more discursive, essay-based model of past papers. This has led to fundamental changes in the approach to teaching and a great focus on the AQA definitions of terminology (as</p>	
--	---	--



## The Henley College Corporation

---

listed in the Routledge flash cards now being used in class). The more able students have perhaps found the new approach more limiting but the lower to mid-range ability students have found the greater clarity very helpful and enjoy the text-book centred approach (focus group evidence).

The A2 mock exams have highlighted the problems represented by two students (U grades in mock) with a history of disciplinary issues and attendance problems. HoS has now placed them both on Stage 4 of the disciplinary process. Both these students have had problematic performance across their programmes and one is on the safeguarding register due to housing issues. Current projections of performance using an ALPs calculator suggest that A2 Philosophy could achieve a Grade 5 provided both these students' performance is improved to a D. As the cohort size is so small however, variations in individual performance could have a markedly disproportionate effect on value-added outcomes, both positive and negative. It may also be that one or other of these two students is asked leave college before the summer exams, which would have a significant impact upon retention and therefore success rates.

The AS mock results represent a much larger cohort and therefore are less susceptible to distortion in terms of ALPS. These results are really quite encouraging and offer much more confidence that the ALPS Grade 5 is achievable. The MIS valued-added projection based on the Promonitor Markbook (which includes the current mock results) is actually now a grade 3, although it should be noted that the mock paper was only half the length of the final exam.

SC explained that the subject had undergone a change with the introduction of a new style exam of 3 hours. The Chair asked why the students were not doing mock exams of 3 hours instead of 1/1/2 hours to cover off the real type of exams that they will now face due to these changes. TA said that students had not covered off all the syllabus which is why exam was 1/2 the time. TA said that the college had invested in new text books and flash cards to help the students plus the teachers had given them a better understanding of the marking within the papers. The college had tried to liaise with Farnborough College which had been helpful. The student feedback to the above had been positive. TA then further explained that the course had moved to a more prescriptive response work within particular guidelines and definitions namely more a history of idea/position and precision of terminology and a less discursive approach. SJ said that he thought that many students did not know what they are signing up for when choosing Philosophy thinking that it was more discursive and not prescriptive leaning. SC said that may well be the case and sited religious studies which has a much more discursive approach. However in the main it was felt that the safeguarding issues are having an big impact on the results.

The Chair thanked TA for his report and all his work.

### **Vocational Arts**

JB reminded that this course was already in transition with the move from Pearson to University of the Arts London (UAL) which had started last year.

Developments: More complex tasks are being undertaken in class to help students develop skills; regular discussion of student progress in team meetings; changes to briefs so that they combine subject starting points for students, where the units are linked; better organisation of



## The Henley College Corporation

	<p>homework for students, so that they are set work on specific days; simplification of feedback to students. The UAL course is not part of ALPS, but the equivalency of projected attainment for year 1 and 2 students (based on UCAS scores) should give an improvement. There is a concern that, particularly in year 1, there are a number of students with health issues that could impact on retention and success rates for the course. SC confirmed that the College does have a high number of vulnerable students but that attendance was good. Students on vocational courses do not necessarily get their grades.</p> <p>The Chair thanked JB for his report and work.</p> <p>Keith Heron left the meeting at 21.45.</p> <p>The Principal then advised the Chair that the college would soon be closing and the alarms set. With this in mind the Chair told the committee that Psychology, Maths, Chemistry and Physics would be for discussion at the next meeting.</p>	
3.9	<b>Discuss the provision of a SAR template – postponed by SC</b>	
3.10	<p><b>Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)</b> It was decided that all members should read the QIP plan, any comments should be sent to SC received by Corporation Secretary by Thursday 3 March and any approval would be by remote decision if appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Academic Enrichment - postponed</b></li> <li>• <b>SAR post Corporation meeting</b></li> </ul>	
3.11	<b>Safeguarding and Prevent Report – postponed</b>	
3.12	<p><b>College Self-assessment Report</b> The report had been circulated to all committee members prior to the meeting asking for any comments, The Chair had fed back to the Principal comments including those that governors had given to the Chair and there being no further additional comments the College Self-Assessment Report was approved.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> <b>The Committee unanimously approved the report and this would be put forward to the Corporation for approval.</b></p> <p>Proposed: Simon White                      Seconded: Rick Holroyd</p>	<b>Corporation Secretary</b>
3.13	<p><b>QSP Terms of Reference (ToRs)</b> The QSP Terms of Reference were agreed by the Committee and will be forward onto the Corporation meeting to be held on 21 March 2016 for final approval.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> <b>The Committee unanimously approved the QSP ToRs and these are to be put forward to the Corporation for approval.</b></p> <p>Proposed Sam Juthani                      Seconded: Simon White</p>	<b>Corporation Secretary</b>
3.14	<p><b>Any Other Business</b> There was no other business.</p>	
3.15	<p><b>Items to Take Forward to Next Corporation Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QSP ToRs</li> </ul>	<b>Corporation Secretary</b>
3.16	<p><b>Confidential Items (if any)</b> There were no confidential items</p>	
3.17	<b>Date and Time of Next Meeting</b>	

