

Standards Committee 23 November 2010, Committee Room, Ashington

	<p>Present : T Shirley (Chair), C Todd, R Casson, M Rossi</p> <p>In Attendance: D Simpkin, H Wright, L Kinghorn, D Ferguson, K Allan</p>	
Stnds/23nov10/01	<p>The meeting was agreed to be quorate.</p> <p>The Chair advised that there was a vacancy on the Committee.</p>	K Allan
Stnds/23nov10/02	There were no apologies received.	
Stnds/23nov10/03	The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 12 October 2010 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	
Stnds/23nov10/04	<p>Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda:</p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p>	
Stnds/23nov10/05 and 06	<p>Self Assessment Report (SAR) review/validation and Quality Improvement Plan (QiP) validation:</p> <p>LK advised that the format had been changed this year to previous years.</p> <p>For clarification for Kevin Allan, the new Clerk to the Corporation, the Chair advised that the Committee had a duty to validate the SAR. It was noted that the SAR needs to be published by the 31st December 2010 on the Gateway.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the document had been delayed due to unforeseen circumstances and therefore asked that the Committee look at the document outside of the meeting and feedback comments to LK. It was suggested that an additional Standards meeting be arranged in order to validate the SAR prior to the FGB meeting on the 13 December.</p> <p>Committee members were invited to comment on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What key information should come before the data. 2. The ease of use of data tables. 3. Any further data analysis needed. <p>Narrative for document – LK to provide and circulate by email and Committee members to feedback to LK.</p>	<p>K Allan</p> <p>L Kinghorn</p>
Stnds/23nov10/07	<p>Retention report:</p> <p>The purpose of this report was to inform members of the Committee of the current in year retention figures for 2010-11. HW advised that</p>	

	<p>all the data has been taken from Pro Achieve.</p> <p>HW advised that the current Pro Achieve data showed that overall retention for all learners at all levels and durations was standing at 96% against a benchmark (national average) of 87%. The report highlighted 11 courses which had been identified as being below course retention benchmark.</p> <p>It was noted that the benchmark figures related to a full academic year; current retention figures may decline further as the year progresses.</p> <p>The report also highlighted 7 courses which had been identified as being only 2% above benchmark. However, it should be noted that two of the courses have a benchmark of 99%, and two at 98%.</p> <p>Following discussions the Chair advised that, in the February report on retention, the Committee would like to see information on those courses highlighted in this report.</p>	Helen Wright
Stnds/23nov10/08	<p>Survey plan/calendar:</p> <p>The purpose of this report was to present to Governors the Survey Calendar for 2010-11 and to propose that a procedure is put in place to ensure that surveys are planned in advance, quality assured and acted upon in a systematic way. LK advised that currently there was no central overview of the surveys carried out by the College, and that there was no strategy in place for the feedback of survey results to the relevant groups that had been surveyed or College committees.</p> <p>LK then highlighted recommendations as:</p> <p>We recommend that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey Calendar is managed by the Assistant Principal Designate, Quality • A planning cycle is designed for the authorisation and use of surveys as well as analysis of results and the reporting of resulting actions. • That this cycle is integrated within key strategies and plans <p>The Committee noted the importance of the document which was discussed and agreed the recommendations. Members noted that reference to obtaining the views of employers had been omitted from the tabled document and asked that these be reinstated before the document received a wider circulation.</p>	Louise Kinghorn
Stnds/23nov10/09	<p>Teaching and learning improvement strategy:</p> <p>The purpose of this report was to seek the views of the Committee on the 7th draft of the Teaching and Learning Strategy. HW advised that the Strategy was the outcome of work undertaken with our LSIS Improvement Advisor and that he had given this latest draft his</p>	

	<p>endorsement. HW added that the draft strategy had been circulated amongst a cross section of teaching staff, as well as the Chair of the Standards Committee and their views had been incorporated into this latest version. HW commented that the implementation plan was also in development and would be finalised by the AP Designate Quality.</p> <p>The Chair thanked HW for the document and commented that this version was much clearer. RC added that it was a good document which comes at an interesting time nationally. He added that this was an opportunity for the College to define publicly what it means by teaching and learning, and raised the issue of continuity between learner experiences in schools and colleges. MR confirmed that teaching staff experienced a number of difficulties in teaching new learners at the college who had come from the school sector. The committee asked that the college explore this issue with the schools, so that this sector understood the importance the college placed on the quality of its teaching and learning</p> <p>HW also advised that another strategy being developed was the curriculum strategy and looking at the Expert Learner, and bringing curriculum and learning activity together.</p> <p>The Chair advised that if anyone had any further comments and/or amendments to the document then to direct these to Helen Wright.</p> <p>The Chair and CT raised the link that this document and its implementation plan had with other developing documents such as the QIP and the Recovery Plan. They agreed that the implementation plan needed to have firm SMART targets, and could, for example, form the basis of a major thrust of the QIP. The Committee asked HW and LK to bear this in mind when developing the QIP. Members asked that the 'implementation plan' (or the relevant sections of other documents) be brought to its attention when completed.</p>	<p>Helen Wright</p> <p>All</p> <p>Helen Wright Louise Kinhorn</p>
	<p>Any other business:</p> <p><u>Terms of Reference</u></p> <p>The Chair advised that at the last meeting the Committee agreed its self assessment report, the summary strengths and weaknesses, an overall grade 3 for its work and an action plan. He advised that the action plan asked him to produce a revised ToR document which took into account the Committee's self assessment conclusions. The Chair advised that he revised the draft ToR, circulated it to members of the Committee who responded and all agreed with the proposed ToR as reflecting the Committees views on the proper business of the Committee and its self assessment. The Chair recommended that the</p>	

Minutes agreed:

Signed:

Date: