

Extraordinary Standards Committee 6 December 2010, Committee Room, Ashington

	<p>Present : T Shirley (Chair), C Todd, M Rossi (for item Stnds/06Dec10/04 only)</p> <p>In Attendance: D Simpkin, H Wright, L Kinghorn, K Allan</p>	
Stnds/6dec10/01	Apologies had been received by M Rossi, however as Robin Casson was unable to attend the meeting due to another commitment, M Rossi was called upon to attend for item Stnds/06Dec10/04 only.	
Stnds/06Dec10/02	The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 23 November 2010 were held for review at the next meeting.	
Stnds/06Dec10/03	<p>Self Assessment Report (SAR):</p> <p>To begin LK updated the Committee on what actions had been taken since the last inspection to ensure greater consistency in the SAR/QiP process covering 2009-10 as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paul Cook had provided individual support to all Heads of Department in the production of departmental SARs 08/09 and QiPs 09/10. 2. Post inspection validation events included external panel members. 3. Implementation of 6 month review by CLs for all course level SARs. 4. Standardised paperwork introduced for 6 month QiP review (distributed at CAM meeting) 5. Development group to devise and implement bespoke SAR documentation for support areas. 6. Introduction of new support area SAR/QiP documentation 7. Support with SMART target setting within QiPs at departmental level – cascaded to course level. 8. Report to SLT on progress made against QiP. <p>College SAR (Point C6, Page 30 of SAR document)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Improved SAR validation panels – additional industry experts and experts for support areas 10. 2009-10 Departmental SARs, sound judgements based on evidence – Good collection of diverse evidence informs key strengths and areas for improvement at departmental level 	

	<p>11. Good opportunities for external referencing e.g. Landex and other partnership work, HE in FE.</p> <p>LK then advised and handed out to the Committee a list of what actions are included in the 2010-11 QIP which are aimed at improving the quality of the process further in 2010-11. She advised that point 22 of the handout was an action relating directly to QIP and that the other points listed were actions but which will fall out of monitoring the QIP.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the Committee would like to have sight of what information goes out to Curriculum Leaders, i.e., the questions that are asked etc as a point of reference in order to see what might be missing.</p> <p>The Committee then reviewed the SAR and the following points were raised:</p> <p>Page 4 – There is no mention of Higher Education (HE). LK advised that HE forms part of SED which is the HE equivalent of the SAR and which is completed in February. HW supported the Chair’s comment and advised that the SAR is a College document and that QAA would not be happy if this document was our only reference to HE as it is not part of the QCF framework. It was discussed and CT advised that the process could run alongside the SED so that both documents could be reviewed at the same time.</p> <p>Page 11 – This page was missing from the bound copy. The Chair commented that the trend for LBI was up but that Business had declined steadily over the last three years. The Chair noted that the document does not mention this decline, or enrolment rates. HW added that there had been issues with Adult Learners within Business.</p> <p>Page 12 – Performance tables – percentage sign to be included together with some commentary. The Chair advised of his concern about the decline in numbers within some areas.</p> <p>Page 18 (point A3) – The Chair asked that LK clarify which was a strength. A discussion took place regarding the number of key areas and actions. It was suggested that there be only 2/3 key areas and fewer actions.</p> <p>Page 25 – Areas for Improvement (IAG) – The Chair advised that this commentary was very vague and should not appear. LK to update.</p> <p>Page 28 – Areas for Improvement (Warden gender imbalance) – The Chair asked for an update and HW advised that inspectors had been concerned but when they had met the students and the female advocates they had been satisfied with the arrangements. However, it was noted that there were issues with recruitment. The Chair asked</p>	<p>Louise Kinghorn</p> <p>Louise Kinghorn</p> <p>Louise Kinghorn</p> <p>Louise Kinghorn</p>
--	---	---

	<p>that it be noted that there were particular concerns regarding this matter.</p> <p>Construction – The Chair noted that there was a gentle decline within this area. HW advised that this area is largely Employer Responsive and was not inspected. She added that Learner Responsive is in decline (page 36 of SAR document) and that Construction is self assessed as a whole area.</p> <p>Retail/Commercial – The Chair asked if this area was included in Hospitality and Catering. It was noted that there were a lot of areas for improvement.</p> <p>The Chair thanked LK for her work and advised that for an external audience the document would benefit from more commentary as a way of an explanation in areas.</p>	
Stnds/06Dec10/04	<p>Due to governor apologies, Mark Rossi was called to the meeting at this point to ensure that the meeting was quorate. The Chair recapped the suggested amendments outlined in Stnds/06Dec10/03 , which were then agreed by the Standards Committee.</p> <p>With the stipulated amendments, the SAR was approved for recommendation to the Full Governing Body.</p> <p>KA requested that the document be split into two separate documents as it was only the SAR that is going to the Full Governing Body.</p>	Louise Kinghorn
	<p>Date of the next meeting:</p> <p>15 February 2011, 3:30pm in the Committee Room, Ashington</p>	
	<p>Members of the committee:</p> <p>T Shirley (Chair), C Todd, R Casson, M Rossi</p>	

Minutes agreed:

Signed:

Date: