



## MINUTES OF THE QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2022 at 6 pm.

**Present:**

Ruth Seabrook (Chair)      Jane Duscherer  
Natasha Meade

Helen Odhams (Deputy Principal, Advising  
Officer)  
Dan Hards (Assistant Principal)  
Ken Kehoe (Clerk)

### 1. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of business interests from the Trustees.

### 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from Andy McVeigh, Ben Obese-Jecty, Kate Parsons and Emily Vanstone. These were accepted by the committee.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> November 2021 were approved as an accurate record.

### 4. MATTERS ARISING

The committee reviewed the matters arising.

**Q&S1-001** Clerk to amend minutes of 27<sup>th</sup> April 2021 to refer to Teacher Assessed Grades. **This had been done.**

**Q&S1-002** The Deputy Principal to consider, with colleagues, how the personal development activities addressed the points made by Trustees. **The Deputy Principal briefed the committee that, following Trustee comments, amongst other courses, the College were looking at Barclays Life Skills courses for 6.1 students as part of the Complementary Studies Programme as these covered some of the issues raised by Trustees. For 6.2 students, the College was looking at the LAMDA public speaking course. This attracts UCAS points and ESFA funding.**

**Q&S1-003** The Deputy Principal to amend the SAR and QIP, in light of the comments from Trustees, for recommendation to the Board of Trustees. **This had been done and the amended SAR and QIP had**

been agreed by the Board of Trustees at the December 2021 Board meeting. The SAR and QIP was sent to Ofsted in December following the meeting.

## 5. STUDENT RETENTION REPORT 2020/21 ACADEMIC YEAR

Dan Hards briefed the committee on the Student Retention Report.

Mental health issues remain the primary reason for leaving College. The overall number of students was broadly level but concerns about student well-being have risen. The College has been pro-active in identifying extra resource through Student Services and an additional Tutor Team Leader to support and retain affected students. The Safeguarding Audit undertaken for the Audit committee did not result in any recommendations being made.

Trustees asked whether the students that withdrew from 6.1 for mental health reasons shared any characteristics and whether bullying was a factor in students leaving. Dan Hards agreed to look at whether the students leaving for mental health reasons, were female. Regarding bullying, he advised that the College had robust systems in place to tackle any cases of peer-on-peer abuse: students had systems to report cases and the College followed up robustly.

**Action:** Dan Hards to identify the gender of students leaving 6.1 for mental health reasons

Drawing upon the Market Intelligence Data Exchange Service (MIDES) In-Year Retention Report, the College has better retention than the national Sixth Form College benchmark by 2.2 percentage points and for every student characteristic group (Gender, Asian, Black, Multiple Ethnic Group and White), the College is performing well above the national Sixth Form college benchmarks. For the second year, however, the 'other ethnic group' is below the Sixth Form College benchmark. There had been an improvement from the previous year but as the 'other ethnic group' only made up 1.8% of the College's student population, it was difficult to determine any statistical significance from this data. This issue would be looked at as part of the Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Self-Assessment Review next year.

The committee thanked Dan Hards for his report.

## 6. UPDATE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE 2021-22

The Deputy Principal briefed the committee on this year's Quality Assurance programme.

### Review of Lesson Observations

There had been 82 lesson observations, including 20 joint observations with either Divisional Directors or SLT. The joint observations had helped to verify the consistency of the evaluation of lessons and feedback. The lesson observations were conducted against the National Teaching Standards, amended for the post-16 environment.

The lesson observations allowed Heads of Department to say well-done to staff, to identify any staff not meeting the standard, to identify themes for development within their Department and ultimately through feeding up to the responsible Assistant Principal, themes that could be taken forward cross-College. These would then feed into the planning for INSET days and other training as well as next year's College Quality Improvement Plan. Departmental areas for development would feed into Department QIPs for next academic year. The Deputy Principal briefed the committee on the small number of cases where the lessons had not met the standard. Individual support for the staff had been put in place by the HoD/DD with the support in some cases of the Assistant Principal.

Trustees asked the following:

Were lesson observations known in advance? The Deputy Principal said that the lessons observations were agreed with staff in advance. She explained that after the observed lesson, there was a Q&A just with the students. This helped identify if the observed lesson was a typical lesson. For example, if a lesson observed had not met the standard, discussions would take place with the students to establish whether this was a typical lesson. Learning walks later on in the year were unannounced.

What were the leadership looking for in lesson observations? The Deputy Principal explained that amongst a range of aspects, they would look at how engaged the students were in lessons, how much progress they were making over time, whether those students needing support were getting it and whether the most able students were being challenged sufficiently. They also considered the outcome of the student Q&A held after the observed lessons.

The Deputy Principal also briefed the committee on other Quality Assurance work that was being carried out, noting that the leadership were carrying out a pilot observation scheme, involving 5 departments, that is looking at how observations can be used as more of a developmental tool for individuals and departments. The pilot would run through this year and next. The Deputy Principal also explained that Early Career Teachers and Trainee Teachers had 6 lesson observations per year and other observations took place where the quality of teaching does not meet the required standard. Learning Walks also take place in the summer term.

Trustees asked about the outcomes of the Mock examinations. The Deputy Principal briefed that Progress Review outcomes are considered by departments and SLT. Where there are departmental issues the results would be acted on by the department and feed into the mid-year QIPs (PR1 and 2) and that the performance of the different groups of learners are reviewed by departments and SLT.

The committee thanked the Deputy Principal, noting how resource intensive the lesson observation process was.

#### Review of Student Survey Outcomes

The Deputy Principal also briefed the committee on the Student Satisfaction Survey for 2021-22, noting that the comparator survey was for 2019 pre-covid. The results were generally in-line with that year and considering the challenges of the past year, this was quite pleasing. The survey also allowed students to offer comments which were reviewed and fed into the relevant part of the College whether that was on teaching and learning, the Learning Resource Centre or IT. The Deputy Principal noted that the SLT also ran student forums to gather student feedback in the summer term.

Trustees asked:

Were the results of the Student Surveys and the actions taken fed back to the students? The Deputy Principal explained that the SLT fed back to the Student Union Executive who in turn fed it back to the student body via student voice events.

Whether data on student satisfaction regarding individual courses was captured? The Deputy Principal explained that this information was captured in a separate exercise taken at the same time as the College survey and that following the outcomes, course teams conduct class surveys to follow up on issues raised and the outcomes of both are fed back to students as well as into SARs/QIPs and the Joint Reviews carried out in the Autumn term together with Departmental SARs and QIPs.

External Quality Reviews

The Deputy Principal briefed the committee on the EQR process, explaining that this was a peer review process in which external experts would come in to review particular areas. This year there had been EQRs in English and Psychology; an EQR on Learning Support would take place next year. Nothing had come out of the EQRs that were worrying; there was lots of good practice and some areas for development. For example, the English EQR had suggested areas for development around the use of homework and the development of independent thinking. The Departments would reflect on the feedback and incorporate it in their future QIPs.

The Deputy Principal noted that quite a few Esher staff were external reviewers who undertook reviews at other education establishments; these were also valuable exercises as it helped identify best practice.

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

Provisionally, Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2022.

*The meeting closed at 7.09pm.  
Attendance was 43 %.*

Signed.....

Date.....

**SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**

<b>Q&amp;S2-001</b>	DH to review whether students leaving for mental health reasons shared protected characteristics.
---------------------	---

**SUMMARY OF GOVERNOR CHALLENGE [C] / SUPPORT [S]**

<b>C/S</b>	<b>Minute</b>	<b>Topic</b>
C	5	<b>Student Retention Report</b>  Trustees asked for further data on whether students leaving as a result of mental health issues, shared protected characteristics.