

The Manchester College Board

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 22nd June 2018 at 10am at OP116/117.

Present: Jenifer Burden, Cllr John Hacking, Lisa O'Loughlin (Principal), Malcolm Sugden, Pauline Waterhouse OBE (Chair) and Sue Murphy CBE.

Apologies: Hassan Mohamed

In Attendance: Rachel Curry (Vice Principal Planning and Performance), John Evans (Vice Principal Quality and Standards), Lindsey Johnson (VP- HE Curriculum and Support), Christine Kenyon (Vice Principal FE), Kate Mackenzie (Assistant Company Secretary and Solicitor), Debbie Sanderson (Divisional Finance Director -College and Income Team), Michael Walsh (VP- HE and Higher Skills)

Helen Whelan (AP- Professional Development) for item 20/18 and members of the Student Focus Group for item 23/18.

No declarations of interest were received.

Part A

17/18	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on November 2017</p> <p>The Part A minutes of the meeting held on 7th March 2018 were received and approved as a correct record.</p>
18/18	<p>Chair 2018/19</p> <p>The Board endorsed Pauline Waterhouse continuing as Chair for the academic year 2018/19.</p>
19/18	<p>Progress update on Post inspection Action Plan and Evaluation (PIAP) of Impact</p> <p>The Board received the progress update and evaluation of impact paper in respect of the PIAP and the substantive paper was taken as read. The Board probed the Principalship on the extent to which, processes for monitoring progress had been currently embedded by teachers. The Board was informed that the majority of processes were fully embedded including Alps and that further processes had been implemented for all other graded courses not covered by Alps. The Board was also assured that the team had developed a process for non- graded courses which, after further work had been carried out by MIS would be rolled out in September. Once implemented this would equate to 95% of students being the subject of a graded system.</p> <p>The Board was also informed that the HoDs Quality were making good progress and that the departmental boards of study were holding teachers and managers to account for progress.</p>

The fact that these boards reported into the new College Improvement Quality Group (QIG) was provided to the Board as the evidence base upon which the Principalship was confident that figures for predicated outcomes were realistic.

Whilst the Board confirmed that they were assured in respect of the process they sought reassurance on the level of progress that had been made and whether this was in line with expectations.

Alps was alluded to and the estimation that the college would be Alps 5 but the key fact to note was that the college would have moved from 8 -5 in 3 years. It was emphasised that the context for this needed to be appreciated, given that the college's learners entered with lower skills and many didn't have the basic skills for study.

The view was that the progress overall was strong and the current workstream supported further and imminent positive movement. The forum on quality was also cited as an important board that had made progress on innovation and ensured connectivity between all the VP areas and HoDs of Quality and that this triangulation was key.

The Board was also informed that teachers whose courses have an end of year exam have more context in which to predict outcomes due to the embedded processes. The Board confirmed that this was reassuring.

The Board noted that the data in respect of level 1 and level 2 courses was the weakest. It was confirmed that this had been identified by the Principalship last year and had been scrutinised. The Board was informed that the reason related to recruitment of learners to the incorrect course level and moving learners to sit a level 1 mid- course which recorded as a failed level 2. The Board was assured that more training and guidance was now in place in respect of recruitment and to prepare teachers to support learners to pass level 2, resulting in fewer learners transferring to level 1.

In response to the Board's enquiry, the learning derived from external visits was shared and the Board endorsed these visits and in particular that teacher grade colleagues were participating in them.

The Board then focused its attention on attendance and requested that the Principalship outline the new initiatives alluded to for 2018/19, which has arisen in the context of the further support and challenge visit. These were explained, including the identification of the issue early on and the possibility of having to earn the right to be on a course and robust communications with parents. By having the HoDs based on campuses this was also predicated to have an impact. Having a change in process for teachers marking absence, to take into account authorised absences for example, work experience, mentor sessions or English and Maths so that learners would not be reported as absent in these circumstances was discussed. The Principalship was of the view that teachers were not marking in this way currently and the key challenge to formally implement this process would be to ensure that teachers recorded accurately in the classroom. The Board noted that the impact of this would all hinge on the wider piece around communication, compliance and consistency of approach due to the multiple physical sites over which the college delivered. The Board queried the process in place that the college operated if a learner was absent and this was shared.

	<p>The Board queried how quickly sessional staff could be brought onboard with the new systems and training and practical support in place was explained.</p> <p>The Board confirmed that they had a sense of real positive and tangible progress and was satisfied that the Principalship was working in a targeted and focused way.</p>
20/18	<p>Teaching, Learning and Assessment Update</p> <p><i>Helen Whelan joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Board received the report, which detailed how well the new arrangements for evaluating teaching learning and assessment (ETLA) and resultant quality improvement activity were working. The substantive report was taken as read. The Board indicated that this was the right juncture to interrogate the issues of lesson assessment and feedback and English and Maths progress.</p> <p>The Board focused in on ETLA aspect 4- the quality of assessment and feedback - and expressed concern that there was less impact than they would have been comfortable with and challenged the Principalship on what steps they were putting in place to make the impact greater.</p> <p>The intervention so far in respect of lesson visits was shared and it was confirmed that the scrutiny work was being completed at present. This was explained as a large piece of work and the process was detailed. The Board considered that this work scrutiny was a positive step and appreciated that it was a lengthy process but considered that it would be of great value to outcomes and was especially pleased that teachers were being involved in the process.</p> <p>The fact that feedback given by teachers in lessons was strong but that this was not always being capturing in written feedback was alluded to and the steps being taken to make this process streamlined for teachers by utilisation of a template to inform feedback against key objectives was referred to.</p> <p>In terms of further positive progress evidence the focus on cross department working to tackle underperformance was highlighted and the strong level of engagement of teachers evidenced by discussion in the Quality Improvement Group. The visibility of how curriculum staff could partner with English and Maths teachers and team teaching was also shared and the zoning of E&M with centralised timetabling for the first time.</p> <p>The system being rich in forensic detail which should feed into the appraisal process was acknowledged. The Board requested that when campus based delivery was in place that the data be cut by department and campus so that the journey could be tracked and if there were any unintended consequences then these could be seen.</p> <p>The Board challenged the Principalship that there were opportunities to develop competences in E& M between visit 1 and 2 but that the concern, as had been identified, was that E&M was where not as much progress had been made. The Board asked for more reassurance about what had been done as it had been alluded to that the practice of curriculum teachers working with E& M teachers was in place so that curriculum teachers could embed E&M into the curriculum. The Enigma resource that curriculum teachers could utilise to revisit the E&M that had been</p>

	<p>taught in the current week and then embed into the vocational lessons was explained.</p> <p>The Board focused on the ETLA of tutorial support having been indicated as in need of improvement as to how achievement tutors were monitoring progress. Concern was expressed as this was considered to fundamental. Compliance with Markbook was cited as key to ensuring that the achievement tutors had the granular level of detail they required to monitor progress so the conversation could move from a generic support one. The Board agreed strongly and that if the tutors didn't have the material then they should name and shamed. Further training around the positioning of tutors had also been identified by the Principalship as a training need.</p> <p>.</p> <p><i>Helen Whelan left the meeting.</i></p>
<p>21/18</p>	<p>Predicated Achievement- 2017/18</p> <p>The Board received the paper on predicted achievement for 2017/18 for 16-18 and 19+ learners. Statistics were presented on current year predictions against national benchmarks together with an analysis against the previous three year trend. The Board referred to those areas of provision which were highlighted as currently behind national benchmarks and sought assurance that appropriate remedial measures were in place to address the issue.</p> <p>The Board was pleased to see the positive retention rate across both categories and an upward improvement in 16-18 pass rates together with the very positive predicted achievement rates. The Board noted that 19 + level 2 and All Ages level 2 were below national average but that progress was clearly being made.</p> <p>Level 2 was noted as below national average and a discussion focused on what was contributing to this and how the college operated differently. The GCSE mandation was alluded to but the choice in respect of learners who achieved below the mandation criteria left the college with a choice. The Principalship was of the view that it was important that a learner was on the appropriate qualification for them, so a GCSE or a lower level. The impact of this however if the learner did not achieve a level 1-2 functional skill was that it would be recorded as a fail but the college was confident that they were providing appropriate delivery for learners. It was highlighted to the Board that the college was above the achievement rate for functional skills overall but level 1-2 depressed the overall achievement rate.</p> <p>The Board was reminded that previously the college was slightly under NR for level 3 due to AS levels but the future impact of this would decrease as these no longer formed part of the delivery of the college. The expectation was for level 3 and 16-18 to move above NR and work had been carried out to address pockets in respect of under achievement at level 2.</p> <p>In order to reassure the Board as to the predicated achievement the Board was informed that attendance, progress and predicated achievement had a forensic focus and were the subject of weekly 1-1 conversations. The plan for 2018/19 was to risk rate qualification and student plans to aid greater forensic analysis. The Board was of the view that this would will give more clarity to the departmental board of study too and the assessment tutors to see those students who are underperforming or overperforming.</p>

<p>22/18</p>	<p>Evaluation of CPD for teachers and plans for 2018/19</p> <p><i>Helen Whelen joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Board received the paper on evaluation of CPD for teachers and plans for 2018/19. The Board asked for confirmation as to what role performance review and appraisal was going to have in CPD activities and in forming the plan for the next year. It was explained that at the moment appraisals drew on ETLA records and this then signposted to CPD, a mapped lesson visit and then the assessment of practice. The appraisal was seen as the golden thread. It was confirmed that the link between appraisal and CPD was in place, it was a question of ensuring that everyone was using it and that this was a key piece of work and change for next year. In response to further challenge, it was confirmed that where most impact was achieved was following 1-1s held with individuals and planning that included coaching. The Board was pleased to learn that coaching was a part of CPD and that this was a positive move to make teachers reflective practitioners and it complemented the ETLA model as a development model. It was felt that this showed the maturity of the college's development.</p> <p>It was noted that the cultural shift in respect of pedagogy and moving from a culture of support to teaching to the top was key to progress and that rapid progress had been made to date but the low baseline start position in relation to this had to be borne in mind.</p> <p><i>Helen Whelen and Lindsey Johnson left the meeting.</i></p>
<p>23/18</p>	<p>Student Focus Group Q&A</p> <p><i>Members from the student focus group joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Board welcomed the student focus group members who represented a range of curriculum areas. The Board invited the members to share what they considered to be the positive aspects of the college. Having 1-1s with teachers where they were coached on what they needed to do to improve on the course and tutors being supportive and challenging them to achieve higher were cited.</p> <p>The Board was keen to learn if teachers encouraged the students to stretch themselves and it was confirmed that they did. One student confirmed that they had been working to merit level and due to the tutor's help and advice had achieved a distinction.</p> <p>The Board questioned the members on what happened in cases of non-attendance. It was confirmed that students would get a phone call from the achievement tutor. Members agreed that having an achievement tutor was positive.</p> <p>The Board also questioned on what the college could do better. More recreation activities at lunchtime was referred to with some students choosing to go into town and as a result returning late for lessons. Also reference was made to Maths and English classes being too long which caused people to lose engagement. The members also discussed the fact that there were courses where learners would spend a full day with one teacher with the resultant possibility that this became a</p>

	<p>challenge to stay engaged. There was however the feeling that the level of engagement was linked to the teacher's learning style and ability to identify when the class required a change of pace or diversion.</p> <p>All members confirmed that they would recommend the college to a friend. The Board asked whether the members felt safe as students. They all confirmed that they did and one member who had been with the college since 2015 commented that the safety had improved so much with the scanning of ID badges and turnstiles and staff checking students and calling them back if an ID badge was not being worn.</p> <p><i>The members from the student focus group left the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Board reflected on the discussion and noted the potential impact on attendance that lunchtime trips to town might have. The Board noted the reinforcement of the positive impact of the achievement tutor having been identified.</p>
	<p>-----</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Date</p>

The meeting closed at 3.05pm