

**WOKING COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Company Number 10821223**

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Academy
held on Wednesday 13th November 2019 at 6pm at Rydens Way, Woking, GU22 9DL**

Present:

Gaynor Mather	Chair
Tim Stokes	Vice Chair
Brett Freeman	Principal
Yasmin Aslam	
Elizabeth Cussans	
Rob Kemp	
Jonathan Miles	
Cullum Mitchell	
John Moffat	
Mike Mulheron	

In Attendance:

Nuweed Razaq	Deputy Principal
Laura Cook	Assistant Principal
Karen Foan	Assistant Principal
Barbara Maude	Clerk to the Trustees

Item	Agenda Description	Action
1.	Apologies for Absence & Declarations of Interest Apologies had been received from Ben Smith and the apology was duly agreed. No member present declared an interest in any item on the agenda.	
2.	Minutes of the Previous Meeting The Board received the minutes of the previous meetings held on 3rd July 2019 (both open and confidential) and 18 th September 2019 respectively. The minutes were agreed as an accurate record and approved for signature by the Chair.	
3.	Matters arising There was only one matter arising, namely the compliance review against the updated DfE Academy Governance Handbook which had been published in September 2019. The Clerk confirmed that this was in hand and in conjunction with the Finance Director, a summary had been prepared and would be brought to the next meeting of the Finance and Audit Committee on 27 th November and then in turn to the main Board at the 11 th December meeting.	
	TEACHING, LEARNING & ASSESSMENT	
4.	Destination Data 2018/19 In an agreed change to the sequencing of the agenda, the Assistant Principal (Pastoral) gave a presentation of the destination data for learners from the academic year 2018/19.	

The destination report itemised university data split between Russell Group Universities and those Universities with 2 or more students attending which were within a 100 mile radius of the College. It also included Year 13 destination information, university places, one-year destinations and information for one-year students staying in education.

There was a separate analysis of student destination by gender, ethnicity, students whose parents had attended university (if disclosed by students); by those students supported by Learning Support; and those with a Learning Difficulty or Disability Code (LLDD).

In summary, there were 584 Advanced Level students who completed their course and of these 94 went into employment, 46 were accepted into Apprenticeships, 335 commenced further or higher education, 90 took a gap year, 15 Level 3 students went on to other FE Colleges, and 3 returned to College to improve their grades. There was 1 Level 3 student whose destination was unknown.

Of the 335 students who applied for higher education courses, 76% gained their first choice, 6% gained their insurance choice.

Key points of note were that there were no significant differences between gender and progression to university. Females were more likely to opt for a gap year, with males more likely to pursue an apprenticeship. Ethnic minority groups were more likely to progress to University with white students more likely to take a gap year.

Students supported by the Learning Support department and those in receipt of Learning Support Fund had broadly the same progression routes compared to those not in receipt of LS or a bursary.

In terms of areas identified as requiring improvement, the Board discussed the further embedding of the Gatsby Benchmarks into curriculum areas. It was noted that the Gatsby benchmarks were a framework of 8 guidelines that define the best careers provision in schools and colleges. In response to questions on how Trustees could see for themselves the integration of the Gatsby benchmarks, then it was agreed that whilst learning walks would not perhaps be the right medium, the use of a focus group to review their implementation would be a better way forward.

Trustees also queried the accessibility of degree apprenticeships and SLT advised that these were often more challenging for students to access due to the requirement of employer funding, but that they were working with learners to access all available apprenticeships both degree and non-degree and it was noted that a UCAS style system for apprenticeships was in the process of being developed.

It was also reported within the sector that there was a slight move away from Universities making unconditional offers to students as there was evidence to suggest that some students who had been made an unconditional offer dropped out of University or arrived with poor or even no grades.

The Board **resolved to note the Destination Report 2018/19.**

The Assistant Principal, Quality for Learning gave a brief overview of the Self-Assessment Process itself and then in turn gave an overview of the College's key strengths and areas for improvement as outlined in the College Self-Assessment Report.

The key strengths of the College were noted as being learner achievement which consistently exceeded national averages; learner progress from starting points which were good or excellent; and learners progress onto a range of good Higher Education, training and employment opportunities. In addition, learners developed the capacity to become independent and skilled in preparation for entering the workforce and both leaders and managers understood the strengths and areas for development and planned effectively for improvements.

The Assistant Principal advised the Board that there had been a few small changes to the data presented at the Autumn Conference, with the success rate now at 90.6% compared to as previously stated 91% and a slight drop in retention to 94.6% as shown below.

Key Performance Data

	Overall - Success/Achievement Rate	16-18			19+			Total		
		16/17	17/18	18/19	16/17	17/18	18/19	16/17	17/18	18/19
A L L	Starters	4535	4018	4306	264	218	272	4799	4236	4578
	Success rate (%)	90.9	91.0	91.0	88.9	87.7	86.5	90.8	90.8	90.6
	Pass rate (%)	96.1	97.5	98.5	94.3	92.1	89.6	96.0	97.1	97.8
	GCSE Average	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.0	4.0	3.5	5.4	5.3	5.6
	Attendance (%)	97.7	97.8	97.8	95.7	96.0	95.3	97.6	97.8	97.8
	Retention (%)	95.1	95.2	94.4	94.3	95.4	96.7	95.1	95.2	94.6
	Punctuality (%)	98.4	97.9	98.0	98.1	98.6	97.7	98.4	97.9	98.0
	High Pass rate (%)	43.2	56.2	56.7	30.4	23.3	16.4	42.5	53.9	53.5

Improvements from last year were notably, further improvements in GCSE Maths High Grades and the removal of a gender gap on overall Value-Added results in A-Level and BTEC.

Areas for development were identified as further improvement required of data use by managers and results in a minority of courses.

The Trustees that had attended the validation meetings as part of the moderation process reflected that the Heads of Department had been well prepared and the sessions had reflected honest and challenging conversations. Whilst trustees attended as observers they were provided with ample opportunity to ask questions. The sessions attended were viewed as constructive and provided a key opportunity for Trustees to see the College in operational mode.

The Board then reviewed the College SAR and in response to the key summary points challenged SLT on whether the College could use other measures against which it could benchmark itself, for example, was the national average actually challenging enough; and could the College use other comparative data such as the top quartile of providers.

KFO

	<p>After discussion, it was agreed that the ALPs data was one of the most reliable measures to utilise as the use of other data could mean that the College was compared against selective schools but it was agreed that SLT would review the range of comparable data available going forward. It was certainly possible to use other benchmarking exercises although whilst some data would be available it was published too late to form part of the current SAR process.</p> <p>The Board also queried the areas for development and the actions for improving the data use by managers. It was clarified that this item related to the flow of data provided to HoDs and SLT. The Board in turn reviewed the actions to be taken to improve the results in some courses. The Board had been provided with the SAR reports from three departments, notably, Media & Film (Grade 2), English (Grade 2) and Humanities (Grade 3), which was the only department to be graded 3.</p> <p>It was noted that for each area requiring improvement, this was underpinned by a management plan that unpicked exactly how each area was going to improve; how that improvement was going to be achieved and the intervals at which the progress would be reviewed. After discussion, the Board confirmed that they were satisfied that the areas that were being underpinned in this manner were being robustly managed and that there would be positive progress towards the targets set.</p> <p>In terms of the formatting of the documents, members suggested that it would be helpful in the future if the different strands (for example, those targets not met, those carried forward etc) that ran through the Quality Improvement Plan could be differentiated to make it easier to follow, possibly by RAG rating them and the addition of cohort sizes to the SAR to contextualise data was also considered helpful. Members suggested that in terms of the references to personal development and those areas for development within the QIP, the Assistant Principal should revisit the language over mental health and in particular the flow of resources in that area.</p> <p>The Board would also welcome some further data on learners in receipt of bursary support. It was confirmed that approximately 200 learners were in receipt of bursary support (about 16% of the student body).</p> <p>The Board also discussed the new terminology of cultural capital introduced under the Education Inspection Framework (EIF) which was a much broader concept and how to specifically ensure the wider development of a student’s cultural capital through curriculum and non-curriculum activities. The Board felt that the College’s wider offer was extensive but suggested that SLT look at ways to improve the take up of that wider offer.</p> <p>The Board also spent some time reviewing the 3 “I’s” of the EIF - intent, implementation and impact and the way in which future Board meetings could be encapsulate triangular thinking.</p> <p>The Board resolved to note the Self-Assessment Report 2018/19 & Quality Improvement Plan 2019/20.</p>	<p>KFO</p> <p>KFO</p> <p>SLT</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Governance Self-Assessment 2018/19</p> <p>The Board reviewed the draft Governance Self-Assessment Report and Quality Improvement Plan. The draft report also referenced the checklist that had been</p>	

