

# CORPORATE GOVERNING BODY OF GODALMING COLLEGE

## Minutes of a meeting of the Curriculum and Quality Committee of Godalming College held at the College on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2010 at 7.00pm

**Present:** Stephen Dennison (Chairman)  
Angela Gallagher-Brett  
Karen Bryan  
Robin Galliver  
Helena Hockridge  
Emma Lewis  
Neil Parsons

**Advisors:** Dave Cartwright (Assistant Principal)  
May O’Keeffe (Assistant Principal)

**In Attendance:** Stella Halloran (Clerk to the Corporation)

### ACTION

1. **Apologies for absence**

All were present.

2. **Declaration of Interests**

None were declared.

3. **Minutes**

An amendment to Item 7 was recorded: It should have read ‘Level 2 to Level 3’, not Level 2 to Level 4.

With the above amendment, the minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2010 were approved and signed.

4. **Matters arising from the minutes**

*Item 7 – Transition Course*

Dave Cartwright reported that the 4 week course for Access students, designed to assist them to make informed choices for their level 3 courses, had received very positive feedback from both students and teachers. Courses had been run in 8 subjects, including some of which the students would have had no experience.

Due to its success, the Transition Course would be run again at the end of this academic year.

*Item 11 – Links with Businesses*

Some progress was reported. Viv Micklefield (Marketing) had set up a database of community links and one of the Business teachers was setting up a breakfast club designed so that local business people could hear presentations from students.

5. **Safeguarding Policy**

The new policy, which replaced the Child Protection Policy, had been circulated with the agenda.

May O’Keeffe explained that in order that the College could be graded ‘Outstanding’ by Ofsted, Safeguarding had to be graded as ‘Good’ or better.

The College’s SMT had agreed that, although they were committed to providing a safe environment for all students and staff, they did not wish to be over restrictive and therefore had not gone down the route of security gates or compulsory badges. The College would grade itself ‘Good’ on Safeguarding.

Governors requested that the Policy had a built in review date. The clerk would contact the author of the policy to agree this.

CLERK

***With the above amendment the Committee recommended the Safeguarding Policy for approval at the next full meeting of the Corporation.***

6. IQRs 2009 -10 summary

May O’Keeffe invited questions on the summary.

The concept of ‘disorganised male students’ was discussed. It was noted that this was particularly prevalent in Social Sciences, where there was a lot of paperwork. It was agreed that remedial action had to be taken early in order that such students improved.

It was noted that Dave Cartwright would, this year, be undertaking a review, looking at male achievement across the College.

It was noted that the reports (here and in the following agenda item) did not identify how students needing learning support came by that support. If support was student initiated many of those who were disorganised would not avail themselves of it e.g. drop in sessions.

It was felt by the teaching staff present that, although help was available and tutors and subject teachers did assist these students to access help, this was not obvious from the documentation.

How the ‘debate agenda’ was being pursued was questioned. May O’Keeffe reported that there was to be a debate in the Teaching and Learning group later this month and that debate in the classroom was encouraged. The College emphasis on students thinking for themselves meant that debate was important. Although governors wondered whether teachers might feel threatened by such debate, the consensus was that this was not the case.

The three themes from these IQRs would now be addressed in Faculty SARs and plans.

IQRs being undertaken between now and March would be reported at the March meeting.

Meanwhile the Chairman requested that any updates on the above should be brought to the Committee as appropriate.

7. **Self Assessment Reports**

Governors requested a standard glossary to cover all reports – this would be very helpful.

A general point, covering all SARs was raised: the words ‘most’ or ‘

M O’KEEFE /  
D  
CARTWRIGHT

the majority' were used throughout the reports without quantifying what this meant or identifying what was being done to manage underperformance in any area.

May O'Keeffe and Dave Cartwright reported the means through which underperformance amongst staff was identified (including the new students reps for each subject and student end of year evaluations). It was tackled through support and development in the first place and then through competency procedures if the first route did not give sufficient improvement. The role of the Director of Faculty was crucial in all this, but set procedures had to be followed, which, in all but the most extreme cases, was necessarily lengthy.

**a) Social Sciences Faculty**

The emphasis throughout this report was to achieve a more rounded education for all students. Lack of time was the largest factor mitigating against these ideals. EPQs gave an opportunity for students to develop skills through something they are interested in. Governors questioned whether only higher achievers were taking advantage of EPQs, but College staff demonstrated that this was not the case – they were being taken by students across the spectrum; strategies were in place to include all abilities.

It was agreed that it would be helpful if it was made clear that EPQs were for all in the documentation.

The management of long term absences was discussed, there being no ideal solution. Normally students do not have the same staff teaching them for the whole two years, but in smaller departments this could not be the case.

**b) Arts and Languages Faculty**

Work Ethic was discussed. BTEC courses have a good work ethic with 1: 1 support and it was felt that perhaps this good practice could be modelled for other areas where work ethic was not so good.

The influence of declining uptake of modern foreign languages in 11 – 16 schools was discussed and it was noted that some language courses in College had very small numbers (notably German and Italian). Before any language ceased to be offered, the College would look into some sort of cooperation with other Colleges. The strategies for improving the uptake in MFL that were being put into place by the College were outlined, including taking good language students into the feeder schools as ambassadors.

The problem seemed to lie at GCSE level, especially with the idea of language learning as an enrichment of culture.

**c) Science and Vocational Faculty**

Governors felt that this provided a slightly more negative report and concerns were raised about Biology. A governor questioned whether Surrey University could be of help here. The problem was seen to be mainly with GCSE re-sits as the College wished to ensure that all students had English, maths and a science at GCSE before they left. It was suggested that perhaps Biology was not the best science to offer

in this situation.

Governors questioned why the 2 year success rates for maths appeared to be low. It was explained that the table indicated the success of all students starting the course and completing through to A2; many students took AS maths and didn't carry on as it was not necessary to what they required for university entrance (medics notable here).

**d) Cross-College SARs**

Curriculum, Student Guidance and Quality were considered together and the following noted:

- 'Connexions', which had been very helpful particularly to those looking to get jobs on leaving College, did not exist any more.
- The pressure on staff due to the increasingly bureaucratic UCAS process was considerable.
- The focus on careers could change with the higher fees universities would charge from 2012; maybe more would opt to go into employment
- It was agreed to invite Carol Horlock to the next Curriculum and Quality meeting to explore further the impact of the loss of Connexions and the change of balance between university applications and entering employment.
- The Student Guidance report indicated excellent provision for students with Aspergers Syndrome.

CLERK

The Chairman thanked May O'Keeffe and Dave Cartwright for their input into this item.

**8. Student Achievements Summer 2010**

Governors received the breakdown of Summer exam results. It was noted that this was raw data and didn't give any value added information, which was better at AS and slightly worse at A2 than the previous year.

*M O'Keeffe to pass on congratulations and thanks to staff*

**The Committee wished to thank all staff for their hard work and to congratulate them on the achievements of last year.**

**9. College SAR and Development Plan 2010 - 2011**

The review of the past year indicated that targets had been met in the areas monitored by this committee.

Many of the issues raised in the Review section had been covered in discussions earlier on the agenda.

It was noted that in Section 3, the SFBac had been launched with L6 students, with a view to the Access students being certificated in the Summer. It was reported that there had been a mixed response from students, but it was thought that it would gain momentum as the year progressed.

The use of SFBac and EPQs for university entrance was questioned and it was thought that they would be useful at borderline cases and particularly if students needed to go through clearing.

Item 17 of the Development Plan was to be noted by Governors – a new admissions policy was being investigated and would be brought to the Corporation later in the year.

***The areas of the Development Plan relevant to this committee were agreed for recommendation to the Corporation at their December meeting.***

10. **Risk register**

The risks due to possible changes to funding were noted. The College would plan for these when levels of funding for next and subsequent years were known.

11. **Proposed term dates 2011 – 2012**

It was noted that there would be 191 teaching days next year as it was a leap year.

***These were agreed for recommendation to the Corporation at their December meeting.***

10. **Date of next Meeting**

Monday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011 at 7pm

The meeting closed at 8.55pm

Signed: .....

Date: .....