

# Minutes

## STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Date:	6 <sup>th</sup> February 2023	Time:	4.00 PM
Chairperson:	Sally Osmond	Location:	Room 284 UCN

Members	Name	Present	Role
1	Iain Wolloff (IW)	*	Principal & Chief Executive
2	Tom Rossiter (TR)	*	External Member
3	Sally Osmond (SO)	*	External Member– Chair
4	Stuart Compton (SC)	*	External Member
<b>Apologies:</b>	Glyn Howells (GH)		External Member
	Sam Dibas (SD)		External Member
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Cathy Wright (CW)	*	Director of HR and Support Services (online)
	Jo Houghton (JH)	*	Director of Business & Partnerships
	Lee Hunt (LH)	*	Vice Principal
	Richard Lee (RL)	*	Clerk to Corporation – Minute taker
	Gavin Brooks (GB)	*	External Member
<b>Quorum:</b>	3 required	*	3 present at start - meeting quorate

Item		Reports
1.	<b>Apologies For Absence</b> Apologies were received from SD and GH. SO noted Nick Fox (NF) has resigned from the Board.  SO proposed GB to be appointed to the SDC. <b>The members unanimously voted to appoint GB to the SDC.</b>	
2.	<b>Declaration Of Interests</b> There were no declarations of interest made.	
3.	<b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b>	
3.1	<b>To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 17th October 2022</b> SO asked for approval of the non-confidential minutes from the meeting on the 17 <sup>th</sup> of October 2022. <b>The minutes were unanimously approved by the Board.</b>	Paper - p. 2
3.2	<u><b>See confidential minutes.</b></u>	Paper - p.7

3.3	<b>Matters arising from the minutes</b> None.	Verbal
4.	<b>Strategy</b>	
4.1	<p><b>Approval of TOR</b></p> <p>SO reported to the Board that that governance documentation including the TORs, Articles and Instruments of Government and Standing Orders have been reviewed; Committees will be asked to approve this documentation moving forward. SO noted that branding has been added to the SDC TOR but that no other substantive changes were made.</p> <p>GB asked if the Chair or Vice Chair should be an external member. SO responded that the Articles state committee chairs are always external. GB suggested this be clarified in the TORs.</p> <p>GB asked, in relation to point 7 - evaluating significant partnerships - that for partnerships that fall outside the remit of the SDC, for example teaching partnerships, which committee would refer these to the FGB for approval. SO responded partnership referred to commercial partners, and should be so referenced in the TOR; other partnerships such as learning partnerships would be approved through the relevant committee.</p> <p><b>Action: modify significant partnership in the TOR to read commercial partnerships (including financial partnerships).</b></p> <p><b>Action: modify the TOR to clarify that Committee chairs and vice chairs must be external members.</b></p> <p>TR asked in relation to reputation and branding if this was represented by a specific Committee member. SC responded that a member of faculty was a marketing specialist. IW noted that he is ultimately responsible for marketing.</p> <p>TR asked if minutes go to the finance and resources committee. SO affirmed they do.</p> <p>SO asked if the SDC would recommend the TOR for approval by the Board for approval.</p> <p><b>The Board unanimously approved the TOR for recommendation of the TOR for approval by the Board for approval.</b></p>	Paper - p.9
4.2	<p><b>Strategic Plan Goals — review for 22/23</b></p> <p>IW asked the Committee to review the current Strategic Plan goals, to identify any aspects requiring new measures. The College Strategy established a series of goals to be achieved by 2024, which are set out in the form of a ‘balanced scorecard’. Several of the measures rely on published national data which was not provided during the pandemic.</p> <p>Managers, staff and students will be involved in reviewing the strategy for consideration by the Board at the Strategy Day. It is not proposed to change the purpose, vision and values, developed in 2021, but a number of goals and their</p>	Paper - p.12

	<p>measurement may need to be adjusted. IW noted that (p.13) student outcomes and progress will always need to be considered.</p> <p>GB noted one HE outcome was omitted - the continuation and completion dataset; the NSS score in relation to overall student satisfaction should be captured moving forward. IW noted that the HE group is small, in line with some other colleges, but NSS questions could be adopted by the College for interviews and used to score student satisfaction. SO asked what outcomes are being used to judge standards moving forward. IW responded the sector does not [currently] have set progress measures. SO asked what standards other colleges are measuring. IW noted colleges have their own measurements which are not necessarily linked to a national framework. LH noted from the FE perspective, under the education inspection framework (EIF), the focus has moved from data (measuring) to narrative (description); for example in relation to the skills agenda the needs of employers would be established and benchmarked against the EIF. IW noted a public perception measure that shows how the College is regarded by the local community is absent. TR responded this would link to branding; SO responded this links to growth. SO asked if self-assessments could be used to assess public perception. LH affirmed they could. SC asked if self-measures are published, IW responded they are not. LH responded that self-assessment results are shared with Ofsted.</p> <p>GB asked if only 6 of 8 measures are achieved, should the rating remain green. LH responded that the way measures are benchmarked would still result in a green rating.</p> <p>GB asked what the growth and income measure is currently linked to and if student growth targets were considered for inclusion. IW responded that it was intended to capture the growth and income (contribution) within the financial health rating - growth was linked to the turnover measure. GB noted as most income was from student numbers, student number ambitions could be used. IW responded that student numbers are tracked and historically had been included as a measure. LH noted student numbers were linked to contribution and tracked against finance director outcomes. LH noted retention and achievement should also be included as an identified measure.</p>	
4.3	<p><b>Branding</b></p> <p>LH reported that brand conversations have been held and that a perception survey - to show community understanding of the College and its products (i.e. the football academy, UCN) - is being developed. GB noted that the last survey (conducted 6 years ago) should be compared to a new survey to see the impact of new products on the community. LH noted the survey results should be ready by summer term.</p> <p>GB suggested re-evaluating how branding is currently used and noted branding direction needs to be steered by the SDC. SO responded that the overall ambition for the College is growth, but a realistic branding budget is required for good growth. SC noted that current branding has given the College a high visibility in local media.</p> <p>SC asked if other college's expenditure on branding had been analysed. IW responded such analysis had not been conducted to date. LH noted the focus has historically been on curriculum not branding; developing new curriculum will</p>	Verbal

	<p>necessitate a heavy marketing investment to understand the market. LH noted new statute will ensure that curriculum is linked to regional economic growth. JH noted education providers that compete with the College have substantial front-end sales provision. SO responded that the focus must be profitable, successful growth; yearly targets should translate back to contribution but that all 16-year-olds should understand that Newbury College is a study option.</p>	
4.4	<p><b>Strategic Planning Day 15th May 2023</b></p> <p>IW reported that the Strategic planning document, specifically background and contextual information, needs to be updated. IW noted the focus must be on targets and understanding the attainment metrics.</p> <p>SO noted staff forum members will be invited to join for lunch and asked how students will be engaged. IW responded members of the student council could be invited. IW suggested AOC members be invited to talk at the start of the Strategy Day. SO responded that direct AOC feedback to the Board would be beneficial.</p> <p>SC asked what KPIs are used to measure community impact noting that net promoters scores are commercially used to give evaluations linked to sales performance. IW and JH responded that employer and partner scores are already solicited through an external agency. LH noted a subset of College partners and stakeholders are interviewed by Ofsted.</p>	Verbal
4.5	<p><b>16-19 Curriculum vision and future needs</b></p> <p>LH noted that areas of curriculum growth have been identified but resource support is required. LH noted the 16-19 study programme area has a key focus linked to the colleges tier 1, 2 and 3 curriculum offer. These tiers are linked to the emerging skills needs but are also linked to developing work readiness skills such as teamwork, resilience and attitude within the 16-19 student cohort. A number of tier 1 areas have been identified for growth in the College but resources are required to take these curriculum areas to tier 2. LH noted that potential funding opportunities will be available from November 2023, but a project needs to be funded to tier 2 in preparation for this.</p> <p>SC asked what this funding will cover. JH responded that initial funding would support a viability study that will identify what grants would be available. SC asked what the success rate for bids is. JH responded bid success rates are varied. SC noted the focus should be on curriculum and not on pursuing funding. LH responded the materials produced for a tier 2 bid can be used for multiple bids. TR asked if sponsorship could be used in the future to support new curriculum areas. LH affirmed this could be possible for successful bids. SO asked if Greenham Trust could be approached for sponsorship. IW affirmed they could. SO asked if initial architect planning would be undertaken as part of the tier 1 requirements. LH affirmed this was correct.</p> <p>SC asked if partnerships based on shared risk could be established - for example the architect would only get paid if a bid was successful. IW responded this has been done historically.</p> <p>GB noted the tier 1 curriculum areas reflected the local skills gap but that sports and rehabilitation were also both areas of potential growth. LH noted that there is a</p>	Paper - p.17

	need for occupational therapy which the College will address. GB noted that construction of renewables had significant potential for growth but required extensive investment. Conversely the Berkshire Business School would support FE progression into HE which would impact the achieve and retain (low attainment) group. LH noted the segmented nature of the course would essentially modularise the learning process.	
5.	<b>Campus*</b>	
5.1	<u>See confidential minutes.</u>	Verbal
5.2	<u>See confidential minutes.</u>	Verbal
6.	<b>PFI &amp; Facilities*</b>	
6.1	<u>See confidential minutes.</u>	Paper - p.18
6.2	<u>See confidential minutes.</u>	Paper - p.19
7.	<b>Climate Crisis and Sustainability</b>	
7.1	<p><b>Update on climate action and sustainability</b>  CW noted that the EAUC report was delayed but will be produced and distributed in a few days.</p> <p>CW reported that CO2 consumption has been reduced; the carbon reduction target will be met by 2030. Some additional resources have been identified to move the curriculum side of the action plan forward. IT resources been put in place and the estate side of the action plan is moving forward. A website has been created to support sustainability in teacher recruitment to attract trainees. Counselling support is being offered to staff to improve wellbeing and staff sustainability. Students have had mental health talks.</p>	Verbal
8.	<p><b>Any other Business</b>  None.</p>	

\* Confidential items