CITY OF GLASGOW COLLEGE

Board of Management

Learning & Teaching Committee

Date of Meeting	**Tuesday 23 April 2019**
Paper No.	LTC4-J
Agenda Item	13
Subject of Paper	**Performance Action Group Output**
Status of Paper	**Disclosable**
Primary Contact	**Douglas Dickson, Performance and Improvement Director**
Date of Paper	**9 April 2019**
Action Required	**For Noting**

1.   **Recommendation**

        The Committee is asked to note the output of the Performance Action Group attached and the associated performance improvement actions.

2. **Purpose of Paper**

   The purpose of this report is to inform Committee members of the output from the Performance Action Group.

3. **Strategic Context and Key Points**

   The SMT Paper detailing the output of the Performance Action Group is attached at Appendix 1.

4. **Impact and Implications**

   The resource and finance implications and mitigations are outlined in the attached.

5. **Risks to the College**

   The risks are outlined in the attached.

Senior Management Team

Date of Meeting	**Day | Month | Year**
Paper No.	*Leave Blank | Executive Office to complete*
Agenda Item	*Leave Blank | Executive Office to complete*
Subject of Paper	**Performance Action Group Output – April 2019**
FOISA Status	**Disclosable**
Primary Contact	**Douglas Dickson, Performance and Improvement Director**
Date of production	**28th March 2019**
Action	**For Discussion**

Recommendations:

- Deans and ADs should revise their portfolios in line with the Board of Management paper of 14th March 2019.
- CHs for courses that are below the national sector performance should prepare an action plan by 30 September 2019 for performance improvement that is shared with teaching teams.
- ADs must develop consistent approach to academic guidance and training of academic guidance advisors should be developed.

1.   Key Points

- All CHs with courses that have PIs below the national sector performance should produce an action plan by 30th September 2019. This action plan should utilise the course improvement toolkit.
- All ADs should monitor the completion of CIAMs and action planning for improvement with their CHs.
- The Head of Performance Improvement will monitor with the relevant ADs course PI improvement.
- A number of programmes have sustained low PIs, therefore Deans and ADs should revise their portfolios in advance of October/November Curriculum Planning events.
- All FT FE programmes should have access to an introduction to college session.
- There is a need to provide a consistent view of what the academic guidance process is and train staff in its use. This view should provide levels of flexibility to accommodate various modes and levels of study.

2.   Purpose of Report

This paper is in line with the College's strategic intent to progress its strategy to '*deliver sector leading student attainment for recognised qualifications*' (Student Experience Strategy) and Strategic Priority 5 *'to deliver excellence in performance'*.

This report provides an overview of the output from the Performance Acton Group (PAG) activities up to April 2019.

3.   Content

Curriculum Planning led to Faculties extensively reviewing their portfolio using dashboard trends to scrutinise performance and recruitment data, and regional and national published data e.g. Skills Investment Plans, Regional Skills Assessments.

A series of Curriculum Planning meetings were held with each of the Faculties, the Depute Principal, VP Student Experience, VP Corporate Services and the Performance and Improvement Director to discuss their portfolios and agree actions for performance improvement.

A number of low performing courses were identified at Curriculum Planning (**Appendix 1**) and a Performance Action Group (PAG) was established. CHs for these courses were asked with their AD to agree an action plan for improvement and were provided with a toolkit to assist develop an action plan.

The purpose of the PAG is:

i   to identify the factors that are impacting on student engagement with the course and leading to low PI. and

ii   to consider the Curriculum Areas plans for PI improvement.

This consisted of validating -
- PI analysis (EW, FW, PS, CS)
- Unit by unit analysis of results
- Planning for guidance/assessment/remediation
- Factors on the student journey (pre-course, induction, guidance etc.) impacting on PIs.
- Student feedback from surveys.
- The current use of Faculty and Student Services resources
- Interventions in learning and teaching.

iii   to agree an action plan for improvement for each low performing course.

PAG Methodology

A   Desktop Research

Desktop research was undertaken to review:

- the Student Journey(see below) for each course,
- CIAMs, to examine planning for improvement, and
- dashboard information (predicted PI, attendance, retention, student satisfaction and benchmarks of unit success)

B   Student Journey - Findings

Course Search, Application, Interview, Pre-Course Event

- Clear entry requirements identified for each course, however in small number of cases staff spoke of students having been accepted for the course without the entry requirements.
- There were positive comments regarding running pre-course events – 'Get Ready for College' - which build affiliation with the fellow students and the course.

- Staff recognise the interview process as being key in matching student aspirations to the correct course choice.

Enrolment, First Day Induction, Guidance

- The student journey information indicates that guidance practice varies and in some courses is utilised for students to catch up on units or assessment. During professional dialogue there was considerable discussion on guidance and what constitutes academic guidance. This discussion focused on issues such as the sufficiency of the current system, the suitability of staff for guidance and the amount of time spent in academic guidance (timetabled and non-timetabled). The current student progress form associated with the academic guidance procedure was mainly used by one teaching team.
- There was significant discussion, during professional dialogue, regarding support of students with mental health issues and staff training to assist students. It was clear that the addition of the wellbeing practitioners was of benefit.
- Teams recognised the importance of first day induction and some were considering elongating the timing of this process so that it was more effective in passing on information.

Qualification and PI

- The student journeys contained a number of observations on qualifications:
  - Few course teams were aware of the timing and number of assessments that their students were sitting.
  - A number of the low performing courses had not completed the PAG action plan for improvement prior to the PAG meeting.
  - A number of low performing HN courses have one HNC cohort articulating to one HND Year 2 cohort.
  - SMT previously agreed that further education courses should be offered as NQs, but this has not happened in all instances.

Learning & Teaching

- For the second year there was no mention of any process of examining approaches to learning in the classroom.
- MyCity was frequently cited as being a support to learning and teaching.
- Teams identified that student attendance was an issue, however they continue to intervene to keep students on track. In FT FE teams identified the changed bursary arrangements were impacting on management of attendance.

Pre Exit Advice, Further Study, Graduation, Alumni

- Teams, again, cited examples of where they were ensuring further progression within the SCQF by making changes to their portfolios

C   CIAMs - Findings

- 17 of the 26 programmes had no submitted CIAMs at the time of this report in academic year 2018/19.
- CIAMs in the main are descriptive and do not give a specific context on the actions that the team are taking to address PI issues. This may mean that teaching team members are unsure of approaches to tackle retention and attainment.

4.   Finance & Resource Implications

There is a requirement to develop an academic guidance approach and to train all academic guidance advisors on how to use it with their classes.

Risk to College	Mitigation
Performance Analysis and Planning	- Targets for Faculties are set in line with College and ROA. - Monitoring of course performance with **ADs** and **Head of Performance Improvement** will ensure a focus is kept on sustained performance throughout the academic year. - **CHs** for all courses with PI below the national sector performance, should produce actions plans that are shared with **teaching teams** and **class representatives**. - **ADs** should monitor student partial success with **CHs** as a number of students in PAG courses are live but have failed units. - All **CHs** with teaching teams

	should have clear arrangements to enable students to remediate or catch up. • **CHs** with teaching teams should consistently review student progress.
Curriculum Planning	• **Deans** and **ADs** should revise their portfolios particularly where there is course performance that is consistently low. This includes reviewing the viability of PAG courses.
CIAM CIAMs should identify planning for course improvement	• **ADs** should monitor that CIAMs are taking place in their area of responsibility to ensure that improvement is planned and shared and the student concerns are resolved. • **CHs** should submit CIAM by end of December, end of March (optional) and fully completed by end of June.
Guidance	• **ADs** to develop a structured programme for academic guidance for FT and substantial PT. • Train all academic guidance advisors on the College's approach to guidance

Appendix 1 - PAG Courses

Creative

Course(s)	AD/ CH	CIAM Submitted	Max PI	Predicted PI %
HNC 3D Design/ HNC 3D Design: Product Design	Eddie Carr/ Joanna D'Annunzio	No	1A – 100 1B – 85.70 2A - 100	1A - 81 1B – 76.20 2A – 93.30
HND Practical Journalism	Jacquie Shaw/ David McKinney	Yes	A - 85.70 B - 87 2A – 100	A - 81 B - 87 2A - 73.70
HNC Creative Industries: Media and Communication/ HNC Media and Communication			1A – 81.80 1B – 87.50	1A – 72.70 1B – 87.50
HND Digital Design and Development	Steph Toms/ Steven Aitken	No	2A - 100	2A - 100
HND Web Development			1A – 90.90 2A – 92.30	1A – 90.90 2A – 92.30

HND Building Surveying	Andy Pollock/ Kenny Martin	No	1A – 81.80 2A – 100	1A – 63.60 2A – 80
HND Construction Management			1A – 86.40 2A - 100	1A – 45.50 2A - 75
HND Advertising and Public Relations	Jacquie Shaw/ Ashley Murphy	Yes	1A – 76 2A – 96.20	1A – 72 2A – 84.60
HND Visual Communication/ HND Graphic Design	Steph Toms/ John Baird	Yes	1A – 86.40 1B – 77.30 1C – 82.60 2A – 94.10 2B – 88.20	1A – 81.80 1B – 77.30 1C – 69.60 2A – 94.10 2B – 70.60
HND Furniture/ HND Furniture Craftsmanship with Design	Eddie Carr/ George McNeillie	No	1A – 100 2A – 87.50	1A – 100 2A - 75
HND Creative Industries: Radio	Jacquie Shaw/ James Wilson	Yes	86.70	66.70
NQ Construction and Built Environment	Andy Pollock/ David Currie	No	73.70	52.60

Nautical and STEM

Course(s)	AD/ CH	CIAM Submitted	Max PI	Predicted PI
HND Electrical Engineering/ HND Engineering: Electrical	Joe Mulholland/ Stuart Logan	No	1A – 78.30 2A – 84.20 2B – 64.70	1A – 73.90 2A – 84.20 2B – 52.90
HNC Nautical Science/ HNC Nautical Science (Alt Route Phase 3B)	Matthew Stewart/ Bryan Flannigan	No	1B - 91.70	1B - 41.70
HNC Computing/ HNC Computing: Software Development HND Computer Science	Joe Mulholland/ Samir Zarrug	No	1A – 95.70 1B – 92.30 2A - 93.50	1A – 91.30 1B – 80.80 2A - 164.50
NC Electrical Engineering (Level 6)	Joe Mulholland/ John Woods	No	1A – 91.70 1B – 81.30	1A – 29.20 1B – 62.50
NC Mechanical Engineering (Level 6) Access to NC Shipping and Maritime	Chris Keenan/ Gareth Dunn	No	1A – 91.30 1B – 86.70	1A – 87 1B – 66.70

Operations			1A – 65.20 1B – 85.70	1A – 43.50 1B - 19

Hospitality and Leisure

Course(s)	AD/ CH	CIAM Submitted	Max PI	Predicted PI
NQ Practical Cookery/ NQ Practical Cookery and Bakery (Int 2)	May Donald/ Amanda Davis	Yes	1A - 50	1A - 37.50
NQ Travel and Tourism (with languages) (SCQF Level 5)	Gordon McIntyre/ Kenny McMillan	Yes	1A – 69.60 1B – 77.30	1A – 56.50 1B – 40.90
NQ Hospitality	Gordon McIntyre/ David Smith	Yes	1A - 88.20	1A - 64.70
NQ Sport Coaching	Iain Houston/ Elspeth McCallum	Yes	1A – 84 1B – 70.80	1A – 80 1B – 58.30
HNC Complementary Therapies	Alison Bell/ Alison Bell	No	1A – 83.30 1B – 84.20	1A – 83.30 1B – 78.90
HNC Hospitality/ HNC Hospitality Operations	Gordon McIntyre/ Jane McQueen	No	1A - 73.30	1A - 40
HNC Events	Gordon McIntyre/ Jane Carrgomm	Yes	1A – 66.70 1B –	1A – 29.20 1B –

			70.80	33.30

Education and Humanities

Course(s)	AD/ CH	CIAM Submitted	Max PI	Predicted PI
HNC Administration and Information Technology HND Administration and Information technology	Derek Timpany/ Katie Ballantyne	No	1A – 96.60 2A – 79.20 2B – 95.80	1A – 79.30 2A – 79.20 2B – 95.80
HNC Social Services	Pamela Greer/ Vanessa Telfer	No	1A – 83.30 1B – 78.30 1C – 81.80	1A – 79.20 1B – 78.30 1C – 77.30
HNC Social Sciences Access to Social Studies	Diane McLaughlin/ Joan Fleming	No	1A – 93.10 1B – 90 1C – 85.20 1D – 85.70 1E – 93.50 1F – 96.40	1A – 82.80 1B – 86.70 1C - 81.50 1D – 71.40 1E – 90.30 1F –

				89.30
			1A - 82.60	1A – 78.30
HND Retail Management	Lisa Logan	No	1A – 79.20 1B – 82.60 2A – 100 2B – 95.70	1A – 66.70 1B – 69.60 2A – 100 2B – 82.60
NC Child, Health and Social Care (Level 5)	Pamela Greer/ Grace Morrish	No	1A – 75 1B – 84.60	1A – 64.30 1B – 80.80

Annex – Delivering Excellence

Dean	• Monitor Performance to realise Faculty targets for 2018/19.	• Now to end of 31 August 2019
	• Identify with AD courses that should be removed/reivised from the portfolio prior to November 2019.	• By 31 October 2019

	• Develop a Faculty plan to ensure that College and ROA targets are met and a step change in performance is realised.
	    o **Target parameters -**
	      ▪ City of Glasgow Targets
	        • 19/20 – FTFE 74.3%, FTHE 77%
	        • 20/21 - FTFE 75%, FTHE 77.2%
		• By 31 August 2019

	• Develop with ADs and CHs targets to deliver improved Faculty performance in 2019/20 and a step change by academic year 2020/2021.	• By 30 September 2019
	• Ensure performance improvement and monitoring is discussed at all Faculty meetings	• Now

Note:

- ▪ ROA Targets –
  - • 19/20 – FTFE 69.7%, FTHE 76.2%
  - • 20/21 - FTFE 71.3%, FTHE 76.6%
- ▪ Scottish Government Targets
  - • 19/20 – FTFE 73.2%, FTHE 74.4
  - • 20/21 - FTFE 75%, FTHE 75%

13

Associate Deans	• Develop interventions to realise Faculty targets for 2018/19 including utilising additional hours to improve student success.	• Now to 31 August 2019
	• Minimise student partial success in qualifications in 2018/19.	• Now to 31 August 2019
	• Monitor student assessment catch up with CHs.	• Now to 31 August 2019

	• Develop with Deans and CHs targets and interventions to deliver improved Faculty performance in 2019/20 and a step change by academic year 2020/2021.
	   ○ **Target parameters -**
	       ▪ City of Glasgow Targets
	          • 19/20 – FTFE 74.3%, FTHE 77%
	          • 20/21 - FTFE 75%, FTHE 77.2%
		• By 30 September 2019

	• Work with Deans to identify courses that should be removed from the portfolio prior to November 2019	• By 31 October 2019
	• Ensure by start of the academic year a consistent approach to student catch up of assessment e.g. Faculty or curriculum area assessment hub.	• By 15 August 2019
	• Develop, with CHs, plans for all courses below the national sector performance to improve student retention and attainment in academic year 2019/20.	• By 31 August 2019
	• Ensure performance improvement and monitoring is discussed at all Faculty meetings	• Now

Note:

- ▪ ROA Targets –
  - • 19/20 – FTFE 69.7%, FTHE 76.2%
  - • 20/21 - FTFE 71.3%, FTHE 76.6%
- ▪ Scottish Government Targets
  - • 19/20 – FTFE 73.2%, FTHE 74.4%
  - • 20/21 - FTFE 75%, FTHE 75%

14

Curriculum Heads	• Develop interventions to realise Faculty targets for 2018/19 including utilising additional hours to improve student success.	• Now to 31 August 2019
	• Manage student assessment catch up with curriculum teams.	• Now to 31August 2019
	• Minimise student partial success in qualifications in 2018/19.	• Now to 31 August 2019
	• Ensure academic advisors are in place for the academic year and clear on their role to keep students on track.	• By 31 August 2019
	• Develop with ADs interventions and plans for all courses below the national sector performance to improve student retention success and attainment in 2019/20.	• By 31 August 2019

	• Work with ADs and Curriculum Teams to deliver improved Faculty performance in 2019/20 and a step change by academic year 2020/2021.
	    o **Target parameters -**
	        ▪ City of Glasgow Targets
	            • 19/20 – FTFE 74.3%, FTHE 77%
	            • 20/21 - FTFE 75%, FTHE 77.2%
		• By 30 September 2019

	• Ensure performance improvement and monitoring is discussed at all teaching team course meetings	• Now

Note:

- ▪ ROA Targets –
  - • 19/20 – FTFE 69.7%, FTHE 76.2%
  - • 20/21 - FTFE 71.3%, FTHE 76.6%
- ▪ Scottish Government Targets
  - • 19/20 – FTFE 73.2%, FTHE 74.4%
  - • 20/21 - FTFE 75%, FTHE 75%

15