



Minutes of the Curriculum, Quality and Student Experience Committee Meeting

held at 6.00pm on Wednesday 28 February 2024
at the College.

Present:	Ms R Turner (RT) Mr J Bolt (JB) Ms A Cornish (AC) Mr G Casley (GC) Ms A Colville (ACo) Mr A Smith (AS)	Chair
Apologies:	Mr B Armstrong (BA) Ms T Kaur (TK) Ms T Aust (TA)	CEO/Principal
In Attendance:	Ms K Frost (KF) Ms M Gajewska-Kopczyk (MGK)	Head of Governance Vice Principal, Curriculum and Quality

1/24 **Welcome and Apologies**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly ACo who was attending her first meeting. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from TA, TK and BA.

It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

2/24 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest relating to the items on the agenda.

3/24 **Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes from the meeting of the Committee held on 22 November 2023 had been received in advance. (Paper 1). IT WAS DECIDED the minutes were a true record of the meeting and they were approved.

4/24 **Matters Arising**

The 'Summary Action Point List' (Paper 2) was received in advance of the meeting and progress towards the actions was noted.

Referring to Action 63/23, *governors asked* whether the comment that SARs should focus more on British Values had been followed up. MGK explained that the College used the term Shared Values rather than British Values. All SARs should comment on Shared

Signed:

Date:

Values and it was always a focus of Deep Dives. During Deep Dives students were asked about their understanding of Shared Values. In response to a comment from a student, governors asked the College to check that Deep Dive conversations with students based at the Feltham site included a focus on Shared Values.

5/24 Risk Register

A 'Cover Sheet for the Risk Review' (Paper 3a) and a 'Risk Register CQSE Extract' (Paper 3b) was received in advance of the meeting.

The Committee reviewed whether the risks on the extract from the Risk Register were the correct risks for the Committee to monitor. It was agreed to recommend to the Corporation that 'Risk 8 Insufficient Demand' should sit with the Finance, Resources and Capital Projects Committee and that the rating for the risk should be reviewed to consider the issues with recruitment to Higher Education courses and apprenticeships.

Action: MGK/MC

The Committee reviewed the ratings for the rest of the risks listed on the extract and the following amendments were suggested:

- Risk 3 Ofsted Rating: It was felt the score was too high at 21. The SAR process and achievement rates were evidence that the College was Good and unlikely to become Requires Improvement in the near future. It was suggested the scores be changed to: Gross: Reputation Impact: 4. Net: Financial Impact 3 Reputation Impact: 3. Likelihood: 2.
- Risk 9 Staff Recruitment: Due to the challenges with staff recruitment in certain areas it was suggested the scores should be: Gross: Financial Impact 3 Reputation Impact 4 Likelihood 4. Net: Financial Impact: 2 Reputation Impact: 3 Likelihood: 3

Governors suggested adding a column to the Risk Register that rated the impact of the risk on student experience or student learning. It was agreed to report this back to the Corporation.

Action: RT

6/24 Student Voice

a) Student Voice Processes

A report on the Student Voice process (Paper 4a) was received in advance of the meeting.

The Committee reviewed the processes in place for student voice. There was a query over whether elections were held for Student Union Executive and Course Reps and noted that elections weren't always held if the number of interested students was very low.

Governors said that when they had attended recent student voice sessions it was clear that the leadership team were already aware of issues being raised and that student voice was used in the decision-making processes.

The Committee discussed the purpose of student voice. It was agreed the purpose included finding out what was happening in the College, understanding the impact of decisions on students and informing decision making.

Signed:

Date:

Governors asked whether students were involved in recruiting staff. MGK said they were to some extent but not as a rule all of the time.

Governors thanked MGK for the summary of student voice processes and confirmed it had provided sufficient information for governors to understand the processes in place. They asked to be provided with an Annual Summary of Student Voice to include information about the impact of decisions made and how students had been involved in decision making.

Governors asked whether the College had asked students what they thought an outstanding college experience looked like and whether the College had written anything down about what outstanding was. MGK confirmed that Ofsted Quality of Education was used as the framework for learning walks. Governors said when they had spoken to students during visits to the College, students had said they judged the quality of college experience by how good a job they would get at the end of the course. It was noted that many students didn't go straight to employment but instead progressed onto Higher Education or apprenticeships.

It was agreed that MGK/AC would look into whether the use of tablets might support the collection of student feedback.

Action: MGK/AC

b) **Student Link Governor Report**

A 'Student Voice Report for the Autumn Term 2023' (Paper 5) was received in advance of the meeting and was noted. GC was thanked for providing the report.

7/24 **Review of Performance**

a) **Data Dashboard KPIs/Development Plan**

An update on progress towards the Development Plan (Paper 6) was received in advance of the meeting. MGK summarised key points from the dashboard:

Teaching, Learning and Assessment

The College was underway with the second wave of learning walks. It was an improved position compared to the same time last year.

Governors asked whether every teacher was seen in the learning walks. MGK said there was a schedule of Learning Walks and Deep Dives and confirmed that every teacher was seen. After the learning walk, every teacher was left with a teacher development plan. The support put in place depended on the actions and the person involved. There were a range of tools that managers could direct teachers to.

Governors asked how students were involved in the learning walk process. MGK said students were always involved, either individually or in groups. Students were asked a number of questions including their learning experience, marking feedback, how safe they felt and what their understanding of shared values was.

Deep Dives

The College was half way through the Deep Dive process. Deep Dives were being assessed against Outstanding criteria so there were a higher number of reds and ambers compared to the same point last year.

Signed:

Date:

Governors asked what support was put in place if a department came out as red. MGK said areas for improvement were identified and the Quality Improvement Plan was updated if necessary. The actions were reviewed through Principal Performance Reviews. Additional support was put in place if it was felt it was needed.

Governors said Business had self-assessed as 'Good' but come out as Red in the Deep Dive. MGK said Deep Dives were a snapshot in time. Work was underway in Business to improve the Quality of Education.

Governors said there were three red Deep Dives but no red Learning Walks and asked why. MGK said Learning Walks were only a part of Deep Dives. Deep Dives also looked at progress towards targets, local and regional needs, employer engagement. Support was being put in place for any area that received a red for Deep Dives.

Governors said it was clear the goal posts had changed and the focus was now on moving areas to outstanding. The work was very thorough and impressive. The staff governor confirmed that the Deep Dive process was rigorous and thorough. It was welcomed by staff as it provided an opportunity to look at their own practice.

Attendance

Attendance was 85.8%, which was higher than the same point last year but had dropped off more than expected. Actions were being taken where needed.

Governors said English and Alternative Provision had lower attendance than other areas. MGK said there was a more transient population in English which was having an impact. There were only small numbers of students in Alternative Provision.

Predicted Achievement

Predicted achievement rates were largely in line with last year. Additional tuition sessions were being put in place where needed. There had been a slight drop in the achievement for High Needs students. This was being investigated.

Governors said adult learning achievement rates looked low. MGK said it often looked low at this time of year. The rates only included half the adult provision at this stage of the year.

Governors said the Data Dashboard was very impressive, and thanked staff for the amount of effort that had gone into it.

Governors asked about the predicted achievement for apprenticeships which looked low at 59% and was below the national rate. MGK said there were very low numbers of students involved which impacted on the %.

Development Plan

A 'Development Plan Update February 2024' (Paper 6) was received in advance of the meeting.

Governors asked whether some of the actions marked green should be amber, for example, some courses hadn't recruited the expected numbers. MGK said it was still only part way through the year and, despite courses not running, was at 90%.

Signed:

Date:

b) **Journey to Outstanding**

MGK said the College's focus was on ensuring the student experience was outstanding rather than achieving an Ofsted outstanding grade. Actions being taken included:

- Agreeing the deadline date for each curriculum area to move to outstanding. This would be determined as part of the Principal's Performance Review (PPR) meetings taking place this half term. The Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) for each area would detail what would be needed to reach the goal of outstanding. The Quality Improvement Plan included Areas For Improvement identified through the SAR and Deep Dive processes.
- Weekly J20 meetings were being held with Directors and CQTMs focussing on different aspects each week.
- Progress towards QIP actions would be measured through PPRs, the Deep Dive process and the SARs.
- Additional resources had been bought in to support with this work.

8/24 **Review of SAR Process**

The Committee reviewed the effectiveness of the SAR process this academic year.

It was felt there would be a benefit in inviting the CQTMs to the meetings and consideration needed to be given to how student feedback could be effectively consolidated in the SARs.

Overall, it was agreed the process had been beneficial for governors, particularly involving link governors in the review of the SAR for their own area. Link governor feedback about the SAR had been beneficial for staff although the level of engagement had varied between governors. Where feedback was given, it had included insightful comments, coaching comments and requests to look and consider. Members of staff had found this helpful. Link governor visits had also been more targeted because governors were more familiar with the area because of the SARs.

The Committee discussed the effectiveness of the SAR validation meeting. It was agreed it would be important for governors to ensure they didn't go into too much detail but instead to focus on being a critical friend and checking that what was being said matched up with the evidence. Members of staff would be convincing a group of critical friends with a variety of perspectives which would help ensure they would feel confident that their judgement was sound and reinforced by the evidence. It was agreed to add in a 30 minutes pre-meeting for the Committee members to the agenda so that governors could ensure they were clear about the purpose for the meeting.

9/24 **Curriculum**

The Committee received the following documents in advance of the meeting: 'Cover Sheet for the Strategic Direction of the Curriculum' (Paper 7), 'Corporate Strategy 2022-25' (Paper 8) and the Accountability Statement (Paper 9).

Governors discussed whether the College's curriculum offer was appropriate, relevant and meeting local need. Governors said based on student feedback, some of the digital skills courses weren't having the required impact as they were too basic. MGK said this was being reviewed with the aim of ensuring students were studying digital skills at an appropriate level.

Signed:

Date:

Governors asked whether the curriculum was being driven by skills demand from employers. MGK confirmed it was but said there was still a gap between where the demand was and the type of employment students found attractive. The LSIF project was looking at this.

Governors asked whether the College was focusing too much on specialist provision in certain sectors rather than on more generalist areas such as finance, human resources and marketing. MGK said the curriculum was structured in a way that the lower levels were more general and then progressed to being more specialised. The College was in the process of planning the curriculum for next year and considering where gaps were, whether there were clear pathways for all curriculum areas and the level of overlap, e.g. between Business and Logistics.

Governors asked whether the College had the right structure at a senior level. Who was going out talking to logistics employers? MGK said that members of the Senior Team made initial links when they were attending events, these links were then passed onto Directors and CQTM's. The College made use of structures that were already in place.

Governors said the College was half way through the current Strategic Plan and unlikely to meet the KPIs for apprenticeships and Higher Education. The College was trying to grow both but not succeeding. MGK said long term planning would focus on specific areas for apprenticeships. The Higher Education offer was changing to more modular short courses which the College was looking to grow. There would be a focus on internal progression, ensuring the right feeder courses were in place and that students were getting enough careers advice and guidance.

After discussion it was agreed that the College curriculum offer was appropriate, relevant and meeting local need but the College would need to look more closely at Higher Education and apprenticeships. Perhaps if there was no demand for the courses, it was a sign that the courses weren't meeting a local need.

The Committee discussed whether there were any factors that might influence the College's curriculum offer in the future. Governors said the impact of the pandemic on people's skills and confidence could be considered. There were a large number of job gaps locally and unemployed people.

10/24 **Safeguarding**

A 'Report from a Safeguarding Review Meeting 12 February 2024' (Paper 10) was received in advance of the meeting.

GC and AC had met with the DSL and came away from the meeting feeling assured. They had picked up on some of the challenges, including the increasing level of demand. It had been good to see that both students and staff were being supported.

Governors said the increasing numbers were a concern although it was good news that students felt safe to be able to report things. MGK said the College was well placed to meet demand and to adequately support students.

GC and AC were thanked for the report.

Signed:

Date:

11/24 Date of the Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting of the committee was Wednesday 12 June 2024.

Summary of Actions

No.	Action	Lead	Target Date
5/24	Move 'Risk 8 Insufficient Demand' to sit with the Finance, Resources and Capital Projects Committee. Ask the Committee to consider issues with recruitment to Higher Education courses and apprenticeships.	MGK/MC	Mar 2024
5/24b	Ask the Corporation to consider adding a column to the Risk Register that rates the impact of each risk on student experience or student learning.	RT	Mar 2024
6/24	Look into whether the use of tablets might support the collection of student feedback.	MGK/AC	Jun 2024

Signed:

Date: