Barnet and Southgate College Corporation
Quality of Teaching & Student Experience Committee
held on 7th February 2023
17:30-20:00
At Southgate Campus

Present	Jenny Jarvis, Chair Cait O'Riordon, Governor Mark Taylor, Governor Chalene Scott, Staff Governor
In attendance	Neil Coker, Principal/Assistant CE Lorraine Jackson, HTLQI Maxine Bagshaw, Director of Governance

The meeting opened at 17:30 and was quorate with all committee members present.

Item	Description	Action
1	**Deep dive – electrical installation** Staff joined governors and provided a presentation which sat alongside the detailed report prepared by Greg Haynes. Key matters highlighted were: • Electrical overview - 4 x study programmes for 16-18 - 3 x adult long courses - 2 x adult short courses - All qualifications accredited by City & Guilds and meet industry requirements • In relation to study programmes: - All courses are 1 year - All students start at level 1 or level 2 dependent upon qualifications on entry - Starters = 196 - Retained = 187 (95.4%) • In relation to adult courses: - 1 year or 10 week courses - All start at level 2 - Starters = 95 - Retained = 94 (98.9%) • Curriculum structure – information was provided on the breakdown between diplomas, technical certificates and advanced technical certificates for study programmes alongside the five different courses offered to adults. • Electrical team - 1 x interim fulltime curriculum manager (12 months in post)	

	- 9 x full time main grade lecturers – MGL (+1 resignation midyear not replaced) - 1 x sessional lecturers - 1 x agency technicians - 2 x part-time casual technicians - This is the first time that the department has had more staff than teaching hours and lecturers not required to do significant amounts of overtime • Issues for the department include: - Lack of applicants for the CM role – out to advert four times, including £10k uplift. One applicant did not turn up to interview. - Issues with quality of internal IQA so currently using agency IQA - No permanent technicians • Teaching, learning and assessment - Still requiring improvements - Lecturers need to complete teaching qualifications - Some IQA challenges mean interventions being put in place - EQA reports to be released soon - Better engagement by students on the new level 2 and better verbal feedback on the level 3 - Increased student attendance and confidence in sitting the exams • Attendance (as at 6th February 2023) - Overall – 84.5% which is 3% above college average - 16-18 main qualification 86.9% which is 5.4% above college average - English 78.9% which is 8.9% above college average - Maths 71.8% which is 1.5% above college average This is a result of: - Revised entry criteria for level 2 and level 3 study programmes and adult courses - An improved and more robust approach to talking and challenging students not attending - However, additional elements of the study programme still have low attendance that is proving harder to tackle i.e. learner services, tutorial and enrichment are between 39 and 66% • Learner voice – information provided in relation to completion rate and specifically the post induction rate increase from 41 to 79%. Committee were given a summary of the aspects scoring high and then those scoring low. • Retention - This is generally higher than the prior year - In terms of the lines of achievement, a lot of adults struggled with English both written and spoken. Committee were given assurance that the department has taken actions in relation to this. In general discussion governors asked what has made the biggest difference to the position in terms of improvements. Staff indicated that these are:	

	• Changes to the entry requirements • Students not being turned away but instead signposted to entry levels • Much more engaged set of students • Tutors have more time to provide support Governors asked whether there were any diversity issues. Staff confirmed that there are. Committee were advised that the area is currently graded as 'requires improvement' and that there have been discussions around it moving in to performance clinic status but the decision taken is to wait and see if the departments own actions and interventions lead to an impact. It was confirmed that a decision on this will be reviewed tomorrow. Principal confirmed that he would email committee with a short update note following the meeting tomorrow (Principal, February 2023). Committee were then provided with an update on planned developments which include: • Recruitment of staff - was a significant issue in 2021/22, including stable management with interim agency • Building a new workshop with local London strategic development fund (SDF) • 2 new short courses, in electric vehicle charging installation and photovoltaic installation and maintenance • CPD for existing electricians wanting to add these skills and offers to their customers • Further developing the 18th edition, full cost short course and the 2193 inspection and testing course • Become an approved provider of the health and safety training to apply for an ECS card • The Level 3 NVQ that was planned to be reintroduced in 2023/24 will need to be put on hold, this is so that further aspects can be put in place first. • Focus on green skills • Other short courses • Health and safety training for the electro technical, this allows people to actually to go on to sites. All work placements need these in any event so it makes sense to provide internally. Governors asked whether the aim for the department is to grow. Staff confirmed that it is but that there needs to be careful consideration as to how this is achieved rather than just additional loading. Governors asked whether there is demand. Staff expressed a belief that there is. It was explained that there are a number of taster days planned, with one tomorrow, and that the numbers are positive particularly compared with other departments. Governors asked whether students go on to get jobs and it was confirmed that they do. Department has positive destinations both in terms of jobs and other qualifications. Governors indicated that it would be really helpful to have a report that they could share wider with the board and it was agreed that	

	this would be provided and circulated with the minutes (Principal, February 2023). Challenge from the committee was that it would be helpful to know what 'good' looks like in terms of numbers and what the staffing implications are for this. Challenge from the committee was to see the strategy i.e. the what, the when and the how and an underpinning plan. Principal confirmed that this will link back to the broader curriculum strategy, with the aim of growth, and that each area will need to develop an action plan to support this. Staff noted that historically partners brought in significant income however this has reduced over the years. Committee all agreed that it would be helpful to link in the development of department plans to the discussions scheduled later at agenda item 7 i.e. committee review and forward planning. (Electrical department staff left the meeting at 6.15pm)	
2	**Preliminary items** **i. Apologies for absence** There were no apologies with all members of the committee present. **ii. Declarations of interests** No declarations were made and standing declarations were noted. **iii. Notification of urgent business** Chair confirmed that none had been identified for this meeting. Before starting to consider the papers provided in detail, committee considered a number of administrative points including: • Going forward it would be helpful if page numbers could be included within the PDF pack (Exec admin, 2023) and • In relation to matters arising from the previous meetings, it would be helpful to link actions requested in to substantive reports (Dir of Gov/Report Writers, 2023).	
3	**Minutes of the previous meetings** **i. Minutes of the QTSE meeting held on 3rd October 2022** The minutes were reviewed and it was agreed that they were an accurate record of discussions. AGREED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd October 2022 as presented. **ii. Matters arising**	

	Committee considered the table provided and key matters noted and discussed were: • In future committee would like the progress/update column to be completed in advance rather than information being provided on a line by line basis of the meeting. • Action tracking document to be circulated with the minutes for information • Agenda item 4: - Progress to be measured against starting points to be included - A Levels proposed and agreed - Quite a targeted approach to give assurance. What will provide assurance? – grade outcomes at yearend and also attendance. - Potential area to predict well with vocational areas - Proposal to move on from the second and third action as student self-assessment is in place this year. This is a new process. Committee will need timeframes for updates. • Agenda item 5 – these are to be discussed later in the meeting at item 7. Staff are working on creating a heat map for risks and KPIs. Link governor for safeguarding to be placed on the agenda for Search and Governance committee. College is actively seeking to recruit someone with this experience to the board and until there is relevant experience the gap will remain. • Agenda item 6 – aspects to be considered at agenda item later in the meeting. Director of Governance and Principal to look at and agree how to circulate the scorecard report on a monthly basis. • Agenda item 7 - to be discussed later in the meeting • Agenda item 8 is an ongoing requirement • Agenda item 9 - the deep dive for this meeting was electrical rather than Equality and Diversity suggested. College is providing neurodiversity training and there is a focus on diversity through LTEs. There is a possibility that diversity can also be a staff development day focus. College is still working to develop student safeguarding ambassadors. As an overview, committee were pleased to see that a lot of actions were being closed and that the college is making good progress. Challenge from the committee was to broaden and strengthen membership and they discussed co-opting to this committee specifically, as well as having full governors. Committee discussed student governor recruitment and it was agreed to invite student governors appointed to join this committee, but with the caveat that they are trained and have the right level of support so that they can make a meaningful contribution. AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.		

4	**Quality and Student Experience Scorecard** Before starting discussions, a challenge from the committee was that they would really want to see this on a monthly basis so that it can be tracked (HTLQI, monthly). An update was given on a number of aspects. 1) Customer perspective – key matters highlighted were: • Still a low survey sample at 35% • A number of areas are seeing a positive increase on the prior year and an example given was electrical • Governors asked how the response is organised. It was explained that surveys are available on Moodle which ensures student access. Some staff try and use teams but often there are multi-factor authentication challenges which have put students off. • There are challenges in terms of surveying students who have off site provision i.e. apprentices, adult community and short courses. • A suggestion is more use of class time with iPads being circulated with questions pre-loaded. Question and challenge from governors is whether there are opportunities to incentivise the process. Governors all agreed that it was important to find a way of getting quality feedback that is meaningful. Governors asked whether there is a type of 'league table' which compares completion rates for staff. It was confirmed that this is in place. A suggestion was to have a very short survey with the expectation that students engage with this as a matter of routine. One governor observed that the satisfaction rate at question 6 is high and they asked whether the college captures data on how students hear about the college e.g. a peer recommendation, so that this can then be correlated. Challenge from the committee was to use a 'call to action' approach. Challenge from one governor was whether or not the organisation needs to do more with curriculum managers so that they understand the value of the surveys. All agreed that staff should really welcome and embrace student feedback. In terms of future reports, it was agreed that completion rates would be shown by staff, overall and curriculum area so that there are three points of triangulation. This will help to ascertain whether there is a correlation between the areas assessed as requiring improvement and what students are saying (HTLQI, 2023). Challenge from the board was that they want assurance regarding sufficiency of data, use of data and impact. It was agreed to link this in to the deep dive reports at each meeting. 2) Internal perspective – committee were happy to note the information provided but asked for further information regarding the off the job statistics. Staff indicated that the figure is impacted by new starts.	

	3) <u>Complaints</u> – committee indicated that it is important to set a target to have no complaints. For the next report a request was made to include some commentary regarding the rates (HTLQI, 2023). 4) <u>Learning and innovation</u> – staff indicated that this is very much influenced by data capture. AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
5	**QIP – Progress Update** Committee worked through this on a line by line basis with key matters highlighted and noted including: • There are 32 areas for improvement • There is commentary on 9 aspects within the report. Challenge from the committee was that they would like to see the whole QIP to give context on progress being made (HTLQI, each meeting). • In relation to the page 2 graph, committee indicated that governors need to know how the 'started', 'not started' and 'in progress' relate to prioritisation. More detail is needed. • Nothing is flagged as urgent i.e. not started or not hitting the time target/deadline. Staff explained that nothing is marked as urgent in the first iteration of the QIP as it is the start of the process. • Important to match the areas of improvement to the actions/steps required • Clarity in terms of the criteria which underpins whether an aspect is high, medium or low. Urgent items should be the ones that are past their due date and/or are business critical. • In relation to the 96 actions, governors need to know the progress particularly on the 'important' rather than the 'urgent' although it was acknowledged that timeliness and/or on time is an important record. • Really needs to be clarity in terms of what is on track • Should be a focus on the high priority and those where there is limited progress. Governors need a better sense of the direction of travel and particularly what is slipping. • Document does not make it clear what the priorities are. In relation to the Quality of Education aspects committee asked whether it is possible to sift to give a greater line of sight. All agreed that there needed to be an affective method to flag so that this can then focus committee discussions. • This approach is not significantly different to a risk register and therefore governors asked whether this kind of approach could be considered. • Request made was that, in the executive summary, some context for the report is provided • In relation to slide 1, governors would like to see more about progress and an example given was that in construction they have been able to obtain cards but	

	electrical engineering haven't. It was explained that engineering are struggling to secure meaningful industry connections and committee were advised that this department has just gone back in to performance clinic because of a number of issues including staffing, attendance, maths and English and student satisfaction. Currently engineering is the only department in intervention with the position for electrical being reviewed tomorrow. In relation to staffing, it was explained that there has had to be agency use which has caused issues and also it has not been possible to appoint to the curriculum manager role. A challenge from the committee was that the label of 'limited progress' doesn't necessarily give the scale of the problem to be addressed. • It was agreed that engineering would be the deep dive subject for the next meeting (Principal, April 2023). • How does the college know that grades are being improved? It was explained that senior staff can access data and look at various aspects. Attendance at exams is an indicator, however the organisation does not have the exam results yet. • In relation to slide 2, it is suggested that there is 'satisfactory progress' and governors asked what would tracking from year 1 to year 2 show. Suggestion was that retention would allow for staff consistency. They would then know the students most at risk and who can then be identified for intervention/support. Challenge from the committee was that the repot doesn't show what else needs to happen to achieve impact. Committee asked whether staff felt that there was anything missing from this report. Staff provided assurance that there is nothing missing where there has been a flag for concern. For the next report it was agreed that the full 32 areas would be sorted in to different categories so that they are clustered together in terms of prioritisation, with the list being: 1) No progress 2) Limited progress 3) Reasonable/satisfactory progress 4) Good progress 5) Significant progress (HTLQI, April 2023) Committee would also like to know that the 'good' areas are sharing practice and then be able to celebrate this with them. All felt that once a year it would be really positive to showcase the great practice. Having reviewed the report, challenge from the committee was whether or not there is a better tool than 'planner' to use going forward for reports. Governors indicated that there needed to be a way to distil the information so that it is manageable and this committee is able to focus its time where most needed.	

	AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
6	**Student Voice and Careers Report (Gatsby Benchmarks)** Detailed report was reviewed and key matters highlighted were: • College is in a much better place this year when compared to the prior year • There is still more work to do to embed the Gatsby Benchmark expectations • Aim is for the curriculum to be more industry focused but there is more to do in relation to this. • Positive movement in relation to student voice and enrichment • More to do on engagement • Challenge from the committee was to focus in more on the soft skills and central skills i.e. core skills which are transferable. Governors indicated that they would want to pick this up as a discussion point in future meetings, with assurance required that students are developing 21st century skills (Principal, 2023). Challenge from the committee was to use enrichment effectively to support skills development. • Use of 'you said we did' is really helpful. • Can the college do more in terms of capturing parent and carers voice. It was agreed that, with T Levels in mind, parents/carer engagement will be key. Staff advised that the position really does depend on the cohort in relation to this. • In relation to destinations data, committee asked what the challenges and barriers are. Staff explained that it is capturing the information once students have left. College does capture intended destinations well alongside UCAS information, however the issue arises once they have left. College does use various mechanisms and external companies however it remains a challenge. Committee asked whether it is possible to incentivise the provision of actual destinations data and an example given was, by completing each student is entered in to a £1,000 draw. • Overall a positive position in relation to Gatsby Benchmarks. AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
7	**Committee Review and Forward Planning** Chair explained that this was intended to be a fluid conversation to include: • Where are we now, • Are we in the right place, • Are we asking the right things, • How we can then give feedback to the board 1) <u>Terms of Reference</u> • Committee discussed quorum and membership numbers and then asked whether anything was missing	

	• One governor asked whether there was a specific enough reference to the quality of teaching and learning and also does the committee have the means in place to give assurance. • Committee considered section 7 headed 'scope of the quality committee' and a number of points were noted and discussed: - The role of the committee should not be to make recommendations but instead it is to give assurance - 7(iii) is key and should be at the core i.e. the impact of leadership and management actions on improving the learner experience. - (vi) is a matter more appropriate to the Search and Governance committee i.e. a programme of governor engagement activities - (vii) there needs to be broader ways in which the committee receives assurance and not just the format and content of reports. Wording on this could be clearer and an example given was that a report presented could be great but in actual fact teaching and learning is poor. • Committee needs to pick up on curriculum strategy development and implementation • Needs to be a focus on teaching, learning and assessment and how it all fits together • Information to be provided on the use of performance clinics • Committee needs to be clear in terms of its tools and mechanisms e.g. QIP, SAR. • It would be useful to split the terms of reference out in to 'core duties' and then the 'how' which would sit underneath this. • An important focus is what the outcomes show and committee is able to extract this information • Committee felt that the terms of reference could be split in to three key components, which are: 1) What is the scope 2) What are the mechanisms 3) What is the data source e.g. deep dives • Challenge from the committee was whether or not the terms of reference can be linked to the Ofsted quality framework. All felt that Ofsted would be a good place to start i.e. actions being taken to remain good or better for Ofsted. It was agreed to update the Terms of Reference and present for discussions at the next meeting (Dir of Governance, April 2023) 2) Risk and assurance approach to monitoring quality of teaching and student experience Key matters discussed were: • Aim is to provide assurance on a risk-based approach. This starts from the bottom and works up. • Challenge from the committee was whether or not there is enough about raising aspirations. Principal indicated	

	that this sits within the quality of teaching and learning, pastoral support and wider experience. It was explained that there are complex component parts in ensuring students are on track to achieve qualifications. Committee asked how governors will know this. It was explained that there are a number of aspects, including: - Curriculum deep dives - Balanced scorecard - Teaching and learning report - Student voice - SAR - QIP - Safeguarding - 'At risk' reports It was acknowledged that none of these on their own is enough and that it is the collective triangulation that is important. Committee then needs to decide how best to report to the board. • In terms of reporting to board, committee discussed whether or not to RAG rate and all agreed that to do this a set of criteria would need to be set which would be based upon the level of committee confidence. All agreed that it was important to avoid appearing to make judgements. That said, the aim of this committee has to be providing assurance or, if this is not possible for some aspects, flagging it as an area of risk and a matter requiring further board scrutiny. One member of the committee asked whether there is a need to breakdown information provided in to student groups rather than 'all'. Another suggestion was that EDI data/diversity needs to be a focus. Challenge was that the college is not just about qualifications. All agreed that the aim of this committee is to hold the organisation to account and not have a set objective. It was suggested that the committee needs to have: 1) An overarching scope i.e. mission and vision and purpose and then 2) Details of how the scope will be achieved Committee suggested that every report should include key information including: - Student voice - EDI - TLA - The workforce – including CPD/morale/motivation Committee then discussed how to potentially measure staff pride and profession and it was agreed that there are a number of aspects, including: • Self-assessment against professional standards • Personal plans • Professional conversations • Confidence regarding delivery against the standards	

	Committee all agreed that it was also important to consider support staff as well teaching staff. In terms of motivation and morale, it was also agreed that part and parcel of this is having a professional teaching workforce. Question and challenge from one governor was whether or not the committee should be using college values as a metric and then there was discussion about how these might be measured. An observation made was that potentially the college doesn't survey staff frequently enough on this. Committee suggested that there could be an annex to the document which includes 'pending measures' and an example given was ensuring a motivated workforce. Challenge from one governor was to be clear in terms of what they are motivated to do i.e. the what and the why. Committee discussed motivation indicators which could include engagement in learning and development and/or absence. In terms of the document, further challenge from the committee was to: • Consider performance management – if staff engage then this is a positive indicator in relation to motivation • What is the fit with leadership and management • Committee always needs to receive safeguarding data 3) <u>TLA report structure and content</u> Principal provided a proposal and feedback included: • Section 2 to include the quality of teaching and learning • Section 3 – focus should be on curriculum areas and performance clinics and/or areas of concern • Section 6 to include risks, concerns and actions • Where do QRMS's fit in to this • Committee always to ask 'how have we gained assurance' • Committee agreed that the only real way to progress this as a development was to review a populated report. By way of an overview it was agreed to change the structure of the agenda with this being focused on: a) Topics b) Reports/data that will inform the discussions in relation to these topics It was agreed • To identify two or three topics for the next meeting and trial this approach. • That the schedule of business/workplan would be revisited at the next meeting. • To update the new summary risk assurance document taking on board committee feedback at the meeting • That 'reflection against college values' be scheduled as a standing item with the request that these be listed on the agenda so that they are easy to see • (All Principal, 2023).	

	AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
8	**AOB** There were no items of additional business.	
9	**Date and time of next meeting** This was confirmed as 20th April 2023. Meeting closed at 8pm.	