NOTES

Barnet and Southgate College Corporation
Quality of Teaching & Student Experience Committee
held on 20th April 2023
17:30
Via Microsoft Teams

Present	Jenny Jarvis, Chair Cait O'Riordon, Governor (until 6.45pm) Mark Taylor, Governor Chalene Scott, Staff Governor Daniel Yilmaz, Student Governor
In attendance	Neil Coker, Principal/Assistant CEO Lorraine Jackson, HTL QI Maxine Bagshaw, Director of Governance Darren Mepham, CEO Greg Haynes (for the deep dive presentation in relation to Engineering) Joel McDonald (for the deep dive presentation in relation to Engineering)

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

Item	Description	Action
1	**Preliminary items** **i. Apologies for absence** There were no apologies for absence with all members of the committee present. Daniel Yilmaz was welcomed to his first meeting. It was noted that Greg Haines and Joel McDonald would be joining the meeting at 6pm for the deep dive discussion. **ii. Declarations of interests** No specific declarations were made and standing declarations were noted. **iii. Notification of urgent business** Director of Governance and the Chair confirmed that no matters had been raised in advance of the meeting.	
2	**Minutes of the previous meeting**	

	i. Minutes of the QTSE meeting held on 7th February 2023 The minutes were reviewed, and it was agreed that they were an accurate record of discussions. AGREED: to approve the minutes of the QTSE meeting held on 7th February 2023. There were several discussion points by way of matters arising, including: • In relation to the deep dive discussions, committee asked for an update on staffing and performance clinic status in relation to electrical installation. • In relation to staffing, it was confirmed that two individuals were interviewed for the curriculum manager post. One was successful and college is currently negotiating in relation to salary. HR department are putting forward a second offer and, if it is possible to secure him, it will be a good appointment. • In relation to delivery staff, there are no capacity concerns. • Growth and student numbers – there are 290 applications now which should be compared to 180 at the same point last year. These are mainly 16-18 students (229). Position at the end of last year was 560, which means there is a lot more to come. • Quality and performance clinic status – engineering is now in the performance clinic process. Department is assessed as 'requires improvement'. There are also now some staffing issues in terms of capability and one member of staff left abruptly in 2023. Agency staff were appointed but have not been retained. Issues are: a) Attendance b) Standard of work c) Feedback to students d) Pastoral care • Electrical department has made some improvements, particularly in terms of attendance and the first-time pass rate for online exams. Consequently, the college has decided not to put it in to performance clinic status at this point in time. Challenge from the committee was they would like to keep a view on this meeting to meeting and therefore asked for the Principal to give an update by way of matters arising at each meeting (Principal, standing update). • One member of the committee made reference to page 6 and the action requested in relation to destinations. Principal expressed the view that the issue discussed here was growth rather than progression. • Committee agreed that they may need to revisit the college wide position regarding destinations and get a better feel for this, particularly in terms of how information is gathered and how successful this process is	

	etc. Principal reminded that this information is included within the QIP. **ii. Actions progress tracker** Committee considered the summary table provided and it was noted that • Line 1 - update in relation to performance clinic status just provided • Line 4 – senior team should be able to provide this on a monthly basis i.e. the scorecard, however the student survey is not undertaken as regularly as monthly and therefore there will only be two measures to report on and it may be that these two measures won't change significantly month to month. • Line 8 – committee agreed that it was important not to lose sight of this, particularly in the QIP and the curriculum strategy. Staff provided assurance that actions are being taken. It was agreed that a more specific report on this would be provided to the next meeting (Principal, June 2023). AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
3	**QIP Progress Update** Committee agreed to take the information provided 'as read' and took the opportunity to thank staff for the change in format which they agreed was very helpful. Governors agreed that it was very informative for them to see all of the document, and that the format now presented makes it easier for them to identify where there is no or limited progress, so that these can be the focus of discussions. Committee indicated that, in terms of their questioning and challenge, this will be around whether the college is doing enough and is there more that can be done. In terms of future reporting, committee agreed that they would want to keep this format and allocate 30 minutes for discussion in future meetings, with a focus on aspects with no or limited progress (HTLQI, each meeting). So as to better understand the position now it was agreed that an update would be circulated by email which gives a summary of those items currently with no or limited progress (HTLQI, April 2023) Committee were invited to highlight matters to be discussed. these were confirmed as: • Attendance • The general versus the specific department issues. In relation to the latter it is the 'groupings' and how the committee might look at these given that they are likely to involve issues which do not always apply to the whole college. • Enrolment procedures and challenges. • Student voice (as referenced on page 33) – is there anything else that can be done?	

	- Quality data analysis centrally – this is an aspect that arises in different places and has been discussed before. - Achievement gaps amongst ethnic minorities – is monitoring enough and can the narrative move more towards actions. Is help effective? In relation to this last point, staff advised that there was only one ethnic minority group who did not reduce to the 3% tolerance agreed. Challenge from the committee was whether or not 3% is an acceptable number. Staff advised that, statistically yes it is, but that as an organisation there is a desire to challenge ourselves. Committee asked whether there is any national good practice that the college can learn from. Staff advised that potentially within the NARTS data which was released at the end of March. A general comment a challenge from the committee was that it is important to be able to measure trends over the last 3 years, however they acknowledged a need to be cautious because of the CAGs and TAGs. In terms of the aspects where there is limited or no progress, these need to be the focus and request made for a short bullet point update on each of these aspects at each meeting to give an overview (HTLQI, each meeting). It was agreed that, the use of the heat map to be discussed at the end of the meeting would help to give assurance in relation to this. Suggestion from the committee was that a point to look at next time was who all the actions are attributable to and how responsibility is spread. AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
4	**Deep Dive – Engineering** Greg Haynes and Joel McDonald were welcomed to the meeting. Committee received a presentation and it was also explained that there is a fuller written report to be circulated immediately after the meeting (Greg Haynes, April 2023). He explained that he had taken the prior year report and had updated. In terms of the presentation, key matters were highlighted, including: - Overview of programmes - Retention is not where the college wants it to be with the most significant issue being returning students from one year to another - Staffing – there are some general issues both in relation to main grade lecturers and agency - Engineering department is now in performance clinic status which means that weekly meetings take place - Teaching, learning and assessment - Judged as inadequate in 21/22 - Currently in performance clinic process - Feedback and non-submission are issues, both of which have been picked up through learner voice - Attendance - Department is below the college average in all areas	

	- Most significant concern is level 3 year 2 – these are returning students who have become disengaged in year 1. - Improvements have been seen at support, enrichment and tutorial sessions this year due to introduction of specialist progression and achievement coaches which is reflected in learner feedback in focus groups. • Learner voice - College now has much greater engagement, however the feedback is not particularly positive. - Progression and achievement coaches were only recruited at week 3 and this survey was conducted in week 6. This means that they only had 3 weeks working with students to make an impression. - The 'recommend to a friend' score is the lowest it has ever been - Focus group feedback has been obtained with most of the pros relating to pastoral support and most of the cons to do with teaching and learning - Some issues can be easily addressed • Retention and achievement - 3 year trends are provided - They are impacted by a smaller intake in level 2 - Position is not looking positive for the current year 2's however there is a better position for the current year 1's. • Destinations - The spread of universities is good, however in 2022/23 only 50% have opted to apply for university. Many have cited finances as the reason for this. - College is introducing HNDs and HTQs in 2024 so will keep in contact with the 50% not going to university as these qualifications may be attractive to them. • Support and interventions - These are fortnightly one to ones with all teaching and support staff - More formal observations are completed - Leading teacher in excellence is linked to each MGL • Planned developments - Recruitment of permanent and specialist staff - Introduction of level 1 progress to engineering course - Develop links with Middlesex University, Herts and Brunell University, this will support development review and delivery of all courses in engineering. - 2024/25 introduction of level 4/5 HNC/D mechanical engineering/automation engineering In general discussion, question and challenge from the committee was the level of confidence that the college can get this area to where it needs to be. It was noted that the 'recommend a friend' score has been the lowest scoring department for the last 5 years. Committee asked whether performance clinic status and associated processes will address the whole range of issues identified. Challenge from the committee was that the whole quality of teaching seems to sit	

	underneath all of the issues and they asked whether the arrangements in place will be enough to bring about the changes, with a focus on what the known issues are. Staff advised that the most significant challenges are: • Recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers and staff generally. Particularly engineering and STEM subject teachers. • Availability of teachers Staff provided assurance that there are plans in place to support current teachers to ensure improvements when and where possible. It was confirmed that performance management steps are being taken where needed but that this then does add to staffing and recruitment challenges. Challenge from the committee was that, whilst there is a lot of data and actions articulated, it is not yet clear when the clinic status will address issues and they asked when it is likely that impact will be seen. Staff indicated that the target date for them is 20th May 2023. Staff confirmed that they have a lot of very rich information and that there is a lot that can be done to address issues raised. They suggested a need to get back to basics with a focus on attendance, engagement, enjoyment and teaching and learning to support improvements. One member of the committee asked what the staff view is in terms of the turnaround required i.e. are they confident and where are the grey areas. Staff advised that the biggest issue raised is workload, but assurance was given that the college has been supportive wherever possible. Committee were advised that there is one member of staff who is reluctant to engage and that there is also another member of staff who will engage but then may slip back in terms of ways of working. One member of the committee asked how influential salary is in relation to securing good recruits. Staff indicated that, whilst it is a factor the college cannot compete with industry. There are also occasions where agency staff go to other colleges for more money. It was acknowledged that the college could look at salary uplift for certain qualifications but queried whether this would be sustainable across multiple departments. One suggestion from the committee was to consider offering a full-time salary for reduced working hours as this is a practice used in industry. Challenge from the committee was that there appear to be some cross cutting themes that they would like to pick up in future discussions and one example given was retention. All agreed that it was important for this committee to continue to monitor the progress of departments in performance clinic status. Committee then discussed the length of time taken for the presentation today and suggested that presentations could be pre-recorded in a video which would then be circulated in advance to allow for more discussion at the meeting. An alternative to this would be a document circulated which could be taken 'as read', with governors then able to move straight to	

	questions. It was agreed that the Principal would liaise with staff in relation to this to agree the best solution (Principal, May 2023). Challenge from the committee was that they would like to see how the colleges position compares to others. Will this provide any insight and where does BSC sit. Principal expressed the view that this may be too challenging at a curriculum level as what colleges offer is very different. He suggested that a better approach would be to learn from colleges who are considered to 'be the best', however there is a need for BSC to get its house in order first. Whilst focusing in on what needs to improve, committee all acknowledged that it was important not to lose sight of the good i.e. positive destinations and outcomes. Committee invited staff to give their confidence level in relation to the improvements required. Leads confirmed that: • Staff are working really hard • Year 1's are doing well and there is very stable teaching in place for this cohort • If the college can retain teachers then it will be in a good place AGREED: to (a) note the content of the update provided, and (b) receive a performance clinic status update at the next meeting (Principal, June 2023) Greg Haynes, Joel … and Cait O'Riordon left the meeting at 6.45pm.	
5	**Accountability Agreement** The CEO introduced this item and provided a presentation. He explained that the intention today was to cover a number of aspects, including: Recap: - What is the accountability agreement - Why are we discussing this here - Local and national priorities - Proposed college response Key is to articulate what we are going to do and how this will respond to local skills needs. The accountability agreement: • Part of revised regime for 'simplified' accountability and funding of colleges • Annual statement owned by the college and signed off by the board • Sets out a small number of prioritised actions that demonstrate how local skills needs are being met • Requirement to publish by 31st May (although there is an option to do this in draft with final submission in July)	

	• This demonstrates how the college is responding to identified national, local and regional priorities
	• National priorities set out in DfE guidance published last week
	• Regional priorities set out in draft LSIP last week
	• Not yet clear how colleges will be held to account for achievement
	• Less important than the curriculum strategy
	
	Context
	• London wide LSIP plus four regional annexes (Barnet and Southgate College operate in three)
	• South Herts LSIP
	• College engages strongly with London wide and West London and local London (i.e. East London partnership)
	• College has a wider understanding, including the market and national market, through specific curriculum links
	• It is impossible for the college to engage with all equally
	• There are not significant sub-regional differences in London
	
	National priorities
	• College is not expected to do them all i.e. haulage and logistics have been ruled out
	• Priorities applicable for the college are construction, manufacturing, digital and technology, health and social care, engineering, science and mathematics.
	• These national skills priorities have been agreed across government and are areas of high volumes of vacancies which are expected to increase, long term structural barriers to recruitment, retention, and progression issues, are important in providing opportunity of employment in key growth areas such as green jobs, creative industries and science and technology (including AI and Quantum).
	• London LSIP is more sophisticated and includes a series of recommendations for government, local government, employers and providers.
	• Priority sectors broadly reflect national position
	• Themes include
	  - More flexibility in qualifications
	  - Better employer/provider collaboration
	  - Inclusive workforce
	
	Proposed priorities for accountability agreement – the principles proposed are:
	• No more than ten priorities
	• Nothing that isn't already in our growth/curriculum strategy
	• Generally areas where we have a range of new provision that shows curriculum and innovation against priorities (i.e. not business as usual)
	• High level summary commitment rather than detail of our provision (because of commercial sensitivity)
	
	Expanded provision intended in five key skills areas, which are:	

	- Digital and technology skills - Construction (including green skills). - Health and social care - Manufacturing - Engineering and science Expanded provision in a number of skills areas which are more locally driven including: - ESOL - Sports Promote and share our experience of good practice in: - Employer partnering & - Inclusive delivery Discussion points for the committee are: • Has the college identified the right priorities, • What further assurance do you and/or the board need to be able to approve the accountability agreement, • Are we still content to submit a final version in May or do we take the opportunity to submit as a draft allowing scope to revise (or not) in July 2023. Question and challenge from the committee, in terms of the timeline, was that the board at their last meeting had given a very clear steer to hit the May deadline with a final rather than draft version of the agreement. Governors commented that it is clear to see that it aligns with the curriculum strategy and therefore there are unlikely to be big shifts. One governor asked what the purpose of the document is. CEO explained that it is an annual exercise but currently with no real 'teeth'. It is likely to be something discussed in the annual conversation with the ESFA. Question and challenge from one governor was whether or not there needs to be more included regarding EDI. CEO expressed the view that the 8th and 9th priorities cover this i.e. inclusivity. One member of the committee asked what the level of governance accountability is. CEO explained that it has to be signed off by the board and that a review by this committee and then by the full board are key parts of accountability expectations. Board has to be confident that it aligns with the colleges own curriculum strategy. Challenge from one governor was to consider collaboration as 'above and beyond' expectations. Also suggested was to consider social mobility and upskilling. CEO expressed confidence that the college is moving forward on aspects included within the agreement already and examples given were areas covered in the QIP and curriculum strategy. Committee asked, at what point the board will be in a position to assess: • Effectiveness of curriculum strategy	

	- Meeting the content of the accountability agreement - Meeting the growth strategy - Meeting local and regional skills needs i.e. the statutory responsibility to review CEO indicated that this will be possible during the next 12 months. One member of the committee asked whether there would be any merit in any further elaboration regarding employer engagement and how they contribute to the curriculum. CEO expressed the view that nationally and regionally there are some gaps in relation to this but that BSC has some really good examples, albeit acknowledging some curriculum areas are better than others. CEO advised that currently the content of the London LSIP is the uncertainty but that this should be known by the board meeting. Committee were happy to endorse the direction of travel proposed for the creation and the content of the accountability agreement, and it was agreed that this would be presented in final form for board approval at the May 2023 meeting (CEO, May 2023). AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
6	**A Levels** The Principal provided an update and key matters highlighted were: - Curriculum manager for A Levels moved to a 0.5 position with the other 0.5 being covered by an experienced interim - A lot of work has been done with students regarding the whole programme e.g. personal development and wider than the curriculum i.e. common skills - Progress has been made in relation to work experience. Year 1s are doing work experience for the first time which highlights the shift i.e. making the colleges curriculum current and relevant. - There are plans in place to ensure more employer links e.g. guest speakers, IAG (life after university). - There are still some issues to address, including: - Attendance in year 2. This is not good enough and lower than previous years. College has seen some students not returning after the summer. - The college lost the NFL contract which effected year 2 retention by 10% - Maximum achievement will be 84.2% but historically there have been a lot of U grades which count against positive achievement Challenge from one member of the committee was to identify the aspects specific to A Levels that governors need to be aware of. Principal advised that these are:	

	- Achievement and getting higher grades - Movement from U, D's and E's - Securing value added i.e. getting above the target grades - Aim is to eliminate U's and E's Committee all agreed that they would want to see A Levels as a deep dive at a future meeting (Principal, 2023) AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
7	**Teaching and Learning Report** The detailed written report was presented and staff indicated that they would welcome feedback on format and content, specifically is it too detailed and does it need to be a broader brush? Key matters highlighted from the report included: - Focus on retention – this is a good indicator for where achievement will be. - High Needs retention is good given known transport issues. - Progress reviews – something new this year in term of the focus. They will be rolled out across the college. - At risk focus has changed – it is now achievement and not attendance, this means that interventions are more relevant. - In terms of headlines, there is a 15% improvement. - Innovations in teaching and learning are being seen and examples given were 'motivation in learning' project and 'drive for change with 21st century skills'. Committee all agreed that they were finding the padlet presentation and video links useful and it was agreed that they would be circulated outside the meeting for further consideration (HTLQI, May 2023). - Other innovation in teaching and learning includes 'mastery project 2022/23' which has a focus on maths and English. Also in place are the '5 R's' in maths. - There has been a real focus on teaching this year including: - Development - Professional upskilling of staff as part of a development day. Most staff chose to go out and see activities externally. - College has taken the opportunity to showcase a number of curriculum areas and one example given was IT at Wood Street. - Good practice reviews are completed - Risks and concerns are known and monitored Committee all agreed that they, as a group, need to spend more time focusing on teaching and learning and it was therefore agreed to have a one hour deep dive on teaching and learning at the next meeting (HTLQI, June 2023).	

	Committee reflected on the meeting today and agreed that they would not want more than two presentations at each meeting and that, all information that governors need to consider needs to be circulated in advance of the meeting. All agreed that this was important so that governors get a better opportunity to identify cross curriculum issues and then focus in where digging deeper is required. An example given was attendance in maths and English for the IT department i.e. why are they doing so well. Governors all agreed that it was important for staff to signpost them to the good and the bad so that discussions can be really focused on these. A suggestion made and accepted was to invite governors to attend staff development days planned for the remainder of this academic year and next (Principal, May 2023). AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
8	**Quality and Student Experience Scorecard** Given time constraints it was agreed to take the detail of the report as read and governors confirmed that they had no specific questions. AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
9	**Curriculum Strategy Update** The Principal presented his report and set out progress timelines. Committee asked when they will have an opportunity to engage with the more detailed plans. Principal advised that the first stage of rollout is tomorrow i.e. he will meet with team leaders and they will then roll out to their teams. Detailed actions/implementation plans are due back by July 2023, there will be 15 in total. Principal suggested that devolving oversight of both the curriculum and growth strategy may have been too much for this committee, given the need to focus on teaching and learning. He proposed that these should be part of the whole board review. Chair suggested that the 15 plans be made available and archived in sharepoint so that they can be accessed as and when governors need them for context. (Principal, July 2023). She suggested that the committee might want to sample some of the content but agreed that ownership at board level is something to be considered. AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
10	**Safeguarding, Prevent and EDI – exceptions report** A verbal update was given to the committee with a steer to highlight any issues and/or risks. These were summarised as:, • Governor assurance and challenge particularly through a link/lead governor	

	• More identified themes and an example given was that Wood Street have a higher number of concerns therefore is more campus focus work needed • Students becoming a victim of crime • Mental health trauma • Increase in the number of prevent referrals this year. There is also a new requirement to share 'requires improvement' action plans with the DfE. • Positives in terms of training, policies etc. • Online monitoring has led to an increase in prevent referrals Committee all agreed that it was useful to have an update by exception at each meeting and it was agreed that it would be scheduled earlier on the agenda next time (Director of Governance, June 2023). AGREED: to note the content of the update provided.	
11	**Governance** Committee considered the updated terms of reference which had been amended to take on board comments and feedback at the last meeting. Committee were happy to recommend as presented to the board for approval. It was agreed that the schedule of business would be reviewed by the Principal and Chair outside the meeting (Principal/Chair, June 2023). Committee took the opportunity to discuss frequency and meeting duration. Suggestion was to schedule meetings for 2.5 hours to allow for in depth analysis on at least two items, subject to governors being able to give this time.	
12	**Heat Map** The Principal presented a recommended format for reporting and giving assurance to the board. Key matters highlighted were: • This focuses in on aspects considered at each meeting and gives a sense of assurance • Committee will need to take a view at each meeting. • Whilst some aspects are standalone there is an overlap. • There is a need to link comments to the Ofsted descriptors for 'outstanding'. Committee all agreed that they felt that the format was helpful and suggested that aspects be scored as the meeting progresses and therefore the template should be circulated in advance for notes to be added (Dir of Gov, each meeting). Suggestion made was to allow 15 minutes at each meeting to provide feedback and grading. It was agreed that the Principal and the Chair would meet outside the meeting to create a prototype which would then be adopted for future use. One suggestion made was that the column should read 'commentary/assurance/evidence base'.	

13	**AOB** There were no matters of additional business.	
14	**Date and time of next meeting** This was agreed as 20th June at 5.30pm. **Meeting closed at 8.10pm.**	