

**Barnet and Southgate College Corporation
Quality of Teaching & Student Experience Committee meeting
held on 6th October 2025
At 17:30 on Teams**

Present: Jenny Jarvis, Chair
Mark Taylor
Amy de Campos
Tulay Rashid-Grant
Neil Coker, CEO and Principal

In attendance: Maxine Bagshaw, Director of Governance
Victoria Cornwell-Lyon, Deputy Principal
Chalene Scott, DSL
Torcato Coutinho, Director of Teaching & Learning and Quality

Item	Description	Action
1	Preliminary items i) Apologies for absence There were no apologies for absence with all committee members present. Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly Amy de Campos and Torcato Coutinho as this is their first meeting. ii) Declarations of interest No specific declarations were made and standing declarations were noted. iii) Notification of urgent business Chair confirmed that no matters had been raised in advance of the meeting. Before starting discussions Chair reminded that a new structure to the agenda is being trialled this time and that she would welcome the opportunity to reflect on this at the end. She asked governors to consider during the meeting:	

	• What should be included in the different 'types' of report i.e. should strategic reports have differing content to those provided for assurance or business items. • How to ensure that those items marked as 'strategic' really do focus on strategy.	
2	Safeguarding	
	DSL presented her comprehensive written report which focused on the 2024/25 annual summary position. Key elements highlighted were: • Report sets out how the college is ensuring compliance with the Education Act • 2025 KCSIE update has a focus on operational elements rather than policy e.g. how organisations should be working with the LA's, virtual school head etc. • There are no recommendations to change the college Safeguarding Policy this year. It is not felt necessary given the limited policy implications of new KCSIE guidance. Committee were happy to support this proposal. • New/extended mandatory reporting requirements. • Future strategic considerations, including: - Online safety - Crime and Policy Bill - Use of reasonable force - DSL role in relation to mandating supervision - Generative AI and safeguarding implications. College has a new AI Policy that has been introduced. This will need to be reviewed to assess any safeguarding considerations. - Responding to new legislation - Key data capture requirements e.g. ethnicity. College will need to consider whether any more needs to be done or done differently for specific groups given the profile of safeguarding concerns recorded. - Responding to and managing the year-on-year increase in the no of cases (+15% up on the prior year). - College needs to consider what more is required. • Identified areas for development, including: - Reinstating the internal cross college safeguarding committee. This will bring staff together from many different areas. - Being more specific about safeguarding responsibilities e.g. teachers, curriculum managers, campus directors etc - Offsite provision assurance - Prevent training – whilst the level of staff completion is increasing, there is more the college can do to gain assurance regarding staff understanding. - Strengthening of safer recruitment arrangements and the Single Central Record (SCR). Proposal is to conduct internal audits. - Recording, monitoring and sharing information in relation to low level concerns.	

	Committee thanked the DSL for her detailed summary and indicated that they would like to see an action plan developed to respond to the points made. This would allow progress to be easily monitored and would enable resource prioritisation. It was agreed that the Safeguarding Lead governor and DSL would discuss this outside the meeting. One governor referred to the data provided in the appendix, specifically the increasing number of cases. They asked whether the team is sufficiently resourced, in terms of capacity and skills, particularly considering the new requirements e.g. the Ofsted framework. DSL confirmed that it is becoming increasingly challenging and gave as an example, the fact that the team had to review over 100 transfer files from schools at the start of this year. She advised that the responsibilities of the DSO's are high and that there may be a need to look a team capacity, structure and processes i.e. can we be smarter. She confirmed an intended review of roles and responsibilities. CEO advised that a review panel/board was established just before the summer to look at safeguarding arrangements. His intention is to reignite this now and progress to phase two discussions. Governors queried the ethnicity percentages provided in the data. DSL advised that the percentage is derived from the 755 students that make up the 'cases' figure. Committee asked if the college has conducted a lockdown practice. DSL advised, not yet but that one is to be planned. CEO confirmed that the college has invested in an all-campus alert system which has now been installed. Staff will start with desktop trials first and then move to campus drills. Governors all agreed that the report provided was incredibly thorough and thought provoking. They indicated that, if resources permit, it would be helpful to start to focus in on more specific groups. Committee asked whether the college is happy with the level of staff training completed. DSL advised that it is now at the highest it has ever been following a real focus this year, with HR having a real push to ensure staff comply with mandatory training requirements. DSL referred to the requirements set out in 'Meeting digital needs in schools' and described it as an area to monitor but acknowledged this was an ever changing and quickly developing area. Governors asked where the student perspective, in relation to cyber security, sits on the risk register. CEO advised that the 2024/25 corporate risk register has been 'closed off' but that cyber security will always appear as a risk. Challenge from the committee was whether college needs to be more specific about potential student impact, safeguarding implications etc if there were to be a cyber security issue.	
--	--	--

	AGREED to A, note the content of the report and update provided, and B, recommend that the board approved continuation of current Safeguarding Policy unchanged into the 2025/26 academic year. (Chalene Scott left the meeting at 6.05pm) Committee took the opportunity to reflect on the Safeguarding Lead Governor role and asked if there is a way to ensure that all governors are fully up to date as there is so much information provided in reports. They asked the lead governor to try and ensure: • A summary of key points is provided • More direction is provided in the executive summary • Reports are accessible, with real clarity in relation to where governors can be assured. Challenge from one governor was that safeguarding reports need to be succinct given that the Ofsted judgement is either 'met' or 'not met'. Request from the committee chair was that all future reports should include an 'up front judgement' from the report writer.	
3	Ofsted	
	Chair thanked the Deputy Principal for the report circulated in advance. She asked that discussions focus on: • What aspects would we be worried about if we were to be inspected under the new framework now? • Do we have gaps? Deputy Principal indicated that: • She is confident that some internal changes being made and have been made will support the new framework e.g. measuring the quality and impact of CPD. • College is in a good position • Framework changes are not hugely significant nor a radical departure. It is still in the spirit of the EIF. • One area requiring more work is inclusion. College does still have improvements to make as there are still some significant achievement gaps, particularly for vulnerable and disadvantaged students. This will be a central focus for the leadership team in 2025/26. In general discussion committee acknowledged that: • Governors really need to understand and 'get under the skin' of achievement data. • Governors need to be clear that their role is to hold leaders to account. • Governors need to better understand the framework content and monitor the roll out to get a sense of the future and any particular nuances. • College needs to continue with the drive to improve and tighten up data processes.	

	It was agreed to schedule in an end of academic year session to look back at actual inspection reports with a view to assessing emerging themes and considerations (Deputy Principal, June 2026). Committee agreed with the view that BSC is in a strong position to respond. All noted that the focus on achievement is back and therefore there will need to be a greater focus on data. It is anticipated that Ofsted will look again at 'headlines' as they will no longer be completing deep dives and work scrutiny. Deputy principal acknowledged that in terms of data, the college is not yet where it needs to be but is improving. Challenge from the committee was that all future reports need to be data driven. All agreed that KPI's reported on need to give an in year 'heads up' so that there are no surprises. Committee suggestions were: • Governors need to be really clear what their statutory duties are. • Taking on board the new EIF, Executive to propose KPIs that really ensure that the critical elements are monitored and discussed. • Consider any links needed with the People Committee in terms of staff welfare and wellbeing. CEO advised that he will be proposing a move away from board level monitoring of KPI's and that instead the intention will be to focus on agreed 'matters of strategic importance'. This will however mean that KPI's at committee level will need more scrutiny. All agreed that the scorecard needs to align with KPI's established. One governor asked whether the new framework would have any impact on the BSC current inspection grade and/or the inspection cycle. In relation to the cycle, Deputy Principal advised that it will 'start again' but that it will be risk based. Risks will be assessed against previous grades and year on year data changes i.e. improvements or declines. She reminded that the cycle is every 3-4 years. She expressed the view that there is nothing within the 2024/25 data which would increase the risk and in fact improved outcomes in some areas could lead to a slight reduction in the risks. AGREED to note the content of the report and discussions.	*
4	2025 Emerging Outcomes	
	Chair thanked the Deputy Principal for the presentation slides circulated in advance and asked her to focus on a summary of what the college is and isn't happy with. Deputy Principal advised: • College is pleased with the 'overall' achievement rate. College should end the year at 87%, which is just short of	

	the national average which is 87.5% and is a 3% improvement on prior year. • Changes in the pass grades for 16-18 and 19+ are now at national average. She reminded that judgements in relation to the quality of teaching and learning are influenced by pass grades and therefore it is important not to be below national average. • The college's 'Achilles heel' continues to be retention, however college has made some significant changes this year which should lead to improvements. • College shifted its focus on qualification, with the vast majority now doing GCSE maths and English rather than Functional Skills. Staff did expect this shift to negatively impact but this has not been as significant as feared. Maths and English results largely support that college took the right action. • In terms of the 'top 3', the positives are: - Pass rates in all areas - Improvements by levels - EHCP achievements The negatives are: - 16-18 retention and the impact this has had on achievement - Achievement gap for those with and without EHCP's - High grades data - External exam performance decline. • Decrease in L2 position is largely influenced by GCSE's. English has improved but maths has declined. • A Levels have improved Deputy Principal indicated that, whilst it is pleasing to see the EHCP improvements there is still too much of a gap with non EHCP performance and this presents an inclusion issue to address. Challenge from governors was that there appears to be some work to do to address departmental variations and that this is something QTSE should look at in more detail this year. Deputy Principal advised that there have been some unexpected departmental declines, and this needs to be fully reviewed to avoid any surprises like this next year. All agreed that it is important to be able to quickly access in year data to spot any red flags early. Governors all agreed that they were pleased to see the progress made in some areas towards national averages. They indicated that in future reports it would be helpful to have the 'direction of travel' articulated. Committee asked what the most significant issues are impacting on 16-18 retention. Deputy Principal advised: • There are issues around student experience in the first 6 weeks of the year which negatively impacts. Too many students get into bad habits as there are not enough controls in place. • Some T&L issues.	
--	---	--

	• A lot of work was done last year to improve enrolment and timetabling, but this has not had the level of impact that the college would have liked. • Retention has historically been an issue on 2-year programmes. This has been changed with students, in the main, being now onto 1+1. • Level of pastoral support available needs to be reconsidered, particularly how quickly the college can respond and provide support. • Social, mental and economic environment is more challenging. • College is really changing the tutorial offer this year with double the time provided. This has been a significant investment. One governor asked how accurate the in year 'predicted' outcomes were. Deputy Principal advised that actuals were not as high as some departments predicted. A theme is external exam performance. She provided assurance that staff have really looked into this to check that predications are based upon actual academic performance. There may be more to do to improve the assessment for learning processes. Challenge from the committee was to bring back more detailed analysis, specifically in relation to the teaching and learning in those departments that did not achieve predications. Deputy Principal provided assurance that some of this work has already been completed, with more planned e.g. in the A Level department, where students obtained U's Curriculum Managers are really focused on the where and why. AGREED to note the content of the update provided.	
5	CEIAG and Enrichment	
	Before considering the reports provided the Deputy Principal confirmed that the new lead for enrichment moved into the role over 12 months ago and has really energised the team and the offer available to students. Governors were happy to take the reports 'as read' and asked: • What do we know about best practice activities which will lead to the most impact? • Is BSC a sector leader when compared with others? One governor noted that CEIAG is one area commonly mentioned as 'could be improved' in the student and governor meetings and therefore it is important for this committee to test impact following any changes made. Committee agreed that they would expect high quality careers advice to have a positive impact on: • Retention • Progression, and • Student satisfaction Challenge from governors was how this will be judged, monitored and reported. They asked what the 'hard metrics' will be to help	

	to assess quality. It was agreed that the Deputy Principal would identify linked data sets at the next meeting (VCL, November 2025). Challenge from the committee was to: • Better understand the 'big hitters' when considering best practice from within and outside the FE sector. • Clearly articulate where we think our current offer sits. • Reports to more clearly focus on impact. CEO expressed the view that BSC is not currently a sector leader, and he confirmed that this should be the intention. It was agreed that this should be added to the 2025/26 QIP (VCL, October 2025). Challenge from the committee was to complete some data analysis comparing those who did and didn't participate in enrichment. Has there been any impact on retention, satisfaction, attainment etc. Committee were advised that there has been growth in the numbers who do participate which is a positive and that this is something Ofsted tested on. Number of adults participating has increased which was described as unusual. AGREED to note the content of the reports provided.	* *
6	Minutes of the previous meeting Committee reviewed the minutes of the meeting held on 17th June 2025 and it was agreed that they were an accurate record. AGREED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17th June 2025. There were no matters arising. In relation to the actions tracking summary, suggestion from the chair was to move this back to the start for future meetings, just to make sure that all elements are picked up during discussions (Dir of Gov, future meetings)	*
7	2024/25 Monitoring Deputy Principal advised that each of these aspects are now being reviewed and would be updated for 2025/26. Today there is an opportunity to briefly look back on 2024/25, but formal end of year reports will be provided at the next meeting (VCL, November 2025) A, Headline AFI's Key matters highlighted were: • College has made mixed progress • Still more to do in relation to High Needs • Still more to do in relation to 16-18 retention. There has been a slight improvement but not enough.	*

	- College had a specific focus on Art, Media and Foundation Learning - Significant improvements in Art – position is 90.5% which is at national average. - Media is 88.8% which is just under national average - Significant Foundation learning improvements at Barnet. Position is 88.3% which is much higher than national average. College is now confident this provision is 'good'. However, it is not the same position at Southgate and Colindale. Retention issues remain and both are significantly below national average. - Achievement at L1 and below – good improvements at Entry Level and L1 but foundation learning is not yet consistently 'good'. - Industry partner contribution to curriculum design – college has not made as much progress as it would have liked. There is good partner engagement but not yet enough contribution to curriculum design. - In relation to raising standards there was a focus on Engineering, ESOL, Foundation and AES: - Engineering results were disappointing. Students struggled with external exams. Overall, the outcomes have not improved and therefore college cannot say that standards have improved. - ESOL – position is still not consistently good but there have been improvements. - AES – this is the weakest area of improvement. It continues to be inadequate. She reminded that there have been some significant middle management issues. - Foundation Learning – there have been some sizeable improvements at Barnet but not at Southgate and Colindale. Colindale saw the least improvements. Committee asked whether it is the intention to retain AFI's moving into 2025/26 and will these be monitored by QTSE. CEO confirmed that this will be the case and that the proposed 'matters of strategic importance' to be monitored by board are broader than achievement AGREED to note the content of the report provided. B, QIP Committee was content to note the draft document provided and asked what the timescales are for finalising. Deputy Principal confirmed that final document will be presented to committee at the next meeting (VCL, November 2025) C, Quality KPI's Committee was reminded that KPI's for 2025/26 are currently under review and proposals will be presented to the next meeting (VCL, November 2025). Deputy Principal advised that she has a spreadsheet summarising the 2024/25 position and it was agreed	* *
--	--	-------------------

	that she would provide this to the Director of Governance so that it can be circulated (VCL, October 2025) In relation to external examination performance and results, committee asked if the college is assessing whether the curriculum in place is right. Deputy Principal confirmed that this is being reviewed as well as how some teachers teach to support exam requirements rather than assessments. College will review the learning excellence framework to address this. She advised that performance in BTEC's and City and Guilds appear to where the issues are. She commented that T-Levels performed very well. D, Risks Deputy Principal advised that there have been minimal changes since the last report, including the Ofsted position following introduction of the new framework. Intention is present identified 2025/26 risks at the next meeting (VCL, November 2025)	* *
8	Committee Self-Assessment 2024/25	
	Director of Governance presented an AI generated assessment based upon meeting minutes for the year. All agreed that it was an accurate reflection. They particularly noted accuracy of the 'amber' area, which include elements discussed today i.e. data accuracy and timely availability, need for more impact analysis etc. Observations made were: - Align 2025/26 self-assessment with the new AFI's to be established (Dir of Gov, September 2026). - Reflect more on the committee's focus on refinements and how these shape 'next steps'. Articulate more this committee's focus on continuing improvement, which includes its own roles and responsibilities. One governor asked whether there should be an 'Impact assessment' section added to the executive summary template. CEO expressed the view that this may not apply to all board reports but that it would be helpful for QTSE to ensure a focus. He acknowledged that the board and committees are always looking for ways to improve governance and that this clearly evidences an intention not to become complacent. AGREED to note the content of the update provided.	
9	Sector/Policy Briefing	
	Deputy Principal confirmed that there was none for this meeting. Committee Chair reflected upon her recent attendance at the Labour Party conference and urged the college to write to MP's, with a specific reference to Green Skills discussions. CEO	

	confirmed that he would follow up on this and issue a college invite for a site tour/visit (CEO, October 2025)	*
10	AOB Committee confirmed that there was none for this meeting. Mark Taylor highlighted a recent meeting he had had with the COO to discuss the updated Southgate masterplan. He expressed the view that there will be an important link with curriculum and this committee.	
11	Heatmap – Risks and Assurance Committee agreed that this would now need a refresh to ensure it aligns with the new EIF. Deputy Principal confirmed that she would prepare a first draft to then be shared and approved by committee Chair. (Deputy Principal, October 2025)	*
12	Reflection of Committee Meeting Against Guiding Principles Committee was content that meeting discussions and areas of focus aligned with the guiding principles set out in the 2030 Strategy. Particularly: • Confidence that this is a very curious committee • A positive group • Looking to be innovative e.g. using AI to support governance • Has strategic transparency It was agreed that college Ofsted aspirations would be revisited at the next meeting within the context of SAR and QIP discussions (VCL, November 2025) Chair indicated that, for the next meeting she would like staff to rethink the approach to presenting the SAR. She urged them to keep strategy in mind and avoid 'walking through' the document section by section. Deputy Principal confirmed that the document would be briefer and more succinct. Challenge from the committee was to be thematic and look across areas rather than individual sections.	

		
13	Date and time of next meeting This was confirmed as Monday 10th November 2025 at 5.30pm. Meeting closed at 7.55pm.	