

**Barnet and Southgate College Corporation
Quality of Teaching & Student Experience Committee meeting
held on Tuesday 28th March 2026
At 17:30 on Teams**

Present: Jenny Jarvis, Chair
Mark Taylor
Tulay Rashid-Grant
Neil Coker, CEO and Principal
Fitwi Kebede

In attendance: Maxine Bagshaw, Director of Governance
Kam Nandra, Deputy Principal: Curriculum and Quality
Torcato Coutinho, Director of Teaching & Learning and Quality
Lorraine Jackson, Director of Essential Skills and Edmonton Green
Jon Long, Campus Director Southgate
Greg Haynes, Campus Director Barnet

Item	Description	Action
1	Preliminary items i) Apologies for absence Apologies for absence were received from Amy de Campos Chair welcomed everyone to the 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.	
2	Minutes of the previous meeting Committee reviewed the minutes of the meeting held on 12th January 2026 and it was agreed that they were an accurate record. AGREED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12th January 2026.	

	The Committee considered matters arising through the actions tracking schedule. Clarification was provided in relation to a previously minuted action concerning cohort-level achievement analysis. It was confirmed that this action referred to retrospective analysis intended to inform strategic governance oversight rather than in-year operational reporting. Management assured the Committee that such analysis had since been incorporated within the Self-Assessment Report, providing governors with appropriate context and assurance. Committee explained that the request for deeper analysis was to provide assurance on any EDI aspects arising from the 2024/25 Year End and that this was likely to inform areas of strategic focus for this committee. Deputy Principal confirmed that data and analysis would be provided by email outside the meeting schedule (Deputy Principal, may 2026)	*
3	Renewed Learning Excellence Framework Proposal The Committee received and considered a detailed proposal for a renewed Learning Excellence Framework. The Chief Executive Officer & Principal set out the strategic context underpinning the review of the existing framework. It was emphasised that while recent years had seen sustained improvement in teaching and learning, there was now a need to formalise and strengthen professional development arrangements while moving away from high-stakes, compliance-driven observation models. A dual-track approach was outlined, combining a trust-based culture of professional learning with clearer, data-informed mechanisms for identifying and addressing underperformance. The Director of Teaching, Learning & Quality presented the framework in detail, highlighting: • its strong alignment with research-informed pedagogy, professional teaching standards, inclusive and trauma-informed practice, the College's strategic vision, and the Ofsted inspection framework; • a clear pedagogical model focused on curriculum coherence, adaptive teaching, high expectations and improved learner outcomes; • an increased emphasis on evidence-informed practice, including the use of cognitive science, effective feedback, retrieval practice and metacognitive approaches; • a deliberate shift away from line-manager-led lesson observations towards peer-led professional learning, supported by Senior Teaching Practitioners and Teaching	

	& Learning Coaches, in order to foster trust, innovation and sustained improvement; - the introduction of a set of core, consistent expectations for teaching practice (referred to as 'non-negotiables'), to be developed through professional dialogue and CPD rather than punitive monitoring; - the use of triangulated intelligence – including achievement, progress, attendance, learner voice, assessment timeliness and engagement in professional learning – to inform fair and proportionate performance conversations. Governors welcomed the clarity, coherence and ambition of the proposed model and recognised its strong alignment with staff wellbeing, innovation and a culture of continuous improvement. Challenge and discussion focused on: - how fairness and proportionality would be ensured within the accountability model, with management confirming that judgements would be triangulated, evidence-based and not reliant on isolated observations; - capacity implications, particularly the role and workload of Senior Teaching Practitioners, with assurance provided that recent investment had strengthened capacity and that the model would reduce, rather than increase, managerial burden; - reassurance that managers would retain appropriate visibility of classroom and learner experience through alternative quality processes, including deep dives, external reviews, learner engagement activity and Ofsted preparation; - how effectively the framework would surface early indicators of underperformance and how the Committee would receive assurance on rollout, embedding and impact. The Deputy Principal confirmed that the longer-term success of the framework would be measured through value-added outcomes, particularly the proportion of learners achieving at or above their target grades. Specific questions asked by the Chair were: How confident are we that an Ofsted team would see this as a robust and credible approach to judging and improving teaching quality?	
--	---	--

	A: There are various reasons we think Ofsted would see the LEF as robust and credible: Firstly, there is a strong external alignment as the framework is explicitly aligned to the FE and Skills Inspection Toolkit, the ETF Professional Standards and national evidence on effective pedagogy to make sure our expectation on quality reflects those of Ofsted. Secondly, we will be using a triangulated quality approach as the LEF has a holistic, evidence-based approach drawing from learner outcomes, student voice, staff professional behaviours and engagement in CPD. Thirdly, the LEF provides a clear, shared definition of high-quality teaching as it establishes a common language, a coherent pedagogical model and consistent expectations across provision. Finally, the LEF will position the College towards a mature improvement-driven culture, which is in line with Ofsted's expectations around promoting, supporting and delivering high quality CPD. Our expectation is that we become a beacon provider within the sector on this. If learner outcomes do not improve at the pace we expect, how quickly would the LEF surface that risk, and what would leaders/ managers do differently as a result? A: The LEF is designed to surface risk earlier and more reliably than current approaches, because it integrates multiple indicators rather than relying on end-point data alone. For example, we expect to have early visibility of risk through a triangulated model of in-year progress and assessment data, learner engagement and attendance, learner voice and professional practice indicators. Where risks are identified, leaders and managers would move more quickly to targeted coaching and support and deploy TLCs/STPs and CPD more strategically to improve learner outcomes. Leaders and managers will also be able to resort to the 'wheel of connected intelligence' indicators/triggers to drive improvement from a quality assurance viewpoint. What specific updates should this committee expect on LEF impact over the next few meetings? A: The Committee should expect a phased set of updates focused on implementation, engagement and impact rather than a single end-point report. For example, staff and managers' engagement with the LEF (briefings, training completion, evidence of adoption of the shared pedagogical model in curriculum areas, early indicators of impact such as improved engagement and consistency of practice. In addition, following roll out; in-year performance indicators (retention, attendance, progress), learner voice trends linked to teaching quality and evaluation of CPD and coaching effectiveness. How will we support managers who may be less confident operating in this new model? (sorry if you have answered this in your intro!)	
--	--	--

	A: The LEF provides a shared language and clear standards reducing ambiguity and increasing confidence. As part of managers' development target CPD will be put in place for managers on interpreting triangulated quality evidence, coaching and developmental conversations. Coaching and peer support from senior managers and STPs who will provide modelling and coaching. Finally, a culture shift where the emphasis is on trust, professional growth and no-blame improvement culture. Linking to people committee - which 2 or 3 behaviours or practices does the LEF most need to change if we are to move towards outstanding? A: To move towards outstanding, the LEF requires a shift in some key behaviours: for example: 1) a move from isolated teaching to shared good practice. This will required greater collaboration and sharing of effective pedagogy across teams. 2) We create a culture where teachers are genuinely self-critical and reflect on and improve their practice using evidence, rather than preparing for observation/learning walks. 3) From performance management to coaching-led development where managers prioritise development rather than judgement. These behaviours will be essential to truly embed a culture of excellence rather than purely short-term improvement. Which outcome measures should we expect to improve first as a direct result of the LEF? A: In the short term, we would expect to see improvement in leading (in-year) indicators before final outcomes, more specifically: Learner attendance and punctuality, learner engagement and participation and positive learner voice feedback on teaching. We should see improved retention and greater consistency in quality of teaching across curriculum areas. We expect improvements (lagging outcomes) in overall achievement rates and value-added outcomes as well as a reduction in attainment gaps. The Committee expressed strong support for the direction of travel, characterising the approach as bold but well evidenced, and requested regular reporting on implementation progress, cultural impact and emerging outcomes. AGREED to support the continued development of the renewed approach.	
4	Monitoring Report – 2025/26 (By Exception) The Committee received and considered the Monitoring Report, with discussion focused on areas of risk and aspects showing slow or uneven progress.	

	The Deputy Principal summarised the key messages from the report, noting: • that overall achievement performance continued to show a positive trajectory when compared with the previous year and relative to the wider sector; • that attendance remained a key risk, albeit with incremental improvement evident; • that retention continued to be a critical success indicator, with relatively small percentage increases equating to significant numbers of learners retained; • the introduction of targeted 'scrum' meetings to address specific pinch points, including attendance and assessment completion; • the evolution of a more risk-based and proportionate quality assurance approach; • proposals for a clearer quality scorecard to enhance governance oversight and focus Committee scrutiny. The Committee welcomed the development of the proposed scorecard and emphasised the importance of identifying a small number of meaningful early-warning indicators that would enable governors to anticipate emerging issues, particularly in relation to equity, inclusion and learner group performance. The Chief Executive Officer & Principal supplemented the report with contextual intelligence from recent inspector engagement, providing reassurance that achievement outcomes compared favourably within the parameters of the new inspection framework, while acknowledging that 16–18 performance continued to require careful monitoring. Committee agreed that at a relevant point in time it would be helpful for them to receive a dedicated Ofsted inspection training session. AGREED: That the Monitoring Report be noted, and that further refinement of scorecard measures and presentation be brought back to a future meeting.	*
5	Provision Receiving Intensive Support (Focus Improvement Programmes) The Committee received a comprehensive update on curriculum areas subject to focused improvement activity. The Director of Teaching, Learning & Quality explained that the term 'performance clinics' had been replaced with 'Focus	

	Improvement Programmes', reflecting a more structured and diagnostic-led approach. These programmes were underpinned by clear accountability, targeted intervention and regular review. Areas currently within scope included A Levels, Electrical, IT, Adult Essential Skills, ESOL, Foundation Learning and Sport. <u>Electrical, IT, Foundation Learning and Sport</u> The Campus Director (Southgate) provided a detailed overview of progress and challenges: • Electrical: Underperformance was linked primarily to qualification structure and exam technique rather than practical competence. Mitigations included front-loading theoretical content, strengthening exam preparation strategies and reconfiguring adult provision. • IT: Challenges were concentrated around a complex assessment unit. Intervention focused on improved formative assessment, targeted workshops and enhanced exam preparation. • Foundation Learning: Improvements had been made to information, advice and guidance and to curriculum pathways and progression routes. However, the Committee recognised the ongoing fragility associated with the complexity of learner circumstances in this area. • Sport: Performance had been adversely affected by staffing instability. Recent appointments and strengthened leadership were reported to be stabilising the provision, with early signs of improvement. The Committee welcomed the clarity of diagnosis and intervention strategies, expressing particular confidence in the emerging improvement trajectory within Sport, while acknowledging continued inherent risk within Foundation Learning. <u>Adult Essential Skills and ESOL</u> The Director of Essential Skills and Edmonton Green reported significant progress resulting from simplified delivery models, earlier assessment cycles, more targeted use of non-qualification provision and improved deployment of staffing expertise. These changes had resulted in marked improvements against national benchmarks. <u>A Levels</u> The Campus Director (Barnet) outlined actions to address retention and achievement challenges, including strengthened	
--	---	--

	leadership following management transitions, tighter review of entry criteria and early programme transfer decisions, enhanced academic support and exam preparation, and work to address variability in subject performance. It was acknowledged that further work was required to ensure consistently targeted deployment of Senior Teaching Practitioners to maximise impact. The Committee challenged the consistency and precision of Senior Teaching Practitioner deployment across priority areas. Management acknowledged variability and confirmed that further refinement was required. AGREED: That progress to date be noted, that early impact be recognised, and that further updates on outcomes and the effectiveness of STP deployment be brought to the Committee.	*
6	Interim Destinations Report The Committee considered a summary of interim destinations data. The Deputy Principal reported that: - the overall response rate was approximately 43%; - positive sustained destinations stood at 61%, below the London average; 16–18 provision continued to perform more strongly, exceeding the London benchmark; - outcomes for learners with SEND and high needs had improved and were now aligned with the wider College position. It was noted that data collection had commenced later than optimal in the year and that further analysis and refinement would be presented to the Committee in June to strengthen assurance. AGREED: That the interim update be noted, with a fuller report to be provided at the next meeting.	*
7	Sector / Policy Briefing The Committee received a verbal briefing on wider sector developments, including qualification reform, changes to V Level pathways, Level 2 reforms and developments within maths and English qualifications. The potential strategic implications for curriculum planning and College positioning were highlighted. Management advised that further clarity was awaited from the Department for Education and that governors would be engaged	

	as specifications, timelines and transition requirements became clearer. Committee agreed that a copy of the presentation slides should be circulated to all governors to support ongoing training and development. AGREED to note the content of the update provided.	
8	AOB None for this meeting.	
9	Reflection of Committee Meeting Against Guiding Principles The Chair reflected positively on the meeting, noting the high level of transparency and openness from senior leaders, the constructive and probing nature of Committee challenge, and the strong alignment between discussion, decision-making and the College's guiding principles. 	
10	Date and time of next meeting This was confirmed as Monday 8 June 2026 at 17:30 Committee reflected on the meeting debate today, particularly in relation to inclusions and it was agreed to schedule an 'Inclusion QRM Report' for presentation at the next meeting (Deputy Principal, June 2026) Meeting closed: 19:55	*