

Kirklees College Corporation

QUALITY, PERFORMANCE & STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held at 15.00 on 3 February 2020 at the Huddersfield Centre

Present: Ms C George Member (Chair)
 Ms M Gilluley Member
 Mr G Hetherington Member
 Ms L Precious Member
 Mr N Taylor Member
 Dr A Williams Member

Attendance: 6/7 = 86% KPI 80% Quorum: 3

In attendance: Ms P Firth Assistant Principal - Adults & Higher Education
 Ms J Green Clerk to the Corporation
 Mr S Harrison Head of Quality, TLA, HE and Teacher Education
 Ms P Harrow Assistant Principal - Safeguarding and Inclusion
 Ms P Hughes Assistant Principal - Quality/Apprenticeship Provision

| Item | Action/ Report Item |
|--------------------------|---|
| PRELIMINARY ITEMS | |
| 0 | WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS |
| i | Due notice having been given and a quorum being present, the Chair declared the meeting open and welcomed everyone. |
| 1 | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST |
| i | Apologies were received from Committee member Prof S Donnelly, Vice Principal Ms C Gonzalez-Eslava ("CGE") and Assistant Principal Ms J Arechiga. Committee member Ms L Precious said she would need to leave at 16.30. |
| ii | The Corporation Chair, Mr G Hetherington, said Ms S Weston had resigned as an Independent Governor on 27 January 2020 and was no longer a member of the Committee as from that date. He said he would acknowledge her contributions as a Committee member when he wrote to thank her for her service. |
| iii | All confirmed that they had no direct or indirect interest in any way in the business to be transacted at the meeting which they were required by the Instrument of Government or otherwise to disclose, other than those matters previously disclosed. |
| 2 | MINUTES OF THE 9 DECEMBER MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING |
| i | The Clerk highlighted an error in the minutes and this was noted: "2019" instead of "2020" for the date of next meeting (Item 12i). |
| ii | <u>RESOLVED:</u> (i) To instruct the Clerk to amend minute 12(i) to give the correct date for the next meeting: 3 March 2020 and, subject to that amendment, to approve the minutes of 9 December 2019 as an accurate record. |

| Item | | Action/ Report Item |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| iii | <p><u>Matters arising not on the Agenda</u></p> <p>No matters were raised that were not on the Agenda.</p> | |
| iv | <p><u>Update on Agreed Actions</u></p> <p><u>Proposed collaboration with the Local Authority and Huddersfield University:</u> The Senior Leadership Team (“SLT”) had been asked to explore the possibility of commissioning research into systems and data capture, and transition and individualised programmes. The Principal Marie Gilluley (“MG”) said she would ask CGE to report on this at the next meeting.</p> | |
| v | <p>Action (rolled over): The Vice Principal Curriculum to give a verbal report at the next meeting on whether there is scope to commission any research into systems and data capture and transition and individualised programmes, in collaboration with the Local Authority and Huddersfield University, or otherwise.</p> | MG, CGE |
| FE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT | | |
| 4 | <p>PERFORMANCE</p> <p>(i) <u>Learner Progress</u></p> <p>i It was agreed that Items 4(i) should be taken ahead of Item 3 to facilitate a better flow of information.</p> <p>ii Members recalled that the sector was taking a broader view of learner progress, particularly since the publication of the Education Inspection Framework (“EIF”). Success measures like destinations and progress were replacing the narrow focus on achievement rates and it was no longer enough for learners to simply pass a course; they needed to achieve more than expected given their starting points.</p> <p>iii In the first section of her paper, Assistant Principal Ms P Hughes (“PH”) had provided a breakdown of the previous year’s progress scores and those of preceding years, illustrating the College’s success in supporting learners to improve on the progress of previous cohorts and on national average progress scores. Members noted that in 2018/19, the 16-18 English and maths learner cohort had made particularly strong progress as compared to the national average.</p> <p>iv As reported in the second section of the paper, the in-year position was looking positive. High grade passes in the GCSE maths and English resit had increased in comparison with the previous year.</p> <p>v PH said, while a relatively high number of maths and English progress assessment results had not yet been added to Markbook¹; the majority had and showed good progress, with an average improvement of +6.72 marks out of a score of 60. PH outlined the steps being taken by maths & English Leads to challenge and address instances of non-compliance; 38% of assessment results had not yet been added to Markbook. Members asked for an update report at the next meeting.</p> <p>vi Action: The Committee to receive an update report at its next meeting on staff compliance with requirements around the timely completion of student initial assessments for English and maths and entering of results on Markbook.</p> <p>vii Mr S Harrison, Head of Quality TLA, HE and Teacher Education (“SH”), presented on the Student Progress Checks, describing the new process as ‘more incisive and</p> | PHu, JA |

¹ Markbook is a class management system software used by the College.

| Item | | Action/ Report Item |
|----------|---|------------------------|
| viii | <p>in-depth' than its predecessor as well as better aligned with the EIF. He said it seemed to be proving popular with staff and managers. This was echoed by Committee Member and Staff Governor Nick Taylor, who said staff in his team had preferred the new 'more tutor friendly' approach and the 'less obtrusive' lesson visits.</p> | |
| ix | <p>246 lesson visits and 124 deep dives had been undertaken, with coverage of virtually all curriculum areas. The two areas not yet visited were next on the list; both were relatively new and had undergone a lot of change, so management had chosen to delay to give things time to settle.</p> | |
| x | <p>Members compared the progress check results, noting how the scores for the various key focus areas (planning, delivery, assessment, progress, students voice and support) interrelated. A member asked why the earlier visits had tended to result in poorer scores and SH said the visits were scheduled in priority order, with higher risk provision first. He said where concerns had been identified, interventions were in place and the areas would be revisited to see what distance had been travelled.</p> | |
| xi | <p>SH said the next round of progress checks would commence at the end of February. All areas would be revisited and strong performers from the first round would need to show they were still strong. External consultants would bring an objective viewpoint.</p> | |
| xii | <p>Action: Progress Check dates to be shared with Governors, to attend as observers.</p> | SH, JG, Govs |
| xiii | <p>MG said another college recently inspected under the new EIF had shared a significant change in terms of Ofsted's approach to deep dives, meeting with tutors on their own, which some had found daunting. It was agreed that a further benefit of introducing the new Student Progress Checks was accustoming tutors to leading on deep dives and increasing their understanding of what Ofsted was looking for.</p> <p>Corporation report: The Committee is developing a good understanding of the new Student Progress Checks process and considers it is adding value. It has been interesting to see how it feeds into the overall quality improvement process and we look forward to observing it in practice when Governors accompany managers on the next round of visits. At this relatively early point in the year there are positive indicators that learners are making good progress compared to previous cohorts. Management is looking into an issue of non-compliance in the inputting of results.</p> | Report Item 1 |
| 1550 | <p><i>Mr S Harrison left the meeting.</i></p> | |
| xiv | <p>Committee Member Dr A Williams ("AW") reported on the progress of an internal project of work to better demonstrate personal/social progress and progress for all programmes. He said the first meeting of the appointed task group had been productive; it had agreed some 'in principle' objectives around identifying starting points, measuring 'softer' aspects of progress, and looking at progression in terms of what students go on to do in future and how the College prepares them. He said the task group favoured bottom-up consultation and wished to ensure that any new system or structure made sense at all levels from tutors to Governors.</p> | |
| 3 | <p>APPROVAL AND MONITORING OF FE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p> | |
| i | <p>The Committee noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Monitoring progress against actions plans resulting from the College's annual self-assessment review was a fundamental part of its remit; ➤ It was intended that the Quality Improvement Plan presented for approval (the "QIP") would be the main quality action plan for the business, incorporating both Further Education ("FE") and Higher Education ("HE") improvement goals and being primarily concerned with the achievement of strategic objectives: | |

| Item | | Action/ Report Item |
|------|---|------------------------|
| | <p>SO1: To ensure all learners develop personally and progress successfully into further training, employment or Higher Education; and</p> <p>SO2: To provide high quality teaching, learning and assessment which is innovative, inclusive and inspirational.</p> | |
| ii | <p>Members acknowledged the good progress that had been done on developing the QIP but agreed further work was needed in terms of clearly articulating and evidencing the priority areas for improvement for Governors' benefit, and bringing the focus around even more to intent, implementation and impact. Members emphasised that they had confidence in management's ability to discern the Areas for Improvement but said, from the oversight perspective, neither the College Self-Assessment Report nor the QIP had explained the rationale in enough detail to enable Governors to grasp it for themselves. It was reiterated that the QIP should be a high-level strategic tool with little focus on historical data and operational detail.</p> | |
| iii | <p>Action: Quality Task Group to work with management on the design and development of the Quality Improvement Plan.</p> | QTG, SLT |
| iv | <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(i) The Quality Task Group shall have delegated authority to approve the Quality Improvement Plan as a working document on the Quality, Performance & Standards Committee's behalf.</p> | |
| v | <p>Members were pleased to note some positive signs, with in-year indicators suggesting that some impact would be felt in key improvement areas by the end of the academic year. The risk around timetabling highlighted in the student survey was revisited and the impact on attendance discussed. It was noted that with additional capacity and expertise in the management team, the College was now well positioned to drive improvement in this area.</p> | |
| vi | <p>There was discussion about the consistency of the RAG rating used in the QIP. Members identified instances where it appeared to have been inconsistently applied: the amber ratings against "All students to complete initial assessment" (which target had been missed by 38%) and "students to be retained through 'swap don't drop'" (76% of eligible students not having been retained).</p> | |
| vii | <p>Action: Management to review the RAG rating approach, to ensure that there is consistency across all areas of the Quality Improvement Plan.</p> | SLT |
| viii | <p>A Member asked management to comment on a proposal to introduce more streaming of learners. PH said this was currently at the exploratory stage, with a recent pilot showing good results. She said while it made sense to stream learners, implementation of streaming on a grand scale would be a logistical challenge.</p> | |
| ix | <p>Assistant Principal Ms P Firth ("PF") said the new HE manager Zulakha Desai was driving a more targeted approach to HE recruitment.</p> | |
| x | <p>Having no further questions or comments, the Committee agreed to report as follows:</p> | |
| xi | <p>Corporation report: The Committee discussed the draft quality improvement plan ("QIP"), which will support the delivery of the quality strategy. Following the discussion, it asked the Quality Task Group to work with the management team to further develop and refine the QIP, so that the Corporation may take stronger assurance from the management reports that flow from it. The management report against the draft version highlighted indicators of progress in several areas for improvement ahead of target dates.</p> | Report Item 2 |

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| <p>4</p> <p>i</p> <p>ii</p> <p>iii</p> <p>iv</p> <p>v</p> | <p>PERFORMANCE (continued)</p> <p>(ii) <u>Student Voice: Induction Survey Results</u></p> <p>PH presented the findings of the Term 1 Student Experience Survey (the “Survey”), highlighting the positive impact of changes to the Survey’s structure and format, in terms of participation rates, administration costs, the quality of the data obtained, and the scope for its practical application. A 74% return rate had been achieved without any need to extend the deadline.</p> <p>Potential risk indicators were discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3% drop from the previous year (96% to 93%) in students feeling the College was a safe place raised concerns for Members, mindful of the Corporation’s duty of care. Planned improvements to campus security would hopefully address them. • Just 78% of respondents had said their course timetable was well planned. PH said maths and English scheduling changes in response to learner feedback had resulted in lower attendance in many areas so, with no expectations of pleasing everyone, management was exploring bespoke solutions for each area. • Members, concerned by the number of respondents (11%) who were unaware of their targets or how to track their progress, were pleased to hear that a decision to ask respondents to provide their student numbers had made it easier to identify affected learners to rectify the issue and eliminate the risk at an early stage. • In light of the particular risk to more vulnerable learners, and mindful of the Public Sector Equality Duty, management was taking steps to ensure that key information about support services, including counselling, was more effectively communicated at induction. • Engineering and Science & Access had been flagged as areas to watch, having received relatively lower scores for learner satisfaction. PH highlighted that, since 2018/19, Engineering scores had improved, whereas those for Science and Access had declined. <p>Continuing dissatisfaction with the College’s canteens and the cleanliness of the campus was noted but was not felt to be concerning from the strategic perspective. The Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Group was monitoring the inclusivity of the food offer. There was agreement that lower learner satisfaction scores in Alternative Provision were partly to be expected, given the nature of the provision and the small number of learners.</p> <p>Assistant Principal Ms P Harrow said the Survey did not really capture students’ personal and social development and the College was looking at new data capture methods, including at software designed for schools which sought to measure emotional and personal development. There was discussion about the need to fully recognise and celebrate the College’s strengths in terms of the emotional and practical support it provided to learners.</p> <p>Corporation report: The Term 1 Student Experience Survey results are pleasing. Learner satisfaction remains high overall and in most areas and there are no concerns to report. The survey results were highly reflective of other assurance sources, so there will be no surprises for Governors in terms of where the scoring was lower. Engineering and Science & Access scored slightly less well than other curriculum areas, while concerns persisted around campus safety and quality of canteen facilities (both issues were already being addressed). Some changes to the survey content and delivery yielded an improved response rate as well as a more streamlined process. The survey, always a useful risk control, has already enabled targeted intervention for ‘at risk’ learners and flagged areas requiring either</p> | <p>Report Item 3</p> |
|---|---|----------------------|

| Item | Action/ Report Item | |
|--|--|---------------|
| 1632 | <p>more resource or a new approach. By way of example, additional work will now be done to mitigate the risk that communication gaps on induction may leave learners (particularly more vulnerable learners) without access to support services such as counselling.</p> <p><i>Ms L Precious left the meeting.</i></p> | |
| FE CURRICULUM DESIGN AND INTENT | | |
| 5 | <p>CURRICULUM UPDATE</p> <p>i PH reported on risks arising from the transition from apprenticeship frameworks to standards, the Committee noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Doing away with, for example, some level 2 programmes and subsuming them into longer level 3 programmes, has created a barrier for prospective learners/employers who could not commit the time, putting apprenticeship recruitment at risk; ➤ Large gaps in pathways could be a further deterrent, as those wishing to progress would need to commit to a higher level apprenticeship with several years of study, a high cost and with no incremental qualifications; ➤ As some new standards lacked adequate funding, it would not be viable to run them, for example the new standard Plastering apprenticeship was a level 2 qualification completed over 3 years with funding of £10k over 3 years; ➤ Requiring apprentices to achieve a maths and English qualification either before or during the programme could cause employers to drive non-completion, as they may not see the value in achieving the English or maths if their employee has achieved the desired level of competence in the required vocational skills. <p>ii Members were pleased to hear from MG that leaders within the sector had been voicing their shared concerns about the implications of the changes, both to Government decision-makers and influencers such as the Skills Commission². MG was encouraged to continue to add her voice to the conversation.</p> <p>iii Although the Committee recognised that the risks were largely outside their control, it was agreed that Governors should nonetheless seek a better understanding of the changes, in light of the potential impact on College learners and the College's ambition to expand its level 4 and 5 apprenticeship offer.</p> <p>iv Corporation report: The Committee discussed risks arising from changes effected by the transition from apprenticeship frameworks to standards. The risks largely arise from the creation of gaps in vocational pathways, resulting in many learners having to sign up to higher level, longer and more expensive programmes than they would ideally like. This is expected to impact on college recruitment and retention nationally. There are also risks around standards that are inadequately funded and which the College will not be able to offer. While there is little Governors can do to influence the national agenda, it would be prudent to spend some time ensuring that the full Corporation is up to speed on the impact of the changes and what they mean for our learners and our ambitions as a business.</p> | Report Item 4 |
| HE REPORT | | |
| 6 | <p>HIGHER EDUCATION AND SKILLS REPORT</p> <p>(1) <u>Access and Participation Plan</u></p> <p>i The College's <i>Access and Participation Plan</i> (the "Plan") had received Director for</p> | |

² The Skills Commission is an independent body comprising of leading figures from across the education sector that meets every month in Parliament to discuss important issues in skills, training and further education policy.

| Item | | Action/ Report Item |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| ii | <p>Fair Access and Participation approval. PF reminded Members of the detail of the Plan and outlined the relevant requirements of the Office for Students (“OfS”) going forwards. Members agreed to report to the Corporation as follows:</p> <p>Corporation report: The College’s Access and Participation Plan (the “Plan”), which was approved retrospectively at the July 2019 Corporation meeting, has been accepted by the Office for Students (“OfS”). It is expected to automatically roll over each year until 2024. Commencing January 2022, the College must produce an annual access and participation impact report for submission to the OfS. According to the Plan, the Quality, Performance & Standards Committee is responsible for monitoring its implementation, with support from the Higher Education Student Consultative Committee. It is recommended that Terms of Reference be amended to reflect this.</p> | Report Item 5 |
| iii | <p>Action: Clerk to diarise the approval of the first (January 2022) access and participation impact report as a Corporation Agenda item and to add monitoring the Access and Participation Plan to the Committee’s work schedule.</p> | JG |
| iv | <p>(2) <u>Office for Students Registration</u></p> <p>PF reported on compliance with the two conditions imposed by the OfS in registering the College on the register of English higher education providers. She said the requirement to supply further information to support the student protection plan had been satisfied, whereas the second concerned the College’s financial situation and engagement with the OfS in this regard would continue, to mitigate the risk to the College’s registration.</p> <p>(3) <u>Teaching Excellence Framework</u></p> | |
| v | <p>It was noted that a new Teaching Excellence Framework was in development but would not be implemented this academic year.</p> <p>(4) <u>Student Voice</u></p> | |
| vi | <p>PF updated Members on actions in response to student feedback and reported on the student voice course committee meetings, which had yielded positive feedback.</p> | |
| GOVERNANCE | | |
| 7 | <p>31 JANUARY 2020 QUALITY TASK & FINISH GROUP REPORT</p> <p>i As the meeting had been deferred due to staff illness, there was no report.</p> | |
| 8 | <p>QUALITY PERFORMANCE & STANDARDS COMMITTEE REMIT AND APPROACH</p> <p>i MG led a discussion about how the Corporation might respond to the Further Education Commissioner’s recommendation that Governors continue to give priority and attention to quality improvement. Her report contained advice from the Clerk on compliance and set out a series of recommendations as to how the Corporation might approach quality improvement from a governance perspective.</p> <p>ii Following discussion, Members instructed as follows:</p> <p>iii Action: Quality Task Group shall undertake a review of its Terms of Reference and recommend revisions to the Committee, which shall then undertake a similar task.</p> <p>iv Action: The HE Manager Zulakha Desai shall lead on a review of HE governance and report on recommendations to the Committee Chair.</p> | <p>QTG</p> <p>ZD</p> |

| Item | | Action/ Report Item |
|---|--|------------------------|
| v | Action: The Committee Chair, with the Vice Principal Curriculum and the Assistant Principal Safeguarding and Inclusion, shall review reporting on Safeguarding. | CG, CGE, PH |
| vi | Action: The Vice Principal Curriculum shall ensure that reports to the Committee originate at SLT wherever possible. | CGE |
| vii | Action: The core agenda items for the Committee shall be: quality improvement plan; celebrating success and good practice; and impact of safeguarding and learner support on quality. | JG, Chair |
| viii | Action: The Vice Principal Curriculum and the Committee Chair shall consider ways to encourage more Governor involvement with curriculum areas. | CGE, Chair |
| ix | Corporation Report: The Committee agreed to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the Corporation's quality governance arrangements. While there is no desire for radical change, it is clear that there are opportunities to do things differently, adding more value and making a more meaningful contribution to the work of the Corporation. The Committee will keep the Corporation updated on progress. | Report Item 6 |
| MATTERS TO NOTE AND ADMINISTRATION | | |
| 9 | GOVERNOR INVOLVEMENT i The Clerk reported as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The College Outstanding Learner Success Awards dinner was well attended, with a number of Governors in attendance; and• AW had been working with management on developing a new approach to measuring progress. | |
| 10 | PUBLICATION OF PAPERS i <u>RESOLVED:</u> (i) To the extent that they are not marked confidential, the Committee's previous minutes should be made available for publication. All other papers, including the report for Item 8 on the remit of the Committee, to remain confidential subject to review, on the basis that (per clause 17(2)(d) of the Instrument of Government, they are deemed to be matters which, by reason of their nature, should be dealt with on a confidential basis. It was noted that the quality improvement plan was a draft, a final version of which would eventually be published more widely. | |
| 11 | DATE OF NEXT MEETING i Monday 30 March 2020, 14.30 dependant on diaries, otherwise 3pm. As Ms C George was due to be away from 16 March for a fortnight and had given apologies for the next meeting, it was agreed that AW would take the chair in her absence. | |
| 0 | There being no further business the meeting ended at 17.25. | |

Items of Report for Corporation

| # | Details | Minute |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | The Committee is developing a good understanding of the new Student Progress Checks process, which it considers is adding value. It looks forward to observing it in practice when Governors accompany managers on the next round of visits. It has been interesting to see how the process feeds into the overall quality improvement process. Although it is relatively early in the year, there are positive indicators that learners are making good progress compared to previous cohorts. Management is looking into an issue of non-compliance in the inputting of results. | 4(xiii) |
| 2. | The Committee discussed the draft quality improvement plan (“QIP”), which will support the delivery of the quality strategy. Following the discussion, it asked the Quality Task Group to work with the management team to further develop and refine the QIP, so that the Corporation may take stronger assurance from the management reports that flow from it. The management report against the draft version was pleasing in that it highlighted indicators of progress in several areas for improvement ahead of target dates. | 3(xi) |
| 3. | The Term 1 Student Experience Survey results are pleasing. Learner satisfaction remains high overall and in most areas and there are no concerns to report. The survey results were highly reflective of other assurance sources, so there will be no surprises for Governors in terms of where the scoring was lower. Engineering and Science & Access scored slightly less well than other curriculum areas, while concerns persisted around campus safety and quality of canteen facilities (both issues were already being addressed). Some changes to the survey content and delivery yielded an improved response rate as well as a more streamlined process. The survey, always a useful risk control, has already enabled targeted intervention for ‘at risk’ learners and flagged areas requiring either more resource or a new approach. By way of example, additional work will now be done to mitigate the risk that communication gaps on induction may leave learners (particularly more vulnerable learners) without access to support services such as counselling. | 4(v) |
| 4. | The Committee discussed risks arising from changes effected by the transition from apprenticeship frameworks to standards. The risks largely arise from the creation of gaps in vocational pathways, resulting in many learners having to sign up to higher level, longer and more expensive programmes than they would ideally like. This is expected to impact on college recruitment and retention nationally. There are also risks around standards that are inadequately funded and which the College will not be able to offer. While there is little Governors can do to influence the national agenda, it would be prudent to spend some time ensuring that the full Corporation is up to speed on the impact of the changes and what they mean for our learners and our ambitions as a business. | 5(iv) |
| 5. | The College’s Access and Participation Plan (the “Plan”), which was approved retrospectively at the July 2019 Corporation meeting, has been accepted by the Office for Students (“OfS”). It is expected to automatically roll over each year until 2024. Commencing January 2022, the College must produce an annual access and participation impact report for submission to the OfS. According to the Plan, the Quality, Performance & Standards Committee is responsible for monitoring its implementation, with support from the Higher Education Student Consultative Committee. It is recommended that Terms of Reference be amended to reflect this. | 6(ii) |
| 6. | The Committee agreed to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the Corporation’s quality governance arrangements. While there is no desire for radical change, it is clear that there are opportunities to do things differently, adding more value and making a more meaningful contribution to the work of the Corporation. The Committee will keep the Corporation updated on progress. | 8(ix) |