

Kirklees College Corporation

QUALITY, PERFORMANCE & STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held from 15.00 to 17.30 on 9 December 19 at the Huddersfield Centre

Present: Cristina George Member (Chair)
 Stephen Donnelly Member
 Marie Gilluley Member (Executive)
 Gerard Hetherington Member
 Lydia Precious Member
 Nick Taylor Member
 Sue Weston Member
 Andy Williams Member

Attendance: 8/8 = 100% KPI 80% Quorum: 3

In attendance: Ms J Arechiga Assistant Principal - Study Programmes/Learner Services
 Ms C Gonzalez-Eslava Vice Principal - Curriculum, Performance & Innovation
 Ms P Firth Assistant Principal - Adults & Higher Education
 Ms J Green Clerk to the Corporation
 Ms P Harrow Assistant Principal - Safeguarding and Inclusion
 Ms P Hughes Assistant Principal - Quality/Apprenticeship Provision
 Mr P Stacey Adult Learning Improvement Network Observer

Item	Action/ Report Item
PRELIMINARY ITEMS	
0	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
i	The Chair welcomed Mr P Stacey ("PS") of the Adult Learning Improvement Network, who had been engaged by the College to provide external input to the Self-Assessment Report ("SAR") validation. PS explained that he was an ex HMI Inspector and had worked for several years in the Further Education ("FE") sector, including with institutions that had experienced the new Ofsted inspection.
ii	Due notice having been given and a quorum being present, the Chair declared the meeting open.
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
i	There were no apologies.
ii	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 14 OCTOBER MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING
i	<u>RESOLVED:</u> (i) To approve the minutes of 14 October 2019 as an accurate record.

Item	Action/ Report Item
ii iii iv v vi vii	<p><u>Matters arising not on the Agenda</u></p> <p>No matters were raised that were not on the Agenda.</p> <p><u>Update on Agreed Actions</u></p> <p>Progress against the actions agreed at the previous meeting was noted as follows:</p> <p><u>Student Success Performance targets:</u> A report had been presented to the Corporation as requested and the proposed targets had been approved.</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 some research into systems and data capture, and transition and individualised programmes. The work had started and the conversation so far had been very positive. This was an ongoing action, which would rollover into the next period.</p> <p>Action (rolled over): The Senior Leadership Team to explore the possibility of collaboration with the Local Authority and Huddersfield University to commission research into systems and data capture and transition and individualised programmes.</p> <p><u>Quality Improvement Plan (“QIP”) Template:</u> This would be presented at Item 4.</p>
STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING	
3 i ii iii iv v	<p>SAR VALIDATION</p> <p>The Chair noted that validation of the SAR was part of the Committee’s monitoring role and pursuant to the <i>Code of Good Governance for English Colleges</i>, the Committee must advise the Corporation whether the SAR was benchmarked against national norms and sufficiently detailed to provide the assurance Governors needed that the learning experience was being monitored and that appropriate learning resources had been made available.</p> <p>With the Chair’s consent, an additional paper was shared: an overview of the new Education Inspection Framework (“EIF”), against which the SAR was benchmarked.</p> <p><u>Overall Effectiveness: Management Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Vice Principal, Carmen Gonzalez-Eslava (“CGE”) presented the SAR and the Committee discussed it, referring to the independent expert PS for input.</p> <p>The management recommendation, following a series of validation panels, was that the College should grade itself “Good” for overall effectiveness against the EIF. CGE said while there was still work to do to get to where Governors wished to be, vocational achievements had improved by +4% for Young People and +1% for Adults; and although maths and English achievements had brought down the overall achievement rate, it was important to bear in mind the context of the high proportion of students doing English and maths compared to the overall student population (51% of 16-18 enrolments were for English and maths) and the extremely low entry points of those students (just 25% of the 2017-18 16-18 intake had gained an English and maths grade 4 or above at school, compared to 64% of all Kirklees school leavers). In addition, the 2018-19 SAR had been benchmarked against a new national framework, which gave less priority to achievement rates and more priority to curriculum quality and progress.</p> <p>Members, who had read the SAR in detail and had been involved in validation panels,</p>

	<p>acknowledged the case for self-assessing as “Good” but cautioned that, without context, some of the wider Corporation membership might struggle to grasp in what sense the College had improved when overall achievement was in line with 2017-18. There was discussion about the need to include an executive summary in future reports and it was agreed that the Committee would need to clearly articulate the case for a “Good” grade if it chose to follow the management advice. CGE was asked to ensure that the Corporation received a summary report, similar to the one prepared for the Committee. She said this was already in train.</p>	
vi	<p>The SAR included a Profile section, which explained in some detail the College context, particularly in terms of the low starting points of many learners and the additional challenges they faced. Members offered suggestions for future reporting on this, saying it would be beneficial to include prior attainment data for other subjects (as well as maths and English) and, if the College had access to Progress 8 scores, this would be a powerful indicator to include.</p>	
vii	<p>PS was asked to comment on the SAR’s high-level findings. He said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SAR was sufficiently detailed in that it adequately described the curriculum structure and the learner demographic, and included adequate evidence of a positive learning experience and a good overall standard of education and training being provided (outstanding in the case of High Needs provision); • The College should explore the reasons for low retention, particularly on adult programmes, considering whether the minimum viability of courses might be a factor in learners placed on the wrong courses; • Some reworking of the “key improvements” section of the SAR would better convey the sense of a ‘college on the move’ (page 10 of the SAR); • In terms of student behaviour, a greater focus on measurements, such as staff and student survey feedback, employer feedback, numbers of serious incidents and exclusions, etc. rather than strategies, would enrich the reporting; • Personal development was such a strength that it possibly deserved to be graded ‘outstanding’. Much hard work was being put in to preparing learners for the next stages of their lives and the College was rightly recognised locally as being excellent at this. <p><u>Key Judgements</u></p> <p><u>Quality of Education - Management recommendation: “Good”</u></p>	
viii	<p>Members considered the management recommendation and agreed that the case for awarding a “Good” grade had been made. There was discussion about the concept of “curriculum intent”, with members noting that this would be an area of focus going forwards, due to its prominence in the EIF and the expectation that governing bodies be able to articulate the curriculum intent of their institutions and describe how it is achieved. There was agreement that the alignment of the curriculum with local needs was a College strength, there being an appropriate range of level 1 and 2 provision in response to low levels education of local residents. Members were pleased to hear that blended learning was enhancing the learner experience substantially.</p>	
ix	<p>It was noted that the labour market information included in the SAR was the latest available.</p> <p><u>Behaviour and Attitudes – Management Recommendation: “Good”</u></p>	
x	<p>While acknowledging PS’s advice that including more evidence for the impact of behaviour strategies (numbers of exclusions, attendance data, numbers of complaints of bullying, harassment and discrimination, etc.) would strengthen the</p>	

	<p>College's case, the Committee agreed that it was appropriate to grade this area "Good", based on the data provided and Members' own experience of the College through student surveys, management reports, and serving on sub-committees.</p> <p><u>Personal Development – Management Recommendation: "Good"</u></p>	
xi	<p>There was discussion about whether the College should be graded "Outstanding" in this area, or "Good with Outstanding features". CGE said the only barrier as she saw it was around adequately evidencing the judgement; the College needed to be more strategic in gathering evidence of its success. There was agreement that the "Good" grade should stand in the expectation that it would be improved on the following year.</p> <p><u>Leadership and Management – Management Recommendation: "Good"</u></p>	
xii	<p>There was agreement that Leadership and Management had been significantly strengthened since the 2017/18 report, which graded the area "Requires Improvement". The restructure of the senior leadership team was complete, with a full contingent of managers in place.</p>	
xiii	<p>Members agreed that the new senior leadership team was effective and had a good understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the College. A member commented that the high degree of transparency and lack of surprises were indicators of good leadership and management.</p> <p><u>Provision Types</u></p> <p><u>Education Programmes for Young People – Management Recommendation: "Good"</u></p>	
xiv	<p>All were agreed that the provision was "good", notwithstanding the impact of English and maths achievements. Members noted the +4% increase in vocational achievements and that the majority of curriculum areas were rated either "outstanding" or "good". Assistant Principal Ms J Arechiga ("JA") said areas requiring improvement such as construction and engineering had made progress from the previous year. There had been a big decline in maths, an area of teacher shortage, and this would feature in the quality improvement plan.</p> <p><u>Adult Programmes - Management Recommendation: "Requires Improvement"</u></p>	
xv	<p>Following discussion, the management recommendation was accepted. Assistant Principal Ms P Firth ("PF") said, until the College saw the impact of the strategies and initiatives she had implemented, she was confident that "Requires Improvement" was the right judgement. She said retention of adults remained an issue, mainly in English and maths and some ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) courses, and although it was possible to evidence some progress in-year, Ofsted advice was that in-year data should not be taken into account.</p> <p><u>Apprenticeships – Management Recommendation: "Good"</u></p>	
xvi	<p>Assistant Principal Ms P Hughes ("PH") said the College had a good quality offer that was well mapped to the skills market and had grown significantly over the last three years thanks to a highly effective programme of employer engagement.</p>	
xvii	<p>A dip in achievement rates was discussed. PH said this was almost entirely due to the performance of a subcontractor that the College had decided to stop working with.</p>	
xviii	<p>It was agreed that the apprenticeship performance data must be looked at in context: the achievement rate for internal apprenticeships (over two-thirds of the provision)</p>	

Item		Action/ Report Item
	<p>was good at 68%, in line with 2017-18 and national rates and the College was significantly reducing its reliance on subcontractors. The qualification achievement rate (QAR) data was not yet available and the national average was expected to drop. On that basis, the Committee approved the management assessment.</p>	
	<p><u>High Needs Provision – Management Recommendation: “Outstanding”</u></p>	
xix	<p>Members congratulated management on the quality of the high needs provision, agreeing that the case for an “Outstanding” grade was very sound. In discussion about learner progression, the need to meet individual needs was highlighted. PS said management might enhance the provision further by focusing in even greater detail on individualised learning.</p>	
xx	<p>There being no further questions or comments, the Committee resolved as follows:</p>	
xxi	<p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p>	
	<p>(i) To recommend the College Self-Assessment Report to the Corporation for approval subject to any changes agreed at the Corporation meeting, and to recommend the management grade judgements contained therein.</p>	
	<p>(ii) To report to the Corporation as follows:</p>	
xxii	<p>Corporation report: The 2018-19 College Self-Assessment Report (“SAR”) is benchmarked against the new Education Inspection Framework (“EIF”) using grade descriptors set out in the EIF Further Education & Skills Inspection Handbook. As such, Governors may be satisfied that it is benchmarked against national norms as required by the Code of Good Governance for English Colleges. Those who attended the 23 September training session on the EIF and/or have since completed online training will recall that, in the new framework, more emphasis is placed on the substance of education, with the removal of the ‘outcomes’ judgement and more importance given to learner progress from starting points, with the introduction of a new ‘quality of education’ judgment, focussing on curriculum intent, implementation and impact.</p>	Report Item 1
xxiii	<p>Corporation report: The validation of the SAR was supported by an external expert: a former HMI Inspector, engaged by the College to provide a degree of external input. With his advice, the Committee agreed that the SAR was sufficiently detailed and that the various management judgements were adequately supported by evidence. The Corporation may be satisfied that the SAR provides the assurance Governors need in terms of the monitoring of the learning experience and the availability of appropriate learning resources.</p>	Report Item 2
xxiv	<p>Corporation report: The Committee made comments and suggestions regarding the SAR, which management will not have time to consider in detail before the 13 December Corporation meeting. All changes will therefore be incorporated into a final version of the report, produced thereafter.</p>	Report Item 3
xxv	<p>Corporation report: Subject to the comments made at the Committee’s 9 December meeting and recorded in the minutes, the Committee recommends the SAR for Corporation approval and agrees with the management grade judgements.</p>	Report Item 4
xxvi	<p>The business of validation being complete, the Chair thanked the management team for their hard work in producing the SAR and PS for his contributions.</p>	
1650	<p><i>Mr P Stacey left the meeting.</i></p>	

Item	Action/ Report Item
<p>4</p> <p>i</p> <p>ii</p> <p>iii</p> <p>iv</p> <p>1710</p>	<p>QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN: UPDATE</p> <p>Members commended the new format Quality Improvement Plan (“QIP”), noting that the changes were intended to reflect sector best practice and enable the College leadership to better measure the impact and effectiveness of actions taken in-year.</p> <p>The ‘front page overview’ and a worked example of an objective were discussed. Members emphasised the need to adopt longer-term thinking, as it might take years to see the impact of new practices. Incremental reviews/milestones might be needed.</p> <p>There was discussion about the need to show a clear link between the SAR and the QIP and JA suggested that an “evidence” column could be included alongside “What we need to do”, cross referencing the relevant section of the SAR, departmental ‘Deep Dive’ report, customer feedback form, etc.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) Subject to agreed changes as minuted, to approve the new format Quality Improvement Plan.</p> <p><i>Ms P Harrow left the meeting.</i></p>
MONITORING	
<p>7</p> <p>i</p> <p>ii</p> <p>iii</p> <p>iv</p> <p>1725</p>	<p>HIGHER EDUCATION AND SKILLS UPDATE</p> <p>With the Committee’s consent, this item was taken out of time.</p> <p>Appendix 3 to the College SAR had contained information about the performance of Higher Education (“HE”) and Skills, despite the area being subject to separate regulation and inspection. Members were pleased to note that, according to the outcome of the Annual Provider Monitoring Review, the College continued to meet quality and standards requirements. Management was congratulated on a successful year for student achievement and retention; and on high levels of student satisfaction with both the resourcing of teaching and learning and the quality of teaching.</p> <p>The need for growth was emphasised and PF presented an update on progress against the Higher Skills Growth Action Plan, warning that progress had been too slow to date and progression levels were not strong. There was discussion about progression pathways and CGE identified that she planned to do some work with the local university on this, hopefully involving them to a greater extent in careers advice. Committee Member Stephen Donnelly, declaring a conflict of interests as an employee of Huddersfield University, said he would be happy to assist the College in making connections, which would be beneficial to both institutions.</p> <p>Corporation report: According to the outcome of the Annual Provider Monitoring Review, the College continues to meet quality and standards requirements.</p> <p><i>Ms P Firth left the meeting.</i></p>
POLICY AND PROCEDURE REVIEWS	
<p>4A</p> <p>i</p> <p>ii</p>	<p>COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLAINTS POLICY</p> <p>PH presented the Compliments and Complaints policy and procedure, intended to apply to students (including HE students), parents (where appropriate), customers purchasing a service from the College, visitors and members of the local community.</p> <p>Members were pleased to see that the policy included arrangements for complaints monitoring and analysis: a termly report of complaints to be considered by the Senior Leadership Team and an annual report by the Quality, Performance and Standards</p>

Item		Action/ Report Item
	Committee - in line with the Code of Good Governance for English Colleges guidance on policies, systems and the student voice.	
iii	A Member highlighted the need for the Procedure to address possible complaints against the Principal and it was agreed that the document should be amended to provide that any such complaints should be referred to the Corporation Chair via the Clerk, with relevant contact details.	
iv	<u>RESOLVED:</u>	
	(i) To recommend to the Corporation that the Compliments and Complaints policy and procedure should be adopted and implemented, subject to the change prescribed by the Committee (addition of a mechanism to deal with complaints concerning the Principal).	
v	Corporation report: The Committee recommends the Compliments and Complaints policy and procedure for Corporation approval, subject to the addition of a mechanism to deal with complaints concerning the Principal.	Report Item 6
MONITORING		
5	FURTHER EDUCATION COMMISSIONER STOCKTAKE VISIT	
i	It was noted that the report had not yet been received.	
6	CURRICULUM UPDATE	
i	Members discussed the report, noting as follows:	
ii	<u>Impact of Quality Initiatives: Structural Changes to English and Maths</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restructure was intended to yield more effective oversight of the quality and inclusivity of the learning experience. Some management capacity risk would persist until the new Head of Faculty joined the team in January 2020; • Training for new Maths and English Leads on carrying out walk-throughs would enable them to become an integral part of the Quality progress check model; and • Timetables for English and maths within study programmes had changed in response to learner feedback. 	
iii	<u>Impact of Quality Initiatives: Structural Changes to Engineering and Science</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All roles were now filled and a recovery plan for the Faculty was being monitored; • As previously reported, the number of complaints was reducing and swift and professional resolution of complaints received was becoming the norm; • Risks around staffing levels to meet delivery demands persisted but significant progress had been made, with 11 out of 15 vacancies now filled; 	
iv	<u>Monitoring the effectiveness of the Student Progress Check Framework</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Student Progress Check process was on target in terms of timeline: management expected to visit +90% of teaching staff by the end of December; • All departments would have a Student Progress Check by the end of January; • A full review would take place at the end of the first term; • 87% of lesson visit judgements to date were 'meeting standards' or better; • Key areas of improvement identified through the 'Deep Dives' process would inform departmental quality improvement plans. Revisits would take place in the second or third term to check progress. 	

Item		Action/ Report Item
v	Corporation Report: The new Student Progress Check process is progressing on schedule and a review will take place at the end of term. To date, 87% of lesson visit judgements have been identified as 'meeting standards' or better.	Report Item 7
8	<p>ED&I GROUP MINUTES 3 DECEMBER 2019</p> <p>i The minutes were received and the Principal Marie Gilluley ("MG") highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A draft Single Equality, Diversity, Inclusiveness and Belonging Scheme and Action Plan 2019-2022 (SEDIBSAP) would shortly go to Corporation; and • Student complaints about College catering in terms of inclusivity and accessibility had still not been resolved. <p>ii It was agreed that there was nothing of note to report to the Corporation.</p>	
9	<p>GOVERNOR INVOLVEMENT</p> <p>i The Clerk reported as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Student Union had notified her of the nominee Student Governors. Both would be at Corporation on Friday. One had recently attended the national Student Governors Conference and day one of the AoC Conference. • Corporation Chair Gerard Hetherington ("GH") and Executive Governor MG had attended the AoC Conference, as well as the Yorkshire & Humber Chairs & Principals forum. • Several Governors took part in the SAR course validations. • GH and Committee Chair Ms C George attended a 'Takeover Day' event at Huddersfield Town Football Club. • Several Governors would be attending the College's COLs award evening. 	
10	<p>FINANCIAL RECOVERY: IMPACT ON QUALITY – DISCUSSION</p> <p>i There was discussion about whether this standing agenda item was still required. It was felt not to be; MG said the focus had moved away from financial recovery to ongoing day to day management of finances and this was agreed.</p>	
ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS		
11	<p>PUBLICATION OF PAPERS</p> <p>i <u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) The Committee's previous minutes, together with those of the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Group, should be made available for publication. All other papers 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 SAR and the Compliments and Complaints Policy and Procedure were drafts, a final version of which would eventually be published more widely.</p>	
MATTERS TO NOTE		
12	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>i Monday 3 February 2019, 15.00</p>	
0	There being no further business the meeting ended at 17.55.	

Items of Report for Corporation

#	Details	Minute
1.	The 2018-19 College Self-Assessment Report (“SAR”) is benchmarked against the new Education Inspection Framework (“EIF”) using grade descriptors set out in the EIF Further Education & Skills Inspection Handbook. As such, Governors may be satisfied that it is benchmarked against national norms as required by the Code of Good Governance for English Colleges. Those who attended the 23 September training session on the EIF and/or have since completed online training will recall that, in the new framework, more emphasis is placed on the substance of education, with the removal of the ‘outcomes’ judgement and more importance given to learner progress from starting points, with the introduction of a new ‘quality of education’ judgment, focussing on curriculum intent, implementation and impact.	3 (xxii)
2.	The validation of the SAR was supported by an external expert: a former HMI Inspector, engaged by the College to provide a degree of external input. With his advice, the Committee agreed that the SAR was sufficiently detailed and that the various management judgements were adequately supported by evidence. The Corporation may be satisfied that the SAR provides the assurance Governors need in terms of the monitoring of the learning experience and the availability of appropriate learning resources.	3 (xxiii)
3.	The Committee made comments and suggestions regarding the SAR, which management will not have time to consider in detail before the 13 December Corporation meeting. All changes will therefore be incorporated into a final version of the report, produced thereafter.	3 (xxiv)
4.	Subject to the comments made at the Committee’s 9 December meeting and recorded in the minutes, the Committee recommends the SAR for Corporation approval and agrees with the management grade judgements.	3 (xxv)
5.	According to the outcome of the Annual Provider Monitoring Review, the College continues to meet quality and standards requirements.	7(iv)
6.	The Committee recommends the Compliments and Complaints policy and procedure for Corporation approval, subject to the addition of a mechanism to deal with complaints concerning the Principal.	4A (v)
7.	The new Student Progress Check process is progressing on schedule and a review will take place at the end of term. To date, 87% of lesson visit judgements have been identified as ‘meeting standards’ or better.	6 (v)