

Kirklees College Corporation

QUALITY, PERFORMANCE & STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held at 15.00 on 30 November 2020 via Microsoft Teams videoconference

Present:	Dr A Williams Prof S Donnelly Ms C George Ms M Gilluley Mr G Hetherington Ms L Precious Mr N Taylor	Independent Member (Chair) Independent Member Independent Member Principal & Chief Executive Independent Member Staff Member Staff Member
Attendance:	7/7 = 100%	KPI 80% Quorum: 3
In Attendance:	Ms J Arechiga Mr H Aslam Ms M Carabine Ms C Gonzalez-Eslava Ms P Firth Ms J Green Mr S Harrison Ms P Harrow Ms P Hughes Dr P Mark Mr J Williams	Asst Principal - Study Programmes & Learner Services Student Governor Observer Independent Governor Observer (from 16.15) Vice Principal Curriculum Asst Principal - Adults & Higher Education Clerk to the Corporation Head of Quality, TLA, HE and Teacher Education Asst Principal – Student Experience (from 15.55) Asst Principal - Quality/Apprenticeship Provision External Expert Independent Governor Observer (from 16.15)

Item	Action/ Report Item
PRELIMINARY ITEMS	
0	NOTICE AND QUORUM
i	The Clerk said due notice of the meeting had been given; the requirement for all participants to be able to communicate with one another was satisfied and the meeting, initiated from the home address of the Committee Chair, was quorate.
0	PRESENTATION: NAVIGATE SOFTWARE
i	A short demonstration of the Navigate software was given by Progress Coach Mr S Patel ("SP") who had been responsible for embedding Navigate across the College.
ii	Members agreed that the demonstration had been informative and that a more in-depth session should be arranged for Governors. SP said he had a Powerpoint presentation about the Navigate software that he could share with the Committee.
iii	Action: To send the Navigate Powerpoint presentation to the Clerk for circulation.
	SP
	<i>15.15 Mr S Patel left the meeting.</i>
1	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
i	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular Student Governor Hash Aslam, attending as an observer, and Kirklees Council's Post 16 and Progression

Item		Action/ Report Item
	Head of Service Dr P Mark ("PM"), who would be providing independent input to the Self-Assessment Report ("SAR") validation. Introductions were made.	
2	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>i There were no apologies.</p> <p>ii Everyone 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.</p>	
3	<p>MINUTES OF THE 5 OCTOBER 2020 MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) To approve the minutes of 5 October 2020 as an accurate record.</p> <p><u>Matters arising not on the Agenda</u></p> <p>ii No matters were raised that were not on the Agenda.</p> <p>iii The Committee was updated on agreed actions as follows:</p> <p>iv <u>2018/19 performance data with English and maths results omitted:</u> This had been actioned.</p> <p>v <u>Baseline assessments for the 2020/21 maths and English cohorts:</u> Assistant Principal Ms J Arechiga ("JA") said, although the College had rolled out the bksb Initial Assessments, there had been some teething problems, mostly technological, and so far only 32% of learners had done them. She explained what steps had been taken to check starting points and measure learners progress in the absence of bksb scores, saying staff had worked with learners on a one-to-one basis to determine start points and set targets, recording them on Pro-Monitor. Management had also carried out an in year assessment diagnostic in September with a 65% completion rate; the next one was due to start in a week's time.</p> <p>vi <u>Century Tech Learning Platform Account Governor Sign-up:</u> This had been actioned.</p> <p>vii <u>Demonstration of the Navigate Software:</u> This had been actioned.</p>	
4	<p>COVID-19 IMPACT UPDATE</p> <p>i Vice Principal Curriculum Ms C Gonzalez-Eslava ("CGE") gave a verbal update on the pandemic impact, the latest government guidance, and the College response.</p> <p>ii Like other providers, the College was confronting engagement and attendance issues, especially in English and maths. Many learners were both ill-equipped to engage and choosing not to engage, having had little formal education since March and many had been awarded overinflated grades, so were finding the transition to College and online learning a challenge. There were no easy solutions. Members were pleased to hear that making more laptops available and extending the Learning Resource Centres' opening hours was having a positive impact.</p> <p>iii Unfortunately, staff absences, for reasons such as school bubbles bursting, or having to self-isolate, were putting pressure on curriculum areas. The Senior Leadership Team ("SLT") was supporting managers with regular catch-ups and having weekly meetings with the trade unions.</p>	

Item	Action/ Report Item	
iv	<p>PM said the Local Authority was pleased with the levels of engagement the College was achieving, as well as the comparatively low numbers of confirmed coronavirus cases within the College. He asked whether CGE could indicate when learners with Education, Health and Care plans¹ might be substantially returned to face-to-face education and CGE said management had just completed a comprehensive data exercise and would soon be in a position to share some relevant information.</p>	
MAIN ITEMS		
5 HIGHER EDUCATION & SKILLS REPORT		
i	<p>Assistant Principal Ms P Firth (“PF”) said the Higher Education (“HE”) Committee had met on 25 November. She reported as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Achievement was discussed. Significant self-assessment work was being undertaken, with individual teams looking at data. ‘Landscaping’ walkthroughs were planned, to check on the level of teaching and learning; ➤ The College was 51 HE learners short of target. It was hoped that the gap would close when more courses began in January. A marketing report relating to Pioneer was received; ➤ The HE student representative provided feedback, prompting discussion about the rigidity of assessment deadlines and the extent of remote working; ➤ The College Outreach Lead provided an update on initiatives the College was involved in, including through Go Higher West Yorkshire, as well as the work she was doing within College. She said learners at Pioneer were enthusiastic about the building, as well as the support they were receiving from staff. ➤ The College was maintaining its relationships with Sheffield Hallam and Lincoln Universities with a view to further joint working; ➤ The HE Committee had ascertained that the College remained compliant with the Office for Students (“OfS”) conditions of registration; in particular, its policies were up-to-date and compliant in line with conditions C1 and E. The College had fulfilled all data returns and the OfS had not responded with any concerns; ➤ The College was taking part in a pilot looking at access and participation and means testing and access and participation plan monitoring; and ➤ The HE Committee minutes would go to the 14 December Corporation meeting. 	
ii	<p>Corporation Report: The Committee received a report from Ms P Firth on behalf of the Higher Education (“HE”) Committee, which reported, among other things, that it had gained satisfactory assurance in terms of the College’s compliance with Office for Students conditions of registration. The Committee was satisfied that work was underway to continuously enhance the HE student experience.</p>	Report Item 1
5A HE LINK GOVERNOR ROLE DESCRIPTION		
i	<p>The Clerk presented the draft HE Link Governor role description, explaining that she had drawn from other colleges’ equivalent role descriptions, had consulted the Higher Education Code of Governance and the College’s May 2018 QAA report, and had liaised with senior leaders, as well as Independent Governor (Huddersfield University School of Computing & Engineering Dean) Prof S Donnelly.</p>	
ii	<p>Corporation report: The draft Higher Education Link Governor role description is recommended for approval.</p>	Report Item 2

¹ Education, health and care plans (EHCPs) have been designed to help children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), and set out how services will work to meet their needs.

Item		Action/ Report Item
6	<p>EQUALITY, DIVERSITY & INCLUSION STRATEGIC GROUP MINUTES</p> <p>i The minutes of the 12 October Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Group (the “Group”) meeting were presented and the Chair reminded Members of the Committee’s role in overseeing the Group’s work and reporting to the Corporation on its effectiveness.</p> <p>ii The Group Chair Mrs C George (“CG”) said the meeting had been productive and inspiring, attended by a good mix of Governors, Senior Leadership Team members, other staff, and a student.</p> <p>iii The Group had attended to some recommendations from the recent review of the effectiveness of the framework for reporting on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (“EDI”). In particular, it would be proposing new terms of reference to the Corporation on 14 December. The Clerk commented that the Group had done an impressive job of defining its purpose and drilling down to its key responsibilities. This was agreed.</p> <p>iv Corporation report: The Committee discussed the refreshed Terms of Reference for the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Group and recommends them to the Corporation for approval.</p> <p>v Other recommendations from the EDI review had also been progressed at the meeting. The Strategic Group received an assurance report on the implementation of the policy on the use of equality impact assessments, and a section at the end of the minutes identified items of report for the Corporation. The annual EDI report would be discussed at the Group’s next meeting in January, before going to Corporation for final approval.</p>	Report Item 3
7	<p>ANNUAL REPORT ON COMPLAINTS</p> <p>i The Head of Quality Mr S Harrison (“SH”) spoke to his paper, which set out the number, type and outcome of all complaints received during the 2019/20 academic year. There had been a small increase in the number of complaints received since the previous year, which SH attributed to changes to the complaints framework which had simplified the process for submitting complaints.</p> <p>ii In 2019/20 there had been 17 formal complaints of which 13 had been fully or partially upheld. SH said as some of the formal complaints could have been closed off at the informal stage, steps would be taken to further improve the College response. Members were pleased to hear that timeliness of resolution had improved since the previous year. In terms of the types of complaints received, SH said there were no surprises. Key themes were the quality of teaching, learning and assessment and support and poor communication, but none of the complaints raised concerns around quality, performance and standards. There had also been no complaints which raised EDI issues.</p> <p>iii Corporation report: The Committee received a summary report on the number and types of complaint (student and others) and how complaints were resolved. The Corporation may be satisfied that student complaints are effectively addressed.</p> <p><i>15.50 Ms P Harrow joined the meeting.</i></p>	
8	<p>ENRICHMENT</p> <p>i Assistant Principal Ms P Harrow (“PHa”) presented her report, which explained the intent of the College’s enrichment programme, linking it to the Ofsted Education Inspection Framework (“EIF”), the statutory guidance Keeping Children Safe in Education, and the Independent Commission on the College of the Future’s recent</p>	

Item		Action/ Report Item
ii	UK-wide report “The College of the Future”. She said the intent of the central enrichment programme was to build students’ confidence and resilience, offering a range of opportunities to deepen their understanding of fundamental British Values and develop their understanding of how to engage positively with society.	
ii	PHa described the actions the College was taking, in partnership with the Students Union, to support effective enrichment provision, including increasing opportunities for staff to access mental health training. A Member remarked positively on the range of extra-curricular activities on offer and asked if they were different this year due to COVID-19. PHa said the type of activities on offer had changed but this was mainly due to students’ interests broadening and tending towards socio-political and community issues.	
iii	Members were pleased to hear that, in consultation with vulnerable learner groups, specific activity was being planned and developed for learners facing barriers and obstacles to participation. A strong team was in place to support all the enrichment activities, including two University placement students and the College had rolled out very specific and focused staff training on relationships and sexual health.	
iv	The Committee discussed the challenge of measuring the impact of enrichment activity on personal and social development, acknowledging the Ofsted view that it may not be evident immediately and may not be seen for many years. There was agreement that the Navigate software, showcased at the beginning of the meeting, would help capture skills developed and reflective practice.	
v	Corporation report: The Committee received a report on the enrichment activities on offer to learners this year, gaining good assurance that the College was providing for all learners’ broader development, enabling them to develop and discover their talents and interests and preparing them for life in modern Britain.	Report Item 4
9	QUALITY TASK GROUP MINUTES	
i	The Quality Task Group (the “Group”) Chair Mr A Williams (“AW”) reported that the Group had received the final report from its Subgroup. Considerable work had been done through it to strengthen the framework for progress measurement, monitoring and reporting to stakeholders and, as it had substantially achieved what it had been set up to do, the Group had taken the decision to wind it up.	
ii	The Group was recommending that it too should be wound up and its activities absorbed into the Committee. AW said the Group had fulfilled its remit and hoped that, as a result of its efforts and those of management, the relationships between teachers and learners would be enhanced by a clearer understanding of where the student was at and at governance level there would be a clearer understanding of what progress learners were making in year, rather than looking back retrospectively. He said the Group had also made progress towards answering the question “what does good progress look like?” and had asked management to prepare a report for the March 2021 Committee meeting to support decision-making on how the conversation would be progressed.	
iii	Action: March Committee Agenda to include a report to support decision-making on how the conversation around progress, in particular what good progress looks like, would be progressed.	JG
iv	Members noted that, in the context of centre-based assessments replacing external assessments potentially this year as well as last year, the Group had withdrawn a request for a report to illustrate the importance of distinguishing wrong predictions from ineffective assessment processes. It had suggested that the Committee might	

Item	Action/ Report Item	
<p>v</p> <p>vi</p> <p>vii</p>	<p>wish to revisit this at some point in the future and this was noted.</p> <p>Assistant Principal Ms P Hughes (“PHu”) thanked the members of the Group and confirmed that the work it had started would continue, with reporting to the Committee and Corporation through the Quality Improvement Plan (“QIP”).</p> <p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) The Quality Task Group having fulfilled its remit, to wind it up.</p> <p>Corporation report: The Committee has wound up its Quality Task Group, as it deems it to have fulfilled its remit.</p>	<p>Report Item 5</p>
<p><i>16.00 A comfort break was taken. When the meeting resumed at 16.15, all re-joined and were joined by Independent Governors Mr J Williams and Ms M Carabine.</i></p>		
<p>10</p> <p>i</p> <p>ii</p> <p>iii</p> <p>iv</p>	<p>SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT VALIDATION</p> <p>The Chair noted that, 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 (it was benchmarked against the Education Inspection Framework (“EIF”) 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>CGE said following a highly unusual year, there had been questions around how to approach self-assessment. The Department for Education would not be publishing any national data for 2019/20 and Ofsted would be using the previous year’s data. In the circumstances, some colleges had decided to use the previous year’s data or not to produce a report at all, but the College had decided to, as much as possible, follow the usual process, taking the centre-assessed grades as the starting point and including an additional section (p10) describing the College’s response to the coronavirus to provide context. She said the centre-assessed grades had been calculated in line with the clear guidance from the awarding bodies and were felt to be very robust. The data showed an improvement in performance, with overall achievement increasing by 4.8% (+6.3% for 16-18), more or less in line with expectations.</p> <p><u>Overall Effectiveness: Management Recommendation</u></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. Members, who had read the SAR in detail before the meeting and had been involved in validation panels, acknowledged the case for self-assessing as “Good” overall but agreed that the Committee should examine each of the key judgements and discuss the aspect grades before reaching a final conclusion.</p> <p><u>Quality of Education - Management recommendation: “Good”</u></p> <p>Reminding Members of the College context in terms of the proportion of vulnerable and disadvantaged learner within the cohort and the relatively low starting points of many learners and drawing attention to the detail provided in the SAR, CGE said she strongly believed that the quality of education remained ‘Good’ across the majority of learning programmes. Speaking to slides, she highlighted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The College had responded well to the challenges of COVID-19; ➤ The majority of learners successfully completed their programmes and developed the skills, knowledge and attitudes needed for progression; 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The College offered a broad and comprehensive curriculum, meeting the needs and interests of all learners, which it had maintained during lockdown, not closing any courses due to the pandemic; ➤ The curriculum provided a broader education than just qualifications; ➤ Students benefited from the high expectations, levels of support and subject expertise of staff; ➤ Governance was highly effective, offering strong support and challenge; ➤ The Safeguarding framework remained strong; it had adapted well, as had pastoral support, which continued to be good; ➤ The careers education service had changed its approach in response to the lockdown but its quality had not been diminished. It had responded to feedback and continued to serve learners well; ➤ All young people undertook a well-planned and structured programme of work-related learning; and ➤ The College was a highly inclusive place and there were no significant gaps in the performance of different groups of students. 	
v	<p>Slide two provided a breakdown of student performance. Members noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Apprenticeship achievements had been impacted by factors beyond the College's control, without which the outturn would have been close to 70%. The pandemic had had a significant effect, with apprentices being placed on furlough, regulations being imposed by the government, and external assessors suffering their own administrative delays, resulting in delayed completions for many and poorer than expected achievement; ➤ Most learners in English and maths made above average progress from their starting points. Internal data estimates showed that English & maths progress scores were 0.25 and 0.22 respectively; a continuing trend, the biggest improvement being maths, which had improved from 0.12 in 2018/19; ➤ 35% of students had improved their Key Stage 4 GCSE English grade by at least one grade, and 33% improved their maths; ➤ 91% of students met or exceed their target grade, +7% from 2018-19; ➤ Students on Free School Meals had a 5% higher retention than their peers; ➤ 87% of students had a positive destination (93% for high needs); and □ ➤ Gaps in performance had been narrowed/closed. 	
vi	<p>A Member commented that it would be useful to receive and discuss outcomes before the SAR validation. There was discussion about whether having a standalone validation session plus a separate Committee meeting would improve the process and it was agreed that the question should be picked up in 2021/22 planning.</p>	
vii	<p>Slide 3 gave a breakdown of the proposed aspect grades, all 'Good', except for Adult Programmes ('Requires Improvement') and High Needs Provision ('Outstanding'). Slide 4 gave a breakdown of the overall curriculum SAR grades and CGE drew attention to page 9 of the SAR, which provided more detail. Finally, slide 5 listed the areas for improvement which would go into the QIP for the current year.</p>	
viii	<p><u>Generic Comments on the SAR</u></p> <p>Members suggested as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Throughout the SAR, apparent inconsistencies between proposed grades and the data could be more clearly explained; ➤ Reliance on the 2016 Kirklees District Strategic Needs Assessment alone was 	

	<p>somewhat unsafe, as the information was out of date - other tools were used and could be referred to as well, to better contextualise the curriculum intent;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The traffic light approach to presenting the data in Appendix 1 to the SAR could potentially be improved on; it showed an improvement overall and each area's allocated grade - but not where areas sat within the grade bands or whether they were improving or declining within them; ➤ Where aspects were not already 'Outstanding', it would assist Governors to have more explanation in the commentary on what was needed to arrive there. <p><u>Specific Comments on the Aspect Grades</u></p> <p><u>Behaviour and Attitudes – Management Recommendation: “Good”</u></p>	
ix	<p>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>	
x	<p>Members recalled that, during the previous year's SAR validation, they had agreed that the then proposed “Good” grade should stand in the expectation that it would be improved on the following year. Explaining that the area was not yet 'Outstanding', CGE commented on the challenge of evidencing the position; she said the College was in the process of becoming better able to evidence a secure 'Outstanding' grade.</p> <p><u>Leadership and Management – Management Recommendation: “Good”</u></p>	
xi	<p>There was agreement that Leadership and Management was very strong and Members queried why it was not 'Outstanding'. CGE agreed that it was a difficult one to call. She said while there were lots of examples of outstanding leadership at the College, equally, there were some middle managers who were relatively new in post and still developing into their roles; there was some work to do around developing high performing leaders across the College and she would also like to see more evidence of impact before recommending an 'Outstanding' grade for this aspect.</p>	
xii	<p>The meeting discussed whether it would be appropriate to grade Leadership and Management 'Outstanding' before the impact of the outstanding leadership was fully evident. There was full agreement that if Management and Leadership was not yet 'Outstanding' it was certainly very 'Good'. A member commented that the detail on page 9 of the SAR made it clear that curriculum areas were improving over time and that leadership addressed underperformance.</p>	
	<p><i>17.05 Mr S Harrison left the meeting.</i></p> <p><u>Provision Types</u></p> <p><u>Education Programmes for Young People – Management Recommendation: “Good”</u></p>	
xiii	<p>All were agreed that the provision was “Good”, notwithstanding the impact of English and maths achievements. Members noted the +6.3% increase in overall achievement for 16-18 and the +2% increase in vocational achievements (a +6% increase since 2017/18). As mentioned, earlier, progress scores continued to improve year on year</p>	
xiv	<p>Four curriculum areas had had a significant drop in vocational achievement due to the coronavirus, with several students in areas such as Construction and Engineering having delayed or adapted assessments, causing them to complete after the end of the academic year. Several curriculum areas had shown improvements, including</p>	

Item	Action/ Report Item
	<p>Business & IT, Creative Industries and Childcare, Sport & Public Services.</p> <p><u>Adult Programmes - Management Recommendation: "Requires Improvement"</u></p>
xv	<p>The management recommendation was that "Requires Improvement" remained the right judgement for Adult Programmes. A Member observed that the provision had improved significantly and said, from the commentary, 'Requires Improvement' did not seem the appropriate grade. This was agreed and Assistant Principal Ms P Firth ("PF") was asked whether the commentary was too positive or the grade too negative.</p>
xvi	<p>PF said the provision had improved significantly but 2019/20 had been a difficult year for all curriculum areas and possibly more so for Adults. She said disregarding the data, there was a lot of very positive work in progress which chimed with Ofsted grade descriptors of 'Good' provision, to the extent that, when she wrote the commentary, it didn't feel like it should be 'Requires Improvement'. However, she said, as the College had not reached national benchmark (despite three years of improvement), she did not consider it could be graded 'Good'.</p>
xvii	<p>PM was asked to comment. He said this was a good example of the College's approach to quality assurance, which he would characterise as 'extremely cautious but accurate'. He said the College was rigorous in applying its standards and making judgements and while it could make the case for Adults being 'Good', it would not be in keeping with its wish to maintain really rigorous judgements over time.</p>
xviii	<p>He said given the number of curriculum areas judged to be 'Requires Improvement' rather than 'Good', as an external stakeholder he would want to know what proportion of learners were in areas that were judged to be 'Requires Improvement', as compared to previous years, as this would evidence improvement over time and from a Leadership and Management perspective would show that the College had addressed areas where the quality had been less good. He said it would be useful for the College to be able to say that over time the proportion of young people experiencing 'Good' quality provision had increased – but, also over the time, the culture may have become more rigorous and exacting in terms of self-assessment.</p>
xix	<p>The Chair thanked PM for his helpful insights. Referring to the number of learners studying English and maths (graded 'Requires Improvement') he said, although this would skew the weighting towards the 'Requires Improvement' areas, it could be contextualised; self-assessment was not purely a numbers game.</p>
xx	<p>Members confirmed that they were happy to accept management's judgement in respect of the Adult provision but asked that some additional commentary be included, to reflect the dilemma of the decision.</p>
xxi	<p>There was discussion about the challenge of measuring progress in Adult learners and a Member suggested that, if the College had a better measure of progress, it might in future be able to justify a 'Good' grade on the basis of the distance learners travelled from their starting points. It was agreed that this should be further discussed but in the meantime the 'Requires Improvement' grade should stand.</p>
<p>17.25 Ms M Carabine and Prof S Donnelly left the meeting.</p>	
	<p><u>Apprenticeships – Management Recommendation: "Good"</u></p>
xxii	<p>The meeting reflected on the impact of the pandemic on apprenticeships. PHU reiterated that it had been a challenging year for the sector but said some good decisions had been made, for example transferring some apprentices to other providers when the College temporarily had skills shortages. She said, and Members</p>

Item		Action/ Report Item
xxiii	<p>agreed, that the provision was still 'Good' albeit not yet approaching 'Outstanding'. A Member commented that the judgement rationale was well articulated within the SAR.</p> <p><u>High Needs Provision – Management Recommendation: "Outstanding"</u></p> <p>Members congratulated management on the quality of the high needs provision, agreeing that the case for an "Outstanding" grade was very sound. While there was no suggestion that the judgement should be changed, management was asked to consider whether more evidence might be needed in an Appendix to the SAR to show what evidence Governors had to support the judgement.</p>	
xxiv	<p>There being no further questions or comments, it was resolved as follows:</p>	
xxv	<p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) To recommend the judgements in the College Self-Assessment Report to the Corporation for approval, and to recommend the management grade judgements contained therein.</p> <p>(ii) To report to the Corporation as follows:</p>	
xxvi	<p>Corporation report: The 2019-20 College Self-Assessment Report ("SAR") is benchmarked against the 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. Governors will know that the EIF places more emphasis on the substance of education than previous frameworks did, with more importance given to learner progress from starting points.</p>	Report Item 6
xxvii	<p>Corporation report: The validation of the SAR was supported by an external expert, Kirklees Council's Post 16 and Progression Head of Service Dr Phil Mark, who was asked 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 7
xxviii	<p>Corporation report: The Committee's comments and suggestions regarding the SAR will be reflected in the version that goes to Corporation on 14 December.</p>	Report Item 8
xxix	<p>Corporation report: Subject to the comments made at the Committee's meeting and recorded in the minutes, the Committee recommends the SAR for Corporation approval and agrees with the management grade judgements.</p>	Report Item 9
xxx	<p>The business of validation being complete, the Chair thanked the management team for their hard work in producing the SAR and PM for his contributions.</p>	
11	QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN	
i	<p>The meeting discussed the 2020/21 QIP, noting that it reflected the key areas for improvement identified in the SAR. Members were impressed by the document, commenting positively on its format and welcoming the strong focus on impact. CGE said the intention was to report to each Committee meeting on progress against the QIP, focusing on whether the actions taken were driving the impact the College expected to see, rather than on the implementation of the actions.</p>	

Item		Action/ Report Item
ii	A Member suggested that when reporting on improvements from the current position, it would help Governors to have the detail of the current position included. This was agreed.	
iii	<p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) To approve the 2020/21 Quality Improvement Plan, subject to Corporation approval of the key areas for improvement.</p>	
iv	Corporation report: The Committee approved the 2020/21 Quality Improvement Plan, subject to Corporation approval of the key areas for improvement.	Report Item 10
12	STUDENT SUCCESS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND TARGETS	
i	The proposed student success performance indicators and targets were discussed. In the majority of cases, there was both a minimum and an aspirational target, to strike a balance between areas that were below minimum and those that were already there. Following discussion about how the targets were arrived at, Members agreed that they were realistic but appropriately stretching, and agreed to recommend them to Corporation for approval.	
ii	Corporation report: The Committee recommends the proposed 2020/21 student success performance indicators and targets for Corporation approval.	Report Item 11
MATTERS TO NOTE AND ADMINISTRATION		
13	GOVERNOR INVOLVEMENT	
i	It was noted that Governors had been involved in validation panels for curriculum areas and that many had signed up to become involved in Student Progress Checks. Independent Governor Ms C George had attended Student Parliament, as had the Student Governors and the Executive Governor Ms M Gilluley.	
14	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
i	8 March 2021.	
15	PUBLICATION OF AGENDA PAPERS	
i	<p><u>RESOLVED:</u></p> <p>(i) All items marked with an asterisk on the Agenda to remain confidential.</p>	

Items of Report for Corporation

#	Details	Minute
1.	The Committee received a report from Ms P Firth on behalf of the Higher Education (“HE”) Committee, which reported, among other things, that it had gained satisfactory assurance in terms of the College’s compliance with Office for Students conditions of registration. The Committee was satisfied that work was underway to continuously enhance the HE student experience.	5ii
2.	The draft Higher Education Link Governor role description is recommended for approval.	5Aii
3.	The Committee discussed the refreshed Terms of Reference for the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Group and recommends them to the Corporation for approval.	6iv
4.	The Committee received a report on the enrichment activities on offer to learners this year, gaining good assurance that the College was providing for all learners’ broader development, enabling them to develop and discover their talents and interests and preparing them for life in modern Britain.	8v
5.	The Committee has wound up its Quality Task Group, as it deems it to have fulfilled its remit.	9vii
6.	The 2019-20 College Self-Assessment Report (“SAR”) is benchmarked against the 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. Governors will know that the EIF places more emphasis on the substance of education than previous frameworks did, with more importance given to learner progress from starting points.	10xxvi
7.	The validation of the SAR was supported by an external expert, Kirklees Council’s Post 16 and Progression Head of Service Dr Phil Mark, who was asked 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.	10xxvii
8.	The Committee’s comments and suggestions regarding the SAR will be reflected in the version that goes to Corporation on 14 December.	10xxviii
9.	Subject to the comments made at the Committee’s meeting and recorded in the minutes, the Committee recommends the SAR for Corporation approval and agrees with the management grade judgements.	10xxix
10.	The Committee approved the 2020/21 Quality Improvement Plan, subject to Corporation approval of the key areas for improvement.	11iv
11.	The Committee recommends the proposed 2020/21 student success performance indicators and targets for Corporation approval.	12ii