

**MEETING OF THE COULSDON SIXTH FORM COLLEGE LEARNING AND QUALITY
COMMITTEE
Wednesday 19 June 2019 at 6.00pm**

MINUTES

Present: Tom Hesmondhalgh (Chair)
Jean Cook
Yvonne White
Caireen Mitchell

Co-opted: Cllr Margaret Bird

Attendees: Richard Beales, Principal of Coulsdon Sixth Form College
Angela Edwards, Vice Principal, Education and Quality
Jeanette Gilbert, Assistance Principal, Students

Interim Clerk: Jill Small
Observer: Clare Mitchell, Clerk Designate

		Action
1.	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Gordon Smith, Andy Booth and Lola Amure.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Cllr Margaret Bird to her first meeting and thanked her for agreeing to join the Coulsdon LQC as a co-optee from the local community.</p> <p>It was noted that Ivan Tomb had now left the College and so a replacement staff co-optee would be required. RB agreed to liaise with the new Clerk to arrange this for the Autumn term.</p> <p>It was noted that Andy Booth had been missed off the circulation list for the meeting papers although he had previously sent apologies. The Clerk agreed to forward on the papers with an apology for the omission and invite him to the Croydon LQC on 26 June.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
2.	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 April 2019</p> <p>Minutes of the previous meeting were approved and signed as a correct record of the meeting.</p>	



Members asked about the difference between Advanced Practitioners and Teaching and Learning Mentors. AE explained that TLM was more of a mentoring role and the staff taking on the role would be involved in delivering CPD and other supportive sessions to their teams. The staff taking on the TLM role would receive 6 hours remission for the role and an honorarium of £2,000 for the year. The role would be held for one year. Training was in place to support the TLMs in their role.

TH asked how the success of the role would be evaluated. AE explained that there were processes in place to monitor the success of the TLMs and to assess improvements.

Members noted the report.

ii) Outcomes for Learners

RB presented this report. Retention at Coulston was at 95% which was an improvement on the previous year. There was also evidence that more vulnerable learners were being retained more successfully.

Attendance figures at Coulston were lower than they should be and plans for improving these figures were included in the quality improvement plans.

In year achievement had improved over the previous year with indications of positive outcomes for GCSE, BTECs and A Level coursework. Predictions were good for A Level results.

TH asked about the spread of outcomes between different groups of students including more vulnerable students. RB responded that there were no major differences in performance or achievement.

Members noted the report.

iii) Student Survey Results

RB presented this report. The survey at Coulston had only been completed by 30% of the student but results were reasonably consistent with no major areas of concern. Next year Coulston students would join with the QDP survey completed at Croydon which would provide better information.

Overall the Coulston students scored their lessons highly at around 98%. Areas which received lower scores were being considered with tutors and would be the focus of quality improvement plans.

Members asked whether the survey included equality and diversity impacts. RB explained that this was not included this year but would be part of the QDP survey next year.

Members noted the report.

iv) Update on the Review of the Quality Framework



	<p>AE presented this report. Following the presentation of the rationale for the new Framework at the previous meeting a draft Learning and Quality Framework had been developed and was attached to the report. This outlined the learning and quality processes with timings throughout the Academic year, all with the aim of meeting KPIs and improving learner outcomes. These processes will be included in the college calendar and underpinned by formalised expectations, further guidance and support for users of the L&Q Framework.</p> <p>The Quality Review cycle included a minimum of four progress review meetings during the year with each Faculty Head (at Coulsdon) or Curriculum Team Manager (at Croydon). These would involve Governors as part of monitoring progress with the QIP. Risk was part of the process with underperformance being identified and tackled specifically.</p> <p>The report also included a paper on the outcomes of the Teaching and Learning Assessment Review group who had developed a new process for lesson observations. The new process would involve annual observation for all teachers but these would not be graded as the purpose would be to support development, feeding into development plans. The observations would only be graded for new teachers or where performance issues had been identified.</p> <p>Procedures would be aligned for both Croydon and Coulsdon with every teaching having a detailed development plan to support improvements in teaching, learning and assessment.</p> <p>This process and approach has been agreed by the Executive team and has been circulated to LQC governors, to Review Group members, and to curriculum managers. Meetings with the Union were taking place and any further feedback that is received through these avenues will be considered before final publication. The plans were to roll out the whole process for September 2019.</p> <p>TH asked about the risks around implementation of the new Framework. AE advised that it was critical for managers to ensure that the focus and non- threatening tone of the exercise were clear to everyone with this being on performance and outcomes for learners coupled with identifying staff development needs.</p> <p>JC asked about how the process would relate to appraisal. AE explained that the individual development plan would become part of the appraisal process.</p> <p>Members noted the report and the ongoing involvement of the LQC in the development of the Quality Framework.</p>	
7.	<p>Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)</p> <p>RB presented this progress report. The latest impacts and next steps were shown together with the outcomes for the year. The progress review meetings were taking place over the next two weeks and some governors were involved in these meetings. Overall the progress was</p>	



	<p>good against the areas identified for improvement, and RB went through the detail of these with the members.</p> <p>TH asked whether each site would continue to have a separate QIP next year. RB confirmed this would be the case as there were specific impacts and steps for each campus, but there would be a combined report for the main Board. The QIP was finalised for each year in October, but was a live document updated on a termly basis.</p> <p>Members noted the report and the updated QIP.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Curriculum Planning 2019/20</p> <p>RB presented this progress report which outlined the key strategies for curriculum planning at Coulston for 2019/20. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to revise the Guided Learning Hours offered to improve cost effectiveness; • reviewing courses with historic low recruitment or low class sizes; • increasing tutorial time and support for work experience and enrichment; • reviewing the qualifications delivered and moving to the RQF BTECs where possible; • maximising the use of elearning for learning and personal development. <p>Members asked how demand for subjects was assessed in the light of the fall in demand for Economics and French A Level mentioned in the report. RB explained that this would be a result of student demand, open events or evaluating successful provision at competitor colleges. However, some areas would still be offered through different routes such as BTEC where entry requirements may be lower. Any new provision would need to align with existing curriculum pathways.</p> <p>TH asked if there were examples whether Coulston and Croydon were planning to share provision. RB confirmed that this was being discussed and considered alongside other processes of alignment.</p> <p>Members noted the report.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Safeguarding and Prevent – Termly Monitoring Report</p> <p>JG presented this report.</p> <p>The termly report outlines the Safeguarding and Prevent referrals to Social Services, the risks that are associated with this area of work and the activities of the College and the team in mitigating the risks.</p> <p>JG also advised that College staff had undergone further training relating to Safeguarding and Prevent. Report procedures were now much more systematic and linked with the Croydon recording systems.</p> <p>Members noted the report.</p>	



<p>10.</p>	<p>Update on latest Ofsted Education Inspection Framework</p> <p>AE presented this report. The previous LQC meeting had received a report on the consultation process for this item which had now been completed. Ofsted had responded to the consultation by ensuring that learners with high needs were embedded within the processes.</p> <p>The report identified how the new Inspection Framework would relate to Croydon College, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon College will receive a full inspection within 3 years of merger – by February '22; • The college will receive 2 days' notice of a full, 4 day inspection; • The 4 point grading scale will be used: outstanding, good, requires improvement, inadequate; • There is an overall effectiveness grade based on grades for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Quality of Education including curriculum intent, implementation and impact. This section therefore includes teaching, learning and assessment and outcomes for learners. This has been described as the most important grade but not a limiting grade. ➢ Behaviour and attitudes including attendance and punctuality ➢ Personal development including employability, enrichment, citizenship ➢ Leadership & management including safeguarding and governance ➢ Plus grades for the types of provision detailed above <p>Future inspections would be much more curriculum focussed with fewer formal meetings and shorter reports. The Governors would still be involved in a meeting with inspectors but the final outcomes would be focussed on key strengths and key areas for improvement of the College. Feedback from pilot colleges was that the process was less stressful and had more clarity with less focus on documentation.</p> <p>The report also outlined the considerations for Croydon including the use the new Inspection regime as a basis for the Quality Framework, appropriate CPD and support for staff and students would be asked to articulate their views to inspectors.</p> <p>Members noted the report and the Board involvement including in the internal preparations for inspection.</p>	
<p>11.</p>	<p>Committee Risk Report</p> <p>Members noted the latest update of the Committee Risk Report which included the three operational risks explicitly monitored by the LQC.</p> <p>Members also noted that the College Risk Register would be completely reviewed before the November meeting following the requirements of the new College Operational Plan.</p>	



	TH raised concerns relating to the future funding of BTEC courses. CM advised that the College needed to look at T Levels although these may not suit all learners so other options still needed to be available. At the moment there seemed to be a poor understanding, on the part of external bodies, of the needs of learners who came from school with lower levels of attainment. The Augar review commissioned by the Government into post-18 education was expected to lead to rethinking on these issues. A report on the review would go to the main Board in July.	
12.	Dates of Meetings 2019/20 To be confirmed following approval at the July Board meeting.	
13.	Any other business There was no other business.	

Signed Chair

Date: