

EXTENDED JOINT LEARNING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE
Wednesday 27 November 2019 at 6.30pm

MINUTES

Present: Jean Cook (Chair)
Caireen Mitchell (Principal & CEO)
Penny Wycherley
Nigel Dias
Lucia Guetcherian (Staff Governor)
Arnold Amoako (Student Governor)
Lashana Peterkin (Co-opted member)
Andy Booth
Tom Hesmondhalgh
Donna Hollick (Co-opted member)
Margaret Bird (Co-opted member)

Attendees: Fadia Clarke, Vice Principal, Training, Skills and HE
Angela Edwards, Vice Principal, Education and Quality

Clerk: Clare Mitchell, Director of Governance

		Action
1.	<p>Introductions and Apologies for Absence</p> <p>The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and those present briefly introduced themselves. Although this was a joint meeting of the two LQCs, all Governors had been invited to attend as this was the main opportunity to discuss the Croydon College SAR prior to presentation at the Board meeting on 4 December.</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Yvonne White, Evelyn Bayerlein, Richard Beales, Gordon Smith, Andrew Lowe, Rahel Haque and Chris Wright.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p>Croydon College Self-Assessment Report 2018/19, KPIs and Quality Improvement Priorities 2019/20</p> <p>The VPE&Q introduced the Croydon College SAR, which was based on the campus SARs considered by the Coulston and Croydon LQCs. The Croydon College SAR would be the basis for Ofsted inspection. As a new merged organisation, Croydon College did not have a current Ofsted rating and would be inspected within three years of merger.</p>	



Prior to merger both Croydon and Coulsdon Colleges had had good Ofsted ratings.

The Croydon College SAR covered all the College's activities with the exception of a small cohort of Year 11 students, HE provision and full cost courses.

The self-assessment for 2018/19 was against Ofsted's new Education Inspection Framework (EIF) which emphasised the importance of intent, implementation and impact and placed less emphasis on achievement rates.

The Croydon College SAR emphasised the differences in the student population between the two campuses. There were high levels of disadvantage, evidenced by the number of bursaries paid and the high proportion of looked after children among students at Croydon campus. Students' academic starting point was also much lower at the Croydon campus. Large numbers of adult students were on courses at Level 1. Only 30% of 16-18 year olds were studying for vocational qualifications. Students were drawn almost exclusively from the north of Croydon and New Addington.

At the Coulsdon campus by far the majority of students were studying courses at Level 3; either A levels or BTECs or a mixture of the two. However, much of the student population was drawn from the centre and north of Croydon rather than from the south of Croydon.

The VPE&Q outlined the main points in relation to progress in 2018/19, key strengths and key areas of improvement in 2018/19, as well as the key areas for development, KPIs and main improvement strategies for 2019/20.

Penny Wycherley suggested that the executive summary could be strengthened by emphasising the College's strategic intent in terms of its decision to move away from subcontracting and to run courses in areas where demand from students and employers was high, as well as opening the SEND provision based at Coulsdon College.

The VPE&Q also outlined the key areas for development, the KPIs and the main improvement strategies for 2019/20. Poor attendance needed to be tackled, particularly at the Croydon Campus, as it was closely linked to poor achievement rates. A number of new strategies were being implemented such as greater monitoring of attendance and increased engagement with parents of 16-18 year old students. High performing students also needed to be stretched.

The P&CEO outlined the leadership key strengths and areas for improvement. There had been a considerable amount of change over 2018/19 with the recruitment of a whole new executive team. Improving standards of teaching and learning was a high priority. High performing curriculum areas would be used to promote and cascade best practice. Teaching and Learning Mentors had been appointed and more accountability was being devolved to curriculum managers. The College leadership was also engaging more closely with the Council and its feeder schools.



	<p>However, there were some areas of underperformance that still needed to be tackled and there had been difficulties recruiting staff, which had impacted adversely on some teams. There were actions in place to make improvements in these areas in 2019/20.</p> <p>Penny Wycherley suggested that the leadership team’s awareness of the areas that still required work, their willingness to change the culture of the organisation and to involve staff in the development of the new vision and values should be highlighted as evidence of intent. It was proposed that QDP tool used to survey students should also be used to survey staff views.</p> <p>The Committee asked whether it was possible to provide national comparator figures for the KPIs that would be monitored in 2019/20. The P&CEO stated that it would be difficult to find comparators among general FE Colleges because of the unusually high level of disadvantage of students at the Croydon campus.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the lower than expected achievement rates in 2018/19. This had been impacted by the closure of subcontracted provision, which had high achievement rates, and at Coulsdon, the move to linear A levels. It was agreed that the underpinning SARs from each area of provision would be made available to Governors.</p> <p>There would be development work in a number of areas in 2019/20 including the development of T level plans for a 2022 start and further development of external relationships to continue to expand, update and improve FE, HE, apprenticeship and SEND provision.</p> <p>The VPE&Q encouraged governors to come into the College to observe teaching and learning and talk to students and staff.</p> <p>As a general point, it was important that those reading the SAR were able to distinguish between points relating to Croydon College as a whole and those that were specific to either the Croydon or Coulsdon Campus. The P&CEO would set this out clearly in her introduction.</p> <p>Improvements in education and learning would be measured through lesson observations, feedback from students and ALPs scores as well as achievement rates. The enrichment programme, study plus and the respect for all team at the Croydon Campus were also key parts of the support available to students.</p> <p>In terms of mental health support for students, a counsellor was available to see students two days a week at the Coulsdon Campus. This was not the case at the Croydon Campus but there were plans for support to be provided by an outside organisation for students in particularly difficult circumstances. The Head of Study Plus was currently the lead for students’ mental health at the Croydon Campus. This was an important issue as students with declared mental health conditions were performing below expectations.</p> <p>In terms of adult learning programmes, the focus was on student progression and promoting students’ aspirations. The Committee</p>	<p>P&CEO</p>
--	---	------------------



	<p>noted the strengths of the apprenticeship programme and some excellent, timely framework achievement rates. In terms of areas of improvement there would be a focus on improving retention on the longer, three to four year, apprenticeship programmes.</p> <p>Croydon College provided for learners with high needs at a number of different levels including learners over the age of 19 with profound and multiple needs. There had been a 58% increase in the number of learners with EHCPs in 2018/19.</p> <p>The Committee confirmed the gradings for each section of the SAR. All were good with the exception of apprenticeships and provision for learners with high needs which were graded as requires improvement. The Committee noted that the RAG rating for each grade, which had been presented to the Committee, would not be submitted to Ofsted.</p>	
--	--	--

Signed Chair

Date: