



Croydon  
College



COULSDON  
SIXTH FORM COLLEGE



Croydon  
University  
Centre

**CROYDON COLLEGE LEARNING AND QUALITY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Wednesday 29 November 2023 at 5.00pm**  
**Room 405B, Croydon Campus**

---

**MINUTES**

- Present:** Andy Wilson (Chair)  
 Caireen Mitchell  
 Louise Cretton  
 Martin Bentham  
 Tony Stevenson  
 Terrance James (Staff Governor, Croydon)  
 Nezia De Roche (Student Governor, Coulsdon)  
 Kevin Oakhill (Co-opted member)
- Attendees:** Martin Silverwood, Coulsdon Principal (CP)  
 Natalie Garner, Vice-Principal Adults, Vocational and Skills  
 Robert Bates, Vice Principal Young People and High Needs
- Observer:** Edwin Dhauke, Senior Manager, DfE, Sussex, Kent and South London Team
- Clerk:** Clare Mitchell, Director of Governance

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <p><b>1.</b></p> | <p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Matthew Sims (Co-opted employer member).</p> <p>The Chair noted that a number of the Committee members were new and very few had been members of the Committee for the whole of 2022/23. All present introduced themselves.</p> <p>To provide context, the Chair explained the outcome of the Ofsted inspection in February 2023. He noted that although the overall grading had been inadequate, and the College recognised that improvements needed to be made in some areas, individual types of provision had received higher grade, e.g. apprenticeships and adults which had both been graded as good by Ofsted.</p> <p>Since the Ofsted visit the College had worked hard to implement improvements. However, the main purpose of this meeting was to review the Self-Assessment Reports (SAR) which looked back on the previous year. When the Committee came to review the SAR for 2023/24 they should see a very different picture.</p> |
| <p><b>2.</b></p> | <p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>   |
| <p><b>3.</b></p> | <p><b>Minutes of Meetings</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2023 were <b>agreed</b> as a correct record.</p>  |

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 4. | <p><b>Matters Arising from the Minutes not on the Agenda</b></p> <p>The Committee <b><u>noted</u></b> the updated action list.</p>  |
| 5. | <p><b>Governors' Dashboard</b></p> <p>In a change to agenda the CP presented the live Governors' Dashboard. Monthly static updates were now provided on the Governors' Portal and the possibility of providing a live link to the dashboard was being pursued.</p> <p>The Committee had queries about the lessons observation process and the numbers on the dashboard, to which the CP responded. The Committee agreed that there should be a deep dive into this area at the next meeting in March 2024.</p> <p><b>Action: CP/DoG - lesson observation process to be the subject of the deep dive at the March 2024 meeting</b></p> <p>The CP also presented the section of the dashboard on markbook completion, learner progress reviews and safeguarding.</p> <p>It was <b><u>agreed</u></b> that in future there would an item on the dashboard at the start of the meeting.</p> <p><b>Action: DoG to include an item on the Governors' Dashboard at the start of each meeting</b></p>  |
| 6. | <p><b>Coulsdon Campus Self- Assessment Report 2022/23</b></p> <p>CP introduced with the Coulsdon Campus SAR, which covered 2022/23 not 2023/24 as stated on the document. At the request of the Chair, the CP drew out the key strengths and areas for improvement at the Coulsdon Campus in 2022/23.</p> <p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A diverse curriculum that met students' needs.</li> <li>• There were curriculum areas, such as creative and cultural, had achieved outcomes in line with national rates.</li> <li>• The number of student achieving high grades for English GCSE was above the national average. MIDAS data was not yet available, but students were expected to have improved by at least one grade when compared to their entry level.</li> <li>• The number of work related activities had increased from 233 hours in 2021/22 to 6067 in 2022/23</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>The Committee noted that student recruitment had been strong in 2023/24 despite the Ofsted grading. This was likely to be the result of Coulsdon's curriculum, which enabled students to take a mix of BTECs and A Levels.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across the campus, outcomes for students had not been good enough in 2022/23. There had been insufficient guidance to students and it was possible that some students' capability had been overestimated. A/S Level performance had been very low. Students had not been properly prepared</li> </ul> |

for external examinations. Internal marking of course work was sampled by the qualifying body and no concerns had been raised.

The Committee suggested that there might be a link between poor attendance and poor performance in examinations. The CP reported that a Quality Manager for the Coulsdon Campus had now been appointed and had a new lead for A levels. Mock examinations would be taken under exam conditions in 2023/24, would cover the whole syllabus and marks would be moderated. The CP reported that a Director of Quality post had been advertised and the interim in that role was focusing on improvements at Coulsdon. The Great Teaching Model was about to be introduced which would challenge each team supported to introduce a new teaching strategy. A schedule of CPD events was now in place for each team.

The Committee emphasised the need for the Committee to be shown the impact of the changes that were being made. Governors had not received accurate assurance about the pace and impact of change at the Coulsdon Campus in 2022/23.

The CP described the scrutiny of lessons that was now in place. Initially, this had been seen as a burden but now teachers were engaging and asking for support. There had also been a significant improvement in attendance and informal feedback from students, particularly in the STEM pathway. There had been 100% attendance at the November 2023 GCSE maths exams. The results would be known in January 2024.

The link governor for the Coulsdon Campus emphasised the need to support staff and listen to their feedback. There were a significant number of agency staff and staff on PIPs at Coulsdon. There needed to be stable, high quality staff and there needed to be more focus on this at LQC meetings.

The P&CEO noted that staff retention had improved in 2022/23 and that she was now focusing on ensuring that on PIPs were supported to move through this process. The Committee emphasised that the standard of teaching needed to be consistent across the campus.

- Attendance and punctuality was too low in 2022/23. End of year attendance was around 72%. Attendance in 2023/24 was approximately 10% higher than at the same period in 2022/23, although there did need to be improvements in attendance at English and maths and tutorials.

The Committee noted that the deep dive at the next Coulsdon LQC related to describing a typical student at the Coulsdon Campus, this would include distance travelled to attend the College. Governors needed to understand the context re attendance. A student might significantly improve their attendance but still not reach the expected level because of external factors. The Chair emphasised the importance of high expectations of all students.

The P&CEO reported that the context for the SAR would describe the typical student, their starting point and the challenges they faced.

The Coulsdon campus SAR for 2022/23 was graded as follows:

Quality of Education – Not yet meeting expectations

Behaviour and attitudes – Not yet meeting expectations

Personal Development – Not yet meeting expectations

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>Leadership and management – Not yet meeting expectations</p> <p>Ability of Campus to meet skills needs - Reasonable</p> <p><b>Overall Effectiveness – Not yet meeting expectations</b></p> <p>The Committee <b>agreed</b> that the SAR was a reasonable assessment of the Coulsdon Campus in 2022/23. It was important to see this assessment as a stimulus for improvement.</p> <p>The Committee <b>discussed</b> the report.</p>   |
| 7. | <p><b>Croydon College Self- Assessment Report 2022/23</b></p> <p>The P&amp;CEO introduced the report, which was significantly shorted that in previous years. The context, emphasising the particular challenged faced by students at the College e.g. low prior attainment, would be provided for the Board meeting. The Qualification Achievement Rates (QARs) had been circulated to members prior to the meeting and would be uploaded to the Portal.</p> <p><b>Action: DoG to upload QAR data to the Governors’ Portal</b></p> <p>Achievement for the College as a whole for 2022/23 was 83%, but with lower outcomes for Coulsdon students. Coulsdon students generally had at least four learning aims so poor achievement had a high pact, given the relatively small number of students. A Level performance at Coulsdon had not improved but this was in the context of a drop in A Level performance nationally. Consideration was being given to increasing the entry grades for the Coulsdon Campus.</p> <p>It was a mixed picture as achievement in other areas as much higher e.g. Access to HE at 94.2%. Achievement for high needs students in vocational provision and SEND students was high. There had been a 10% increase in achievement for 16-18s at the Croydon Campus but overall achievement for 16-18s was too low and some achievement gaps still remained.</p> <p>Performance in Building, Engineering and Technical Professions (BETP) had met the target set of 75% and that challenge was to improve this to 85% in 2023/24. Teachers in this area, who had mainly come from industry, were improving their formal teaching qualifications.</p> <p>Behaviour and attitudes were generally good, but attendance was still not good enough at the Coulsdon Campus. There were also some areas of concern e.g. BETP and ESOL, were the vast majority of students were Children Looked After (CLAs). If students were withdrawn because of lower attendance, there were concerns about that their future.</p> <p>In terms of personal development, the new tutorial framework was working well in some areas, but some modules were being taught at different times, mainly to address enable specific issues to be addressed e.g. knife crime and personal safety. Attendance at tutorials had been too low at the Coulsdon Campus at the start of the year. IAG was generally good, and the number of extra curricula activities was increasing. The Committee asked that the SAR explain what good engagement with the local community meant in practice.</p> <p><b>Action: P&amp;CEO – SAR to explain what good engagement with the local community meant in practice</b></p> |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | <p>The Committee also asked for the reputational impact of the College’s inadequate Ofsted rating to be reflected in the SAR.</p> <p><b>Action: P&amp;CEO to reflect on whether the reputational impact of the College’s inadequate Ofsted rating should be reflected in the SAR</b></p> <p>The fact that the development work undertaken in 2022/23 with teaching staff at the Coulsdon Campus had not resulted in the predicted increase in achievement should also be reflected in the SAR.</p> <p><b>Action: P&amp;CEO to reflect the fact that the development work undertaken with teaching staff at the Coulsdon Campus had not resulted in the predicted increase in achievement in the SAR</b></p> <p>The Chair expressed his view that there had been a failure in leadership and governance given that the outcome of the Ofsted inspection had not been foreseen. Either the leadership had been wrong in its assessment of its performance or Ofsted’s judgement had been incorrect. The P&amp;CEO’s view was that the SAR for 2021/22 should have been explicit that the College’s performance was between Good and RI. As it was the SAR for 2021/22 had not included overall grades. The decision was taken to focus on worded judgements against each line of enquiry to ensure targeted actions were put in place to improve the quality of provision.</p> <p>The Board had been made aware early in 202/23 that an RI grading from Ofsted was likely. The specific issues were mainly at the Coulsdon Campus and the weight that this part of the College’s provision would have on the Ofsted judgement had not been known.</p> <p>The P&amp;CEO expressed that view that given the inconsistency of performance a judgement of RI was the highest that the College could consider for any of the four aspects of the SAR for 2022/23.</p> <p>The Chair of the Coulsdon LQC noted that there were serious concerns at the Coulsdon Campus but there were also areas that required attention at the Croydon Campus and consistently high performance across all areas was essential. It was important that this was recognised for the development of a common culture across the whole College.</p> <p>Subject to the amendments discussed above, the Committee <b>recommended</b> the Croydon College SAR for 2022/23 to the Board for approval.</p> |
| <p><b>8.</b></p> | <p><b>Update on Ofsted Monitoring Visit</b></p> <p>See separate confidential minute.</p>  |
| <p><b>9.</b></p> | <p><b>Single Improvement Plan and QIP</b></p> <p>The Chair had asked for the SIP and the 2022/23 QIP to be taken together. There were a number of red and amber ratings in the year end update on the QIP and this would feed into the monitoring of the QIP for 2023/24.</p> <p>The P&amp;CEO reported that the definition of the RAG ratings included in the SIP were still under discussion with the FEC. One area had been flagged as amber</p>   |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
|                   | <p>and this was attendance for 16-18 year olds. Attendance for this group was just over 83% against a target of 83%, and there was a concern that attendance could slip below the 83% target for the year. The VPs were working with each area in improve attendance as a priority. The P&amp;CEO confirmed that attendance figures only included “live” learners.</p> <p>The ESFA would be having a separate discussion with the CP about progress against the QIP. The Committee asked what action had been taken in response to the 2022/23 SAR. The P&amp;CEO reported that the current QIP had been adapted to Ofsted recommendations and the requirements of the FEC at the end of 2022/23, ahead of the SAR for 2022/23.</p> <p>The QIP for 2022/23 had included finance and staffing, which the current QIP did not. Discussions would be taking place about whether these areas should be included in the 2023/24 QIP.</p> <p>The Committee <b><u>discussed</u></b> the report.</p>  |
| <p><b>10.</b></p> | <p><b>Key Issues Report</b></p> <p>The CP introduced the report. At the Coulsdon Campus, attendance remained high in the STEM pathway but actions were being taken to improve attendance in all the other pathways.</p> <p>A formative assessment policy was now in place at the Coulsdon Campus and mock examinations would cover the whole curriculum and be taken under exam conditions.</p> <p>A change proposal was about to be launched at the Coulsdon Campus, which would flatten the management structure, with the establishment of curriculum heads who would report direct to the CP. The current four pathway s would be restructured into three areas, with each areas having two curriculum managers. Staff resources would remain the same. The new structure would be implemented in the New Year. The Committee asked for a report on the effectiveness of the new structure at the March meeting of the Committee.</p> <p><b>Action: CP to bring a report on the effectiveness of the new management structure at the Coulsdon Campus to the next meeting</b></p> <p>BETP at the Croydon Campus also needed further improvements. BETP had met its achievement target of 75% for 2022/23 but this target was below the College average and had been raised for 2023/24.</p> <p>The Committee <b><u>discussed</u></b> the report.</p> |
| <p><b>11.</b></p> | <p><b>Student Governor’s Report</b></p> <p>The newly appointed Student Governor reported on the national Student Governor events that she had attended and the connections she had made as a result.</p> <p>She was pursuing a number of opportunities to increase the variety of enrichment activities available to students, to develop greater engagement with the local community, better relationships between students and the police.</p>  |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>She was speaking to students about their experience of the College. Student representatives needed a greater understanding of their role. In future there would be more student representative meetings so they could raise issues. The Student Executive was meeting fortnightly.</p> <p>She reported that students often did not receive information because they did not check their College email accounts regularly. She suggested that the College should invest in a PA system to make announcements to students and that their should be a student newspaper and social media page.</p> <p>The Chair asked how students had reacted to the recent incidents in College Square. The Student Governor reported that students felt safe when they were in the College building and she had reassured students that the Executive were doing all they could to make College Square a safer environment but they did not have control of this area. She emphasised the need for students to take part in enrichment activities so they had less time to congregate in College Square.</p> |
| 12. | <p><b>Safeguarding Annual Report (Whole College) 2022/23</b></p> <p>The Vice Principal Young People and High Needs reported that the annual report had already been presented to the Coulsdon Campus LQC so had already been seen by most of the Governors present.</p> <p>There had been a significant number of staff changes, including a new Head. The number of safeguarding incidents reported to date in 2023/24 was lower than for the same point in 2022/23. It appeared that this was because in 2022/23 the safeguarding team had become involved in managing student behaviour and this had been recorded as safeguarding. The Committee asked that future safeguarding reports included a narrative to explain the difference in numbers.</p> <p>There also needed to more use of the student wellbeing and proactive intervention to avoid formal intervention.</p>   |
| 13. | <p><b>High Needs Learners Position Statement</b></p> <p>The Vice Principal Young People and High Needs explained that this paper was based on the position statement prepared for Ofsted. Improvements to high needs provision was progressing. The SEND curriculum was where the most work was needed. Kevin Oakhill offered this support in this area.</p>  |
| 14. | <p><b>Information Papers</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the Croydon Campus Complaints and Compliments Report for 2022/23 and the Supporting Positive Behaviour Policy (whole College) Annual Report for 2022/23. No questions had been raised in advance of the meeting.</p>  |
| 15. | <p><b>Policies</b></p> <p><b>Safeguarding and Prevent Policy – Annual</b></p> <p>The Vice Principal Young People and High Needs explained that there changes to the policy for 2023/24 were minor. The Lead Governor for Safeguarding had asked for the policy to be amended to include greater detail on adult safeguarding.</p> <p><b>Action: VPYP&amp;HN -Safeguarding Policy to be amended to include greater detail on adult safeguarding</b></p>  |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>The Committee noted the length of the policy and asked for a short summary of the policy to be developed for staff.</p> <p><b>Action: VPYP&amp;HN - a short summary of the Safeguarding Policy to be developed for staff</b></p>   |
| 16. | <p><b>Committee Risk Register</b></p> <p>The Committee reviewed the risks allocated to the Committee.</p> <p>The Committee asked the P&amp;CEO to review whether Strategic risk 1 (inability to improve from a Grade 4 at the next Ofsted inspection) should be reworded so that the risk related to not improving to Grade 2 at the next Ofsted inspection.</p> <p><b>Action: P&amp;CEO/VPF&amp;R to consider whether Strategic Risk 1 should be reworded so that the risk was not improving to a Grade 2 at the next inspection.</b></p> <p>The P&amp;CEO gave an update on the actions being taken to mitigate the risk to keeping staff and students safe from local threats.</p> <p>Re Strategic Risk 2 – (inability to improve the outcome for student at the Coulsdon Campus) the Committee asked for a target for sufficient improvement. This should be linked to the QIP targets.</p> <p><b>Action: VPF&amp;R/CP– Strategic Risk 2 to include a target for “sufficient improvement” at the Coulsdon Campus. This should be linked to the QIP targets</b></p> <p>Re Strategic Risk 7 (Inability to develop and create work related activity and sustainable outcomes for SEND provision learners which will meet employability needs and local growth demand at both campuses) the Committee queried the low number of actions and commented that the title of the risk was not clear about the actual risk to the College of non-achievement.</p> <p><b>Action: VPF&amp;R/VPYP&amp;HN– Strategic Risk 7 – to address the low number of actions and to reword the risk so that the risk to the College of non-achievement was clearer.</b></p> <p>i Deep dive topic – IT was agreed that the next deep dives should cover two areas performance management linked to teaching and learning (which had not been fully covered at this meeting) and the lesson observation process.</p> <p>The deep dives should be supported by a separate paper.</p> <p><b>Action: CP – a separate paper to be provided for the two deep dive topics for the March meeting (performance management linked to teaching and learning and the lesson observation process)</b></p> |
| 17. | <p><b>Post Meeting Evaluation/Self-Assessment</b></p> <p>The Committee’s view was that the meeting had gone reasonably well, although it had been longer than usual.</p>  |



|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   | <p>There had been three responses to the Coulsdon Campus LQC Self-Assessment for 2022/23 and five for the Croydon College LQC Self-Assessment. A range of grades had been given re the effectiveness of the Committee. The Chair reported that his comments had been critical of both LQCs. In this view there had been a failure of governance as the Committees had been unable to foresee the outcome of the Ofsted inspection. Specifically, the correct information had not been provided re performance at the Coulsdon Campus. However, improvements were now taking place and there were new members on the Committee to provide additional scrutiny. The Chair of the Coulsdon Campus LQC noted that she had become Chair of the Committee only four weeks prior to the inspection. Governors also needed better data and to visit the Coulsdon Campus to talk to students and observe lessons.</p> |
| <p><b>18.</b></p> | <p><b>Dates of Future Meetings</b></p> <p>Wednesday 13 March 2024 6pm to 8pm in person – Croydon Campus</p> <p>Wednesday 26 June 2024 6pm to 8pm in person – Croydon Campus</p>  |
| <p><b>19.</b></p> | <p><b>Other Business</b></p> <p>The Staff Governor raised issues relating to delays in the refectory reducing staff lunch breaks. The queues were too long and there were implications for the quality of teaching in afternoon sessions.</p> <p>The P&amp;CEO explained that the College had to priorities student access to the canteen. There were a high number of children looked after and students who received free school meals. The P&amp;CEO reported that HR/staff morale issues were the remit of the Finance and Resources Committee.</p> <p>Kevin Oakhill informed the Committee that he had some health issues, but they were very unlikely to affect his role on the Committee. The Chair emphasised the College’s willing to provide support if needed.</p>  |

*Approved as an accurate record by the Croydon College Learning and Quality Committee at its meeting on 13 March 2024*

*Clare Mitchell  
Director of Governance*