



Heart of Yorkshire Education Group

Curriculum and Quality Committee Minutes of the

Heart of Yorkshire Education Group

On 8th November 2022 at 4pm in the board room at Selby College

Focussing on the Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment

Present: Ruth Baxter (RB), Dmitry Fedotov (DF), Julian Harrison (JH), Gordon McAlpine (GM), Ben Porter (BP), and David Powell (Chair - DP)

Apologies: Vijay Teeluck (VT) and Dmitry Fedotov (DF) – (part)

In attendance: Clare Allcock (CA), Lisa Macdonald (LM), Matthew Staples (MS), Joanne Taylor (JT), and Antonia Praud (AP – Director of Governance)

| Item | | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| 1 | <p>Declarations of Interest, Apologies for Absence and Welcome</p> <p>The Chair welcomed all attendees to the Committee meeting and a round of introductions was made.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Vijay Teeluck which were accepted with consent and partial apologies were also received from Dmitri Fedotov (arriving late) which were accepted with consent.</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest noted.</p> <p>There were no items of Any Other Business received.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>To receive and approve the Minutes of the Meeting on 21st June 2022</p> <p>Governors confirmed the minutes of the last meeting were an accurate record and they were approved.</p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor asked for an update on the college appeal with Pearson. It was confirmed that only a few pupils were affected and the outcome is expected soon. The chair confirmed he had met with Gordon McAlpine and reviewed the aide memoire, which had also been circulated to the committee. The board agreed it | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>was a useful document and it will be useful to keep these five questions on the committee's agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors confirmed they had agreed an additional meeting via teams for the validation of the SAR. • The terms of reference are in the meeting pack for review at this meeting. • MS will provide an update on learning walks and governor monitoring at this meeting. • An attendance update is on the agenda for this meeting. • The new agenda item called student matters will include student experience updates, and will be given at local board meetings, in addition to group board student updates. Local boards can raise items for the attention of the Curriculum and Quality Committee. <p>Governors approved the confidential minutes.</p> <p>DF joined the meeting.</p> | |
| 3 | <p>Local College Boards Matters</p> <p>It was noted that the development of the reporting structure between the new committees and this committee is still in its infancy, and each of the local boards are in different stages of their development too. The cycle of business will be reviewed regularly, but future meetings will see local College Board reports feeding into this committee.</p> <p>The chairs of the committees are meeting next month to determine how this will best happen. The proposal is in the future there will be an agenda item at each local board meeting to agree their update to the curriculum and quality committee. The Director of Governance will also write up and share summary reports.</p> <p>The local boards are keen to learn more about the student experience and in particular are looking forward to welcoming new staff and student governors at Wakefield and Castleford. Governors were also keen to familiarise themselves with their college, and Governors at Wakefield have requested a governor tour, before their monitoring activities begin.</p> | |
| 4 | <p>Achievement rates across all provision types</p> <p>Governors reviewed the end of year performance results which had also been presented to the local boards.</p> <p>Governors challenged the accuracy of predictions the previous year and were given assurance that the triangulation completed, which included AVARs, and teachers</p> | |

professional judgments, had predicted an 8% fail rate. (The Avar process had predicted a 9% fail rate and the actual fail rate was 6%.) This is partially as a result of tutors being more cautious as a result of teacher predicted grades in the past and also the push towards the end of the year, and support given to students, to achieve pass results. Governors challenged if the targets set had been ambitious enough? The team confirmed they were, and this had been reflected in the SAR.

Governors challenged how the results had compared with those from other colleges. It was confirmed that the results for English and Maths compared similarly to other inclusive and like-minded colleges.

Governors then expressed their concern for the low number of high grades achieved, particularly in Maths. It was confirmed that we now have the Midas results which reflects the college results are below average, with Wakefield achieving 6%, Selby achieving 5%, set against the national average of 11%.

Governors were given assurance that the team are also disappointed with the results and that improving attendance, engagement in Maths and English, and achieving more high grade results in Maths would all carry forward to the quality improvement plan (QIP) for the next year.

Governors questioned which exam board had been used and was this a factor in the lower results achieved this year? It was confirmed that the two main exam boards were used across the group this year. Governors then questioned if there were plans to move to one board across the group and have more shared practise? It was confirmed that the team would like to move to one board as soon as possible but it is a significant task to rewrite the curriculum and ideally staff will be given a year to plan and prepare. Currently the teams are looking at the pros and cons of each option.

Governors then questioned what was meant by a high grade and it was confirmed this was a level 4 or above (old grade A* to C). The team confirmed it is unprecedented for either college to have results this low. Governors challenged why staff believed results had dipped this year and it was confirmed that during lockdown a number of students had opted out of attending the maths sessions. Engagement had declined.

Governors challenged this noting that many students nationally would have felt disengaged during the pandemic and why had the group under performed against the national rate? Is this due to the remote learning approach taken, or how the group engaged with students? Or was it due to other factors – eg regional pressures? Governors challenged whether the high performance team had reviewed the quality of teaching during lockdown and questioned if it was as effective as face to face teaching? It was confirmed that the quality of teaching remained good, however it was acknowledged that attendance had been an issue.

All students had been entered for GCSE results whereas in the past some students had completed functional skills courses.

Governors questioned what assurance could be given to the committee that improvement will be seen this year? A number of assurances were given including:

- Last year had been impacted by TAG's (teacher assessed grades) and CAG's (Centre assessed grades), and there is evidence of some artificially high prior results. This will have less of an effect this year.
- The group now have a maths task force and have recruited a number of new teachers.
- Tomorrow the high performance team are bringing all math teachers together to look at any systematic issues, to review how to engage more students, how to share best practise, and this collaborative approach will continue for the rest of the year.

Governors questioned to what extent the group were learning from research and best practise from high performing colleges? It was confirmed the team are looking out to see how other colleges are achieving success. A number of staff are representing the group on forums and committees.

Governors asked if the level of overall passes is in line nationally? They also questioned if the group might rethink the use of functional skills for some students? It was confirmed that this year they would deliver functional skills for around 20 students, who would otherwise find the GCSE's overwhelming. It was noted that the starting point was higher for students at Selby College than Wakefield College, (level one and two in comparison to level three students), but both colleges came out with similar results.

Governors noted they were supportive of being ambitious for each student but were concerned whether the expectation of a GCSE for some students may be setting them up to fail. The committee asked for an update before the decision was made for the next year reviewing the option of sitting a functional skill or GCSE and asked to understand whether the students own ambition or views would be taken into account.

Governors questioned the maths tuition in place for apprentices and it was confirmed that students are expected to come in for math classes. Failing functional skills in maths would impact on the apprentice's achievement rate.

Governors were informed that the QIP (Quality Improvement Plan) at Wakefield College had been ambitious and they had identified issues with achievement rates for some ethnic groups the college in previous years. The college had worked with an EDI project and look forward to reviewing the output from this project to inform future support and teaching.

It was also noted that compliance in keeping accurate and updated one to one records needed improvement in some areas and checks have been added to the latest quality review process.

ESOL: In the past, the achievements were low and it was identified as an area for improvement. This year the college results are in line with national rates.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>Governors questioned if items from the Selby quality improvement plan had been reviewed and would be carried forward in the new group plan? It was confirmed that many items had been completed and attendance and achievement in maths were key items to carry forward for the group.</p> <p>There had been a lot of successful results achieved across the group too. Governors reviewed the quality improvement plans and recorded their thanks and congratulations to all staff. The Wakefield QIP saw seven out of eight actions achieved, and the Selby QIP saw six out of seven actions achieved.</p> <p>Governors reviewed the papers and questioned item 5 on page 37, asking if it should be “students are well prepared for work”.</p> <p>Governors questioned when the committee would be able to look at carry forward activities and it was confirmed this would be part of the SAR validation process.</p> <p>Governors were then informed that the language of Ofsted inspections was changing and there is a move away from the focus on the three I’s (intent implementation and impact).</p> | |
| 5 | <p>Final progress report and outcomes against the quality improvement plans</p> <p>Due to staffing challenges, and the pressure of the audit, an apology was given that it was not possible to obtain all of the kpi, and that the information on the dashboard was not sent out in advance in a timely manner, for this meeting.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the latest group attendance result was 88% attendance.</p> <p>Governors were informed that that student survey results would be reviewed at the next meeting.</p> <p>Governors received an overview of the QER process and from the 34 reviews, only three observations did not meet expectations.</p> <p>See confidential minutes.</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Data dashboard matters</p> <p>Apprenticeships</p> <p>JT provided an Apprenticeship Accountability Framework Measures demonstration.</p> <p>The ESFA have a set of criteria they will review, and governors were reminded they are interested in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the data reviewed, • taking a risk based approach, (RAG rating) • encouraging self improvement, • the timeliness of information and • proportionality. <p>Governors reviewed the quality indicators paying particular attention to retention and the level of withdrawals.</p> | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <p>The quality improvement team confirmed national achievement rates of 59% and that they had looked at the barriers to achievement at the Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) employers did not want to do the end point assessments (EPA's) ii) the pressures of the labour market and cost of living <p>Governors reviewed the two new ratings (apprenticeship ratings and employer ratings of providers) and noted the scale of measurement. The ESFA also want off the job training to be monitored.</p> <p>Governors noted the variety of interventions offered to students. They were shown an example of the R14 report and noted the ESFA want all colleges to achieve at least 65% by 2025.</p> <p>Governors challenged what the group's reputation was with employers now? They noted the committee would benefit from a report at the next meeting for the colleges (currently received three stars out of five)</p> <p>Governors questioned if a large employer has the same vote as a small employer and it was confirmed that this was the case.</p> <p>Work placements</p> <p>Activity completed by a student is seen as work experience if they remain with one employer for a period of time. The merger has brought the team together with a number of benefits - there will be scope for all Level 3 students and T Level students to benefit from a wider work placement offer, and the team is strengthened. Students have planned time for work placements which are offered in blocks, except for Public Services and Sport.</p> <p>There have been challenges at the start of the year (e.g. with staffing in health and social care) but there are no concerns that students will be able to complete their requirements across the year.</p> <p>On 4th November, there was an employer forum, offering an opportunity for students to meet with employers. At Wakefield and Castleford, staff use a system called Navigate which supports the development in skills, and tracking of work placements. Currently Selby College are using a spreadsheet but it is hoped they will move to Navigate during the course of this year.</p> <p>Governors challenged if the group had plans for the proposed industrial action noted in the media? It was confirmed that plans had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Governors questioned if there were areas of concern to highlight as the group moved to introduce more T Levels? it was confirmed this will be an area of focus this year and the group are lucky to have good relationships with employers. Digital skills is an area that is proving challenging as the college group is surrounded by a number of SME's and it is an areas where employers are also finding recruitment challenging.</p> | |
| 7 | Curriculum Strategy | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Governors were informed that the new curriculum strategy would be presented in the new year and this would be informed by the curriculum planning process. Governors questioned when this would be and it was noted the planning starts now, with the bulk of activity between February to April.</p> | |
| 8 | <p>Student matters</p> <p>The group have developed some new surveys, and results will be reviewed by this committee and the local college boards.</p> <p>Student voice - there has been an incredible start this year with a huge induction event with lots of students involved. The group then had a successful student conference.</p> <p>SSIG - the student support group looks at really vulnerable students and there are meetings at each site. The group monitors which students have been referred, and why, and currently there are 61 students at Wakefield, 30 students at Castleford and 13 students at Selby.</p> <p>Governors questioned if this was higher or lower than previous years? They noted it was on par with other years at Wakefield and Castleford but they do not have data for Selby. Some of the main reasons students are referred include mental health, well-being and family reasons.</p> <p>Governors asked what assurance they could have that the process was sufficiently robust to pick up students in need of support? All staff monitor their students and the AVAR process has proven to be successful, in the past.</p> <p>The group are also looking at student interventions and support, and this has increased in comparison to previous years. Currently across Wakefield and Castleford 230 students are being supported.</p> <p>Governors asked if numbers were consistent across all courses, or level of programmes and it was noted that this year there is a higher number of students needing support in Hair and Beauty. 61 students are getting support at Selby College and 60% of those have been referred because of their mental health.</p> <p>Student disciplinary's: There are 75 at the formal stage one process and eight at a higher level at Wakefield and nine at Castleford (there are no students at Selby). This is higher than evidenced before Covid.</p> <p>DF, as the Governor Lead for Student Support, fed back he was really pleased with the take up at the Class Rep conference where 92 students attended, and noted the enthusiasm in the room. He is excited by the possibilities ahead for student voice. DF had opened the conference and was proud of the students who are representing their college and course.</p> <p>Governors noted the number of young adult carers has doubled from the previous year and noted the cost of living crisis will compound some of the challenges these students face.</p> | |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | The team confirmed they want to ring fence this area when looking at budgets and in the past had used STF funding to provide additional support. Wakefield College had prioritised support for students in previous years too. | |
| 9 | Quality Matters (QER shadowing, monitoring /self-assessment and schedule for governor monitoring) There will be a review next week and governors were invited to attend. Governors are invited to shadow any of the QER reviews and just need to let MS know. They will then report back to the committee at the next meeting. | |
| 10 | SAR Validation process This year it is proposed that individual governors will lead on specific areas across the two SAR documents. The chair had spoken to governors individually and it was agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH will review Leadership and Management • VT – will review Quality of Education • BP will review Quality of Education • GM will review Careers Education and guidance, within the curriculum, within personal development • GM and DF will review Behaviour and Attitudes and Personal Development • BP will review Education of Young People • RB will review Provision for Students and High Needs • VT will review Adult Education • DP will review overall effectiveness • DP will review Apprenticeships It was agreed that AP would circulate the new Ofsted grade descriptors. It was confirmed that the SARs would be circulated by the end of the day on 22 nd November, after review by the Executive Team. Governors agreed to send lists of questions for consideration to the chair by Monday the 28th of November at 9am. Governors questioned if student governors should be included in the process. It was confirmed that students could be involved in the future, within their specific curriculum area, working with that curriculum lead and could comment on the learner experience and journey. | 3 |
| 11 | Celebrating Success A student apprentice was successful in reaching the welding final. | |
| 12 | Ofsted Update CPD The team are designing a more comprehensive programme of CPD and development of industry knowledge for staff. GM and Lorraine Cross attended a webinar on LSIP provision and governors received a written summary report. | |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 13 | Terms of reference Governors agreed the terms of reference subject to the following amendments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> changing the number of meetings from 5 to 4, on page 53 the head of each local college will not be attending, students will report back to the board not to the curriculum quality committee. | 4 |
| 14 | Date of next meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29th November for the validation panel Meeting via teams 28th February Meeting on 12th of June in person at Castleford | |
| 15 | Any other business There were no items of additional business | |
| 16 | Effectiveness of the meeting Governors confirmed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That there had been good detailed and informative discussions at the meeting. Governors noted the committee had kept to timings Governors noted it was good to spend time on the quality of education Governors noted some items could warrant a longer time and they would be comfortable to potentially having additional meetings across the year A governor noted they were still trying to find the right balance between local board items and curriculum items and work would be ongoing with local board chairs. It was noted the chair had chaired the meeting effectively and there was a good complement of skills around the table. Governors were particularly pleased with the ability to raise challenge outside of the restricted time in main board meetings. | |

Action Log from the Meeting:

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------|-----|
| 1 | Provide update on GCSE and Functional Skills Plans | Next year | LM |
| 2 | Share student survey update | Next meeting | CA |
| 3 | Note dates for the validation process | | ALL |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------|----|
| 4 | Update terms of reference | ASAP | AP |
|---|---------------------------|------|----|

Action Log from the previous Meeting:

| | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| 1 | GM to share an aide memoir with DP and the committee, detailing the interaction between this committee and the Local Boards | ASAP |
| 2 | Hold an additional meeting for the validation of the SAR | ALL |
| 3 | Make adjustments to the ToR or the schedule of business | Next meeting |
| 4 | Share the plan for learning walks across the academic year, taking into account the feedback from the Committee | Next meeting |
| 5 | Present a detailed attendance report to the next meeting | Next meeting |
| 6 | Add an item on student experience (at group level) to the schedule of business for the committee | Next meeting |