



**Curriculum, Quality and Standards Committee  
Monday 3 October 2022 18:00-20:00, Teams**

## Draft minutes

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>Committee</b>     | Mike Sutcliffe (Chair); Sue Kingman (VC, Board); Ian Valvona; Cait Orton; Jason Jones (Acting CEO & Principal); Peter Flew; Student governors to be elected   |
| <b>In Attendance</b> | Andrew Rogers (Assistant Principal Curriculum and Quality) Sheila Fraser-Whyte (Executive Director Business Development & Innovation); Rachel Scarborough (Head of Student Experience); Vincent Neate (safeguarding link governor); Chris Dearnley (ESFA); Sarah Connerty (interim governance advisor); Chidi Okolo (Director of Quality and Compliance); Pauline Hagen (FEC support) |
| <b>Apologies</b>     | Susanne Davies (interim Assistant Principal Curriculum and Quality); Cait Orton; Vincent Neate  |

| <b>Agenda item</b> | <b>Item Description</b>  | <b>Action</b> |
|--------------------|--|---------------|
| <b>1</b>           | <b>Welcome and apologies</b><br>The Chair welcomed colleagues to the meeting. The Chair welcomed AR to his first meeting.  |               |
| <b>2</b>           | <b>Declarations of interest</b><br>There were no declarations received.  |               |
| <b>3</b>           | <b>The minutes from the meetings held on the 5 July 2022 were agreed as a true and accurate record.</b>  |               |
| <b>4</b>           | <b>Actions and matters arising</b><br>All actions are addressed under the agenda items or in progress.<br>SD has provided an update on item 8 – Functional skills and BTEC resit numbers at the foot of the action list.   |               |
| <b>5</b>           | <b>Safeguarding</b><br><b>1. Annual Safeguarding report.</b><br>SC noted that CO and RS are holding a refresher safeguarding session for governors, with the date to follow shortly.<br>RS noted that CO has covid so is unable to attend.<br>RS reported that mental health remains the largest referral category with the onsite team and the NHS team. There are a number of statutory cases. Social services have informed the College that there is such an increase in demand post Covid that the College cohort are unlikely to be able to access social services so the safeguarding team are holding cases at a much higher threshold.<br>Last year there was an increase on child on child sexual abuse cases. There are agencies coming in to deliver sessions to students and provide training and awareness. The more the College can get students to talk about it the more disclosures there will be. Post pandemic the thresholds have risen as there were less disclosures when remote. All levels of behaviours have spiked. The team are keeping up with cases and can provide safe spaces for disclosure.<br>IV noted that if there are students in need of help or protection, they should receive it in a formal local authority setting and he would be interested in looking at the threshold document for professional interest. IV noted that there is an operational reality but he is keen |               |

|   |  |                               |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
|   | <p>there isn't a sense that the College aren't likely to reach the social services threshold when there are students that need that help and protection. These students need to receive the support. RS noted that the College is putting through referrals and have pushed back on cases and are going to additional meetings to see how this can be resolved. There are students the team feel would meet the threshold and there is an operational need from Achieving for Children (AfC). IV noted that the Board can be part of that escalation framework and make representation to a local authority if needed.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> RS to share the threshold document with IV and request support from the Board for the escalation to the local authority if required.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> PF noted the one case on stalking and the suggested clarifying the language to read: one potential stalking issue and no further action was taken.</p> <p>The Chair asked if against the national benchmark the College is not hitting any red flags and RS confirmed this is correct.</p> <p>PF noted that in one of his governor roles in the arts the discussions around safeguarding involve the national lead for the LADO and it is very much on a needs basis. RS explained that in FE it is the needs document for social care and LADO is for staff referrals.</p> <p>The Chair asked if there is sufficient resource for the team to resource this area appropriately and RS noted that the beginning of the year is a stretch but the resource is in place.</p> <p><b>Child and Vulnerable Adult Protection Policy (annual)</b></p> <p>RS reported that the policy has been updated in line with Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE).</p> <p>PF asked about the Level 2 offered to all staff in house and whether everybody at the College has to have safeguarding training. RS explained that Level 1 training is mandatory and Level 2 is best practice for all staff and mandatory for the safeguarding team. <b>ACTION:</b> The Committee suggested this is included in the policies and procedures list on the last page of the report.</p> <p><b>2. Update on mental health and wellbeing</b></p> <p>RS reported that RuTC continues to be the best practice model for mental health and wellbeing and is embedded with the trailblazer team. Other teams in the cluster are using the College as an example of best practice.</p> <p>The College has the highest level of referrals and of those being accepted only two had too high a threshold. An action plan is in place for the cluster the College is working as part of locally. This year it is looking at linking with EDI and more meaningful conversations in the STEM area which is predominately male. There have been a lot of offers to deliver sessions from MIND.</p> <p>A new post has been created - Welfare Engagement Adviser for STEM and EHCP students which has been welcomed by AfC. The College is ticking a lot of boxes for innovative practice The Chair thanked RS for a very comprehensive report.</p> | <p>RS</p> <p>RS</p> <p>RS</p> |
| 6 | <p><b>Key Performance Indicators</b></p> <p><b>1. KPIs for 2022-23 and performance against current CQS KPIs</b></p> <p>JJ reported as follows:</p> <p><b>Attendance</b> – this remains the achilles heel for the College. Staff have been working hard to improve and it remains a stubborn area for improvement. There is poor achievement against last years' KPIs. A further revised Attendance and Punctuality Strategy is now in place. The Committee asked about the 90% target. JJ explained that last year's target of 85% was challenged by Pauline Hagen as there is an expectation both from Ofsted and the FEC to aspire for much higher. It was recognised by SLT that 85% wasn't an aspirational target but was realistic from a low base.</p> <p><b>Achievement rates</b> – this is in the context of the 12% decline in 2021-22 and the quality improvement plan being in place. The College has made an improvement and a move back towards where it wants to be. It is not as significant as what was predicted. It is a 4% increase. The primary driver of the improvement is the quality assurance processes and</p>   |                               |

|  |   |                     |
|--|---|---------------------|
|  | <p>management interventions. This year it is the ability to put in a robust teaching staff development programme (because of the teaching staff contract negotiations) that will support the College to make further, more significant improvements.</p> <p>SK asked about projections made, where they fell away and what changes need to be made on the projection model. JJ reported that there is an underperforming courses action plan to look at predicted achievements and ground not gained. The key assessment point model is being looked at. Consistently engaging with the teachers on the ground instead of just using Markbook and looking at individual students' performance and the robustness of data is underway. The SLT are clear that the model needs to be refined and that is being done. The Chair noted that last year the Committee were led to believe that there would be a greater improvement and there is still some way to go. JJ noted that it is important to note the improvement and the work done in the minutes rather than just reporting a disappointment. A corner has been turned. The Chair agreed that this is the case and it is about the way the expectations of the Committee were managed.</p> <p>The Chair noted that a key part of the model was about staff judgement and this is consistent with there being a systematic error that needs to be addressed. JJ noted that the College was 4% below the predictions but this does not indicate a systematic issue. The SLT put in place a system to address a systematic issue and this system needs refining. Now in place are three key assessment points through the year, using Markbook for in-year achievement and consistent use of teachers' feedback which is being worked on. The Chair asked if some teachers need training on their judgements and JJ agreed they do, and this is a training issue which is being addressed.</p> <p>SK asked about <b>retention</b> and whether 94% is sufficiently challenging. JJ noted that in 2019-20 it was at this rate. The achievement rate depends on retention and pass rate. It is for teaching and learning to improve dramatically. The flexing needs to come off the confirmation of the national average and that is not confirmed yet. There is an upward trajectory at the College but more than 95% would be unrealistic.</p> <p>There is work being undertaken to ensure the right student is on the right course before the October census date and staff will manage student's progression points beyond that.</p> <p>JJ noted the targets for <b>work experience</b> and asked for views. It was agreed that full compliance is the aim but it is unrealistic given the starting base and 80% is still challenging. SK noted that the outcome was 6% for the Covid year and is this a realistic jump. JJ explained that different colleges define work experience in different ways. Every student who takes on a study programme should have an opportunity, but the target is for undertaking the work experience. It is about planned hours and completed hours. PF suggested a KPI is framed around the learners and what they are getting out of the experience would be helpful. Knowing how many students are already working in their spare time is useful. JJ noted that he would want to include sightlines to careers week and the raft of experience around employability. <b>ACTION:</b> IV suggested selecting HCUC's KPI target and if merger does not take place resetting and this was agreed.</p> <p>JJ reported that there are lots of staff involved in the management of WEX and EEPs. There is the management of the planning of the hours, execution of hours, management of teaching staff for the completed hours and Kath Rangeley is providing a lot of support on this with the recording of planned and delivered hours. <b>ACTION:</b> The Chair asked that the milestones for WEX and EEPs come to the next CQS meeting and JJ reported that it is included in the risk register.</p> <p><b>Student satisfaction</b> – there has been a significant dip in the results.</p> <p>SK asked about destinations and why the spike in learners progressing to HE is unexplained. JJ explained that in 2021-22 the outcome column is 26% higher than recorded in previous years. The College has not yet got all the destinations data in to report fully on this. SK noted that it would be useful to know why some students move. JJ noted that the data is no longer split</p> | <p>JJ</p> <p>JJ</p> |
|--|---|---------------------|

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
|   | <p>because the company the work is outsourced to do not split it out as standard. In addition the HE offer at the College is currently very small.</p> <p>JJ explained that the large majority of 50% not recorded are expected to go into the FE destinations.</p> <p><b>Apprenticeships</b> and timely finishing – SFW reported that timely is 32.4% and this is expected due to the delays to end point assessments. Achievement stands at 53.7%.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: The CQS KPIs for 2022-23 were recommended for approval, noting the use of HCUC's target</b></p>  |    |
| 7 | <p><b>Quality of Education</b></p> <p>1. <b>Emerging achievement rates 21/22</b></p> <p>AR reported as follows. The picture varies between schools. <b>Business</b> shows a clear improvement for 2021-22 of over 10% and has a new HoS who is driving improvements. <b>Creative Industries</b> is 89% and on the three-year trend is at a consistent level. This school has a consistency of staff and well led, good quality processes and comms.</p> <p><b>Early Years, Health and Social Care</b> shows a drop year on year with clear reasons. The main issue was the course timings with an exam put on too late and challenges around staffing so students were not as prepared as they should have been.</p> <p><b>English and Maths</b> has had a downward trend for three years and an improvement this year. There were changes in the exam body and timetabling improved and a change to GCSE.</p> <p><b>A Levels</b> had a more robust recruitment and information, advice and guidance to prepare students. Achievement has been the same with an overall drop over the last two years.</p> <p><b>Construction</b> is 64.2% and has been below the national average for three years. There have been staffing issues and a new HoS came in in January. There is an issue with large cohorts, having the right teacher in place and an issue with exams and learners being on the right courses. Exams have been brought forward this year to allow two opportunities for students to pass. It is about making sure that there is an E&amp;M requirement and that students are prepared and ready for the course and a more robust induction process is in place.</p> <p>There has been an improvement <b>vocationally</b> to a 77.2% achievement for 2021-22.</p> <p><b>Vulnerable (Send/Adverse Experience) v Non Vulnerable</b> - the achievement rate for this cohort has improved by 2% from the previous academic year and now stands at 80%, three percentage points above the projected achievement rate landing point of 77% for the total college population. AR reported that he has been working with RS on case studies and examples are included in the papers. These show examples of the good work of teachers and the Student Support services.</p> <p>PF noted that the data demonstrates that vulnerable students do better at RuTC and asked if cost effective elements of this can be brought to other areas of the College to improve achievement and move good practice on, and whether advertising to promote this can be done. RS noted that she is working with the Inclusive Learning team and there is a lot of tracking and support in place. It is the quality of the 121 support that vulnerable students receive that drives achievement up.</p> <p>AoC have asked Colleges to go out to schools at an earlier point for SEN students and the College is doing this.</p> <p>RS noted that this year there are moving on track days. Predictions are based on a much more robust 121 level of support which is resource heavy but important.</p> <p>SK asked if this is picked up through the tutorial system. RS noted that there is 121 session time with students. CO has done training on attachment awareness and SEND learners; there is staff CPD session on how to identify SEN; there are three Welfare Engagement advisors who offer 121 support and 121 tutorials with half an hour set aside for smart targets. This has all been done and needs to be revisited more regularly.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> AR agreed to update the colour coding in A level and Early years noting the update</p> | AR |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>depends on the national average. PF noted that the best colour is above national average even if achievement has gone down.<br/>The Chair noted that it looks like there is a plan in place for areas that need more support.</p> <p><b>2. Progression data and case studies</b><br/>At level 1 there has been a 17% drop from level 1 to 2 and it has dropped incrementally year on year. Level 2-3 has seen an improvement over 3 years with a slight drop in 2021-22, Level 3-4 is consistently high at over 90%. For Level 1-2 there is work to be done to develop the relevant study skills as there is a jump in levels and there is a need to understand why the learners are not progressing.<br/>The College is not seeing new students coming in, this is internal progression. <b>ACTION:</b> It was agreed that the numbers that don't progress would be a good number to include and would give context and link back to destinations data.</p> <p><b>3. SEN Report</b><br/>RS reported that there is quite a lot of work to do on SEN. The College is one of the largest post 16 providers for Achieving for Children (AFC) students with ECHPs and it is documented in the written statement of actions which is a large report following the AFC Ofsted inspection. This is an action plan of what the provider has to do. It has been a positive headway with 36 large actions and these are being broken down into more tangible actions. The paper is a brief overview. RS asked does the Board want to receive details of SEND achievement and the needs of students going forward.<br/>The Chair noted that reporting is important and he asked RS what should the Board see from a statutory and best practice view. The Chair asked how will the statement impact on RuTC students going forward. RS explained that the College will be going into schools earlier, providing curriculum pathways and it is about how AfC want it quantified. The College has to get the learner voice about the transition and experience.<br/>The Chair suggested looking at what HCUC report on. Do the providers have an expectation of what needs to be delivered? RS explained that these are the 36 points.<br/><b>ACTION:</b> It was agreed that RS would report back on the action plan to the Board as this is an area that the Board and the College take very seriously. RS will look at what HCUC report on to the Board.</p> <p>The Committee discussed whether a governor to lead on SEN and meet up with RS and the team would be useful and IV agreed to meet with RS to take forward. IV noted that he did not know the answer to RS's question about what the Board wants to see and suggested that this is started iteratively. The Board want to spend more time looking at disadvantage and vulnerability and it is about how to draw the framework reporting around this. The Board should be cognisant of the HCUC frameworks when exploring this. Looking at the numbers is quite straightforward but being able to look at and interpret it will be a real learning curve for the Board. <b>ACTION:</b> It was agreed that SEND training at the right level for the Board would be a useful starting point and RS agreed to organise.</p> <p><b>4. Stakeholder engagement</b><br/>SFW reported that the paper was drafted around the new Ofsted EIF four categories of stakeholders - community, civic, employer and education which was suggested by Pauline Hagen. A key part of the work with stakeholders is around the impact of the engagement in the delivery of curriculum and how to meet the qual reforms. This paper is a starter for ten for governors to understand the space.<br/>The College works with a number of stakeholders including development work on apprenticeships and work with the NHS and mental health trailblazer. The College has MoUs with different universities, the South London Partnership, works with 300 employers and work with other FE colleges and community groups. The focus is how it impacts on the student's experience.</p> | <p>AR</p> <p>RS</p> <p>RS</p> <p>RS</p> |
|--|--|---|

|  |   |                      |
|--|---|----------------------|
|  | <p><b>ACTION:</b> SFW asked about engagement with stakeholders and other board members. IV suggested going straight to Keith Smith in the first instance to get a clear framework for stakeholder engagement. SK asked how this will work post-merger and is the engagement at Group or College level. SK asked how do you locate stakeholders to the Stakeholder and Scrutiny Committee as a direct line of sight to the Board?<br/>The Chair noted that the paper was very helpful for understanding the constellation of interactions.</p> <p><b>5. Draft College Self-Assessment Report 2021-22 – process and timelines</b><br/>COk reported that SLT met last week to produce the whole College SAR which will go through the validation process. Pauline Hagen supported on the individual SARs. The SAR is on schedule to meet the final draft on the 7 October. Heads and Assistant Heads of School have contributed to show the action taken and impact. There are 42 individual actions as a team which have had a direct impact on improving achievement.<br/>The SAR will go to the CQS Committee in November with a recommendation to the Board in December.</p> <p><b>6. Draft College QIP</b><br/>JJ reported that a lot of input from Pauline Hagen centred on the six central themes which will run through all the action plans from the school. The QIP is very detailed and contains all metrics.<br/>The Chair noted that he had understood that the revised QIP would be shorter and simpler. This version creates a lot for the CQS Committee to monitor and, although shorter than the previous QIP of 25 pages, is this more of a management document at 14 pages. JJ explained that it is a leadership and management document and the level of detail is necessary to enable the QIP to run at the College. To produce a distilled version for the Committee in addition to the full QIP would run the risk of producing more work for senior colleagues to meet the Committee’s need and JJ needs to balance that against other commitments for the SLT. JJ noted that the College has a lot of issues and there is a lot to monitor, which is why the QIP is so detailed. There have been many conversations about streamlining. It is not just an aspiration to meet targets but the process underpinned to meet those targets and there does need to be a recognition that a lot of work goes into the QIP. JJ noted that he did not want to double up work on the QIP by producing both the QIP and an additional version for CQS.<br/>IV noted that Pauline Hagen is providing external verification for the QIP and he would like to see at that point PH’s feedback. The involvement of the FEC in the quality recovery is an important step for an institution. It would be important for the Committee to ask for advice on the level of detail the Board should be receiving through the QIP. The Chair noted that PH had fed back that governors have got too much operational detail to wade through in the previous QIP. It is a difficult set of circumstances and a lot to stay across but if PH thinks the right thing is to focus on a slimmer, distilled QIP and not the management tool then it is important to take her advice.<br/>IV suggested that PH offers a view and the Executive draw up something that is right for the Board based on PH’s advice. It was agreed that the Committee would always want the full QIP as a management tool annexed.<br/>PF agreed noting that he was not in favour of SLT having to do an extra document for governors. A suggestion is to look at the areas governors need to look at and comment on and action and rank actions. The document does contain a number of areas that governors don’t need to know and it does need to be at the right level for the Board.<br/>JJ noted that the document is shorter than last year’s QIP. There is already in place a process for paper production to the Committee with the bulk of detail in an appendix and a high level summary for the Board. The Chair noted that if the QIP had had an appropriate coversheet this would help the Committee to focus on the priority areas.</p> | <p>SFW</p> <p>JJ</p> |
|--|---|----------------------|

|   |  |            |
|---|--|------------|
|   | <p><b>ACTION:</b> The QIP to be externally verified by Pauline Hagen and feedback to come to the Committee. A revised version to be produced if recommended. SC to request advice from PH to the Committee on the level of detail that should be included for the Committee and Board.</p>   | JJ/SC      |
| 8 | <p><b>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion update.</b><br/> To note: EDI report and plan deferred to 23 November Committee<br/> AR reported that initial meetings have taken place with the College’s new EDI champion, Shebaz. Drafting and developing a policy and pathways is the first step and looking at the current status of EDI at the College. Priorities have been formulated for EDI and actions have been drafted for term 1. These are for students to look at the visibility of EDI through the College. Further work on achievement, the student experience and comms is to follow. There are opportunities for staff from a range of backgrounds to see how diverse leadership works. AR noted that he was bringing in best practice from his former role at Lambeth College. SK asked if the work would look at other dimensions of EDI as well as ethnicity and AR confirmed it would.</p>   |            |
| 9 | <p><b>Student Experience</b></p> <p><b>1. Learner voice and Learner Voice action plan</b><br/> RS explained that the Committee generally receive details on the opportunities formally to get learner voice. The action plan gives a holistic view and shows where the most successes come from through curriculum. Media students are getting involved through their curriculum areas to get an improved return on the learner voice. Student reps are now all part of the Student Council. Working groups will be set up including the EDI group, events committee and sustainability group. Teachers are invested in this as part of the curriculum projects. A lot more linking is going on with courses including feedback on safer travel for students and work with travel and tourism.<br/> The Chair noted that it sounds like it is moving ahead well.<br/> SK asked where the Student Survey results are and what are the students saying. RS explained that the results will feed into the next Student Forum meeting. They are based on the student survey results from last year. The Committee agreed that it would be useful to have a reminder of the results. COK noted that the student survey results for this year will come to the November CQS Committee.</p> <p><b>2. Student numbers and enrolment</b><br/> SFW noted that the College hasn’t done as well as it wanted to for 16-18s enrolment. The current number is 1979 which will be below target. Staff have contacted students who applied and didn’t convert. Feedback to report to date is that a lot of students have stayed on at school, or at colleges closer to home although students are still coming across different boroughs. A lot of students have not picked up the phone. Enrolment started off very positively and then there was a downtrend. There is a breakdown on courses included in the paper. Health and Social Care and childcare numbers have gone down considerably. Level 1 courses did not recruit well and this is an area of work for the College. Some courses over recruited including Business, Forensic Science and IT.<br/> The Committee asked about speculation that schools are keeping more students and whether there is an opportunity to recruit students at a later date if this does not work out. JJ agreed that January starts will be looked at but it wouldn’t be in place for this year and would be part of the strategy to look at with HCUC. SFW noted that HCUC have seen a drop in 16-18s. There is further analysis and work to do on the gaps in enrolment and the reasons students have not come. There is a decline in conversion to A Levels which hasn’t been seen before and a lot of work has gone into this area. SFW noted that despite it being a brand new building there is still a building site outside.<br/> SK noted that retention figures through the various points become more important with the low numbers and JJ agreed that the College’s focus is now on retaining students.</p> <p><b>3. Learner voice strategic rapid intervention plan</b></p> | RS/<br>COK |

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
|    | <p>COk noted that he has worked closely with RS and team on the learner voice to get an understanding of the quality and operations. There has been a focus on the speed to getting things done and the College wants to be much more responsive to students with rapid action. There are a series of interventions and tracking of what is going on. Five themes came out of the student voice from last year – poor comms; security and feeling safe; equipment/resourcing; lack of/insufficient teaching levels; planning, sequencing, delivery and assessments. The plan defines the actions that each member of the team undertakes and reports back. This plan is about interventions and rapid change.</p> <p>The Committee asked about improvements compared to last year and COk explained that the plan is currently comparing the first six weeks of term to last year and progress is where it should be. It was agreed that a lot of good work is going on around the student voice.</p> <p><b>4. Behaviour action plan</b></p> <p>RS reported that behaviour has been a lot better than last year. The College is working with the police closely and ensures that duty officers are fully trained. The plan is always moving due to changes in police personnel.</p> <p>There have been over 30 risk assessments for students and the team look at behaviours of students who have not disclosed with disciplinaries and breach of the learning partnership agreement instigated. The College is much more proactive around behaviour and there are excellent police links onsite. There are still ongoing issues with the Magenta carpark.</p> <p>IV commented that the plan shows a series of actions which is positive and a sense that behaviour is better, but it is not clear why this is the case. IV asked what the framework is for measuring the impact of actions that correlate to keeping on track with managing behaviour better.</p> <p>SFW reported that from admissions and enrolment the amount of intelligence on students who have misbehaved previously is much more evident and there is more of a targeted intervention. This had a big impact and wasn't done previously. IV noted that this is a strategic approach, connecting the action plan to the senior team's strategic approach to managing behaviour. RS noted that police interaction has really improved.</p> <p>SK asked if there are useful metrics for measuring impact including withdrawals and the reasons, disciplinaries and the nature of them. SK suggested that retention may improve because more of the students who are here have been more thoroughly processed at admissions and enrolment and will want to stay.</p> <p>[RS dropped off the call due to technical difficulties]</p> |       |
| 10 | <p><b>Complaints update</b></p> <p>SFW reported that all complaints from last year are resolved. The Chair asked if processes have been changed following complaints and SFW confirmed that process changes have been made and support has been provided to staff to address any issues and comms issues have been addressed.</p> <p>The Chair thanked SFW for keeping on top of the complaints process which must involve a significant amount of work.</p> <p>[JJ dropped off the call due to technical difficulties]</p>   |       |
| 11 | <p><b>Risks relating to CQS</b> (the full risk register was not included in the papers)</p> <p>JJ had reported to the Chair by email that the risk register would be going through the SLT prior to coming to Audit and Risk Committee for consideration and recommendation for approval on the 13 October and would come forward to the November Committee. SFW noted that it was important for the Committee to have sight of the risk register as there are a number of CQS risks and it was agreed to circulate the draft with the opportunity for the Committee to ask for further details from SLT. The Chair asked colleagues to have a close look at risks relevant to the Committee when circulated.</p>   | JJ/SC |
| 12 | <p><b>Ofsted preparation</b></p> <p>This item was not taken due to timings. [After note: JJ provided an update to the SRP Committee the previous week noting that the College is prepared as it can be. Because of the</p>  |       |

|           |  |    |
|-----------|--|----|
|           | amount of extraordinary business and the merger preparations JJ would request a deferral of inspection if necessary].  |    |
| <b>13</b> | <b>Any other business</b><br>Dylan McTaggart from HCUC to be invited to the CQS Committee on the 23 November 2022 if merger is proceeding as part of the merger transition.<br>To note that the update on HE has been deferred to the November 2022 meeting. | SC |
| <b>14</b> | <b>Meeting dates for 2022-23:</b> 23 November 2022   |    |

Meeting closed: 20:15