



**Curriculum, Quality and Standards Committee
Thursday 25 November 2021 18:00-20:00, Teams**

Draft minutes

Committee	Mike Sutcliffe (Chair); Sue Kingman (VC, Board); Ian Valvona; Vincent Neate; Cait Orton; Jason Jones (Acting CEO & Principal); Rose Turner; Will Whitmore; Yasmine Eltaki; Mohamad Armoush
In Attendance	Rose Turner (interim Assistant Principal Curriculum and Quality) and Susanne Davies (Quality consultant); Lois Vassell (Assistant Principal C&Q); Sheila Fraser-Whyte (Executive Director Business Development & Innovation); Rachel Scarborough (Head of Student Experience); Chris Dearnley (ESFA); Sarah Connerty (interim governance advisor); Marc Dodi (for item 9 - EDI)
Apologies	Cait Orton

Agenda item	Item Description	Action
1	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed colleagues to the meeting and welcomed Lois Vassell, Assistant Principal and Mohamad Armoush to their first meeting of the Committee. Committee members introduced themselves.</p> <p>Apologies received from Cait Orton.</p> <p>Will Whitmore did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>Yasmine Eltaki attended the meeting at the College and SC agreed to ensure that members are clear on venues.</p> <p>Rose Turner had technical issues so joined the meeting via the chat and Jason Jones confirmed he would present RT's items</p> <p>The Chair thanked colleagues for reading the papers and apologised for the late items.</p>	
2	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>There were no declarations received.</p>	
3	<p>The minutes from the meeting held on the 19 November 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.</p>	
4	<p>Actions and matters arising</p> <p>Actions were updated as follows:</p> <p>Action 1: HoS to be invited back in three months to present to the Committee against the Quality Recovery Plan and actions being rolled out – the Chair noted that a session will be scheduled last week of January/first week of February as this will phase with other items on the College's agenda. At least two independent governors will attend.</p> <p>IV asked about the right time for Board colleagues to come together to look at the QRP and to see if interventions are working. JJ noted that the end of January/February QIP reporting would tie into the QIP. It needs to include key people from the Board with eyes on the data to see if the College is on track.</p>	

	<p>SK noted that she would be happy to participate in a meeting to look at a snapshot of this time.</p> <p>JJ felt the meeting should be formalised and minuted.</p> <p>VN felt the meeting needed to be very clear on what the expectations are from a Committee perspective. The governors need to be leaving that meeting with a sense of what the data is saying and actions required to make the quality improvement happen are in place. An understanding of how management are linking the day to day that will result in the quality improvement that is needed.</p> <p>The Chair suggested looking through the QRP and then reviewing what is required for a January/February meeting.</p> <p>RT asked how beneficial it is to meet with the Heads of School (HoS) and whether a meeting with the Exec would be better. The Chair noted that the meeting was with the HoS to ensure they are accountable and are reporting into the Board. JJ noted that the meeting would include Exec that are student facing plus HoS because it is leadership and management in this context.</p> <p>LV felt that there needs to be a discussion about why HoS are asked to attend. The Exec should be able to report on what the HoS are saying and needs to be clear on the data. The senior leadership of the College only should be invited to the first meeting to get a clear picture.</p> <p>JJ disagreed because if Ofsted come in the HoS will be front and centre of the inspection. It is essential that CLT can explain the situation but it is really important for HoS to have that experience.</p> <p>IV noted that from a governor’s perspective it is about getting assurance from the HoS on an identified weakness in the system. IV noted it is an extraordinary position and it will be done collaboratively, but this is an important and active step and an intervention by the Board. It is being brought forward to January rather than waiting for the CQS in March so there is time to make a difference.</p> <p>MD agreed with VN’s comment about seeing the impact of the actions in the QIP. If CLT cannot see small actions from HoS then intervention needs to happen at an early stage. The impact on the actions could be driven by CLT and be giving assurance to governance mid year.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the meeting would involve the HoS and student facing members of the CLT.</p> <p>SC advised that the meeting is a formal CQS or Board to ensure there is a record of the meeting to document the progress against the QRP both for the Board and external agencies. This was agreed.</p> <p>Action 2: Ofsted preparation – Susanne Davies is leading on this and is scheduling a session for governors on 23 February 2022. SC to circulate once confirmed</p> <p>Action 3 – Enrolment – on the agenda at item 15</p> <p>Action 15 – Careers strategy – will come to the 9 March meeting</p> <p>Actions 17, 19, 23 – student matters – on the agenda at item 10 and on the Board agenda for 14 December</p> <p>FRC action - JJ reported on the FRC joint action on the increasing overlap of FRC and CQS remits around curriculum and finance and resources and IT. It was agreed that this would be related and co-related items on each agenda to ensure the work is connected. This extends to the QRP as significant resource has come in to support the recovery. JJ reported that agendas will be coordinated and SC was asked to set up a meeting with JA and the Chair.</p>	<p>SC</p> <p>SC</p> <p>SC</p>
5	<p>Safeguarding</p> <p>RS reported on the safeguarding update in CO’s absence.</p> <p>There has been an increase in students known to the safeguarding team.</p> <p>Mental health remains the highest referral into the service.</p>	

There is a lot of support in place. The counselling service has been developed with a lead counsellor and four extra volunteers and the Trailblazer service is up and running with two advisors in College. The College has been working with MIND with support for all age groups of students. MIND are going to deliver workshops for parents to raise awareness. The College is looking at setting up a mental health group with MIND. Mental health provision is well covered in terms of resource and support.

With behaviour there has been a rise in issues. The College has been working with outside agencies. The team have done a mapping exercise looking at links between behavioural issues and space at the College. [confidential item] Service leads in Richmond and Kingston (AFC) have come out and delivered a behaviour health check working at transition level for young people going forward.

At the last CPD there was a session about the Protect strategy for staff and students responsibilities within that.

There was one Prevent incident raised to the police and no further advice was required by the College.

There have been a significant amount of meetings with external agencies. A couple have been complex meetings discussing more than one student at a time.

The safeguarding audit was submitted. The feedback was positive and instructive feedback was provided.

[confidential item] IV welcomed the report and felt it was comprehensive. IV questioned the increase in safeguarding from November 2020 and the reference to complexity and asked a question about whether the safeguarding team as the resource to deal with the increase and the complexity of multi agency work.

IV noted that he wanted the Board to report as a discreet item on the risk in behavioural issues. SC to action.

SK noted the comment about the behaviour being a lack of socialisation through the pandemic and how much of this is sector wide or specific to the College. RS reported that with all the groups she is a member of they have all seen a spike in behaviour issues. There has been almost two years of lockdown. Boys have not had the social skills of talking to their peer group in real life. RS noted the College have put in a new reporting tool for students to report any type of harassment. Racial and sexual harassment need to be reported out separately. SK felt that if this is a shared issue can the College call on outside support. RS confirmed that the College has tapped into the Local Authority quite a lot. The College is liaising with the Contextual Safeguarding Manager to keep on top on issues.

The Chair noted the reference to gangs. RS reported that the team have been working with the Gangs Outreach manager, there has been no formal training but the team are working with them locally and the understanding is better. The term gangs is very specific and has to fit all the criteria in the matrix. The definition is included in the paper.

The Chair thanked RS for a comprehensive report. IV re asked the question about whether the team have the capacity required. RS noted that now figures have come down the team are doing all right. JJ is still the DSL, and a request has been put in for another member of staff. The College has a highly qualified Kick Start worker who will finish in January/February and three support officers. JJ noted the request is coming to CLT on Tuesday.

Report on the student experience from student governors and Head of Student Experience (item 10)

RS reported that the format has changed from student union to student council. This time last year there were only two members in role but this year it is full with people still coming forward as project leads. There is a positive increase in student engagement. MA and YE have met with Beth Pattison and come up with many ideas on how to improve the student experience and how to engage with students in wider numbers. There are a lot of

SC

	<p>enrichment opportunities going on in the College and it is about how this is communicated to students. The student survey results report students feel there are not a lot of activities going on so this will be discussed at the upcoming student forum.</p> <p>There was a lot of positive feedback from the Freshers fair and students would like more of these activities. Another fair will take place on the 10 December and this will be used to promote College opportunities.</p> <p>MA reported that he has met one of the previous student presidents to see what activities were run. For this year there is more opportunity now lockdown has eased. It is MA's first opportunity as a student president and a lot of activities can be planned.</p> <p>The Chair thanked RS and MA for a really useful report.</p> <p>[RS departed:18.49]</p>	
6	<p>College Self-Assessment Report 2020-21</p> <p>JJ recorded his thanks to RT for the report and the huge amount of work carried out on the SAR. In terms of the structure the College has adopted the agreed HRUC structure and this does broadly follow the Ofsted EIF format with the four key judgements. The College then self-assesses against the key provision. It is concise to get to the heart of the key issues around the performance last year. In terms of process curriculum area reviews feed into the whole College SAR, the SAR is scrutinised by CLT who give challenge and debate around grades and key areas for improvement. This year there was a lengthy meeting with CLT including LV, who is an Ofsted inspector, and that is very welcome. On the panel was the new Director of Quality and Compliance and three C&Q consultants. In terms of independent scrutiny it was very positive. The CLT feel the grades are sound in terms of the judgement, the overall effectiveness grade is RI and the contributing grades underneath are almost exclusively RI. There was a lot of debate around the grade for curriculum impact. It is a helpful way to be able to self-assess which goes to the heart of curriculum and planning processes.</p> <p>JJ noted that there is text that explains the reasoning and rationale for the RI grade. The CLT felt that with a 12% decline in achievement grades it would be hard to assess impact as anything other than inadequate. Destinations data is collected later in the year and it may be that this demonstrates a better story which may support an RI grade for impact, but as it stands that data is not available.</p> <p>The Chair reminded colleagues that there is a four point scale (Outstanding, Good, Requires Improvement, Inadequate).</p> <p>JJ reported that the SAR is one side of the coin and it is the bit that looks back. Even more important is the QIP, and the QRP that sits within the QIP, which looks forward and provides actions for a trajectory of improvement. The decline last year is a significant dip but there had been improvement over the last two years. The expectation is that with the QIP and QRP achievement will go back up.</p> <p>SK noted that it is interesting and picks up many nuances. The sentence on the historical failure in leadership is quite a strong and narrow statement in the light of results improving up until this year. The Chair agreed and last year the grade was Good so this either reflects poorly on this comment or last year's judgement. It also presumes that this was the only driver. JJ agreed with the comments and indicated that the wording would be changed. Over the last two years there has been a churn in leadership which has had an impact.</p> <p>The Chair noted that culture is a bigger issue. There have been some issues with leadership but there are concerns about culture generally. JJ agreed and noted that almost three years ago there were cultural issues that were identified, addressed and improved upon. As a result of Covid there has been some back sliding into cultural ways of the past.</p> <p>ACTION: It was agreed to change this statement. It is about not overstating this point. JJ agreed this is fair and will talk about culture to this point as well.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the Committee agreed with the proposed grades.</p>	JJ

	<p>IV asked if an Ofsted inspector would see it as credible for all RI with one Inadequate. LV noted it is credible when you are asked by an inspector, it is about how you argue the grades. With 11% in the wrong direction there is little choice in the grades. Inadequate is about arguing where you are. A lot of time was spent on this to come to this judgement. The Chair noted that the pattern suggests that the College is doing a lot of things right but not impacting on the outcomes. LV noted it is about showing Ofsted where we are now and how are we moving forward. It is what we do with the data to move forward. JJ noted that now having completed the self-assessment it is about demonstrating to Ofsted that we have travelled that distance.</p> <p>SK asked about implementation and suggested this is critical. There must have been something wrong in the execution of the intent and the implementation last year. JJ noted that these are crystallised on the table on page 7 which hinges on tracking of student progress and consistency and rigour not being there therefore the support and intervention was not consistently put in place. The checking of students in remote lessons was an issue, so the focus on attendance was there but the focus on engagement was not consistently there.</p> <p>VN noted that he didn't feel any of the gradings need to be changed but it tells us collectively across the College that people are not clear about what the intent was and the flaws with this, but that the flaws are not inadequate but are RI. Then it can clearly link through intent, address the flaws in intent and this is why the College feels it can recover from these failings in the outcomes. The question is how can we make sure that in the organisation we are collectively on the right page.</p> <p>LV noted that when you look at the QIP it identifies every single issue and that is how we track what is happening.</p> <p>The Chair felt this was a really good discussion and has improved governors understanding.</p> <p>The Chair noted that CQS is asked to recommend to approve the grades and the SAR.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee recommended to approve the draft SAR 2020-21 to the Board subject to the one change detailed above</p> <p>The Chair passed on his thanks to RT and JJ for all the work.</p>	
7	<p>Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and Quality Recovery Plan for 2021-2022</p> <p>JJ reported that there are no points to highlight. Colleagues have seen this at the Board and the previous CQS. The QIP is an annual document and the QRP is embedded within the QIP so two separate plans are not being run alongside each other. The specific QRP elements are in blue font. This has been updated in the last week and the updates are reflected in the paper. A lot of the impact has not been ragged yet because this will be seen later in the year.</p> <p>RT noted that this is a dynamic document that is updated monthly. There will be new actions added to it as the team identify other actions that need to take place. RT noted that she was sure LV will want to review this and will have other good ideas to incorporate into it.</p> <p>SK asked for reflections on the red items and on impact.</p> <p>JJ reported as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English and maths is still experiencing difficulties and is not where it needs to be. It is better than last year and there is an ongoing attendance programme. A lot of work is going on in the background. It is too early to see the impact but this will be reported back at the next CQS • The induction plan didn't have the impact intended and will stay red but is fully expected to change next academic year • RT reported that E&M is inconsistent across the curriculum and time consuming and HoS have not been able to give enough time to this 	

- Improved quality process – JJ noted he was not sure why this is red. RT noted that School QIP and SARs were not completed on time and the team are late reviewing the Schools QIP to check they will have impact.
- SK asked how far through the year is it still ok to be red. JJ noted it depends. For attendance it is never too late to keep trying. If there is a student with poor attendance they need to withdraw. If they don't respond to support by now it is too late. RT reported that the actions on attendance at the start of term did not have the required impact. The team have had to put other actions in place to tackle attendance. These are beginning to show some improvement and there has certainly not been any further slide.

The Chair noted that there is a related point about retention. There are two sides with attendance and retention.

- JJ reported that withdrawal is not the only part of the strategy for attendance. All withdrawals impact on retention which reflects on achievement overall. Last year retention was 89.5 overall. Throughout the year the retention was artificially inflated because there were a lot of late withdrawals so it wouldn't be useful to track against last year but the College will track against the previous years. RT reported that the College were very strict on withdrawals up to the census period but are now doing everything to retain students
- RT reported that the conversation re retention is linked to the KPI paper. Moving forward the team will be able to report on the likely achievement 'best case and worst case' and also the progress tracking via Mark Book. RT confirmed that at the next CQS colleagues will be able to see Mark Book completion and also estimated achievement.
- Attendance – CoG meetings are focusing on attendance but the impact is not coming through
- Rapid recovery – this was the action in place to address the fails to get achievement rates up, achievement sat at 72% so there was minimal impact

IV raised the question of progress tracking (p.8) which was a key issue from the diagnostic from last year. The area of catch students before they fall is really important and he asked if the College is really clear this is amber and green and can there be more information on strand 1, 2 and 3. It feels like a really key part of the recovery plan. It is the totality of the plan coming together to talk to engagement. Progress being tracked accurately feels like such an important area. IV clarified that is part of LV's role.

RT reported that the Catch them before they Fall project is not green due to the timeframe slipping for the implementation of Mark Book. The completion of ILP at the start of term (strand 2) was much improved but not 100% much improved. Strand 3 is target setting and there is CPD on this in January as the use of this is inconsistent across the College.

The Chair agreed that the Committee needs to be on top of the QRP and be assured it is progressing. It is predominately red and amber and this does raise some concern.

JJ noted that quite a lot of the impact will not be measurable until achievement rates are in but there will be more data on where we are going and the direction of travel.

IV noted that following the achievement decline the Board had lost confidence in the data and asked if it will be the meeting at the end of January where the data has the confidence required and the Committee can return to a more business as usual oversight. JJ

explained that the catch them before they fall approach is the consistent use of Markbook across the piece and that will feed into the January review HoS will be giving on their individual QIPs. That will provide the data that was lacked last year.

RT noted she felt governors can be confident on the data - the big issue will be does the data tell us what we want to know. RT noted that MD is implementing this within his own school.

	<p>The Chair noted that it is disconcerting that the timetable for Markbook is slipping. JJ reported that timeframes have slipped a little but this has been an incredibly tough term. It is only a couple of weeks out and it will be pulled back. One of the HoS is leading with RT on this.</p> <p>RT reported that the slippage is unfortunate and not what she would have wanted, however it is not critical to the overall project and it may have been an overly optimistic timeframe.</p> <p>MD noted that the new Director of Quality and Compliance started eight days ago and the impact on auditing and QA has been enormous already.</p> <p>LV noted that lots is being implemented. There will be a difference by Christmas and Committee members are very welcome to meet with LV to get an update on impact on what is happening in the background. LV noted that she is a Governor elsewhere and has come from an Outstanding college. There will be a termly SAR and data verified by end of term and LV will be looking at the impact of externals coming in and working with staff. LV noted that she understood the Board's anxiety and wanting to be a bit more hands on but they need to have a bit of confidence in where the College is. LV noted that she could see the issues and was putting things in place after only four days in the role. LV noted that the QIP is reviewed weekly and updated monthly and she will review on a daily basis. Governors will be able to see that and that data will be verified and will be meaningful.</p> <p>The Chair noted JJ's assurance that by the next meeting data would be in place that is comprehensive.</p> <p>The Chair asked if LV would have confidence in the data by the January/February 2022 meeting and impacts from this and LV confirmed she had 100% confidence.</p> <p>VN reported that listening to LV does give him confidence and it is exciting to hear. VN agreed with IV that he liked the phrase catch them before they fall and asked if engaging Student Services so the student body themselves would have the benefit of osmosis and give a message across the College about supporting students. JJ reported that Student Services are very much plugged in and RS is part of the Curriculum Operations Group. There is an Attendance Engagement Outreach Lead who does a lot of supporting on attendance and engagement and there is the student voice and engagement and enrichment. That is what the study programme is about and the core development of English and Maths and the employability piece is wrapping around it.</p> <p>RT noted that there is a very good link between attendance chasing and student services. The teams liaise to make sure that they know which students are High Needs or Looked After Learners so that the attendance chasing is appropriate for each student.</p> <p>IV noted it was a good conversation and it has become clear about the importance of the end of January meeting and what needs to be seen from officers.</p>	JJ/LV
8	<p>Performance against CQS KPIs</p> <p>JJ reported that some of the columns are blank because it is not at the time of year for predicted achievement rates and in the next CQS this will be covered following KAP data drops that are taking place now.</p> <p>On the question of the intention to bring Ofsted inspectors in it has been agreed at CLT that at this stage weighing the pig won't help fatten it. Targeted support is being provided from consultants and LV will be working alongside HoS to really focus on the problems and getting those problems fixed. The College know what the issues are and it is about fixing it.</p> <p>The appointment of a T&L manager is key and this role has been focused on by Susanne Davies who is leading on the GOAL walks and lesson observations that start next week. A new structure is in place with HoS. The CLT feel comfortable with the structure but it is the roles that are being redefined. The right structure is in place there are five HoS one of those schools is very large and has increased in size again and is unmanageable for one individual and has been split. This is one of the flagship schools so it is essential to get it right. STEM and digital and construction and engineering and health areas are a key part of the College's strategy and for meeting local employment needs.</p>	

	<p>RT noted that she has already seen the positive impact following the decision to split STEM into two schools in that relevant HoS are now meeting internal deadlines.</p> <p>RT noted that there will be more in year data in KPI reports. Moving forward the appendices will be updated so that the Committee can see more of the in year data and how it changes throughout the year. Around tracking the team can also report on the % of assessment that have been completed (this is Mark Book).</p>	
9	<p>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Report</p> <p>Objectives and Action Plan</p> <p>MD noted that he was pleased that the paper aligns with the conversations that have taken place so far this evening.</p> <p>A RAG rating has been included in the actions against the 5 intents the EDI Committee set last year. This prefaces the evaluation the Committee conducted in October. That is not yet fully aligned because a lot of the actions are quite small but aligned together over the next few years will have an impact on culture.</p> <p>MD asked the Committee to consider the proposal for the intents to remain the same until 2023. This will enable a 3 year plan for the EDI Committee to fully assess the impact. The Chair asked what the EDI Committee feel and MD noted that they had discussed and were in agreement as the five substantial intents cover the depth and diversity of the Committee's remit. Next year there will be a focus on College identity, student feedback on actions and impact, and racial and ethnic diversity within the College. There has been great progress on other protected characteristics but the Committee want to drive forward racial and ethnic diversity this year.</p> <p>MD presented the short video made by students which was a Level 2 media campaign. It was a year in the making and will be promoted on the website. MD noted that it is a really great campaign and will stand in good stead to promote EDI. As there were technical issues it was agreed to bring the action plan and the video to the Board on the 14 December as it is such a fundamental part of the College's work.</p> <p>The Committee agreed with the proposal to stay with the current intents in the action plan with a full evaluation in 2023. VN felt this was a brilliant idea and it is important for everyone to understand the intent. MD echoed this and reported that at the AoC conference EDI was a really hot topic across all colleges and the question was around how to measure impact. The consensus was that it is measured over a long term plan. [MD departed 19.55]</p>	MD/SC
10	<p>Report on the student experience from student governors and Head of Student Experience – this was taken under item 5</p>	
11	<p>Emergent Curriculum Plan for 2022-23</p> <p>JJ reminded colleagues that the overarching curriculum strategy has been in place for 2 years and is being updated. The main priorities link to the Skills for Londoners agenda and Labour Market Intelligence (LMI) and the broad focus is around increased and adapted curriculum offer in Creative industries, Digital, Construction and Engineering and Business & Accounting. STEM sits large within that and that aligns with the STEM centre. A lot of new STEM offer is moving ahead within the strategy despite the delays to the capital build programme. It is moving along particularly in response to the pandemic. The College will gather more up to date data on LMI and HoS will be trained in using that data. The CLT are exploring opportunities for further collaborations so the College is not delivering in a vacuum. HEI and other destinations are being explored. A more detailed account will come to the 9 March 2022 meeting and this will be an agenda item for LV.</p> <p>The Chair asked about HEIs. JJ reported that the College has a developing partnership and MoU with Roehampton and St Marys. JJ noted he was at St Marys yesterday and there were discussions about interesting variations and exciting opportunities around partnership delivery with Allied Health and Engineering.</p> <p>L4 and 5 is very small numbers and is a key priority for the College.</p>	LV

	The Chair thanked JJ and noted that there is a great work in progress and wished LV good luck taking it forward.	
12	<p>Adult Delivery Programmes</p> <p>SFW reported a meeting took place with the GLA today and CLT are discussing enrolments and adult delivery to bring it to a better place. Currently the College is £200k down on AEB delivery. Good Work for All is £20k up. This will come back to the Committee as a substantive item and will link to the curriculum strategy and intent.</p> <p>SFW noted that there is a new HoS for Sixth form and E&M who is looking at ESOL delivery increase.</p> <p>The Committee noted that a full update would come to the next meeting.</p>	SFW
13	<p>Apprenticeships</p> <p>SFW reported that it is still tough for apprenticeships. Some of achievements did not come through and some were not in a timely manner. There are 30 learners due to complete in 2021-22; this is a very low number so every learner will have an impact on achievement a lot of work is being done on this with SMART targets. SFW noted that it is all about going out and getting employers.</p> <p>At the moment there is a significant risk of not meeting planned targets. A GP surgery consortium have been in contact looking for 15-20 apprenticeships and Kick Start learners have end rates with distinctions and merits so this is being taken forward.</p> <p>In the market generally employers are not recruiting or are looking at HE opportunities. There has been a significant drop in engineering achievement rates and added to this there is the current crisis in the sector.</p> <p>The College has had some apprenticeships who have completed end point assessments getting distinctions and merits and the first one has been achieved in IT.</p> <p>In terms of numbers these are low with only 14 new enrolments at the moment another 13 to go on the ILR. There are 61 continuing learners.</p> <p>The Chair noted the concern about the numbers and highlighted the impact of the pandemic.</p>	
14	<p>Complaints update</p> <p>SFW reported there had been 10 formal complaints since the last meeting. There are two still being resolved, one which is an appeal being reviewed by IV. All others have been resolved. There was a complaint from a local resident about litter and the College has been clearing up in the areas around the College. The Chair asked about the complaint about a member of staff and SFW noted that this has been resolved and there are no issues to report.</p>	
15	<p>Enrolment and Application update</p> <p>SFW reported that current enrolment figures are:</p> <p>16-18 – 2077 learners. The funded count of learners was 2103 at census and allocation for 16-18 is 2090.</p> <p>19+ - 217 leaners on Full Time programmes. There has been 40 withdrawals since the beginning of term with adults. Withdrawals of 19+ has occurred across all curriculum areas. The highest number of withdrawals and non starts was within Construction and Engineering.</p> <p>Withdrawals</p> <p>155 students enrolled but didn't start at the College</p> <p>Pre census there were 165 withdrawals with a number related to nonattendance and behaviour.</p> <p>Post census there have been 26 withdrawals.</p> <p>Applications</p> <p>These stand at 939 at the moment. The Chair asked how this compares to previous years and SFW reported it is about the same but the breakdown of courses is different and this is being analysed at CLT on Wednesday. It is a bit early to do much scrutiny as it is only</p>	

	<p>seven weeks in but there will be a substantive item on applications at the next CQS in terms of curriculum strategy and intent. There is three-year data for the courses to benchmark.</p> <p>This year there will be an interview schedule for all the courses. Last year automatic options were done. In January schools will come in and have tours and there is a new officer in school liaison who is taking this forward. This wasn't possible last year because of the pandemic and is so important. For Richmond upon Thames School it will be the first year of students progressing so this is a real opportunity.</p>	SFW
16	<p>Risks relating to CQS</p> <p>JJ reported that whilst the RAG rating of curriculum and quality risks hasn't changed apart from a couple there has been travel in terms of likelihood, mostly positive. For the improvement of achievement rates it is too early to see any impact but the likelihood has shifted downwards because of the QRP and the curriculum and management structure and additional resource.</p> <p>Ofsted want to recognise distance travelled and the College is not there yet and needs to be focused on that.</p> <p>The impact on reputation is a risk around the fatal stabbing but this may be mitigated as the year goes on.</p> <p>The Chair asked about the curriculum management structure being too lean and if the current structure is appropriate or is more emphasis and resource needed. JJ reported that it is appropriately resourced but it is more about the impact of the newly and soon to be appointed additional resource and this takes time.</p>	
17	<p>Any other business</p> <p>There were no items raised.</p> <p>The Chair thanked colleagues for a great discussion and noted the importance of the Committee's role for ensuring the College is on track in terms of curriculum and quality and for providing support to JJ and team.</p>	
18	<p>Meeting dates for 2020-21:</p> <p>9 March 2022; 21 June 2022</p> <p>All 18.00 start</p> <p>The Chair noted that a further meeting will be scheduled with the Heads of School in late January/early February.</p>	SC

Items deferred items to the next meeting were:

Work experience and employability

Careers strategy

Meeting closed 20.31