

Meeting of the Quality and Curriculum Working Group

Thursday 1st May 2025 at 4 pm

Seminar room 4

Minutes

Present: Andrew Lord (Chair), Neil Boggin (Governor), John Mansergh (Governor) Mary Osmaston (Co-opted Governor), Jane McCormick (Governor)

In attendance: Richard Evans (Deputy Principal for Education and Standards) DPES, Tamara Breeze (Director of Governance and Compliance) DGC, Kelli Horner (Head of Quality), Sinead Kay and Gayle Salt (Directors of Curriculum)

117	Apologies for Absence: Kevin Boles, Mike Seaton, Kelvin Nash (Principal)
118	Declaration of Interests None
119	Minutes from the Meeting 4th of March 2025 The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.
120	Ofsted readiness: Pragmatics and 'from the call' action plan The Quality team provided the Quality and Curriculum Working Group (QCWG) with an overview of the College's readiness for a potential inspection. Preparations for inspection had included the identification of 'mini-nominees' and stakeholders for all courses, alongside staff training on 'mini-nominee' and 'intent conversation' topics. Regular staff briefings and bulletins had provided updates on inspection matters, with access to Quality Improvement Plans at college and departmental level for all teaching staff. A comprehensive Ofsted preparedness and response plan was in place, and centralised resources available to help staff prepare programmes and learners to articulate their programme narratives effectively. Senior leaders and the Quality Manager had attended Ofsted and AoC inspection updates, while Further Education Associates were on standby for a 'Mocksted'. Seven full deep dives replicating inspections and additional tailored deep dive elements had been conducted, with external deep dives completed in two areas. Heads of Faculty had engaged in development days focused on inspection readiness and action planning. The DPES explained that key staff possessed greater inspection experience compared to 2023 and had access to the data supporting swift interventions and evidence preparation. Teachers had been briefed on shifting inspection priorities, such as inclusion and the broader educational purpose of providers. Since the October 2023 inspection, reasonable progress had been made on identified areas for improvement, with actions demonstrating a positive and sustainable impact on learners, as confirmed by a monitoring visit in October 2024.
121	Self- Assessment position The DPES confirmed that Kendal College was a 'good' provider. The measures taken following the Ofsted inspection in October 2023 had addressed the key issues identified at that point and continued to strengthen the quality of educational provision. The Chair asked whether the quality believed that that the provision was consistently good in quality. The

DPES stated that the College had areas of excellence but was not yet outstanding due to those areas being too few. The quality processes, after substantial investment were sufficiently able to address inconsistencies and any emerging concerns in a timely manner, evidenced by members of teaching staff who were no longer working for the college, since the last inspection. The capacity of the college to improve was noted and group members asserted that was a crucial factor in inspection judgements. It was acknowledged that the interim self-assessment reflected the current EIF, with plans to align the 2024/2025 self-assessment report (SAR) to the forthcoming EIF once sufficient detail was made available, probably by summer 2025. Governors and an external advisor would validate the SAR later in the year, against Ofsted's scorecard system, though calibration would be challenging due to the lack of benchmarks available. Quality improvement plans (QIPs) were in place at both college and departmental level, these would be further updated prior to inspections to highlight progress. Staff training had focused on the existing EIF, with detailed preparation for the new EIF deferred until later in the year.

The group members asked if impact statements could be provided alongside the stated improvement measures along with data to evidence the impact. The HoQ stated that the Curriculum Performance review documentation triangulated that evidence. The governors asked to be kept up to date on any underperformance of courses or departments.

A discussion took place on whether the Business Support areas also had performance reviews, and the group was informed that they did not, this was noted as a risk to the organisation and to be reported to Audit and Risk Committee.

The self-assessment grades were as follows:

Overall Effectiveness	Good
Behaviour and Attitudes	Good
Personal Development	Good
Leadership and Management	Good
Meeting Skills Needs	Reasonable
Education Programmes for Young People (EPYP)	Good
Adult Learning Programmes	Good
Apprenticeships	Good
Provision for Learners with High Needs	Good

Recent improvements included an upgraded apprenticeship provision assessment to 'good' due to stronger workplace links, improved retention, high satisfaction levels, and strong End Point Assessment outcomes.

Personal Development has progressed owing to initiatives like 'Ready, Steady, Go!' and enriched programmes in EPYP, which had reduced quality disparities.

Stakeholder engagement in curriculum design had significantly improved, and learners with High Needs were achieving better progress. Challenges remained in refining the assessment of EHCP outcomes, addressing the issue of recruitment and retention of skilled teachers, ensuring consistent feedback and clear pathways for learners, and improving attendance in English and maths for 16–18-year-olds. The recruitment and retention of teachers was discussed and the DGC updated group members on proposed work of the Task and Finish group, that would address this issue and feedback to Corporation in July.

The group discussed how the SLT could improve the skills judgement from 'reasonable' and suggested a whole college stakeholder event, such as a partner conference, to improve the college's relationship with stakeholders. The group agreed that such an event could be beneficial reputationally and could be tied into the introduction of the new Principal.

Priorities included tackling recruitment and workload issues, enhancing inclusive support, expanding enrichment and pastoral services, strengthening stakeholder engagement in skills-based courses, and extending CPD and managerial support for staff.

The group asked how the teams had prepared students for the inspection. The student survey mirrored the likely lines of enquiry from an inspection team and the learners were familiar with

	those. The team were also confident that the feedback initiative, 'one thing' had helped learners to identify what they needed to do to improve and would be able to articulate this to inspectors.
122	Terms of reference for Quality and Standards Committee The group discussed the proposed Terms of Reference and requested the inclusion of; monitoring of the accountability statement, and to strengthen the meeting of the skills agenda, to escalate risk to ARC when necessary, oversight of educational CPD/ training. DGC to add these points into the terms and recirculate to the group.
123	Membership of QSC Neil Boggan resigned from the group to concentrate on ARC and FRC and was thanked for his valuable input to the working group since November 2023. Membership was confirmed as: Andrew Lord (Chair), Kevin Boles, John Mansergh, Mary Osmaston (Co-opted) and Jane McCormick.
124	Any other business None
125	Date of next meeting; 24th of June 2025