

Minutes of Full Board Training, Development & Strategy

Date: 8th Feb 2024

Time: 4.30 - 6.03 pm

Location: Itchen College, S10

Present:	Mr B Jones (Chair)	Mr A Scott (Principal)
	Mr R Parke	Mr T Grant
	Mr M McCauley	Mr B Tyers <i>[left 1733, item 5.20]</i>
	Mr D Batten	Ms S Garner <i>[arrived 1627, item 4]</i>
Virtual:	Mr C Breckenridge	Mrs L Court
	Ms M Lico	
In attendance:	Mr M Jones <i>[Left 1642, item 5]</i>	Mrs R Startton
	Miss F McIntyre	
Apologies:	Mrs S Hammtt	Dr C Carpenter
	Mr M Brown	Miss Shannon
	Mrs M Harris-Bridge	Mrs D House
	Mr E Unigbe	

1 Apologies

1.1 Apologies for absence as above.

2 Declarations of interest

2.1 None in addition to those previously declared.

3 Minutes of the last meetings

3.1 Minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and agreed as a true record.

4 Chairs Update

4.1 In a good position as numbers look good and a good working atmosphere. LRC is now completed and within budget.

4.2 The external governor review is underway and appointed AoC with the review being completed by Mary Malcom.

4.3 New build is progressing with planning agreed and a contractor appointed.

[SG arrived - 1627]

4.3.1 Confident contractor will get to the figure required to proceed. Should be completed by the end of the year.

4.4 Chair will speak to governors to complete the annual governor review process. Students will be done together.

5 Principal's Report – Strategic Review and Local Needs Duty

- 5.1 Presentation shared with governors that will be shown to all staff tomorrow.
- 5.2 Heading toward the next strategic planning cycle. Moved on sufficiently to start considering now. Next plan will be 2026 - 2030.
- 5.3 In a strong place as a College but risks to be considered and how concerns are navigated.
- 5.4 Previous strategic plan overview shown with priorities and objectives which turn into key performance indicators.
- 5.5 In 2017 were under threat and just had Ofsted RI and the financial position was not as strong.
- 5.6 Strategic plan offers a framework to operate and to measure progress.
- 5.7 The next plan will cover 2026-30 and will be reviewed over the next 18 months. Need to consider if the emphasis is correct to move forward.
- 5.8 Press release shown regarding the new South Hampshire College Group. They are undertaking a period of curriculum consolidation. Likely to be a reduction in city provision and they will not directly compete with Itchen.
- 5.9 Southampton UTC - hoping to start recruiting Sept 2025 and looking to lease premises close to Southampton Central station. Will offer courses for 14 to 18 year olds.

[MJ left at 1642]

Principal does not consider it to be a threat. They will be selective at 14 will be GCSE curriculum. 16 A level with no level 2. There will be high entry requirements. Location not ideal. Will be close to RT so more of a threat to them.

Q: What is purpose of it then?

A: Government wants to improve and increase the technical education of young people.

Q: Is it a national program?

A: Yes there is one in Portsmouth too.

Discussion over whether this meets needs and if location is correct.

Q: So the UTC GCSE and A levels only?

A: Yes.

The need was identified as students were travelling to Portsmouth. Potentially confusing SO postcodes as Southampton residents.

Q: What is the expectation of numbers?

A: Around 100 in each year group.

Need to be aware of it but not a threat.

Will be offering an engineering qualification.

Since dealing with 14-16 there are rules around outside space also.

- 5.10 Destinations of students from Southampton schools over the last seven years shown in graph form. Itchen has an upwards trend. In general terms this shows Itchen is recruiting well. This is Southampton schools only as half students come from Hampshire schools.
- 5.11 Demographics for next four years looked at. 2024 15% growth. Majority of this growth is on this side of the city. Does suggest could recruit well again next year.
Q: Why is this a concern?

A: Need the new building and be operational as soon as possible. It will start to put some of the central services under pressure. Students would again be unfunded. Possible to have a geographical effect to get more from this side of the city and less from the other side so less need for buses.

Q: Why are RT numbers decreasing?

A: Variety of issues such as reduced curriculum offer. Students will not go there when not offering what they want to do and then will lose good staff.

- 5.12 Deprived statistics for students looked at. Above national and Southampton at band 4 and less at the bottom of scale. Same for adult learners.

Q: What is the measure of deprivation? What is level 3 vs 6.

A: It is index and looks at a whole range of factors, incomes, working and other categories.

Fareham and Eastleigh and the other way round with an upwards curve.

- 5.13 Pie chart showing Itchen against Colleges nationally shown. Very different mix of courses with more level 2 and entry levels.

National average on entry 6.5 while Itchen is 5.6

Vocational 4.9 nationally and Itchen 4.5.

Q: Where are the other btecs being done?

A: They are still one but in FE Colleges.

- 5.14 Achievement data shown and mainly compared to 2018/19 pre covid.

The 2021/22 data still has the covid adjustments.

- 5.14.1 Value added is more important to consider.

- 5.15 Financial position - tight year as ahead of allocation so unfunded students.
£1.1million less than should have

- 5.15.1 Tougher for adult and community and less work to compete for

- 5.15.2 China market - hard for students to get a visa.

- 5.15.3 £500,000 in year funding confirmed which is more than expected.

- 5.15.4 Funded for 1570 next year.

- 5.15.5 £8.2million grant for 16-18 provision likely (was £6.4m). High needs growth now agreed additional £230,0000

- 5.15.6 Additional resources through T levels which will be in March

- 5.16 Risks:

- Bus contractor increase in costs
- Unlikely to be funding injection post election
- Further growth helpful but could have unfunded students.

- 5.17 *Q: Is there a cutoff point for enrollment?*

A: Though the enrollment process then looks at late applicants on a case by case basis. Numbers coming through looked at carefully with historical data. The cut off could be not accepting late applications if required.

Comment: need to consider the ethos and size of the College and ensure do not cause damage to College through over recruitment.

Response: Can accommodate growth expected this year but if it continues with an additional 200 years after then would need to look at timetables.

This would form part of the strategic process over the next eighteen months to consider what wants to be and the purpose of the growth.

The demographics do not continue to rise and do fall again.

Well positioned to support the community across all levels. Kept the broad offer and inclusivity and will keep College in good standing going forward. The growth will be short term and identity will be maintained during this time.

Student Comment: Curriculum shown at both Colleges were similar that visited but Itchen being smaller appealed and can build better relationships with other students and teachers.

This is the ethos of College and would not want to lose them.

Q: Applications to student numbers - how different?

A: Predictor was 1560 and was very close to those. Works on a proportion of applicants and looks at proportions that turn up to interviews. It is very accurate.

- 5.18 Age profile of staff shown. Majority between 30-39. Itchen has no under 25 teachers. Majority 50 to 59 and 10% 60 and over.

This will be an issue so needs to be considered as part of planning going forward.

Teacher recruitment and retention is an issue nationally.

At Itchen retention is less problematic and steps are taken to reward loyalty.

- 5.18.1 Recruitment has become more of an issue post pandemic. More repeat advertising. Principal and RS attended a staff shortages session at Southampton University by Dr Sam Sims which looked at the non monetary incentives and implications of work as a source of meaning. The more meaningful the job is, the more it outweighs the income and hours.

- 5.19 Where are the issues?

- Out of city
- Competitors
- Lower GCSE score on entry
- Recruitment issues

How to address

- Ongoing strategy to remove reasons to go elsewhere
- Reintroducing lost subjects at A level
- Competing on being next can be

Meaning

- Overall context gives purpose other colleges does not have
- Staff make fundamental difference to students lives
- Because of contact and misconception need to work harder to show not second best

- 5.20 Refocus on VESPA - Vision Effort Systems Practice Attitude

[BT left at 1733]

Focus on staff to be considered in the next strategic plan.

- 5.21 The presentation gives contextual information to the strategic documents shared with governors.

- 5.22 *Q: In terms of recruiting a marketing manager and a strategic campaign to improve College reputation. How is this going to be progressed?*
 A: Worth considering as advertised to replace Emma and included marketing and did not get many applicants and now removed. Most powerful advertising is word of mouth which is going in favour but slow. Do not want a 'surprisingly good' message. SLT has considered what is needed whether a content manager would be better to push out messages subtly. Need to consider how marketed. Not looking to replace the marketing manager role at the moment. May become part of conversation as the strategic plan continues.
 Staff recruitment was using outdated information so this has been looked at.
- 5.23 There is work to be done to market College to students, parents and potential employees.
- 5.24 Discussion on marketing and how it is changed.
- 5.25 Prospective shows the engagement of students and is well done.
- 5.26 Need to be aware of the reviews online such as google reviews which come up when College is searched online.
- 5.27 Discussion on parent feedback which is done via surveys and reviews.
- 5.28 The students sell the College well so using them during school visits could be beneficial.
- 5.29 To follow up - governors to have discussion on why the numbers have gone up and how to improve on success without compromising the quality of the College.
- 5.30 Anticipated changes to curriculum
- 5.30.1 Government is committed to a Btects and Ctects reform which is wide ranging. Still uncertain when this will happen due to the election.
- 5.30.2 Have a strong curriculum offer so not concerned.
- 5.30.3 *Q: What is funding for establishing a T Level?*
 A: T levels attract a higher rate than an A level program. In additional specialist equipment allocation to set up the course. Early years started last September and received an extra £60,000 for equipment. Media and care so around £200,000 set up.
Q: On the document it states Computer science A level introduced and IT dropped - why is this?
 A: IT will no longer be funded. Deemed too much cross over. There is a digital T level option that could be offered. Looked at in depth and do not feel right fit for students.
 Looking at T level media and content creation.
- 5.31 The governing body has undertaken a review of provision in the context of the Local Skills Improvement Plan, taking into account the latest data on post 16 destinations and recruitment patterns, proposed curriculum change at the College and partner/competitor activity. **This review confirmed the significant contribution the College is making to address local need.** Governors also sanctioned the plan to extend provision at 16-18 to enable learners a greater choice of qualification in the city, removing reasons to travel further afield.

6 Policies

- 6.1 Safeguarding and Prevent reviewed by G&E - approved.

7 Impact and Action Review

- Good meeting with discussion
- Looked at strategy
- Future of College
- Action - further governor discussion planned to move forward

8 AOB

8.1 None

Meeting concluded at 6.03pm and was quorate at all times.