

Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 1 December 2025 at 4.00pm

Present physically at ASFC: B Welham, EEGT (ASFC) Parent Committee member
K Points, EEGT Trustee
R Cannon, WSC Governor
S Daley, EEGT Trustee and WSC Governor – **Chair**

Present virtually: C Chua, WSC Governor
J Drake, WSC Governor (part)
J Wakelam, EEGT Trustee and WSC Governor – **Vice Chair** (part)
S Garner, EEGT (OSFC) Parent Committee member
S Snowdon, EEGT Trustee and WSC Governor

In attendance: A Adamson, Group Deputy Principal – One Sixth Form
A Carr, Group Deputy Principal – One Sixth Form (part)
A Harvey, Group Assistant Principal – Sixth Form Provision
A Hurrell, Group Head of Quality Assurance
C Shaw, Group Principal – WSC Sixth Form
D Murray, WSC Governor (observing as part of induction)
G Evans, Group Quality Manager
G Huntington, Head of SEND Services
J McDonnell, Trainee Clerk and EA to the Governance Professional
J Robson, Group Principal – One Sixth Form
J Stockings, Group Assistant Principal – Sixth Form Provision
N Savvas, Chief Executive Officer
N Payne, Group Director Careers, Opportunities, and Progression
R Bamford, Group Vice Principal – Quality
R King, Head of School, Supported Learning
S-L Neesam, Group Head of Welfare and Safeguarding
S Gales, Governance Professional
S Hughes, WSC Governor (observing as part of induction)
S Langthorne, Group Deputy Principal – WSC sixth form (part)
S Small, Group Deputy Principal – Abbeygate Sixth Form
T Lloyd, Group Director Skills

Apologies: C Durrant, Group Head of Pastoral and Administration
K Brown, Group Assistant Principal – Teacher Education
M Williams, WSC Staff Governor
R Head, WSC Student Governor

Absent:

The agenda was discussed in this order: 1, 2, 3, 11, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16

1. Declaration of Interests and Apologies for absence

Members recognised the standing declarations. No other conflicts of interest in relation to the items of the agenda were declared.

Members noted that C Chua is WSC Governance Lead for Skills, J Wakelam is EEG Governance Lead for Safeguarding (sixth form), K Points is EEG Governance Lead for People, S Daley is EEG Governance Lead for Careers and S Snowdon is EEG Governance Lead for SEND.

Apologies were received from M Williams and R Head.

2. Minutes of the meeting on 3 November 2025

Members reviewed and **agreed** the minutes of the meeting on 3 November 2025 as an accurate record, subject to adding '(part)' alongside S Garner on page 1.

Action

Gov. Prof.

3. **Matters arising from the meetings on 3 November 2025**

Seven of the ten matters arising from the previous meetings were complete, one was noted and closed, one was for assigned to another Committee and one was ongoing.

MA1 – The Executive noted this ongoing as IT seeks to find a solution which meets our cyber security standards without requiring all governance members to have EEG log-ins.

MA4 – Members commended the draft AI strategy.

4. **First-Hand Feedback**

Members received and considered the feedback resulting from members' visits to the Sixth Form Colleges.

J Wakelam fed back on her visits to Abbeygate in July, WSC sixth form in September and to Abbeygate in November.

J Wakelam noted that in her visit to Abbeygate in November, there were concerns about estates and queried the reasons for this. The CEO explained that there have been staff absences in the estates team which have impacted the service and outlined plans to address this. The CEO informed that more detail on the proposal will be discussed at the Strategic Conference.

S Daley and R Cannon fed back on their visit to Abbeygate in November for a student Hackathon event and commended the student engagement and reflected that it showed that the student councils were effective vehicles for student voice – as the issues raised at the event were also raised in the student councils.

S Daley fed back on her visit to One in December to support its careers accreditation and commended the positive culture and student learning environment.

K Points fed back on her visit as EEG Governance lead for People, to a joint HR and H&S team strategy workshop in October and commended their use of data and trend analysis to plan staff development and support.

J Wakelam fed back on her visit to WSC sixth form in November to support of its 'Go Green' event and commended how EEG's sustainability strategy is influencing the wider community.

The Chair encouraged members to liaise with the Governance Professional to arrange First-Hand visits to our colleges.

SAFEGUARDING

5. **Annual Safeguarding report**

Members received and considered the annual report which analysed the volume of students accessing the range of student welfare services in 2024/25 and identified any trends and reported on actions taken to address the trends.

The Chair commended the quality of the report and analysis.

S-L Neesam summarised the key points.

Members queried how this Committee will monitor the impact of the expanded counselling offer. S-L Neesam explained that statistics will be reported termly.

Members reflected that demand from each college for student services is increasing, and queried what wellbeing support is in place for student support staff. S-L Neesam outlined the supervision support provided and other wellbeing support provided including increasing the staffing team to spread workload.

Members reflected that the report uses the binary gender terms and queried whether we support students who do not identify with a binary gender. S-L Neesam explained that Intuition (our safeguarding system) records using binary genders, however informed that if we have their/their parents' permission we will use their alternative gender and/or preferred name.

Members queried whether demand for student services is increasing proportionately with or above, our student cohort size. S-L Neesam confirmed that demand for student services is increasing beyond proportionality.

Members reflected that over the years we have provided early intervention support for more students with low-level mental health concerns and queried whether we are able to measure the impact of this e.g. did our early intervention support students to develop their self-support strategies. S-L Neesam advised that this is difficult to quantify though gave examples of how students disclose low-level concerns and can access support. C Shaw added that we are also working with students to explain what is natural and normal and what is a low-level concern (e.g. anxiety before doing a presentation to other students is normal and not a concern), and confirmed that we are developing some case studies to evidence how early welfare support has resulted in student retention.

Members reflected that the report indicates that there are no drug issues at our sites, and queried if this is realistic. S-L Neesam informed that we haven't found evidence of drugs at our sites and explained that police testing supported this finding. S-L Neesam explained that we are mindful that drugs could be present discreetly and informed that we continue to work to discuss County Lines and drug use with students, so that they are informed and feel able to disclose any issues. C Shaw added that we also routinely have sniffer dogs visit our colleges unannounced to check for drugs and as a deterrent to drugs being brought to college.

J Wakelam, as Governance lead for Safeguarding (sixth forms), commended the work to support students and the use of the 'top 10' meetings to coordinate efforts for vulnerable and 'at risk' students.

Members queried how the threshold for Prevent had changed and what now happens for students who don't meet the threshold but are a significant concern. S-L Neesam informed that roughly 18 months ago following the Shawcross review, Prevent changed to require a clear 'ideology' for a referral, otherwise the referral route was to the Police. S-L Neesam advised that since the Southport incident this requirement has been removed which has improved rigour as the Prevent teams have more resources to monitor individuals of significant concern. S-L Neesam gave examples of the types of cases which are emerging nationally, from her knowledge as a member of the Channel panel. S-L Neesam added that S Singh (part of the safeguarding team) was previously part of the Prevent team so is highly experienced to help EEG oversee this.

Members reflected that the media show an emerging trend of hostility towards immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers, and queried whether/how this intolerance is impacting students. S-L Neesam advised that we are informed of local issues by the Police and Prevent teams and gave examples of how they work with these teams and Local Authorities when issues emerge. C Shaw added that the PPT teams do a lot of work with students to promote understanding, tolerance and British Values and gave examples of students and staff praising the inclusive and safe culture at our colleges. The CEO reflected that nationally non-white college CEOs feel vulnerable given rising national hostility and racism, and outlined how EEG is leading our community to promote tolerance.

LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

6. 2024/25 Complaints and Compliments Log

Members received and considered the annual report which analysed the complaints and compliments received from stakeholders in 2024/25.

The CEO explained how we use complaints to improve issues and communication.

Parent members reflected that students may not know how or feel confident to raise concerns/complaints and queried how students are informed and supported to raise concerns and/or complaints. R Bamford explained how students are supported to do this (e.g. through their teacher, PPT, directly to the Principal, etc.) and S Small informed that students can raise matters through the student council. Parent members queried how often staff proactively canvas student's opinions to identify emerging concerns. S Small summarised the frequency of this. The CEO invited parent members to reach out if they have suggestions on how to improve the process to better support less-confident students to disclose emerging issues to staff.

Members asked that the student's name be removed from the report.

A Hurrell

Members commended the strong performance of the colleges to result in so many compliments vs. complaints.

7. **2024/25 Student Exit Survey results and Destinations**

Members received and considered the report provided which analysed the outcomes of the student exit surveys and analysed the intended student destinations.

A Hurrell and N Payne summarised the key points and noted that this builds on the information in the self-assessment reports.

Members commended the positive student destinations and reflected that the results of the exit and induction surveys show a transition of intended destination throughout their study and queried the reason for this. N Payne and the CEO explained that this is quite common as students' ambitions change as they have more support and guidance and explore their progression options.

8. **Student Induction & Parent Survey Feedback**

Members received and considered the report provided which analysed the results from the induction student and parent induction surveys and identified any areas for improvement.

A Hurrell summarised the key points.

Members queried how SLTs follow-up on any emerging themes/concerns. A Hurrell explained that these are picked up in focus group and/or student council meetings.

Members queried the reason for the low survey response rate from parents at Abbeygate. A Hurrell explained that the survey was only circulated via a QR code following an in-person talk, which not all parents attended; and reflected that in future surveys will be separately communicated with parents to improve engagement.

INCLUSION; CURRICULUM, TEACHING AND TRAINING; ACHIEVEMENT

9. **High Needs students (SEN)**

Members received and considered the paper provided which analysed attendance and retention across OSFC and WSC sixth form's supported learning provisions and for updated on ECHP target setting.

R King and G Huntington summarised the key points.

Members queried why there has been an increase in the number of student placed by the Local Authority whose needs, identified during the admission process, we could not meet. G Huntington explained that the Local Authority can direct students to us following a tribunal, however reflected that many of those students are choosing not to attend as the college environment is not right for their SEND needs and is impacting their wellbeing. G Huntington explained that this evidences that our admissions process is robust, and that decisions are made in the best interest of the student.

Members queried what was meant by the risk section and plans to 'withdraw identified learners when appropriate'. G Huntington explained that as part of the ECHP annual review, where students are refusing to attend college as the college environment does not suit their SEND needs, we work with the student and the Local Authority to secure them a more appropriate placement.

Members queried the data in the HNF retention table. C Shaw explained the purpose of the table and the data.

Members reflected that ECHP target setting is lower at One and queried the reason for this. G Huntington explained that there has been staff absence and a change of leadership at One which slightly delayed target setting compared to Abbeygate and WSC sixth form.

Members queried the intention of the 'pathway to success' offer and the timeframe by which we will be able to evaluate impact. G Huntington explained the rationale for the offer, the uptake and key milestones.

Members commended the use of supported internships.

10. 'At Risk' Students (Children in Care & Young Carers)

Members received and considered the paper provided which analysed the attendance, retention, gender, SEND needs, and progression plans of children in care and young adult carers.

The Chair commended the quality of the report and analysis.

Members queried how we identify these vulnerable students if they have not self-disclosed. S-L Neesam informed that we are often made aware of them when they transition from school and noted that PPTs also record when a student mentions their caring roles.

Members commended this practice though queried how new PPT staff are trained to ensure every PPT works this way. S-L Neesam informed that she is looking at training packages.

Members queried the reasons for the lower average attendance of care experienced students at One. S-L Neesam explained that the PPT and welfare team are investigating to understand if the reason(s), though added that the high levels of student retention and progression evidence that this cohort is still suitably supported to continue and to progress.

Members queried what was meant by 'purple' students. S-L Neesam explained that this is an additional RAG rating used for students who have disengaged but not yet formally withdrawn and helps us evaluate the effectiveness of our strategies to re-engage them.

11. WSC Sixth Form

Members received and considered the paper provided which analysed attendance and retention compared to previous years and updated on student assessment and task completion.

S Langthorne summarised the key points and explained the complexities of analysing student data at this point in the year, given enrolment is still live and students are still transferring between courses which all impacts registers. S Langthorne explained that by the fixed DfE R04 data return the data will be more accurate and will likely improve.

Members reflected that last year, Level 1 students' attendance was too low and a particular concern, and queried whether year-to-date Level 1 attendance is a result of reporting before the data is clean or if it indicates that our interventions were not effective. S Langthorne explained that while Level 1 attendance is currently too low

it is also one of the datasets most influenced by analysing the data at this point in the term as these students are typically late to enrol and are more likely to transfer between courses. S Langthorne informed that these students are also typically harder to engage having not achieved in their GCSEs and that this cohort includes the 'engage' programmes which are targeted at students 'at risk' of becoming NEET who are known to have poor attendance, so especially at the start of the year we expect this cohort to have low attendance.

S Langthorne left and A Carr joined the meeting at 4.15pm

12. **ASFC**

Members received and considered the paper provided which analysed attendance and retention compared to previous years and updated on the outcome of the progress review.

S Small summarised the key points.

Members queried the reasons for the lower attendance especially for 'next steps' and 'supervised study' sessions. S Small reflected that it is normal for there to be high levels of sickness absence in Autumn term and explained that the two-week rota for the next steps sessions, skews the attendance data depending on when a student is absent. S Small explained that the supervised study sessions are additional support interventions and so are less critical than attendance at their core subjects. Members queried whether this is the same at One. A Adamson confirmed that it is and explained the nuance differences between Abbeygate and One's attendance and data, and explained the impact of late enrolments on the data.

Members queried what EPQ stands for. S Small explained the acronym is for extended project qualification and informed that circa 180 students at Abbeygate undertake the voluntary qualification.

13. **OSFC**

Members received and considered the paper provided which analysed attendance and retention compared to previous years and updated on the outcome of the progress review.

A Adamson summarised the key points.

Members queried why Year 13 tutorial sessions have lower attendance. A Adamson explained that tutorials are fortnightly, so the percentage data is skewed by absences during that week. A Adamson added that we are also looking at how we record absences as currently if a student is absent, they're being marked as absent for all of the potential sessions during the day which might include a tutorial session that they're not due to attend until next week, which also skews the data. Members asked for an update on progress to address this in the next scheduled report.

A Adamson

J Drake and J Wakelam left the meeting at 5.50pm

A Adamson informed of work to analyse the reasons why some students have low attendance to help implement effective interventions where needed (e.g. for SEMH needs and anxiety issues) and to understand if they are valid/authorised absences (e.g. for medical appointments).

CONTRIBUTION TO MEETING SKILLS NEED

14. **Skills Need Update (WSC)**

Members received and considered the paper provided which updated on the Group's progress in delivering the Skills agenda, including current activity, quality assurance developments, employer engagement, and alignment with regional labour-market needs; and updated on upcoming national reforms, future considerations and associated risks.

Members commended the thoroughness of the report and the strategic approach.

Members queried whether it is consistently embedded e.g. is every course leader using the labour market intelligence (LMI) to support students to connect to employers. T Lloyd confirmed that the LMI data is now live and course leaders can self-generate reports (previously they couldn't) and noted that future data will monitor impact.

Members queried how this data is used to support students to understand the progression opportunities available. T Lloyd and A Harvey explained and gave examples of how careers information, advice and guidance is provided.

Members discussed the actions from the quality review, and T Lloyd apologised as the some data report were shared in error.

15. Risk Register Extract

Members reviewed the Risk Register extract which included **0 red**, **2 amber** and **3 yellow** risks.

The Chair reflected that it is unchanged from the status at the last meeting.

Members reviewed the risks and **felt assured** by the mitigations proposed

16. Any Other Business

None.

The meeting closed at 6.04pm