



Department  
for Education

# **FE Commissioner Intervention Summary: Highbury College, Portsmouth**

**November 2019**

## **Update on progress since FEC intervention assessment**

Strong interim leadership and governance has had a positive impact since the FEC intervention assessment. Effective leadership and communication from the interim principal/CEO have improved staff morale and the culture of the college. The staff survey, and staff and trade union feedback, all reflect a significant step-change in openness and trust. This has led to a more positive culture across the college with managers more empowered and engaged, and staff now working well together. There is, however, a wish for greater certainty regarding permanent leadership arrangements.

Governance continues to improve with clear leadership by the chair, positive governor recruitment, regular meetings and developing structures. Encouraging progress has also been made in ensuring continued student progress, and preparations are well underway for the 2020/21 year start, despite restrictions relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The interim leaders have proven their ability to uncover and deal with financial issues, having finalised the 2018/19 financial statements, and have clarified the position with the overseas ventures and secured the cash position. Governors trust the college leadership and the information that they are presented with; however, they must remember that the future sustainability of the organisation still needs securing.

The college has reported encouraging news regarding enrolment, and arrangements responding to government COVID-19 guidance appear to be sound and safe.

A structure and prospects appraisal (SPA) process is in progress and recommendations for the future structure of the college will be made in October 2020.

# Contents

Background to FE Commissioner Intervention Assessment	5
Overview of the College	5
Leadership and Governance	6
Role, composition and operation of the board	6
Leadership and senior management team	7
Curriculum and Quality Improvement	9
Curriculum planning and development	9
Quality improvement and self-assessment	10
Trends in student recruitment and retention	11
Student views	12
Staff views	12
Effectiveness of the college to manage and improve quality	12
Finance and Audit	13
Recent financial history and forecasts for coming years	13
Financial performance 2018/19	13
Financial forecast 2019/20 to 2020/21	13
Cashflow / liquidity (including overdraft details and usage if appropriate)	14
Financial (budgetary) control, management and record keeping	14
Estates and Capital Plans	15
Tower block	15
Conclusions	16
Recommendations	16
Annex A - Information reviewed	17
Annex B - Interviewees	18

# FE Commissioner Intervention Summary Report

## Highbury College, Portsmouth

<b>Name and address of college</b>	<b>Highbury College Tudor Crescent Portsmouth PO6 2SA</b>
<b>Assessment undertaken by</b>	<b>Richard Atkins – FE Commissioner  Frances Wadsworth – Deputy FE Commissioner  Martin Sim – Deputy FE Commissioner  Anna Fitch – FE Adviser</b>
<b>Chair of the college</b>	<b>Tim Mason</b>
<b>Principal / Chief Executive of the college</b>	<b>Stella Mbubaegbu</b>
<b>Clerk to the Corporation</b>	<b>Paola Schweitzer</b>
<b>Date of assessment</b>	<b>11 to 12 November 2019</b>

# Background to FE Commissioner Intervention Assessment

Highbury College was referred for an FE Commissioner-led (FEC) intervention assessment following a diagnostic assessment (DA) monitoring visit that was undertaken in October 2019.

The October 2019 DA monitoring visit found a number of serious issues regarding leadership, management and governance that could have significant impact on the college's operation, and which required further investigation.

The FEC intervention report is intended to advise the Minister and the chief executive of the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) on:

1. The capacity and capability of Highbury College's leadership and governance to deliver quality improvement and financial stability within an agreed timeframe.
2. Any action that should be taken by the Minister and/or the chief executive of the ESFA to ensure the delivery of quality improvement and financial resilience; and
3. How and when progress should be monitored and reviewed taking into account the ESFA's regular monitoring arrangements and Ofsted monitoring visits.

## Overview of the College

Highbury College is a medium-sized general further education (FE) college serving the city of Portsmouth and the surrounding areas of East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport and Havant. The college operates from 4 centres locally: Highbury Campus (the main campus in Cosham), Highbury Northarbour Centre, Highbury Arundel Centre and the Solent Marine Academy, which is based in the dockyard of Portsmouth. The college owns Highbury Apprenticeships (Birmingham), a commercial training company that was previously known as New Horizons Trading.

The college provides education and training programmes in a number of community venues in and around Portsmouth. It offers apprenticeships and a broad curriculum with an emphasis on vocational subjects spanning entry level and level 1 to level 4 and above.

Highbury College was inspected by Ofsted in April 2018 and judged to be Requires Improvement (RI) overall. The college was previously judged by Ofsted to be Outstanding in May 2011.

The college is no longer able to recruit further tier 4 international students following the publication of the Ofsted report and RI grade. The college withdrew from A level provision

with effect from the end of the 2018/19 academic year. With the loss of the opportunity to recruit international students to the A level programmes, the provision became unviable.

Local competitors include the Portsmouth Sixth Form College and the UTC, which are both located in the city; the Havant and South Downs College has a vocational site that is 3 miles away and Fareham College, with a recent Ofsted Outstanding judgement, is 10 miles away and easily accessed via bus or train.

Portsmouth is one of the most densely populated cities in the country. It has the fourth largest economy in the South East, with a broad employment base, and is the national home of the Royal Navy. The city has several areas of high deprivation. Portsmouth has a higher proportion of young people who are not in education, employment or training compared to Hampshire and the South East region average.

Highbury College was until recently a key member of the Gazelle Colleges Group, which now no longer exists. This group was formed in 2011 to promote enterprise in colleges.

The college has entered into a number of commercial ventures to diversify its income streams, including a contract with Cross River State Government to develop and then manage a college in Nigeria. The college exited this contract in July 2016. A debtor and cash balance, which are both held in Nigeria, are proving difficult to realise and repatriate to the UK. Formal legal proceedings to recover the debt have begun.

Highbury has a 50% stake in a joint venture company that trades as Highbury Burton Saudi Arabia Ltd (HBSA), which is based in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The remaining 50% share is held by Burton and South Derbyshire College. The terms of the Saudi Arabia college consortium project are such that full release and distribution of the profit is delayed until completion of the contract. The current contract was due to expire in July 2019; the HBSA has been formally offered a further 1-year agreement.

The college sits within the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership and is located within the South-East England Regional Schools Commissioner area. The local authority for the college is Portsmouth City Council.

## **Leadership and Governance**

### **Role, composition and operation of the board**

The current chair first joined the board as a member in March 2018, becoming acting chair when the previous chair resigned in December 2018. His role as chair was formalised by the board in February 2019.

The board structure, the clerk told the FEC team, is moving away from the Carver model that was previously in place towards a more conventional governance approach. However, the board is still in the process of refining the structure over a year later. The

clerk informed the FEC team that originally the board comprised at least 11 and not more than 14 members, but that the decision has now been taken to increase this to at least 13 and not more than 16. There are currently 4 vacancies. In addition, there has been no staff governor since January 2019 and no student governor since February 2019. There is no qualified accountant on the board or separate finance or quality committees. This calls into question the level of scrutiny and challenge that has been possible.

Overall, the strength of the board seems to have been compromised by the number of vacancies, ongoing transition in board structure (as outlined by the clerk and chair), lack of current staff or student governor input and lack of a qualified accountant.

The ability of the board to set and monitor work objectives for the only senior post holder, the principal, appears to be insufficiently developed. However, remuneration committee meeting minutes (November 2018) note that the board is taking steps to address this: “there needed to be a more structured, robust and transparent system against which performance could be appraised”.

The chair has expressed his wish to urgently address a range of governance issues. He said that, in his opinion, the board had not operated with sufficient scrutiny and challenge, relying too heavily on advice or recommendations from the principal and that he had since tried to strengthen the work of the board. He noted concerns of low staff morale and had tried to engage more directly with staff, holding open coffee meeting sessions for the staff with him. He welcomed an opportunity for assistance from a National Leader of Governance (NLG).

During the FEC team’s visit, concerns were expressed by both the chair and the clerk that there was a lack of confidence by the board in the principal. The clerk said this was evident from governors’ meetings that she had attended. Comment was also made regarding the staff survey and staff lack of confidence in the college leadership.

## **Leadership and senior management team**

The principal was appointed in 2001. Since January 2015, she had been the only senior post holder in the college, which is unusual in the sector. In October 2019, she announced her retirement with effect from July 2020.

Most of the managers whom the FEC team met had been with the college a considerable number of years and were clearly committed to their college, the area and the learners. However, a number of significant leadership and management issues were identified by the FEC team on the visit, including the very high turnover of new staff in their first year, low staff morale, views of leadership and an expressed lack of trust by staff in their leaders. These problems were evidenced in the Investors in People (IiP) and staff survey reports and were also raised in various FEC team meetings with staff, governors and managers. Both the April 2019 IiP assessment and staff survey indicate that staff morale is low. The IiP assessment has dropped from ‘Gold’ to ‘Standard’.

The liP report states, "Although, the organisation does not currently fully meet its previous accreditation level, there are positive principles and processes in evidence for which Highbury College is to be commended on. The College is seeking to work with people to address its challenges and thus regain organisational confidence, but this assessment has identified that there is a significant cohort whom (sic) remain concerned about the future, are uncertain as to whether the college can achieve its goals and do not feel fully supported or engaged." Less than half of college staff agreed that, "My organisation has a plan for the future", and that, "My organisation embraces change."

There is comment in the liP report that interviews gave rise to a striking range of opinions, ranging from the positive to, "people are too scared to challenge or feel nothing will come of it."

There were concerns emanating from the staff survey. This cited that a low percentage of staff would recommend Highbury College as a place to work and that, "42% lack confidence in leaders, of which there is a lack of trust and belief that leaders are passionate about the success of Highbury". The FEC team also learned that just under half of leavers from the staff had been with the college less than a year. The executive director of HR and OD noted this as a particular concern. Perhaps most worrying was the significantly low percentage of respondents who answered positively for, "I trust the leaders of my organisation", and that the college develops great leaders.

The high turnover of new staff and the inexperience of some recently appointed managers was reported by those whom the FEC team met to be of serious concern, particularly as the managing director (MD) of one area had been absent due to sickness for some time, so not present to mentor as had been intended.

There was a shared view by many managers whom the FEC team met that the organisational restructure to Learning Companies had been damaging and reduced the overall effectiveness of the college's operation. They said it had led to a 'siloed' operation and inconsistencies, whilst impacting adversely on communications and cooperative working across the college.

Managers whom the FEC team met spoke candidly about their current views of leadership and how they felt undervalued.

Given all of these matters, governance and leadership at Highbury College are a significant concern. Low staff morale, an expressed lack of confidence in leadership and governance lacking robust processes are all significant risk factors for the college. Ultimately, these factors could negatively impact upon all aspects of college operation and the quality of delivery if not addressed urgently.



## Curriculum and Quality Improvement

The college's provision encompasses all 15 sector subject areas. The college also offers apprenticeships in the following framework areas: automotive, business, IT and management, construction, creative and cultural, engineering manufacturing, health, care and early years, science, hair and beauty and hospitality and catering.

The college's provision meets the expectation of the June 2016 Solent Area Review that emphasised the need for Highbury and others to sustain a broad and accessible curriculum offer within travel-to-learn areas of Portsmouth and Southampton.

A level provision was withdrawn at the end of the 2018/19 academic year as it was not financially viable. This was largely a result of the 2018 Ofsted inspection that assessed the college as RI and the loss of international students following removal of tier 4 status.

In addition to the 4 sites and community venues in and around Portsmouth, the college operates outside of its local area through Highbury Apprenticeships (Birmingham).

Amongst the college's commercial ventures is the now inactive contract with CRSG to develop and then manage a college in Nigeria and a 50% stake in an FE College in Saudi Arabia.

## Curriculum planning and development

The current size of the college requires a careful balance between maintaining income and reducing costs. Discussions between FEC team members and managers suggested a tension between improving class sizes and the reduction of choice, with the negative consequence on enrolment as students choose a different destination. This issue is exemplified by this year's recruitment following the removal of A level provision.

Curriculum managers whom the FEC team met were knowledgeable about their curriculum and confirmed their involvement in the planning process. To their credit, significant operational savings were achieved for the 2019/20 financial plan; however, this was largely achieved through the cessation of A Level. In addition, despite the curriculum planning processes that are in place, there is an apparent lack of strategic direction, resulting in a potential for curriculum drift or stagnation. Lower level curriculum managers had a clear understanding that the financial stability of the college and the recent improvements can only be sustained with prudent curriculum management that is facilitated by clear executive direction. The risk of inefficiencies is further increased by a disappointing 16 to 18 enrolment and the likely requirement for additional efficiency savings.

An expectation was raised through area review that as a continuing standalone FE college, Highbury College would be open to collaboration in the future with other colleges serving the Portsmouth area and that this would be considered in curriculum planning;

especially rationalisation and areas for specialisation. There is little evidence to suggest that much progress had been made with this suggestion, although there had been some collaboration on quality improvement.

Despite a number of partnerships with external stakeholders, staff at all levels of the organisation whom the FEC team met were concerned that the college was perceived as being too inwardly focused.

## **Quality improvement and self-assessment**

Highbury College was inspected by Ofsted in April 2018 and judged to be Grade 3 – RI for overall effectiveness. Previously, the college was judged as Outstanding by Ofsted in May 2011. The January 2019 Ofsted monitoring visit judged that reasonable progress was being made against all the reported areas.

Qualification Achievement Rates (E&T) at the college have steadily improved for the past 3 years and are now above national rates. Apprenticeship achievement data is just below the sector benchmark; however, timely achievement is significantly below.

Analysis of apprenticeship data reveals that achievement rates are negatively impacted by poor retention rates for apprentices who were enrolled between 2015 to the first half of 2018. The college had introduced various strategies to improve performance, but the impact of these strategies is not expected to be reflected in performance figures until the 2019/20 outturn. The changes in process, procedure and staff are well evidenced in the Self-Assessment Report (SAR).

The fact that apprenticeship provision is both local and geographically distant (Birmingham) was not perceived by managers to have caused operational or consistency issues. Whilst the college's apprenticeship strategy provides reasons for the Birmingham-based provision, the FEC team had concerns about whether it adds value to the local provision.

Managers were particularly pleased with improvements in mathematics and English GCSE. Measures had been taken to improve attendance in mathematics and English through timetabling (sandwiching mathematics and English lessons between vocational classes) and staff walking students to their lessons to encourage attendance. Managers reported that attendance at mathematics and English classes was now higher (at 92.5%) than at vocational classes (89.5%).

Managers felt that teaching and learning had improved and that working on a quality improvement project had helped them benchmark judgements and reflect on best practice. Middle managers recognised the need to learn and acquire good practice from other quality institutions and, whilst they had visited other institutions, it remains an area for further development. Further progress in working with other local Good or Outstanding providers would be welcomed by middle managers and staff.

The observation team had benefited from further benchmarking of observation judgements with input from a part-time Ofsted inspector and now felt confident that judgements were accurate. Whilst lesson observations are not graded, they felt confident that learning walks highlighted any performance issues that needed addressing and that appropriate actions were being taken where required.

The SAR in its current form is detailed and provides evidence to support judgements. Managers were currently considering the final SAR grades for the college. Given significant improvements in achievement rates, it is of no surprise that outcomes are provisionally judged to be Good; however, changes to the inspection framework and the reduced emphasis on outcomes presents a risk. Leadership and management is currently self-assessed as Good; however, given the serious leadership issues that have been identified, it is difficult to endorse.

## **Trends in student recruitment and retention**

Recruitment remains challenging and unpredictable. The negative trend in 16 to 18 student recruitment was reversed in 2017/18, only to fall in 2019/20.

Managers whom the FEC team spoke with expressed disappointment with the latest learner enrolment picture. Whilst recognising that recruitment was ongoing, they noted that numbers were down when compared to the same time the previous year. There was comment that 2018/19 had been an unexplained 'spike' and that this year's numbers were more in line with demographics and reflected the impact of withdrawal from A level provision. The early leavers rate was similar to previous years. Managers recognised the financial impact that reduced numbers would potentially have.

Demographic trends suggest that enrolments will increase by 3% in 2020/21.

Retention levels within the college have increased significantly since the last inspection; particularly with 16 to 18.

The following programme areas had each shown significant improvement in retention over the past 12 months:

Programme Area 1: Health, Public Service & Care (+7%)

Programme Area 2: Science and Mathematics (+8%)

Programme Area 4: Engineering and Manufacturing Technology (+8%)

Programme Area 12: Languages, Literature & Culture (+8%)

Attendance in 2019/20 is currently estimated 3% higher than the whole year 2018/19. However, it is too early in the year to form a judgement.

## **Student views**

Students whom the FEC team met were mostly positive about their overall learning experience; however, several noted issues of poor course and curriculum management, including staff absence and poor cover and communication arrangements when classes were cancelled.

## **Staff views**

Staff whom the FEC team met confirmed that morale was very low. They pointed to successive staff restructures, the financial crisis at the start of the 2016/17 academic year and the fall in Ofsted grading as contributory factors. Despite alleviatory measures being put in place, these events had contributed to a high staff turnover. For those staff remaining, concerns included the impact of financial cuts on the quality of learning and implications for staff job security.

Staff reported that workloads had increased as they strove to ensure minimal impact on the learner experience. They also reported that Learning Companies had become increasingly isolated even though each is trying to provide a good learning experience.

Staff are of the opinion that there is a lack of visibility of senior management and that communication channels are poor, with inconsistent messages. Teaching and support staff are more complimentary about support and encouragement from middle management. Staff welcomed briefings by the finance director (FD) as a step in the right direction and, in general, staff were pleased to see the heightened presence of governors in college. In their view, this is a recent positive improvement and they were particularly appreciative of efforts that had been made by the current chair to meet staff and recognise their contribution.

## **Effectiveness of the college to manage and improve quality**

Evidence that was provided through the Ofsted monitoring report and the 2019 outturn provide assurance that teaching, learning and assessment had improved. This has been facilitated by a thorough improvement plan. The key issue is whether this improvement is sustainable. In order for it to be sustainable, there is a need to put in place strong senior leadership that is capable of supporting, utilising and developing a promising middle management team. This challenge is particularly pressing given the expected Ofsted inspection in the new year.

## **Finance and Audit**

### **Recent financial history and forecasts for coming years**

Although the college self-assessed their 2016/17 outturn as Good, the ESFA reduced the grade to RI (known as Satisfactory at the time).

The financial health of the college is forecast to increase to Good for 2018/19. This is based on the draft financial statements. However, risks remain around the operating performance and cash balances. These must be monitored carefully by governors.

The financial statements for 2016/17 and 2017/18 both report significant operating deficits. The budget for 2018/19 was set to break even; however, the draft results indicate an operating deficit, which, while worse than budgeted, is an improvement on the previous year.

Although the forecast financial health for 2018/19 is Good, the college failed 3 of the 6 FEC benchmarks: the operating deficit, cash days in hand and staff costs as a percentage of adjusted income. Borrowing as a percentage of income scores highly because the college paid off most of its debt with proceeds from the sale of the Highbury College Portsmouth Centre (HCPC).

### **Financial performance 2018/19**

After the removal of exceptional items relating to the sale of HCPC and income from the Saudi Arabian joint venture with Burton and South Derbyshire College, the 2018/19 draft outturn stands at a deficit. This is worse than budgeted. This is mainly due to higher than budgeted staff costs, which the college attributes to the cost of delivering a 16% increase in 16 to 18 learner numbers and an increased use of agency staff in curriculum areas where permanent staff are difficult to recruit. There was also an increase in restructuring costs and in depreciation in the year.

### **Financial forecast 2019/20 to 2020/21**

The budget for 2019/20 is designed to deliver a surplus in the core college operations without relying on the joint venture income. Total income is budgeted at similar levels as was forecast to be achieved in 2018/19, with an increase in the 16 to 19 ESFA allocation, and reductions in higher education (HE) and other income. The pay budget includes a provision for a general pay award of 1% and an overall reduction in staff costs. Of the total savings that were identified, around 28% arises from the closure of the college's A level provision. These savings are partially offset by increased pension costs and the 1% pay award. Managers stated that the required restructuring was completed by 31 July 2019.

The forecast for 2020/21 assumes that 16 to 19 recruitment in 2019/20 remains at 2018/19 levels. This did not appear to be the case at the time of writing this report. As of 31 October 2019, the number of funded 16 to 19 learners was 7% less, compared to the 2018/19 outturn. This could lead to income dropping in 2020/21. Therefore, further efficiency savings need to be found.

## **Cashflow / liquidity (including overdraft details and usage if appropriate)**

The financial plan forecasts an increase in cash in 2019/20, of which 73% is a dividend from the joint venture company. Similarly, a further forecast increase in cash in 2020/21 is mainly due to an expected dividend. These dividend payments will be made from the retained reserves of the joint venture company, so are not dependent on future performance or continuation of the contract to run the Saudi Arabian college. The figures quoted above suggest that the college's cash generation from operations is not high enough to build up cash balances after loan repayments and capital expenditure.

The college holds cash in a Nigerian bank account and is reluctant to transfer it to the UK until the exchange rate becomes more favourable. This cash is reported in the management accounts every month but at a higher value than that which was recorded at the time of writing this report. The true month-end figure should be reported in the management accounts, along with the associated exchange rate gain or loss. In addition, there is the outstanding debt that is owed to the college by CRSG.

## **Financial liabilities / loans**

Following the sale of HCPC in August 2018, the college fully repaid its bank loan, suffering an early repayment charge. It took up a new loan, which is repayable over 5 years, with interest only payments in the first year and a break clause at the end of the third year. The college then has the option to repay the loan fully over the following 2 years, or refinance with another lender.

## **Financial (budgetary) control, management and record keeping**

The finance team of 6, which includes the payroll function, is smaller than the FEC team would normally expect to see in a college of this size. Two members of the finance team have been at the college for less than 6 months and the finance team feels stretched.

Compliance with internal college procedures, such as raising purchase orders in advance of committing to expenditure, is low. When questioned by members of the FEC team, the finance team stated that high staff turnover across the college made it very difficult to train staff to comply with the financial regulations. College financial procedures that the FEC team saw were dated and inefficient compared to sector best practise.

The group FD prepares the management accounts himself because the college accountant has not got the capacity to undertake this task. This is unusual. Monthly pdf budget reports are sent to the MDs of the Learning Companies. These detail performance against budget, the current establishment for their areas and any outstanding commitments. The MDs are also given an excel spreadsheet detailing every transaction that is posted against their budget.

Budget meetings and discussion of the college management accounts are held termly, which is not frequent enough and not in line with best practice.

## **Estates and Capital Plans**

It was reported to the FEC team that most of the college's estate was in very good condition. Space utilisation was very low in 2017/18; however, this will have improved in 2018/19 with the closure of the HCPC. At this point, ESOL provision was moved to the Arundel site and travel and catering provision was relocated to the main campus.

The college has an up-to-date property strategy, which recognises that the college has too much space. In the strategy, various options to reduce space are identified but rejected.

Due to the current cash position, investment in maintenance and capital expenditure has been and continues to be limited. This has resulted in plant, such as the main campus heating system, failure on several occasions.

## **Tower block**

The college's tower block, which is on its main campus site, houses 5 floors of residential accommodation and 4 floors of teaching space, including specialist information technology (IT) rooms, a nursery and the reprographics centre.

An internal tower inspection was conducted by Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service (HF&RS) in August 2017 and steps were subsequently taken to address the action points from HF&RS.

Governors have been monitoring this situation closely and a decision has been made to re-clad the tower block. Planning permission was granted in September 2019, and the college is currently awaiting the return of tenders from design and build contractors. Once the final cost is known, the college will make a final application to the ESFA for funding.

## Conclusions

Governance and leadership are seriously dysfunctional. The relationship and trust between the chair and principal has broken down and this is impacting upon effective governance and leadership. This situation needs addressing with urgency.

The organisational restructure into Learning Companies is not deemed by many of the staff and managers whom the FEC team met to have been effective.

Whilst students whom the FEC team met were generally positive about teaching and learning, they were concerned about inconsistencies that they experienced in course management which impacted upon their learning.

Budget monitoring is infrequent and lacks appropriate rigour.

The remoteness of the college's apprenticeship provision in Birmingham makes it high risk in terms of assuring its quality. The provision currently also makes little or no financial contribution.

The current draft SAR requires further review and reflection so that the board can be assured that they have a full understanding of the college's strengths and weaknesses and that an appropriately tailored quality improvement plan is in place.

## Recommendations

1. Leadership and governance need to be addressed as a matter of urgency because they are impacting on staff morale and the quality of education. Governors have been attempting to address these serious matters recently but have not yet made sufficient progress.
2. The financial capacity and capability of the board needs to be addressed urgently as there are currently no governors with financial qualifications.
3. In view of the serious concerns about governance and leadership failures at this college, it is recommended that Highbury College is placed in supervised college status.
4. The college needs to seek external validation of the 2018/19 SAR to secure robust and accurate judgements.
5. The board should seriously consider working with the FEC team to carry out a structure and prospects appraisal (SPA).
6. The chair should engage with an NLG to benefit from mentoring and support on the college's improvement needs.



## **Annex A - Information reviewed**

SAR

Quality Improvement Plan

Annual Accounts

Board and Committee meeting minutes

Management Accounts

Student numbers/enrolment data

Achievement data

Ofsted reports

Organisation chart

Estates Strategy

Corporation membership with CVs

Principal's appraisal documentation

Costed curriculum plan

Amazing College, Amazing Staff survey 2019

liP Report 2019

## **Annex B - Interviewees**

Principal & CEO

Chair

Vice Chair

Group of Governors

Clerk

Group of Staff

Group of Students

Executive Director, Quality & Professional Development

Quality and Standards Manager

Group FD

College Accountant

Facilities Manager

Student Central Managers

Finance team members

Technical Professional Learning Company managers

Director of Training Highbury Apprenticeships

Centre Manager Highbury Apprenticeships- Birmingham

Executive Director HR and OD

Regional Union representatives



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2020

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)

email [psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk)

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

download [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Reference: DfE-00176-2020



Follow us on Twitter:  
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)