

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
LEICESTER COLLEGE CORPORATION:
MEETING OF THE CURRICULUM STRATEGY
AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 18 JUNE 2026**



ON MS TEAMS

Present:	Jackie Rossa (Chair) Kyle Cameron Shawn George Sue Hopewell	Shabir Ismail Lesley Giles Jude Mellor Nicky Randall
----------	--	---

In Attendance:	Randeep Sami Louise Hazel Matt Widdowson (Minutes) Stephanie Low	Deputy Principal, Curriculum and Quality Director of Governance and Policy Governance and Policy Officer Observer
----------------	--	--

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 1.1. There were no declarations of interest.
- 1.2. Stephanie Low attended as an observer as part of her Leadership and Management qualification.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1. Apologies were received from Neil McDougall.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- 3.1. The minutes of the meeting on 26 March 2026 were agreed as an accurate record and approved.
- 3.2. Item 3.2 in the confidential minute of the meeting of 26 March 2026 was still in progress.
- 3.3. The confidential minute of the meeting on 26 March 2026 was agreed as an accurate record and approved.
- 3.4. The minutes of the special meeting on 14 May 2026 were agreed as an accurate record and approved.

4. QIP UPDATE

4.1. The Deputy Principal provided an update on the QIP. The following points were highlighted.

4.1.1. The new QIP was in place and had been updated by the DoCs. Actions were still being developed and risks were being monitored.

4.1.2. Although progress was being made, there was still inconsistency within all areas.

4.1.3. Progress made:

4.1.3.1. 70-75% of sessions demonstrated formative assessments and responsive teaching.

4.1.3.2. Ninety-two percent of students had reported that teaching on their programme was good.

4.1.3.3. English attendance was at 80.5% and maths at 77.8%.

4.1.3.4. Attendance had improved to 84.85% by week thirty-five, although this was still below the KPI. A task force was in place to address this.

4.1.3.5. Twenty-seven percent of students remained in the 50-80% attendance risk band.

4.1.3.6. L1 EPYP was predicted below the NAR at 77.6%.

4.1.4. Risks included inconsistent teaching quality, weak target setting (with only eight reviews on time) and underperformance in maths and English.

4.1.5. Planned actions included a diagnostic assessment framework, focused improvement programmes, and stronger accountability.

4.1.6. **Governors made the following comments.**

4.1.6.1. **There had been good progress. Governors recognised that there was a limit to what could be achieved this year. Some of the impacts would not be seen until 2026-27.** Agreed.

4.1.6.2. **Did all staff know what high quality teaching and learning looked like?** Staff generally understood expectations, but there were still consistency issues across curriculum areas. Curriculum Leadership meetings had been reinstated to share good practice, and DoCs and PAMs had fully engaged with these to share good practice. There would still need to be more focus on CPD.

4.1.6.3. **Action 2 used the words “meets expected standards”. Did this refer to the Teaching and Learning Framework?** It did, although this would continue to be adjusted for next year.

4.1.6.4. **It would be important that staff knew what was expected of them.** Agreed.

4.1.6.5. **Would there be further developments to help manage governors’ expectations of what would be achieved next year? Governors needed to get a sense of trajectory.** An expanded summary, including timelines, could be provided to the CSQI Committee to enable governors to see where progress was being made.

- 4.1.6.6. **The actions gave a good impression of a collaborative approach being taken.**
- 4.1.6.7. **Would the focused improvement programme start next year?** This had already started.
- 4.1.6.8. **It would be interesting to know how many programmes had been improved. Could this be incorporated into the data?** Noted.
- 4.1.6.9. It was clarified that, in the context of this report, "FSM" referred to 'functional skills maths' and not free school meals.
- 4.1.6.10. **How could governors be sure that standards would remain high over the next two to three years?** There would always be the risk that the Quality Team would be so focused on internal data that they would be unaware of what was happening in the wider sector. To overcome this, the Quality Team would be linking up with other quality teams from across the sector to ensure that they were not always looking inwards.
- 4.1.6.11. **Would the Quality Team's work with external partners be reported on?** This could be considered.
- 4.1.6.12. **How successful had 1:1s been?** The general impact had been good, although it was not known what the effect had been at a granular level yet. Staff had been asking for examples of best practice and, as a result, best practice roadshows were now taking place across the College.
- 4.1.6.13. **There had been a lot of change and staff were now more accountable. Had there been any feedback on this?** Managers had been discussing this with staff and feedback had been provided. Additionally, programme leads now attended the Performance Review meetings and would be given further training on how to effectively use the dashboard. This meant that staff were now involved a lot more. The aim was to have distributed leadership and ownership across curriculum areas. Programme leads should be the College's future managers and this had provided a good development opportunity for them.
- 4.1.6.14. Staff had welcomed the new collaborative approach and there was now a real sense of ownership. The right systems and culture were in place to ensure that this was sustainable.
- 4.1.6.15. **Ofsted inspections and quality were now a standing item at CLT meetings as it was understood that 2026/27 was when improvements needed to be made.**
- 4.1.6.16. **There would be a higher level of challenge which may have a HR impact. It would be important to ensure that there was a higher level of support for staff and that CPD was tailored to individuals.** As with any change, there may be some resistance which would need to be managed.
- 4.1.6.17. **The root cause analysis had been successfully translated into a plan. It would be good to hear some feedback from the focused improvement group.** Noted.

4.1.7. **Governors noted the QIP update.**

5. CURRICULUM STRATEGY AND DELIVERY PLAN 2026/27 AND 2026-2029 SECTOR STRATEGIES

5.1. The Deputy Principal and Assistant Principal presented the Curriculum Strategy and Delivery Plan for 2026/27. The following points were highlighted.

- 5.1.1. Construction aimed to be the number one regional provider which would be supported by over three hundred employer partnerships.
- 5.1.2. The Engineering Strategy was aligned with employer demand.
- 5.1.3. The Financial, Professional and Business Services Strategy considered the preparation for curriculum reform.
- 5.1.4. The Health and Life Sciences Strategy would be focused on strengthening NHS partnerships and developing a dedicated hub.
- 5.1.5. The overall aim of the Curriculum Strategy was for the College to be a high performing, inclusive and employer-responsive provider by 2029.
- 5.1.6. The next step would be to cross-reference the Curriculum Strategy with the other strategies, including the Quality Improvement Strategy.

5.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

- 5.2.1. **Were there any courses that might fall outside of the scope of V Levels?** There were only a handful of qualifications coming out in 2027/28. Most general FE colleges were looking to take a pause until the majority of V Levels were out. How courses fitted into V Levels would be dependent on subjects and sectors. It would only be possible to respond when more information was made available.
- 5.2.2. **There was no reference to national partners such as sector bodies or Skills England, and some key documents would be published shortly on the industrial strategy. Was the College able to seize on any potential opportunities?** This was a fair challenge. The conversation around national and local priorities at the Governors' Away Day had been helpful, and it was acknowledged that more thought would need to be given to this. The College was not in a devolved region which made it more of a challenge and the area had a lot of SMEs. However, some of the local priorities already aligned with national priorities. A mapping exercise would need to take place for all the strategies.
- 5.2.3. **What would be the short-term tactical stance of the College while a comprehensive mapping exercise was being completed? Were there areas that could be identified where the College could work nationally?** The strategies were a springboard for further work, for example, the College was part of the construction CTEC, and some thought would need to be given to how to expand on this.
- 5.2.4. **The Curriculum Plan is clear and well aligned with the quality process.**

5.3. **Governors agreed to recommend the Curriculum Strategy and Delivery Plan for 2026/27 to Corporation for approval.**

5.4. **Governors agreed to recommend the 2026-2029 Sector Strategies to Corporation for approval.**

6. QUALITY IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY

6.1. The Deputy Principal presented the Quality Improvement Strategy. The following points were highlighted.

- 6.1.1. There would be a focus on measurable impacts, including on progression, retention, achievement and reducing gaps.
- 6.1.2. The key strengths that had been identified were the good coaching culture and high engagement with CPD.
- 6.1.3. The risks that had been identified included variability in the quality of teaching, workforce pressures and the challenges posed by artificial intelligence.
- 6.1.4. There were five strategic objectives: consistent teaching quality, inclusive pedagogy, evidence-based CPD, strong monitoring and the ethical use of AI.

6.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

- 6.2.1. **It was positive that compliance would be seen as an output of culture rather than a driver.** Compliance was a symptom and not a cause.
- 6.2.2. **The five KPIs would provide governors with feedback.**
- 6.2.3. **Did staff feel that everything was now coming together?** For a lot of staff this had been their first opportunity to work collaboratively. The process had help to shift away from silo working. Staff were also able to understand the reasons behind why their managers were asking them to do new things.
- 6.2.4. **SLT were now better able to understand what the College was trying to achieve. An example of the benefits of this had been how the College had been able to develop Foundation Learning.**
- 6.2.5. **Teacher involvement would continue to be important.** Ownership and accountability were beginning to bed in. It would be important that a supportive approach was taken.
- 6.2.6. **It felt like there was more transparency and openness now.**

6.3. **Governors agreed to recommend the Quality Improvement Strategy to Corporation for approval.**

7. REVIEW OF RISKS

7.1. The Principal presented a review of risks. The following points were highlighted.

- 7.1.1. Quality of provision remained red which reflected the ongoing issues with variability.
- 7.1.2. Curriculum reform was rated amber due to continued uncertainty.
- 7.1.3. Partnerships had improved to green with new collaborations being formed.
- 7.1.4. Apprenticeships were now above the national average with further improvement expected.
- 7.1.5. Adult provision was either improving or maintaining its current levels of performance.
- 7.1.6. EPYP was improving but still below national average.

7.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

- 7.2.1. **What happened to the risk register at the end of the academic year?** There would be a new iteration of the risk register. This would be slightly different to the current version. There would be a similar set of strategic risks, but these would be described differently. There would be 'loss' risks and 'opportunity' risks. Some thought would need to be given to how committees would discuss risks and opportunities.

7.3. **Governors noted the Review of Risks.**

8. **TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORKPLAN FOR 2026/27 INCLUDING ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

- 8.1. The Director of Governance and Policy presented the Terms of Reference and Workplan. The following points were highlighted.

8.1.1. There were no major changes to the ToR, although new references were made to monitoring strategies. There would be a question over how this could be done without losing the emphasis on quality.

8.1.2. The workplan was similar to 2025/26 with the flexibility to adapt.

8.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

8.2.1. The changes to the ToR were sensible and introduced the opportunity for some useful challenge.

8.3. **Governors agreed to recommend the Terms of Reference to Corporation for approval.**

8.4. **Governors approved the Workplan for 2026/27.**

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 9.1. The student governors, Kyle Cameron and Shawn George, were thanked for their contribution to the CSQI Committee over the previous year.

10. **DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

- 24 September 2026
- 19 November 2026
- 25 February 2027
- 15 April 2027
- 17 June 2027