

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
LEICESTER COLLEGE CORPORATION:
MEETING OF THE CURRICULUM STRATEGY
AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 26 MARCH 2026**



Present: Jackie Rossa (Chair)
Kyle Cameron
Shawn George
Sue Hopewell

Shabir Ismail
Neil McDougall
Jude Mellor
Nicky Randall*

In Attendance: Randeep Sami
Louise Hazel
Kully Sandhu
Dave Flannery**
George Fowler**
Hager Strougo**
Lyndon Gorgon**

Roamanay Bowdon**
Jody Kerrod†

Matt Widdowson
(Minutes)

Deputy Principal, Curriculum and Quality
Director of Governance and Policy
Vice Principal
PAM, Hospitality and Food
Student, Culinary Skills L1
Student, Culinary Skills L1
Student, Advanced Diploma in
Professional Cookery
Culinary Skills L2
Head of Quality, Teaching, Learning and
Assessment
Governance and Policy Officer

**presented item 4 in her capacity as Joint Director of Curriculum, BECT*

*** item 4*

† item 5

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1.1. There were no declarations of interest.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1. Apologies were received from Lesley Giles.

**3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE
PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26 FEBRUARY 2026**

3.1. The minutes of the meeting on 26 February 2026 were agreed as an accurate record and approved.

3.2. MATTERS ARISING

3.2.1. All matters arising were included in the agenda.

Dave Flannery, George Fowler, Hager Strougo, Lyndon Gorgon, and Roamanay Bowdon joined the meeting.

4. CURRICULUM AREA FOCUS: HOSPITALITY AND FOOD

- 4.1. The Joint Director of Curriculum and Programme Area Manager gave a presentation on the Hospitality and Food programme area. They were joined by four students George Fowler, Hager Strougo, Lyndon Gorgon, Roamanay Bowdon and introductions were made. The following points were highlighted.
 - 4.1.1. Leicester College was the leading provider of hospitality and food training in the area. The nearest other providers were based in Loughborough and Nuneaton but had much smaller provision.
 - 4.1.2. The Food and Hospitality programme area was part of the BECT curriculum area which had 1,239 students, 242 of which were in Food and Hospitality.
 - 4.1.3. The programme area had 183 EPYP students and 59 adult learners and was almost at capacity.
 - 4.1.4. Food and Hospitality offered a progressive learning journey from entry level through to L3. The programme area was one of the few within BECT that offered an entry level course and next year there would be a student who had worked up from entry level to L3. There were also plans to introduce an L4 Front of House qualification.
 - 4.1.5. The aim was to prepare students for further education or employment, and students were equipped with professional skills and behaviours that would benefit them even if they did not go into employment in the hospitality industry.
 - 4.1.6. Food and Hospitality had the highest number of students with EHCPs within BECT and had recruited a key worker to support students.
 - 4.1.7. The pathways were predominantly practical rather than academic which had helped with retaining students.
 - 4.1.8. The area had grown over the last few years from 189 students in 2022/23 to a planned 262 in 2026/27. Numbers could be further increased if the Taste kitchen were converted into a training kitchen and the pastry kitchens were updated. An application would be submitted to the Savoy Trust for further funding.
 - 4.1.9. Retention and achievement were good. L1 could be challenging in terms of attendance but it had been found that those progressing from entry level had much better attendance at L1. The programme area was proactive when it came to achievement and exceeded the NARs.
 - 4.1.10. This year's attendance was high, and above the College average. The programme area worked closely with parents with a 'Meet the Team' event at the beginning of the year inviting students and parents into the College. There were further events for parents throughout the year.
 - 4.1.11. Food and Hospitality also had a good initial assessment, from which information was gathered from students. This information would be used to work out what was required for each student. For example, if a student lived in a rural area, then public transport issues might mean that they were unable to work in Taste in the evenings. Dietary needs were also considered. Once this information had been obtained, the programme area would ensure that it was acted upon.

4.1.12. KEY CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

- 4.1.12.1. The area continued to work on improving attendance. This year there had been challenges around ill health and mental health. The Fitness to Study and Disciplinary Policies had been used effectively. Food and Hospitality tried to discover and address the root causes of poor attendance. It was recognised that there would be some students who had not been in education for a couple of years before joining the College and the programme area would work with this.
- 4.1.12.2. Rising food prices were impacting delivery, although this year the area would come in underbudget.
- 4.1.12.3. Further ALS was required to meet the needs of SEND and NEET.
- 4.1.12.4. The programme area had limited space to expand provision and had aging equipment in some kitchens.
- 4.1.12.5. The area was continuing to work in partnership with employers; however, it was recognised that employers were getting busier and were having to cope with rising costs.

4.1.13. HIGHLIGHTS

- 4.1.13.1. Taste and BK2 had been refurbished in recent years. Taste now had a five-star rating on TripAdvisor.
- 4.1.13.2. The programme area continued to work with the community, although opportunities to do so had reduced since the pandemic.
- 4.1.13.3. Alister Birt, the Executive Pastry Chef at Harrods, continued to work with the College and had recently supported the preparation of an afternoon tea event for charity.
- 4.1.13.4. Students had the opportunity to carry out paid work at the Nevill Holt Festival. This had previously led to L3 students gaining employment with one of the festival's caterers.
- 4.1.13.5. One of the College's lecturers had won an award for desserts at the Cook and Serve Challenge.
- 4.1.13.6. The Turing Scheme had provided opportunities for students to travel to Seville, although a planned trip to Thailand had been cancelled due to global events.
- 4.1.13.7. Students had the opportunity to serve members of the Royal Family.

4.1.14. DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH

- 4.1.15. The programme area needed extra space for growth. This would require refurbishment of 2.22 to allow for L4 Culinary Arts, and the 1.28 kitchen so that it was in line with 1.26.
- 4.1.16. Ideally Food and Hospitality would be merged with Travel and Tourism. Zest could be converted into a travel and hospitality hub while retaining the café. This space could then be used as both a restaurant and classroom.

4.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

- 4.2.1. **Students were asked how their experience of cooking at the College differed to what they had experienced at school.** It was very different. There had not been much hands-on cooking at school, but at the College there was step-by-step guidance during lessons. School lessons had been limited to an hour but at College there was much more time given to prepare food.
- 4.2.2. **Students were asked about the opportunities they had to travel abroad.** Ten SEND students had travelled to Seville. For one student, it had been their first time on a plane. They had enjoyed their experience and had been able to prepare meals most evenings. One evening they prepared a meal for the lecturer, after which they had left the kitchen clean and tidy.
- 4.2.3. **Students were asked what they had thought their teachers would be like at Leicester College.** One student had expected lecturers to be like Gordon Ramsey but had found that this was not the case.
- 4.2.4. **The student who had progressed from L1 was asked what had persuaded him to carry on.** The student had thought about leaving after L1 and put this down to his attitude. His lecturers had 'set him straight' and had provided support. He had a passion for cookery which had persuaded him to progress from L1 to L3.
- 4.2.5. **Students were asked about their future plans.**
 - 4.2.5.1. One student wanted to go into industry. He was not bothered what kind of dish he would be preparing; he just wanted the opportunity to work with food.
 - 4.2.5.2. Another student wanted to open a café which she could manage alongside family commitments.
 - 4.2.5.3. Another student wanted to move on to L3 and ultimately work as a chef.
- 4.2.6. **Students were asked what the best thing about being a student at the College was.**
 - 4.2.6.1. One student talked about the opportunities they had been given including working at the Neville Holt Festival, which had been an amazing experience. They were also looking forward to the trip to Crete and had always wanted to visit Greece.
 - 4.2.6.2. A student had recently moved to the UK from Egypt. They had found the teachers in Egypt to be strict and unhelpful and were surprised by how understanding the teachers were at Leicester College. They stated that the staff at the College cared about students' progress and wanted them to come out of each lesson having learned something new.
 - 4.2.6.3. Another student had been at the College since before the pandemic. They had not enjoyed being in Supported Learning and found Food and Hospitality more enjoyable as it was an opportunity to learn life skills.
- 4.2.7. **Students were asked what they would like to see improved.**

- 4.2.7.1. Students wanted more time in lessons as three hours was not enough time to prepare a dish. The PAM told the meeting that some classes would be lengthened to three and half hours in the new academic year.
 - 4.2.7.2. Students also wanted more practical classes.
 - 4.2.7.3. One student stated that, although cookery was fun, they wished that maths were not part of their course.
 - 4.2.7.4. Cleaning up after classes was an issue. The Director of Curriculum explained that, as the programme area was at capacity, there was often only half an hour between classes for kitchen assistants to clean up. There might be the need for more kitchen assistants.
- 4.2.8. **The College's Capital Board would be considering the request to refurbish kitchens, and the Strategic Bids Manager had been working on a submission to the Savoy Trust.**
 - 4.2.9. **Governors had observed the positive behaviours demonstrated by Food and Hospitality students and noted the pride that was taken in their work.**
 - 4.2.10. **How long did kitchen equipment last for?** Although the programme area carefully looked after the equipment, some of it had been at the College for around fifteen years. While some of the chefs preferred the older equipment, it had become difficult to source spare parts.
 - 4.2.11. **When the College was bidding for new equipment, it should be clear that this was to replace old equipment which had no remaining value. It should also be noted that commercial kitchens had a much more rapid turnover of equipment.**
 - 4.2.12. **There was something to be learned from how Food and Hospitality had addressed the attendance issues at lower levels. IAG and support had been mentioned, but there was also something around how students gained immediate feedback and could see what they had achieved in each lesson.**
 - 4.2.13. **Having students on the right programme was fundamentally important. This related to the piloting of foundation learning.**
 - 4.2.14. **In areas such as computing there was the tendency for students to 'drift off' due to learning being primarily classroom based. There might be the opportunity for computing students and food students to experience each other's areas. This might also provide a useful opportunity for computing students to trial their work in a real-life environment.**
 - 4.2.15. **Taste had been hugely beneficial, and students had been able to model expectations and behaviours.**
 - 4.2.16. **Were destinations tracked?** Although the College tracked destinations, there had been conversations about meeting with students before they left to discuss their plans.
 - 4.2.17. **Did the programme area keep in touch with alumni?** There were annual 'Meet the Ex' events where former students came in to speak to current students about their journeys and achievements.
- 4.3. **Governors noted the Hospitality and Food programme area presentation and thanked the students and staff for their contribution to the meeting.**

Dave Flannery, George Fowler, Hager Strougo, Lyndon Gorgon, and Roamanay

Bowden left the meeting.

Jody Kerrod joined the meeting.

5. QIP UPDATE

5.1. LEVEL 1 ATTENDANCE

5.1.1. The Deputy Principal provided an update on L1 attendance. The following points were highlighted.

5.1.1.1. Overall attendance was at 84% (against the KPI of 88%) with English at 82% (KPI 85%) and maths at 78% (KPI 85%). Overall attendance was up two points on the previous year, while English was up one point and maths was static. Vocational attendance was at 86% (against the KPI of 88%) which was up three points on the previous year.

5.1.1.2. While 86.5% of students were not at risk, 6.7% of high-risk students were in the 50%-80% attendance band. It was this latter group that required targeted action.

5.1.1.3. A root cause analysis had found several factors affecting student attendance and risk rating. These included:

- Poor initial IAG which had resulted in students enrolling on courses which were not their first choices.
- Inconsistent quality of teaching and learning practice.
- Curriculum structure and sequencing
- Early adaptations not being in place for vulnerable students.
- Difficult home and personal situations for students
- Inconsistent timely follow-up on the impact of attendance interventions
- Low attendance/high risk students not having a relevant target identified for maths and English.
- Historic issues in some L1 programmes.

5.1.1.4. These issues did not apply across the board, but it was important to get it right for this particular cohort of students.

5.1.1.5. Intervention activities for the current cohort of students included:

- Low attendance/high risk students identified and provided with an improvement target, with parents, students and staff engaged in attendance resolution.
- For vocational curriculum areas, progressing students with continued low attendance to the next stage of the attendance process.
- 75% of programme areas with quality improvement support had shown an improvement in attendance.
- For PP3, L1 was two points ahead of the previous year, and L2 and L3 were both one point ahead.

5.1.1.6. Future improvements would include:

- A robust approval process to ensure the offer met the needs of L1 applicants and ensure all approved provision provided a strong teaching and learning experience.

- Maths and English engagement initiatives and operational alignment between Maths and English and vocational management structures.
 - Improvements tracked through the new QIP.
- 5.1.1.7. Actions included:
- Continued targeting of quality activity prioritising the reduction of the 50%-80% attendance in Launch Pad, maths and English and Sport.
 - Reinforcing a whole programme approach ensuring that maths and English were embedded in all interventions and monitoring processes.
 - Embedding consistent target setting, review, and follow-up
 - Improving tutorial consistency

5.1.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

- 5.1.2.1. **What was meant by maths and English targets not being identified?** It meant that some students identified on high risk did not have a specific academic target to focus on. This could lead to students disengaging.
- 5.1.2.2. **What was meant by “inconsistent quality”?** Not all students identified on high risk had clear milestones.
- 5.1.2.3. **There had been a lot of measuring. What had been the impact?** There had been an impact in some areas. In Engineering, target setting was at 60% in some classrooms and students were also receiving a clear start to lessons. Similar progress had not been seen in Sport where there were problems with teaching and learning and assessment.
- 5.1.2.4. **How were managers involved in changing practice?** A collaborative approach had been taken. PAMs had joined the Quality Team for drop-ins. Managers were also starting to carry out viewings which would be compared to those done by the Quality Team.
- 5.1.2.5. **How were the Sports managers involved?** This area had experienced a difficult relationship between staff and managers. The College would be looking at the offer and the reasons behind running these courses. The Deputy Principal would be having a robust discussion about whether these programmes would be run next year.
- 5.1.2.6. **What did a good session at Leicester College look like?** There was a framework in place for sessions, but this might have been diluted.
- 5.1.2.7. **The quality framework might not be good enough.** There needed to be a more streamlined process to ensure consistency.
- 5.1.2.8. **It would be important not to over complicate things. It might be useful to strip it back and focus on what was working well.** Agreed.
- 5.1.2.9. **An Ofsted inspection would be looking at last year’s data. For EPYP achievement, this would mean a judgment of ‘needs attention.’** There had been feedback that Ofsted inspections had been data driven and the bar had been set

high. Proportionality also needs to be considered along with the progress of students from their starting points

- 5.1.2.10. **It was important to recruit with integrity and ensure that the right learner was on the right course.** Some of L1 students did not know what they wanted to do. Often parents pushed them onto courses. The College will be piloting a foundation offer next year that will be discussed at the Governors' away day.
- 5.1.2.11. **There was value in documenting the actions that had already been taken.**
- 5.1.2.12. **There was the matter of relevance: were courses relevant to what students wanted to learn? Were students aware of the careers which were available after a course had been completed?** Agreed.

5.1.3. **Governors noted the update on L1 Attendance.**

5.2. REVISED QIP

5.2.1. The Deputy Principal presented the revised QIP. The following points were highlighted.

- 5.2.1.1. There was now a filter for programme types.
- 5.2.1.2. Termly updates would be aligned with the QIP.
- 5.2.1.3. The QIP would be shared with directors and there would be meetings to track and monitor progress.
- 5.2.1.4. The QIP would not be locked to the academic year although there would still be a position at the end of each year.

5.2.2. **Governors made the following comments.**

- 5.2.2.1. **Could milestones be included?** This could be added to the termly updates and linked back to the impact measures.
- 5.2.2.2. **Governors needed assurance over what was and was not working. It was acceptable if something was tried and found not to work.**
- 5.2.2.3. **Could a filter be added to show when actions were due, so that there could be a focus on near term issues?** A due date column could be added and, in the future, termly updates would be more focused on milestones.
- 5.2.2.4. **Twelve different frameworks were mentioned in the QIP. This could be difficult for staff to follow.** There would be a single framework and a themed approach taken to provide a clear direction of travel.
- 5.2.2.5. **This new QIP would provide governors with more assurance and confidence.**

5.2.3. **Governors noted the Revised QIP**

Jody Kerrod left the meeting.

6. REVIEW OF RISKS

6.1. The Principal presented the review of risks. The following points were highlighted.

6.1.1. Three risks were allocated to the CSQI Committee:

6.1.1.1. Risk 1: Unable to maintain and build quality of provision: this may be reduced in the future as most provision was of a good quality and areas of concern were small and in pockets.

6.1.1.2. Risk 2: Inability to capitalise on opportunities: this had been reduced as the curriculum was aligned with priorities.

6.1.1.3. Risk 9: Not gaining suitable leverage from collaboration and partnership: there were still a lot of unresolved policy issues including devolution, meaning the risk remained unchanged.

6.1.1.4. Risk levels for 2 and 9 were likely to come down further.

6.1.2. The Director of Governance and Policy advised that the next meeting would take place after the final meeting of the Audit Committee for the academic year. This would be the last opportunity to influence the final iteration of the risk register in this academic year.

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

6.2.1. **Was there enough acknowledgement of curriculum steer that was beyond the College's control, such as the White Paper and the new Ofsted framework?**

6.2.2. **The mood of the meeting was that there had been improvement, so there was the question of whether this would warrant a change to risk ratings.** The College was in a good position, however the latest progress point review for EPYP was still slightly low, meaning that the whole provision was still in red. It was worth considering whether this was now an amber risk.

6.2.3. **Proportionality was noted but it still felt too soon to reduce the quality risk level at this point in time.**

6.2.4. **On the issue of this being the final opportunity to influence the risk register, changes should be made when necessary; no changes were needed at this time.**

6.3. **Governors noted the Review of Risks and agreed the risk ratings.**

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

7.1. The Chair requested suggestions for agenda items for the meeting of the CSQI Committee.

7.1.1. **The agenda for the June meeting was already full. The delivery plan and QIP would be discussed and a work plan agreed for the following year.**

7.2. **Governors agreed to not add anything further to the agenda for the next meeting.**

Kully Sandu, Nicky Randall, Kyle Cameron and Shawn George left the meeting.

8. CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE – CONFIDENTIAL

9. 16-19 PERFORMANCE TABLES

9.1. **Governors noted the 16-19 Performance Tables.**

10. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

- 14 May 2026
- 18 June 2026