

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



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

Shabir Ismail
Neil McDougall
Jude Mellor
Nicky Randall

In Attendance: Randeep Sami
Louise Hazel
Kully Sandhu
Andy Cookson
Darren Roome*
Jody Kerrod

Deputy Principal, Curriculum and Quality
Director of Governance and Policy
Vice Principal
Assistant Principal
Director of Curriculum, CNST
Head of Quality, Teaching, Learning and
Assessment
PAM, CNST
Y2 Electrical T Level Student, CNST
Y1 Electrical T Level Student, CNST
Governance and Policy Officer

Nick Allen*
Jack Hine*
Neve Bartlam*
Matt Widdowson
(Minutes)

** Present for item 4*

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1.1 Randeep Sami and Jude Mellor were welcomed to their first meeting, and introductions were made.

1.2 There were no declarations of interest.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1 No apologies were received.

3 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 2025

3.1 The words "and was" needed to be deleted from paragraph 4.1.1.

3.2 **The minutes of the meeting on 27 November 2025 were agreed as an accurate record and approved.**

3.3 MATTERS ARISING

- 3.3.1 The two actions arising from the previous meeting had been added to the agendas for this meeting and the next.

4 CURRICULUM AREA FOCUS: CONSTRUCTION

- 4.1 The Director of Curriculum and Programme Area Manager gave a presentation on the Construction Curriculum Area. Two T Level students were also present. The following points were highlighted.

- 4.1.1 There were three streams of provision in Construction: Onsite construction, BSE: Plumbing and Heating and BSE Electrotechnical, multi-skills, and HE. Each stream was managed by a PAM.
- 4.1.2 Discrete level 1 courses had previously been offered but these had been combined to create two multidisciplinary foundation courses: L1 Building Services Engineering and L1 Onsite Construction. When the two foundation courses were first offered in 2023/24, the achievement rate had been 75%. In 2024/25 the achievement rate rose to 90%.
- 4.1.3 The T Level enrolment had previously been high, although this number would reduce in the future due to the changes in carpentry. Full-cost enrolment was predominantly in the Gas Centre. Attendance was one of the highest in the College. A lot of hard work had gone into getting the right measures in place. Retention was holding up well.
- 4.1.4 2022/23 achievement had not been great, but the curriculum area had since bounced back. There had been a slight drop off during 2024/25, but this had been isolated to two programmes which had since received attention. The 2025/26 figures were the grades predicted at PP2. At PP3 there would be a more confident estimate of the outturn.
- 4.1.5 The biggest impact on T Level achievement had been retention. The gap between years one and two were when students were lost to industry.
- 4.1.6 Highlights included investment in the accommodation including the staffroom, a new Green Tech Hub funded by the LSIP and the electrotechnical workshop came online in September 2025. It provided more space and access to full fault rigs for students to use.
- 4.1.7 Key areas for improvement were Increasing achievement rates on identified L2 EPYP programmes and Continuing to develop recording methods to evaluate student work.
- 4.1.8 In year challenges included staff recruitment which affected what could be offered. Although there had been improvements to facilities, there were still issues with the estate. L2 and L3 curriculum reform was still a challenge, as was retention to positive destinations.

4.2 Governors made the following comments.

- 4.2.1 **The rise in achievement in the two foundation courses from 75% in 2023/24 to 90% was a huge change.** The biggest change was that

staff were able to take ownership of their units. Delivery could then be planned and monitored through regular team meetings which discussed progress and any concerns. This combination of staff ownership and team meetings had made a significant difference.

- 4.2.2 **How many of the foundation level learners had progressed internally?** Last year fourteen electrical students had progressed to L2.
- 4.2.3 **What GCSE levels were required for L2?** Students needed to have achieved a grade 3 in English and maths.
- 4.2.4 **Was there no adult provision for L1 BSE?** Adults came in at L2. There was no demand for L1 as most adults wanted to get into industry as soon as possible.
- 4.2.5 **With changes to the T level offer, what alternatives would be provided?** L3 site joinery would be reintroduced for existing learners.
- 4.2.6 **Was there any information about destinations yet?** Destinations data was collected at the end of the last term of the year.
- 4.2.7 **It would be interesting to know the destinations of students.** In-year leavers generally went into apprenticeships or employment. With the T Level students, there was an issue with employers retaining work placement students as apprentices. Additionally, it appeared that the government had not adequately thought through what would happen to students when they exited T Level carpentry and plumbing courses as these students would have to take a step backwards when starting an apprenticeship.
- 4.2.8 **Was there consistent EPYP attendance across all levels?** T Levels generally had the highest attendance but all levels were fairly equal.
- 4.2.9 **The attendance had improved from last year.** This had been a matter of supporting Programme Leads to make the necessary early interventions with students and parents. Attendance in the first few weeks was key and it had been important to put the right support in place for individuals.
- 4.2.10 **Had there been any changes to teaching and learning which had helped with improving attendance?** The new facilities had helped, as had digital assessment. Digital assessment involved posting a voice recording on Teams for students to listen back to. Students had been provided with individual feedback and suggestions for improvement.
- 4.2.11 **Did the two students present think that digital assessment had helped other students improve their attendance?** When students received individual feedback, it made them feel like they wanted to be at the College.
- 4.2.12 **Did students receive notification on Teams when their work was marked, and did they ever refer to the feedback?** Students did receive notification and often noted the feedback.
- 4.2.13 **The full-cost income did not appear to be correct.** Agreed. This was an issue due to courses being predominantly short courses. If a student did not turn up, it would have a significant effect on the figures. The majority of these students were in the Gas Centre.
- 4.2.14 **Did full-cost students receive a refund if they did not turn up?** They did not receive a refund.
- 4.2.15 **Were the numbers of T Level students lost to industry captured?** The numbers were captured as far as possible.
- 4.2.16 **Students were asked what it was like being a T Level student?** T Levels were better than being an apprentice. There was the opportunity to go into more depth and receive an explanation for why work was

done in the way it was. This provided students with a greater depth of understanding.

- 4.2.17 **With the new facilities, did the students feel that the College was investing in them?** They did.
- 4.2.18 **T Levels depended on having the right spaces for students to learn in.** The electrical workshop had taken two years to plan and ensure that there were the right materials for the students to practice on. It was great to see the space being used. The new CEO of East Midlands Housing had recently visited the facilities and would be bringing his executive team to the College with a view to forming a new strategic partnership.
- 4.2.19 **The presentation had shown that staff were taking ownership.** There had also been investment in staff CPD. Additionally, the new facilities and equipment had made teaching more exciting for staff.
- 4.2.20 **Managing attendance issues early had an impact.** Agreed.
- 4.2.21 **Construction was both a national and local priority, and there was a sector package available which sought to address issues around staff recruitment and retention. Were there any local developments that would help with staffing challenges?** The level of pay did not attract staff. There were few applicants for posts. Any incentives that were out there were not reaching the industry. There was also an issue of potentially losing staff to private providers.
- 4.2.22 **Congratulations on turning the area around in such a short space of time and thank you to the students for attending the meeting.** Noted.

4.3 **Governors noted the Construction curriculum area presentation.**

5 QIP UPDATE

- 5.1 The Chair had previously met with the Deputy Principal to discuss the QIP. It had been recommended that, as the Deputy Principal was new in post, there should be an overview of the QIP format. This was the reason a fully formed QIP could not be presented at this meeting.
- 5.2 The Deputy Principal and Head of Quality provided an update on attendance and the QIP. The following points were highlighted.
 - 5.2.1 Cumulative attendance was at 86% which was four points above the previous year.
 - 5.2.2 Following a lot of interventions there had started to be a rise. Even if there was a dip in attendance it was hoped that the outturn would still be above the previous year.
 - 5.2.3 Although there was year-on-year improvement there were still challenging areas. The Quality Team had been reviewing the data and wanted to strengthen the use of the Attendance Policy.
 - 5.2.4 Vocational provision had been performing well and had improved on the previous year. The current attendance was 87%.
 - 5.2.5 Maths had remained slightly low at 79%.
 - 5.2.6 EPYP attendance was in line with previous months although there had been a slight drop which had been the result of mental health and transport issues. The current figure was 80% against the previous year's outturn of 82%,

- 5.2.7 With apprenticeships there had been inconsistency in attendance.
- 5.2.8 There was concern over L1 which was at 80%. L2 was broadly stable at 83% with a 2% increase seen over February.
- 5.2.9 The Quality Team were working with curriculum areas to look at parental engagement and the use of the Fitness to Study Policy.
- 5.2.10 For Excellence in Inclusion, three areas for development had been identified: quality-first classroom practice, student starting points, and graduated approach implementation. The actions proposed included having a CPD programme to develop the capture of starting points, learning needs, and identifying individual learning strategies.
- 5.2.11 For Excellence in Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, the actions would include a focus on formative assessment and targeted curriculum support where value added and predicted achievement were below the KPI.
- 5.2.12 For Participation and Development, there would be a focus on attendance including looking at attendance by banding. There would also be a revised PD framework.
- 5.2.13 For Leadership and Governance, the performance review cycle would include enhanced scrutiny of attendance, target review compliance and progress tracking. There would also be a review of target setting.
- 5.2.14 It was noted that the performance review meetings had been having the right conversations and that there were actions taking place on the ground that were making the right difference. The College was on the right path but to step up to the next level there needed to be a QIP driven by root causes.
- 5.2.15 There would be a new QIP template that provided a stronger level of accountability and be mapped against the Ofsted toolkit. The plan was to have this embedded in the next academic year.

5.3 **Governors made the following comments.**

- 5.3.1 **What was the attendance target?** The KPI target was 88% and was average for all provision types.
- 5.3.2 **What could have caused a spike in L1 attendance in the previous year?** This could be due to the enrichment activities offered after the Christmas break. This was being looked into in more detail including what lessons could be applied for the following year.
- 5.3.3 **When was the Fitness to Study Policy introduced?** This had started during the previous year although the current year was the first year that the policy had been implemented fully. In 2024/25 25 students had been through the Fitness to Study process, this year the number was already at 44 and Curriculum areas were now identifying students earlier.
- 5.3.4 **Attendance was still very low at the lower levels. The update did not provide the confidence that governors required at this point in the year.** The attendance was marginally better than last year, more interventions had taken place with students identified as having low attendance. Further work was being undertaken to identify root causes and analyse whether interventions were having the desired impact.
- 5.3.5 **The data presented on some of the graphs did not use the same scale. This made them difficult to compare.** Noted.
- 5.3.6 **L1 students often felt that they had already experienced twelve years of educational failure, which meant there was the question of what the College could do to allow them to feel success and**

getting them into an achievement mindset early. Some students had joined the College with previously very poor attendance at school. In many cases, their attendance at College had improved but not to the levels of the College target.

- 5.3.7 **The fact that L2 and L3 had stabilised said something about students having acquired the habit of learning at those stages.**
- 5.3.8 **Too many of the actions involved monitoring and checking. It would be good to know what was actually happening on the ground.** The Principal had been pushing attendance and challenging the SLT during discussions about students' barriers and the impact on attendance. There had been honest conversations whether the curriculum was right; whether there were adequate levels of commitment in some curriculum areas; and whether IAG was right.
- 5.3.9 **There had not been much said about the quality of teaching and learning which was often the root cause.** An inclusion thematic review had just taken place. Some good practice had been observed. For the areas where practice had been below expectation, the Quality Team was putting in place support.
- 5.3.10 **A previous governor visit to catering had noted that students were engaged, keen to show off their work and had acted professionally.**
- 5.3.11 **There were some quick wins which could be made, for example ending lessons with, "next time we will do..." in an exciting voice.**
- 5.3.12 **There were students who did not want to do English and maths. There were other students who had ended up on a course that they did not select. Some students found theory sessions boring. This made them ask themselves why they would attend College.**
- 5.3.13 **There were students who were in College but were still not attending lessons.**
- 5.3.14 **With regards to students not being keen on theory sessions, this could be resolved by embedding theory in practical sessions.**
- 5.3.15 **Alarm bell had been ringing for L1 early on in the year, but it appeared that nothing had been done. Governors had been told that a review was going to take place, however, this was still being talked about at this meeting.** As discussed earlier, a lot of work and interventions had been put in place but it was acknowledged that the impact was yet to be seen. There needed to be a strategic look at this cohort of students and the College was discussing piloting the introduction of foundation learning. This would be discussed at the governors away day in June. It was recognised that a different approach was needed to have the desired impact.
- 5.3.16 **Had the Quality Team spoken with L1 students?** Yes. Quite a lot of these students had said that they did not want to be on their programme.
- 5.3.17 **There seemed to have been a lot of planning and measuring but not much action. Governors would want to see what actions had taken place at the next meeting of the CSQI Committee.** Noted.
- 5.3.18 **Turning to the QIP, it was noted that EPYP L1 provision in Hairdressing and Sport were below the NAR. What was teaching and learning like in these lessons?** Teaching was generally good but there were inconsistencies. The Quality Team were looking at a more robust programme to put support on the ground.
- 5.3.19 **Students with attendance below 50% only equated to 4% of students. The College should focus on the higher attendance**

bands.

- 5.3.20 **Governors had noticed that catering students had said that they enjoyed their personal development sessions. It might be worth looking into this.**
- 5.3.21 **The actions that needed to be driven forward by the QIP were around teaching and learning.**
- 5.3.22 **It was important that the QIP reflected the Ofsted framework.**
- 5.3.23 **While attendance might not improve much this year, it was important to look at the rate of decline.** L1 students generally had not engaged with school. It was important to make them feel that College was a new environment for them. College should be a safe space for young people who needed a second chance.
- 5.3.24 **A lot of L1 students did not know what they wanted to do with their lives and only came to College because they were compelled to. To be successful, there needed to be teamwork between College staff, students, and their parents. Even something as simple as being able to contact parents by text could make a difference.**
- 5.3.25 **Governors acknowledged that there was pressure on the new Deputy Principal but acknowledged that it would take time to make some of the changes needed. Governors' only expectation was that every step that was taken from now on was in a position direction.**

5.4 **Governors noted the update on attendance and the QIP.**

6 REVIEW OF RISKS

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

- 6.1.1 The Committee was asked to consider whether anything that had been discussed would mean that risks could be moved. Additionally, were there any planned actions that could be added to the risk register.

6.2 **Governors made the following comments.**

- 6.2.1 **The CSQI Committee had previously observed that many of the controls were actually monitoring. The associated risks should stay in red until the controls were in place. The controls would not be in place until a root cause analysis had been completed.**
- 6.2.2 **Why was attendance not an overt risk category?**
- 6.2.3 **Attendance was not a risk in itself. Instead, it was an indicator. Poor student outcomes were a risk and one of the controls should be an action which improved attendance. It was up to ELT to define risks and controls. The role of governors was to question the decisions made by the College's management. There would be a further session on risk for governors.**
- 6.2.4 **For Risk 1, and reference to an 'overall judgment' under the new toolkit there would not be an overall judgment. Noted.**

6.3 **Governors noted the Review of Risks and agreed that there would be no change to the current 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 **There would be an update on the QIP meaning that attendance could be discussed.**

7.1.2 **The Food programme area should be invited in to give a presentation.**

7.2 **Governors agreed to invite the Food Programme Area to provide a presentation at the next meeting.**

8 DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

- 26 March 2026
- 14 May 2026
- 18 June 2026