

LEEDS COLLEGE OF BUILDING

QUALITY, CURRICULUM & PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 3 December 2024 at 4.00pm, North Street, Meeting Room 1 / Microsoft Teams.

PRESENT:

Sandra Burnhill (SB)	Chair & External Governor
Steve Carmody (SCa)	External Governor
Nikki Davis (ND)	Principal & Chief Executive
James Dunford (JD)	External Governor
Sarah Gibson (SG)	External Governor (<i>joined via Microsoft Teams</i>)
Caroline Meehan (CM)	External Governor (<i>joined via Microsoft Teams</i>)
Michael Norton (MN)	Staff Governor
Dave Russell (DR)	External Governor (<i>joined via Microsoft Teams</i>)
Julie Tolley (JT)	External Governor
William Wallace (WW)	Staff Governor

ATTENDANCE: 10 / 10 = 100% (KPI 80%)

Cumulative attendance: 16 / 21 = 76%

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rob Holmes (RH)	Vice Principal – Curriculum, Quality and Innovation
Steve Connell (SCo)	Assistant Principal – Study Programmes
Chris Tunningley (CT)	Assistant Principal – Adults & Apprenticeships
Daniel Grimes (DG)	Head of Quality (Agenda Item QCP/24/124)
Nicky Robinson (NR)	Head of Inclusive Learning Service (Agenda Item QCP/24/125)
Jane Taylor-Holmes (JTH)	Director of Governance
Nancy Fearnside (NF)	PA to Strategic Leadership Team (Minutes)

Agenda items were considered in the order recorded in the minutes.

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
101	QCP-24-118 - Appointment of Chair & Vice Chair JTH reported that DFC had resigned as Governor and Chair of QC&P due to work commitments. Following discussions, SB had agreed to step up as Chair of QC&P and JT had agreed to take on the Vice Chair role.	
102	Resolved: SB was appointed Chair of the Committee for 2024/25 and JT was appointed Vice Chair of the Committee for 2024/25.	
103	QCP-24-119 - Apologies for Absence There were no apologies for absence.	
104	QCP-24-120 - Determination of Observers / Attendees Members agreed attendees at the meeting as per the attendance list above.	
105	QCP-24-121 – Declaration of Interests in any Agenda items There were no declarations of interest.	
106	QCP-24-122 – Minutes of the previous meeting Resolved: The minutes of the previous meeting held on 22 October 2024 were accepted as a true record.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
	<p data-bbox="197 203 616 237">QCP-24-123 – Matters Arising</p> <p data-bbox="100 271 1054 304">107 Members noted the updates recorded against the matters arising.</p> <p data-bbox="100 338 1238 405">108 SB noted that no student Governor representatives were yet in place. JTH confirmed that this was still being progressed.</p> <p data-bbox="100 439 1238 775">109 JT queried the position with regard to Governor representatives on the EDI Committee. RH commented that he was waiting for new Governors to start but confirmed that W Feroze (WF) as EDI Link Governor, was involved in the EDI Committee. JT commented that she would be happy to stand in if necessary. Committee members questioned whether a Governor representative was required on the EDI Committee. RH commented that if any Governors wanted to attend, even on an ad hoc basis, he could share the invites to these meetings; these were held approximately every six weeks. RH commented that WF had been kept up to date on matters discussed at the EDI meetings and a catch up had taken place with J Francis as EDI Link Manager.</p> <p data-bbox="100 808 1238 875">110 SB commented that the update on English & Maths at the recent Governor Training session had been very interesting and useful.</p> <p data-bbox="100 909 1238 1066">111 SB commented that RH had requested that his items (QCP/24/128 Self-Assessment Report 2023/24 and QCP/24/127 Quality Improvement Plan) were taken next. He was giving a presentation to the Cross Industry Construction Apprenticeship Task Force on 4 December and had to leave the meeting early to catch the train to London.</p>	
	<p data-bbox="197 1113 975 1146">QCP-24-128 - Self-Assessment Report (SAR) 2023/2024</p> <p data-bbox="100 1180 1238 1314">112 RH gave a brief explanation of the Self-Assessment process for those that were not familiar with this. RH commented that at the last QC&P meeting, there had been a robust discussion around the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and the six actions raised by Ofsted.</p> <p data-bbox="100 1348 1238 1449">113 RH explained that the final agreed data for 2023/24 had only been released at the end of October confirming the final position. This was the first opportunity to present the full SAR to the Committee.</p> <p data-bbox="100 1482 1238 1583">114 RH commented that the full SAR was available on the Governor Hub. A full published version would be produced when the SAR was approved. RH had provided a detailed Executive Summary.</p> <p data-bbox="100 1617 1238 1718">115 RH stated that the SAR and gradings had been discussed by the SLT last week; an additional paper had been distributed to Committee members, proposing grade adjustments in the SAR.</p> <p data-bbox="100 1751 1238 1919">116 RH explained that, given the final position and all the evidence within the SAR, he had proposed adjustments to some of the grades. He commented that significant work had taken place since the March Inspection and throughout the last academic year in terms of all the interventions that had been reported to the Committee and the Board.</p> <p data-bbox="100 1953 1238 2054">117 RH appreciated the paper had only been circulated the day before the meeting. The paper outlined the proposed grade changes by provision types; the evidence / detail was included in the SAR, QIP or in the justification within the paper.</p>	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
118	RH commented that Education Programmes for Young People (EPYP) had been graded Requires Improvement by Ofsted. Robust evidence was in place in term of improvements in all areas raised by Ofsted and therefore the proposed grade was Good.	
119	JT acknowledged that small improvements were being evidenced and asked how this compared to national benchmarks. RH commented that benchmarking had been undertaken comparing the College against GFE national benchmarks and sector skills area benchmarks. If the College was compared against construction departments, then the College was significantly outperforming other providers but if compared against GFE national benchmarks then the College was slightly down. Looking at EPYP in general the College could evidence around a 5% increase in achievement rate last year.	
120	RH explained that the College only delivered provision in two or three sector skills areas and comparing the College to GFE colleges remained a challenge.	
121	JT commented that this was a useful positioning statement and if that was the stance being taken then this should be signposted at the beginning of the SAR.	
122	DR agreed with RH that comparing the College with similar curriculum provision, rather than all subjects, was the best way. He agreed with JT that this needed to be signposted in the SAR. RH agreed that this could be included at the beginning of the SAR to make it clear how the College was benchmarking itself.	RH December 2024
123	SCa raised concern that changing the grades could result in criticism. The College needed to be confident in the evidence base in terms of distance travelled since March to October and ensure evidence was available to confirm the progress made.	
124	RH commented that Ofsted would ask for the College's SAR to assess how well the College understood its provision and would test out what the College was stating within the SAR.	
125	RH stated that with all the improvements made, the SLT was confident regarding the proposed grade changes. Significant work had taken place and RH felt that the grades reflected the true position of the College.	
126	SCa agreed that it was good to be bold but the evidence needed to be in place to support the College's position.	
127	RH explained that the SAR did not have to be graded but he understood that the Committee wanted grades to be included. He commented that he would not be comfortable leaving EPYP as 'Requires Improvement' based on all the evidence / justification available. RH commented that he was unsure what more assurance the Committee required in order to be comfortable with the SAR and grades, without going through the SAR page by page. SCa commented that the College needed to judge itself accurately and be confident about this.	
128	JD agreed that the College needed to be confident about judging itself accurately. He noted the issues regarding PGOs, attendance and punctuality but acknowledged that improvements were being made and could be evidenced.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
129	SCa commented that if you resonate from top to bottom, with everyone agreeing and understanding, that was a positive place to be. He suggested it might be beneficial to ensure the same messages are consistent across all areas of the College.	
130	RH commented Curriculum areas had completed their own SARs and Development Plans and the themes represented in the College SAR had come directly from the Curriculum area SARs. As an example, the University Centre Self-Assessment Report was included on the agenda.	
131	RH explained that the first Performance Reviews for the academic year had been carried out (EPYP, Apprenticeships, Adults and High Needs). These reviews ensured the College was closing the loop, with the evidence bases being reinforced. Staff were assessing their own performance in their areas and RH commented that there was evidence of improvement in a short space of time. The position of the teams came through in the SARs and ultimately in the QIP.	
132	JT raised some concern regarding the statistics in the report around PGOs. She noted that more than 50% of those observed were graded as Requires Improvement and had not met the PGO criteria. She felt that this raised issues regarding the quality of teaching and learning, which was quite worrying.	
133	SCo explained that the feedback from PGOs was not necessarily regarding teaching and learning. Staff may not be achieving the PGO standard because they were not following the Inclusive Classroom model, not because teaching was poor. The PGO had a rigid criteria in place to ensure standardisation across the College.	
134	JT commented that the criteria set was what the College believed to be good practice and should be followed. If this was not the case, then no doubt action would be taken to ensure the criteria was met moving forward.	
135	RH explained that the PGO process was in its very early days and the evidence base was small at this stage. The PGO process only commenced in the middle of October and approximately 30 observations had taken place, with approximately 50% of those not meeting the standard. RH commented that the Quality Team had been working with those individuals who had not met the standard and were confident that when re-observed they would meet the standard. RH suggested that once a larger evidence base was available then it would be easier to assess the impact of the PGOs.	
136	JT acknowledged that the PGOs had been introduced to enhance the quality of teaching and learning but this could not be evidenced at the moment and she was concerned that the College may be unable to evidence positive impact.	
137	RH suggested that the wording could be amended to reflect that PGOs were being conducted and support was put in place for individuals with regard to teaching and learning.	
138	JD commented that details of where the criteria was pitched, i.e. top level, could also be included.	<p style="text-align: right;">RH December 2024</p>

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
139	DR commented that he was not uncomfortable with the grade changes. The PGO process was an improvement initiative that could be argued as identifying clarity of where improvements could be made and increasing teaching standards.	
140	SB commented that, from the discussions, some members may have reservations regarding the proposed grade changes. SG felt that changing the grades at this stage was a bit too soon. CM felt that the wording could be an issue; she noted that the PGOs had been introduced to improve teaching and learning and supported this process.	
141	SB commented that with regard to the timeline, the SAR would be presented to the Board on 17 December 2024 and at the moment she did not feel the Committee could recommend the SAR for approval without some additional wording being included around the areas highlighted. JT queried whether the College should consider removing the grades from the SAR. SB commented that Ofsted would expect the SAR to be graded and for Governors to agree these.	
142	ND commented that potentially Ofsted were moving to where there was no statement of overall grade moving forward. She queried if there was some middle ground of grading individual areas and not the overall effectiveness. ND explained that the timescale of the SAR was standard; the real focus was the improvements made. She did not believe that further evidence was required. ND commented that timewise the SAR could be recommended to the Board but the grades could be delayed until a more certain strategy had been embedded.	
143	SCo felt that if the grades remained the same this would not reflect the improvements made and evidence available, although he acknowledged that some areas still required further improvement.	
144	SG commented that she did not fully understand the risk of not including grades or putting grades and getting it wrong. She was happy with the commentary; confidence regarding the proposed grade changes was her main concern. She acknowledged that there had been improvement in attendance, which was noteworthy.	
145	DR noted SG's concerns but felt the paper offered justification as to why the grade had been improved. Ultimately, he was satisfied that justification / evidence was in place to support the grade changes.	
146	SB commented that the SAR would be presented to the Board at the December meeting. RH had two weeks to look at this further, together with the grades, following all the comments made by members.	RH 10 December 2024
147	Resolved: Committee members received the Self-Assessment Report for 2023/24 and discussed the proposed grade changes.	
148	<p>QCP-24-127 – Quality Improvement Plan Update</p> <p>RH explained that he was mindful that the QIP had been presented at the last QC&P meeting in October. He had provided updates for November and within the Executive Summary had referred the Committee to those updates. He acknowledged that there had not been significant change since the last report.</p>	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
149	SCa raised the question of High Needs. RH agreed that there was still work to be done in this area and confirmed that the grade for High Needs would remain as Requires Improvement.	
150	RH asked that any further questions / points on the SAR be sent through to him prior to the Board meeting on 17 December 2024.	
151	Resolved: Committee members received the Quality Improvement Plan update noting the updates since this was last reviewed in October.	
152	RH left the meeting at this point.	
	QCP-24-124 – Quality (closing the loop) / Student Voice Annual Report	
153	DG provided a presentation regarding curriculum improvements for 2024/25. The key improvement interventions were: Professional Growth Observations (PGOs), Apprentice Review Observations (AROs), Learning Visits, Enhanced Quality Improvement Team, Formalised Appraisal of Apprentice Review process and Performance Review process.	
154	DG explained why PGOs had been introduced and briefly described the process and what happened following the PGOs.	
155	DG outlined the criteria for PGOs which was based on the Inclusive Classroom template. DG commented that Ofsted had said some really positive things about the Inclusive Classroom and these were highlighted.	
156	DG explained that other staff would also be reviewed as part of the PGO process, although these would not be graded. These included new starters, Progress Coaches and Apprentice Assessor & Compliance Coaches.	
157	DG outlined the Apprentice Review Observation (ARO) process, which would commence in January 2025.	
158	Learning Visits were carried out by Curriculum Managers and the Quality Team. Teachers who underwent a formal Learning Visit received an Action Plan which was shared with their managers. Any support required was put in place through the Quality Team.	
159	DG explained that a formalised appraisal of the Apprentice Review process was carried out each term.	
160	DG commented that PGOs and LVs would be an integrated part of the robust Performance Review process. The first Performance Reviews would be carried out in December 2024.	
161	An enhanced Quality Team was now in place to support the PGO and LV processes. Each curriculum area would have a linked Curriculum & Innovation Lead. One to one support, training programmes etc. would be provided for teachers. Teacher Training would soon be delivered in-house by a member of the Quality Team.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
162	SCa asked if there had been any staff concerns about the new PGO process. DG acknowledged that there had been some resistance, but he felt this would improve. Some positive feedback had been received from teachers. ND felt that the moderation process was important, ensuring the teacher's experience was very positive.	
163	CM commented that the presentation had been useful. She queried if the College used UDL in standardising lesson plans etc. DG confirmed that the College did not use this. CM commented that the UDL framework was very interesting, and she would be happy to speak to DG about this. DG agreed to contact CM to discuss further.	DG / CM February 2025
164	JT asked if any patterns were emerging. DG commented that there were some themes, i.e. assessments for learning / checking of learning, too much teacher input and less student input, and questioning. SCo commented that issues were to be expected as it had been some time since a formal lesson observation process was in place. It was noted that for some staff this would be the first time they had been observed.	
165	DG provided a presentation regarding the Student Voice Annual Report.	
166	DP explained that previously a middle option had been included in the Student Survey, which had now been removed following comments by the Committee during 2023/24. The three Key Performance Indicator questions showed the impact of this, all three KPIs showed an increase in the 'Agree' scores.	
167	DG commented that two other questions were worth mentioning ('Teachers manage behaviour well at the College' and 'The teaching on my course is good or better'); both had increased by +9%.	
168	DG outlined some of the survey results, including that 100% of female students felt safe, 100% enjoyed their time at College. The enrichment offer was seen as an important element of the College experience.	
169	SB asked what EDI metrics were used. DG commented that the College used male, female, non-binary, prefer not to say and other. SB also queried what metrics were used for ethnicity; DG explained that around 20 metrics were used for ethnicity.	
170	The key strengths from the survey were outlined. DG commented that one of the areas that was pleasingly and consistently strong was that students felt safe at the College.	
171	The areas for Improvement from the survey were outlined; DG commented that food, toilet facilities and Wifi were some areas that were raised which had been previously raised. SB asked if the College responded to the feedback from the survey via "you said, we did". DG confirmed that details were passed to Marketing so that this could be shared.	
172	DG commented that English & maths focus groups were held to obtain feedback from students. The Quality Team were working with the English & maths team to address any issues raised.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
173	DG outlined some of the strengths from the Curriculum Area Review activity. These included: students had good relationships with tutors, students benefited from tutors with a wealth of industry experience and improvements in digital tools. Some of the areas for improvement included: English & maths, attendance, tutorials and lack of specific learning support. DG commented that staff were being trained on EHCPs (education health care plans).	
174	DG outlined some of the strengths in relation to Learning Visits. These included: Today's Talks and Digital Assessment tools. Some of the areas for improvement included: behaviour and conduct, attendance, some tutors not effectively "working the room".	
175	Feedback from Female Focus Groups confirmed they had not experienced gender-based discrimination and felt the College was an inclusive environment and that they felt safe from the threat of gender-based harassment / abuse whilst at College. Improvements to social space had been addressed in the North Street refurbishment.	
176	DG outlined the key points / feedback from the LGBTQIA+ Focus groups.	
177	DG commented that class reps continued to be successful. There were 38 class reps last year, compared to 40 this year. The class reps held focus groups, supported by Progress Coaches, to collect feedback from their peers.	
178	The impact of the Student Voice activity in 2023/24 was detailed. This included: personalising the tutorial programme, North Street refurbishment, behaviour and readiness to learn, wider enrichment offer, a more robust / formal appraisal of teacher performance through the PGO process.	
179	DG outlined activity that had taken place so far in 2024/25: collection of data from Today's Talks (600 responses had been received to date), over 600 responses had been received to the start of the year student survey, LGBTQIA+, female and EDI focus groups had been arranged (one per term) and feedback was being collected through the PGO and Learning Visit processes.	
180	SG thanked DG for his presentation and commented that this was also supporting evidence and reassuring in relation to the SAR gradings. With regard to the "you said, we did", she queried how students received feedback from the College on the things that could not be changed and why. DG explained that all returning students were informed via presentations of the reasons for the Inclusive Classroom model, removal of hats / coats etc. The Progress Coaches also reinforced this in the Employability sessions. Teachers were also expected to reinforce these.	
181	SCa queried how the College was using these scores to attract new students. ND commented that case studies showcasing the feedback etc. would be included on the new website, which was due to be launched in March 2025.	
182	SB thanked DG for his presentations; these would be uploaded to the Governor Hub for information. SB felt that the Student Voice was very important and asked that this was a standing item on the agenda for future meetings.	<p style="text-align: right;">NF December 2024 JTH February 2025 & ongoing</p>

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
183	SB commented that student achievement was also important and noted that ND had recently sent out details regarding SkillBuild. SB commented that it would be good for members to see the key achievements throughout the year. This was agreed.	ND February 2025 & ongoing
184	Resolved: Committee members received the presentations on Quality, including the Student Voice Annual Report.	
QCP-24-125 – Spotlight on SEND / High Needs provision		
185	NR provided a presentation on SEND / High Needs provision. NR commented that numbers were very similar to last year. EHCP numbers were slightly less than last year; NR commented that the College received funding for 85 places and there may be a risk of clawback in relation to some of the funding. The key reason for the lower numbers was the plans being sent through for support which the College was unable to provide and accommodate.	
186	NR provided the new structure in Inclusive Learning; a number of staff had been employed in the roles for less than a year which had provided some challenges. There were also a number of vacancies that were being carried. A key vacancy that the College was struggling to recruit to was an Inclusive Learning Advisor, which had been advertised a number of times with no success.	
187	NR commented that having a direct line manager for Support Workers was having a significant impact; support workers had a dedicated person for support, and it enabled them to gain more CPD involvement.	
188	NR explained that training / upskilling was in place for Support Workers, Teaching teams and Observers. Learning Difficulty specific training was being looked at to pick up any threads.	
189	NR explained that the Bridge programme was a discrete provision for High Needs students. The model had been changed, with slightly later start times and earlier finish times. There were still some issues around punctuality and attendance, but some improvement had been seen. Meaningful encounters with the world of had been considered and the DWP had visited to see the groups and some external visits had taken place. A review was being undertaken to see how this was working.	
190	NR commented that Bridge students had an individual target around attendance and punctuality. The attendance data would be included in the slide for information. NR stated that attendance for High Needs students was quite positive. The majority had 95% attendance but there were a number who had less than 80% attendance; these were mainly Bridge students.	
191	NR explained that mini targets would be in place for individual students each term. Each area needed to be involved with these (e.g. English / maths, vocational tutors, Progress Coaches, Support Workers etc).	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
192	SCa queried the opportunities for employment for High Needs students and asked if the College had had any success with this and was there more that could be done. NR explained that a lot of the Bridge students were not ready to participate in specific work experience. The Bridge students were able to undertake visits and the team were looking at pre-employability skills around enterprises / charities; getting the students involved in the community as a stepping stone for employment.	
193	SCa raised the question of engaging with employers who were open to supporting these students. NR explained that Emma Pearson was engaging directly with larger employers and looking at what placements could be offered, together with talks that could be delivered to Bridge students. NR commented that the College was also involved with Scope to support discussions around careers and opportunities.	
194	CM commented on the challenges faced by the College in relation to recruitment to vacancies and queried what feedback was being received. NR explained that the key issue had been not getting the quality of applications for such a niche role. CM stated that she would forward any interested parties from her contacts on to NR.	
195	SB asked whether NR had done a self-assessment. NR confirmed that she had but felt the grade was still Requires Improvement. NR felt that there had been some improvement, but that impact may not be seen until March 2025.	
196	SB thanked NR for her presentation; this would be placed on the Governor Hub for information.	NF December 2024
197	Resolved: Committee members received the presentation on SEND / High Needs provision.	
QCP-24-126 – Quality Report - 2024/25 Performance		
198	SCo presented the Quality Report and explained that no data had been included on last year’s achievements as this had not yet been uploaded to Strata when the report was produced. The data had since been uploaded and would be available for the next meeting.	
199	SB requested that a live demonstration of Strata was given to members at the next meeting.	SC/CT 11 February 2025
200	SB raised the question of sub-contracting and asked if there were any risks regarding this. CT explained that most of the sub-contracting related to NG Bailey and was being phased out. ND commented that numbers were very small and there were no concerns.	
201	SB raised the question of the College’s requirements for OfS. She asked if any risk assessment had been carried out on this. ND commented that a report had been received outlining the conditions of registration. ND agreed that more visibility on this was required, and this would be revisited.	CT February 2025
202	Resolved: Committee members received the Quality Report.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
QCP-24-129 - University Centre Self-Assessment Report (UC SAR)		
203	CT presented the UC SAR 2023/24 and Improvement Plan 2024/25. CT commented that he felt the report was very thorough and strong, particularly on the links with employers and the growth.	
204	SB asked what the SAR included, did it just relate to the UC or did it include other courses / programmes as well. CT explained that the UC delivered Level 2 to Level 6, but it also now included Foundation T Levels, T Levels, Level 2 and Level 4 Apprenticeships, together with Degree Apprenticeships. CT commented that this was being looked at strategically regarding changes due to the growth. Potentially Levels 4-6 could be split off and the UC could just focus on those. This would be considered by the senior team further.	
205	SB commented that she had found the SAR confusing due to the amount of provision it covered. SB asked if the UC SAR would be graded. CT stated that it would not be graded but Level 2 provision would be graded elsewhere.	
206	ND explained that Ofsted had raised this and commented that the growth in the area had created some challenge around the size and scope of the provision.	
207	DR noted that there was some FE in the UC SAR which you would expect to be covered in the College SAR. He appreciated the functional management in terms of location and use of staff etc. He queried if the reporting on quality was distinct from that and how this sat against the OfS conditions.	
208	DR felt that there was some work to be done on this report. There was a lot of good information in the report, but he was struggling to see the clarity of the different nature of the provision.	
209	JT queried the retention data included in the report and asked if it was possible to have some context against national benchmarks and year on year trends. CT would look at this further.	CT February 2025
210	DR queried the retention rates on the Extended Diplomas and asked if this was annual or two-yearly. CT confirmed that it was two-yearly.	
211	Resolved: Committee members approved the UC Self-Assessment Report noting the ongoing commitment to review the strategic direction of the provision.	
QCP-24-130 – Student Union Policy		
212	ND presented the Student Union Policy for approval.	
213	SB commented that she was happy with the content but was unsure what had changed since the previous version.	
214	DR raised the point regarding the Student Union being “critical” to maintaining a positive and inclusive student environment. He felt this may be a challenge as the Student Union was a component on student engagement and this may be challenging to achieve if this was not functioning.	
215	Resolved: Committee members approved the Student Union Policy.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
216 217 218 219	<p>QCP-24-131 – Single Equality Scheme</p> <p>ND presented the Single Equality Scheme for approval.</p> <p>JT raised her concern that EDI data for staff was challenging to collect. ND commented that this had been discussed at SLT and explained that the College could not force people to provide the data. One to one conversations with staff had been suggested and ND commented that staff needed to see the benefits of sharing this information. ND explained that data would improve going forward as this was now being captured at recruitment.</p> <p>JT emphasised that Governors could not monitor this properly without the data.</p> <p>Resolved: Committee members approved the Single Equality Scheme.</p>	
220 221 222 223 224	<p>QCP-24-132 – Consideration of risks relating to the Committee</p> <p>JTH commented that an action from the last meeting had been to look at COL60 and the wording of this. It was noted that this would be considered and an update provided to the next meeting.</p> <p>SB commented that the Safeguarding Risk had a risk score of 21 and the target score was 7 and queried whether this could ever be achieved.</p> <p>ND explained that the Audit Committee had discussed the risks and now the number had reduced all risks needed to be assessed individually to see whether the College should be more ambitious or less ambitious around some of the risks and the appetite. JTH commented that the Audit Committee had also asked for some visibility of the approach and timeline to the review of the risks and scoring at their next meeting.</p> <p>MN explained that currently risks were scored by the three impact scores, multiplied by the likelihood.</p> <p>Resolved: Committee members noted the risks relating to the Committee and that the scoring and risks would be reviewed in the new year.</p>	<p>JTH / SLT February 2025</p>
225	<p>QCP-24-133 – Matters to be reported to the Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A long discussion took place regarding the SAR and proposed gradings with a view to comments made and feedback to the Board at the December meeting. • The Quality Improvement Plan was received / discussed noting that there had not been significant change since this was last discussed in October. • There was a presentation received in relation to Quality and closing the loop around teaching quality. Daniel Grimes also provided the Student Voice Annual Report which indicated an improving picture in relation to feedback. • There was a presentation around SEND / High Needs provision. There was a discussion around the grading in relation to SEND provision and the progress made around improvement actions. • Committee members had discussed the performance report noting that sub-contracting provision was very limited and reducing and that there would be an update provided to the next meeting around OfS registration requirement. 	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University Centre SAR was approved. • Committee members had also approved the Student Union Policy and the Single Equality Scheme. • Committee members had discussed the risks relating to the Committee. Committee members noted the work to be undertaken by the Audit Committee to consider the scoring and definition of risks. 	
226	<p>QCP-24-134 – Any Other Business</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed.</p>	
227	<p>QCP-24-135 – Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 11 February 2025 at 4.00pm (North Street).</p>	