

LEEDS COLLEGE OF BUILDING

QUALITY, CURRICULUM & PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2 December 2025 at 4.00pm via Microsoft Teams.

PRESENT:

Sandra Burnhill (SB)	Chair & External Governor
Phil Burgess (PB)	External Governor
Steve Carmody (SC)	External Governor
Nikki Carthy (NC)	Staff Governor
Nikki Davis (ND)	Principal & Chief Executive (attended from 4.30pm)
James Dunford (JD)	External Governor
Sammy Lambert (SL)	External Governor
Mick Norton (MN)	Staff Governor
Dave Russell (DR)	External Governor
Julie Tolley (JT)	External Governor

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

Cumulative attendance: 41 / 72 = 71%

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rob Holmes (RH)	Vice Principal – Curriculum, Quality & Innovation
Steve Connell (SCo)	Assistant Principal – Study Programmes
Chris Tunningley (CT)	Assistant Principal – Adults & Apprenticeships
Daniel Grimes (DG)	Head of Quality Improvement (Agenda Item QCP-25-181)
Chris Duncan (CD)	Observer
Lee Powell (LP)	Observer
Jane Taylor-Holmes (JTH)	Director of Governance
Nancy Fearnside (NF)	PA to Strategic Leadership Team (Minutes)

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
583.	SB welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. QCP-25-174 - Apologies for Absence	
584.	There were no apologies for absence. JTH stated that ND would join the meeting at 4.30pm. QCP-25-175 - Determination of Observers / Attendees	
585.	Members agreed attendees and observers as per the attendance list above. QCP-25-176 – Declaration of Interests in any Agenda items	
586.	There were no declarations of interest. QCP-25-177 – Minutes of the previous meeting	
587.	Resolved: The minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 October 2025 were accepted as a true record. QCP-25-178 – Matters Arising	
588.	SB commented on the highlighted section in the minutes; JTH confirmed that this would be redacted prior to publication of the minutes on the website as this was commercially sensitive.	
589.	Members noted the updates recorded against the matters arising.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
590.	Item QCP-25-170 (575) – JTH commented that an additional Governor Strategy Session had been planned for 10 March 2026, prior to the next QC&P meeting. This would be an opportunity to get all new Governors, existing Governors and Strategic Leadership Team members together to go through some key issues, including Ofsted, White House progress and CTEC matters. It would be a relationship building session but would also have a strategic focus. JTH confirmed that she would send a diary invite to all Governors for this session.	JTH Dec. 2025
QCP-25-179 – Spotlight – Self-Assessment Report 2024/2025		
591.	SB explained that the main focus of the meeting would be the Self-Assessment Report (SAR). SC requested that RH explained the acronyms used as appropriate, for the benefit of the new Governors.	
592.	RH provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Self-Assessment Report 2025/25 and gave an overview. RH explained that a number of supporting documents had been uploaded to the Governor Hub to help support Governors. RH explained that the QC&P Committee would need to provide a recommendation for approval to the full Board on 16 December 2025.	
593.	RH outlined the key SAR spotlight themes: overview on judgements (whole provider and provision type), Exec summary using the RAG secure fit methodology, judgement and evidence base aligned with the Ofsted Toolkit, and the external validation report.	
594.	RH explained that he had taken a late decision to prepare the SAR in alignment with Ofsted’s new Report Card framework. This would ensure consistency with the standards and language expected in future inspections.	
595.	RH commented that the SAR evaluated the College’s performance across whole provider and four provision types. In recent communication, Ofsted had explained that their expectation was that areas would be graded expected standard; this was a high bar and the judgments of ‘exceptional’ or ‘urgent improvement’ would be rare gradings. The Safeguarding assessment was met or unmet.	
596.	RH outlined the whole-provider judgements and explained the reasons behind the judgements (which were detailed in the presentation): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership & Governance – Strong Standard (RAG alignment: Green). • Safeguarding – Met (RAG alignment: Green). • Inclusion – Expected Standard (RAG alignment: Amber). • Contribution to Meeting Skills Needs – Strong Standard (RAG alignment – Green). 	
597.	RH explained that Inclusion was a new judgment area introduced by Ofsted and would require significant information / evidence, e.g. through the Professional Growth Observations (PGOs), context and student data. RH commented that Inclusion had been rated Amber due to the need for stronger data dashboards and cross-curriculum consistency, and further development required in long-term impact measurement. These Areas for Improvement would be included in the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) Action Plan.	
598.	RH explained that the provision type judgements also included three separate judgements against Curriculum, Teaching & Training, Achievement and Participation & Development. The judgements were detailed in the presentation.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
599.	<p>The overall RAG alignment for each provision type were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Programmes for Young People (EPYP) – Green. • Adult Learning – Green. • Apprenticeships – Red. • High Needs Provision – Green. 	
600.	<p>RH explained that all judgements were informed by a secure-fit methodology, supported by extensive evidence including achievement data, student and staff surveys and external validation.</p>	
601.	<p>RH explained that he had used AI to compare the College’s SAR against Ofsted’s FE Skills Toolkit and ascertain whether this was aligned. RH commented that overall the College was well positioned for an inspection under the updated Toolkit with a comprehensive SAR that demonstrated a reflective, evidence-based and learner-centred approach.</p>	
602.	<p>RH explained that the SAR process included a robust external validation process, which involved ThinkMove Consultants, York College, Solihull College and Oldham College. RH commented that following the external validation the SAR was judged to be accurate, reflective, evidence-led and aligned with Ofsted’s 2025 Report Card model. Suggested improvements included greater consistency in contextualisation, stronger impact language in areas of strength, more visual data, additional trend evidence and further detail in High Needs and Adult Learning impact. RH confirmed that those recommendations had been incorporated into the final SAR.</p>	
603.	<p>RH asked members to consider recommendation of the SAR to the Board.</p>	
604.	<p>Committee members thanked RH for his presentation.</p>	
605.	<p>LP asked RH if he could explain the backdrop and concept of the SAR and whether the document was for internal purposes. LP acknowledged that the SAR had been externally validated by several colleges and establishments and asked if these were selected by the College. LP asked if there was any formal governance in terms of who carried out the validation and whether there was a check and balance of this, e.g was the SAR reviewed by Ofsted or a similar organisation to ensure objectivity.</p>	
606.	<p>RH explained that the SAR was a reflective document based on the performance of the last academic year to review all aspects of provision. The purpose was to identify the strengths and areas for improvement within the College and to identify actions for improvement for the next academic year.</p>	
607.	<p>RH commented that Ofsted did place significant importance on the SAR and the SAR was one of the first items to be uploaded on the Ofsted portal on notification of an inspection. The SAR provided Inspectors with an overview of the College and was reviewed alongside the QIP. Ofsted’s goal was to assess whether, from a Leadership & Governance perspective, the College understood its strengths and areas for improvement.</p>	
608.	<p>RH explained that external validation of the SAR was undertaken utilising sector colleagues for peer review, there was sufficient support, independence and challenge in the process and the external review of the SAR was reciprocated.</p>	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
609.	RH commented that the SAR was a reflective process, acknowledged what the College did well and where improvement was needed. Ofsted would triangulate this during inspection by engaging with students, stakeholders, and leaders to verify the College's statements.	
610.	LP asked, hypothetically, if another organisation lacked self-awareness and rated itself highly in one or more sectors, only for Ofsted to find the opposite during inspection, would that affect the overall outcome of the Ofsted report? RH commented that it would significantly impact the Leadership & Governance rating as it would suggest lack of understanding about their provision.	
611.	JT thanked RH for the report and acknowledged that it contained well-triangulated evidence, which was good to see. JT commented that in the last meeting English and maths were highlighted as key priorities, which was reflected in the minutes that were reviewed today. JT commented that she did not see this emphasis strongly represented, while there were positive aspects noted for English and maths, she felt the report was less explicit about the challenges the College faced. JT requested that RH checked that the priorities discussed by the Committee were clearly reflected in the SAR and QIP. This was agreed.	RH Dec. 2025
612.	RH commented that English and maths was included in EPYP. Ofsted would look at this by provision type. RH explained that he had sought to include improvements in attendance and retention etc. within the provision types. The two areas that the College needed to focus on for English and maths, i.e. improving high grades for students and positive progress were included within the QIP. RH asked JT if she felt there was anything else that should be included in the QIP.	
613.	JT asked where attendance was included within the SAR. RH explained that this would be reviewed in EPYP as that was where GCSE's sat and also within Participation and Development.	
614.	SC agreed with LP's points regarding the external validation and checks on the SAR and felt that these improvements were a positive step forward. SC commented that as a Board of Governors it was the Board responsibility to validate the findings and confirm and agree with the conclusions presented.	
615.	JD commented on the Inclusion judgement and agreed that classifying it as Amber was appropriate. JD commented that there was a potential risk that, if Inclusion was not implemented effectively, it could undermine provision in areas such as EPYP and High Needs.	
616.	JD commented that Professional Growth Observations and initiatives like "Constructing Excellence" seem to be designed to support inclusive practices in classrooms. JD explained that, as Governors, there was a need to ensure that Inclusion was clearly embedded and monitored.	
617.	RH agreed with JD's comments and explained that Ofsted had broadened its definition of disadvantage; many of the College's students fell under this category due to prior attainment levels. RH explained that an Inclusion Working Group had been formed, led by the Head of ILS, to review provision types and strength evidence, particularly in Apprenticeships, to ensure there were no gaps.	
618.	JD commented that early feedback from recent inspections suggested the new framework was rigorous and strongly tested; this reinforced the need for robust Inclusion practices across all areas.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
619.	DR appreciated the significant amount of work undertaken to produce the SAR to respond to the new framework. DR commented on the importance of developing a document which was focused on key points making it more practical and meaningful and easy to understand and analyse.	
620.	DR commented that the use of AI was interesting and asked how effective it was in providing some comparability against the framework and whether it concurred with the College's judgements. RH explained that he was not an AI expert and remained somewhat sceptical, but he had noticed some benefits. Both documents had been evaluated very quickly and AI produced a document that was fairly close to what he expected. The report did flag areas as Amber where the College met Expected Standards but not all Strong Standards, which aligned with Ofsted's change from a "best fit" to a "secure fit" model.	
621.	LP referred to a comment made by RH regarding the significant improvements in English and maths from previous years and asked whether the reasons had been captured and did the College follow up on lessons learned in success.	
622.	SCo commented that the significant improvement mentioned by RH related to attendance this year in English and maths. The reasons had been analysed and it was clear that several factors had contributed to this. Teaching and Learning had improved, evidenced through PGOs, with 100% of English staff meeting the expected standard. Better classroom engagement helped engage students to attend more regularly. Collaboration with vocational areas had been strengthened and intensive At-Risk meetings were held early in the first term. SCo commented that overall it was not one single factor, but a combination of improvements, that had driven better attendance and achievement in maths and English.	
623.	SB raised a question regarding the number of QC&P meetings mentioned on Page 10; RH clarified that the Committee had met six times last year.	
623.	SB commented that she was unaware of the breadth of Adult provision at the College and felt it may be useful to add in some context regarding this.	RH Dec. 2025
624.	SB referred to the Score Card and queried the grade regarding EPYP, specifically Participation and Development and attendance (relating back to JT's earlier comment around English and maths). RH commented that attendance was strong last year, and significant progress noted by Ofsted as part of the monitoring visit. Attendance for 16-18 year olds had improved consistently over the past three years, despite a general decline in the wider sector.	
625.	SB asked members if they were happy to recommend the grades to the Board on 16 December 2025, subject to the comments noted above.	
626.	Resolved: Committee members received the presentation regarding the Self-Assessment Report 2024/25 and recommended the grades, subject to the comments noted, to the Board.	
	QCP-25-180 – Quality Improvement Plan	
627.	RH presented Agenda Item QCP-25-180 and explained that the QIP was one of the College's most important documents. It outlined the key areas which needed improving this academic year, based on the SAR and student and staff feedback.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
628.	RH commented that the QIP built on a successful year in 2024/25 against a backdrop of a three-year trend of improvements across all aspects of provision. The QIP would be reviewed at every QC&P Committee. RH commented that the format had been developed over the past couple of years and the current format incorporated feedback and updates from Term 1 up to 1 December 2025.	
629.	RH commented that each action now included a RAG rating and a risk score, as recommended by the Committee last year; updates reflected progress toward achieving the improvement goals.	
630.	<p>RH outlined the recent enhancements to the QIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion actions had been strengthened with clear expectations for embedding inclusive practice and ensuring all staff received targeted CPD. This was now clearly aligned through the College’s CPD programme delivered by the Quality Team. Inclusion was integrated into the Constructing Excellence programme for teaching staff. • Apprenticeship Achievement – actions now included pass rates to address recent dips. • CTEC actions – work was accelerating to meet the five key areas required by the Department for Education. • KPI alignment – a new column had been added to link the QIP actions to the College’s Strategic Plan, ensuring alignment with Board-level priorities. 	
631.	SB questioned whether everything in the SAR listed as an area for improvement was included in the QIP. RH explained that some matters would be for provision types as Areas for Improvement (AFI) due to the QIP focus on College wide initiatives and improvement.	
632.	JT raised concerns about the current risk impact ratings. Out of nine targets, four were rated at 7 and two at 8, meaning approximately two thirds were at risk of not being achieved. JT questioned whether these ratings accurately reflected progress, particularly for targets that were on track for completion by March 2026.	
633.	RH explained that the higher risk scores were due to limited evidence early in the academic year; only two months of data were available. As more evidence emerged these risks were expected to decrease. RH emphasised that achieving actions was not sufficient, the real measure was the impact of those actions.	
634.	JT suggested revising the risk key to include impact considerations. SB commented that the current RAG rating system focused on timely progress rather than impact, which may not align with risk assessments.	
635.	RH agreed to consider this feedback but cautioned against premature changes. RH explained that the update only reflected around ten weeks of work, adding another column could lead to duplicating effort – essentially measuring the same thing multiple times. JT explained that under the risk impact key, the numbers related to risk but there was no description of the impact and felt that adding a description could make it clearer.	
636.	JT commented that some of the items were marked as Red and felt these were areas that the College had full control over and assumed these would be achieved. She questioned if the Red status meant these would not be delivered or that they had not yet been delivered. RH explained that it meant they had not been delivered yet. RH commented that the RAG and risk columns represented a point-in-time view based on current evidence, rather than a holistic view.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
637.	NC raised a question regarding the first risk item around creating a CPD programme and fully understood what RH had said about impact. However, NC commented that she was unclear how the impact would be measured to show whether it had been achieved or not.	
638.	RH commented that the questions in the Staff Survey around inclusion and teaching quality could be one way to measure this but it would only provide a snapshot at a specific point in time. Additional measures would include the PGO's and learning walk outcomes etc. RH explained that the CPD around inclusion, which staff would be undertaking, would give them more confidence to embed inclusion within their teaching and learning; this would be measured through the oversight of the Quality Team. SB agreed but felt a KPI was required to be included against which it could be measured to show it had been achieved.	
639.	RH queried what type of number SB felt was required. SB commented that this particular target related to implementing a CPD programme, how would Governors be able to measure the progress against this? RH explained that updates would be provided throughout the academic year, with evidence coming from the PGO's and Quality Team, e.g. x amount of PGO's had taken place, x% had met the expected standard etc. Such evidence would contribute to meeting the action and would provide the measure.	
640.	LP commented that as part of his business they used a balance score card with strategic objectives across various categories. LP explained that this was a standard approach but included two RAG columns, one for year to date which showed current performance, and one for forecast indicating where they expected to be by year end. LP explained that it could be common to see a Red year to date column whilst the forecast was green, indicating the action was on track to be achieved. LP commented that measuring qualitative objectives was much harder than quantitative ones.	
641.	RH commented that LP's point was helpful and it was agreed that this would be implemented.	RH Dec. 2025
642.	SB commented that the impact measure would therefore be based on PGOs which were essentially lesson observations. SB asked that RH review the QIP based on LP's comments and suggested this could help simplify the risk column, making progress more visible and easier to interpret.	RH Dec. 2025
643.	Resolved: Committee members received the Quality Improvement Plan update.	
644.	<p>QCP-25-181 – Student Voice – Student Perception of College Survey</p> <p>DG commented that the results had just been received and hence why the paper had been uploaded late. DP explained that this survey was the first of two formal Student Perception of College (SPOC) surveys that were carried out each year. DG commented that it was an important tool for understanding how students felt about their experience at the College and provided assurances that students were getting a high-quality experience. DG explained that the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) focused on areas such as safety, enjoyment, behaviour and overall satisfaction.</p>	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
645.	<p>DG commented that engagement with the survey had seen a positive improvement this year. A 35% increase in responses had been seen compared to last year; 1,068 students had taken part. The end of year survey last year had also seen a significant increase (+118%). DG explained that the improvement in responses was largely due to the introduction of WhatsApp messaging, alongside the usual channels. An increase in Apprentices completing the survey had also been seen. Adult participation remained low but DG explained that this was expected due to the smaller student numbers, but still required attention.</p>	
646.	<p>DG commented that the overall satisfaction score was 94%, an increase of 2% on last year. The feeling safe at College score was 97% (+1%) and the highest score ever recorded for this question. Behaviour management in lessons had increased to 96% (from 82% two years ago); this could be attributed to initiatives such as the Inclusive Classroom and the Behaviour On-call system. DG explained that if a member of staff was struggling with behaviour in class, they could press the on-call button for support.</p>	
647.	<p>DG commented that over the past two years significant improvements had been seen in behaviour management and staff development. Two Heads of College Experience, Behaviour & Engagement had been recruited and the Quality Team had also been strengthened by the appointment of a CPD Lead.</p>	
648.	<p>DG commented that, in relation to staff CPD, a “Brick by Brick” programme had been delivered last year and this year a “Constructing Excellence” programme was in place. DG commented that several behaviour specialists had also delivered sessions on behaviour management.</p>	
649.	<p>DG commented that the question regarding teachers taking individual student’s needs into account had risen by 4% to 94%. From the end of the year survey the score for recommending the course to a friend had also increased by 5% to 94%. DG commented that these improvements reflected key strategic decisions made by the College, e.g. introduction of the Inclusive Classroom, PGOs etc.</p>	
650.	<p>DG commented that the PGO initiative had not initially been welcomed by some teachers, however the College was much more confident in its quality assurance since introducing PGOs. At this time last year 43% of teachers had met expectations, this figure had increased to 73% this year. DG commented that these improvements had been helped by a stronger Quality Improvement Team and the targeted support provided by the Team. The work done on CPD programmes such as “Brick by Brick” and “Constructing Excellence” had shown an impact on the student experience.</p>	
651.	<p>DG commented that satisfaction levels across Faculties remained consistently high, with English and maths leading at 96% and other areas averaging 93%-94%.</p>	
652.	<p>DG commented that 100% of English teachers had passed their PGO at the first attempt this year, which showed a genuine improvement in the quality of teaching and learning, which in turn had impacted on attendance.</p>	
653.	<p>DG commented that, with regard to overall satisfaction, males scored slightly higher than females – 95% compared to 94%. 16-18 overall satisfaction was 92%, with 19+ at 90%. DG explained that there was not much difference between the demographics across all scores. The score of most ethnicity groups was around 90% but was slightly lower at 88% for black and gypsy traveller communities. DG commented that there were no immediate causes for concern as most scores were within 1% or 2% of each other.</p>	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
654.	<p>DG explained that students could add comments to the survey on important questions. One of the questions was about why students felt safe at the College; positive comments about Face ID scanners, CCTV and security presence were noted. DG commented that in addition to the security presence, staff meet and greet students on arrival and when On-call, staff also walk round the corridors, ensuring a consistent presence from leaders and managers.</p>	
655.	<p>DG commented that when Curriculum Area Reviews were carried out, feedback from students was that tutors and staff were supportive and approachable. However, there were some repeat issues of concern e.g. car parking, quality of food options, toilet facilities etc.</p>	
656.	<p>DG outlined the next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty-level feedback would be shared with Heads of Faculties for action planning. • Support-related feedback would be passed to appropriate managers. • A “you said, we did” campaign would be considered to communicate changes to students. • Additional student voice activities would supplement the survey findings. 	
657.	<p>DR commented that the results were positive and queried what the percentage responses was by provision. DG explained that the College had around 2,000 students, with 400 responding to the survey. There were around 3,000 Apprentices, with 450 responding to the survey. DG commented that whilst this was an improvement it was still lower than the College would like and there would continue to be a focus on improving participation.</p>	
658.	<p>DR recognised the difficulty in obtaining responses and commented that typically responses came from those who felt strongly, either very positive or very negative, about an issue. DR felt it was important to note the percentage of responses, particularly when preparing for the National Student Survey and complying with OfS conditions.</p>	
659.	<p>DR commented that the College may wish to consider how students were invited to complete the survey to see whether participation could be further improved.</p>	
660.	<p>SC agreed that the results were very positive. SC commented that some of the recommendations related to internal discussion and felt some of the key messages could be externalised in the longer term, perhaps with support from the marketing team, to encourage students to come to the College. DG agreed that this was a very good point and would be considered further.</p>	<p>DG Spring 2026</p>
661.	<p>ND commented that she had emailed Governors recently regarding the forthcoming Student Rep meeting and noted that JT had stated she would be attending. This forum provided Governors the opportunity to test out what the responses from the Student Survey and enable Governors to have informal conversations with students.</p>	
662.	<p>SB commented that she had attended a ‘Meet the Governors’ event at another college and the Student Reps had found it a really useful and positive meeting. SB suggested something similar could be held prior to a Board meeting and she would pick this up with DG.</p>	<p>SB/DG Jan. 2026</p>

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
663.	SB referred to the response to the question regarding students feeling safe at the College, which scored 97%, and asked what was happening regarding the 3% that did not feel safe. DG commented that students seemed to have misunderstood the question and the student comments did not indicate any wider issues.	
664.	Resolved: Committee members received the update on Student Voice / Student Perception of College Survey.	
QCP-25-182 – Quality Report (2025/26 Performance)		
665.	SCo presented the report and provided an overview, focusing on a few key points and addressing some concerns to assure Governors that the Areas for Improvement were being monitored.	
666.	Current attendance overall was 88.7%, which was 0.3% lower than last year. EPYP attendance was 87.3%, an improvement from 85% at the same time last year. English and maths attendance was 78%; SCo explained that this improvement was largely driven by adult students on Study programmes; 16-18 year old attendance was 55.6%. Issues had been identified among 16-18 year olds and these were being monitored by the Heads of English and maths and their teams with interventions in place.	
667.	SCo explained that the new Dashboards allowed staff to drill down into attendance with greater accuracy, enabling targeted interventions to be put in place.	
668.	SCo commented that the PGO process had started this term and 70% of staff were currently meeting expectations, a 26% increase from the same time last year. SCo commented that this was a positive result and a direct reflection of the early intervention and support provided by DG and his team.	
669.	SCo outlined some concerns regarding attendance, including English and maths. Painting & Decorating attendance was currently 78.2% and SCo commented that the main reason seemed to be that this was not the students first choice of course. Interventions were being implemented to try to address this.	
670.	SCo commented that 218 students had been withdrawn from EPYP, this was broken down in the report and the reasons for withdrawal specified. SCo explained that students withdrawn in the first 42 days of their programme did not count in the college data; students withdrawn post 42 days did count. SCo commented that 14 of the withdrawn students had returned to the College as Apprentices.	
671.	SCo explained that the College had made a strategic decision to over offer, knowing that some students would drop out. Some students applied to multiple colleges and some offers were based on exam results. The decision to over offer had meant that the College was aligned much closer to the Curriculum Plan.	
672.	SCo reported on retention which applied students post 42 days. EPYP retention for 16-18 year olds was currently 99.7%, with 19+ at 97%. SCo commented that the College would always lose students due to behavioural issues, lack of attendance, gaining employment etc. However, SCo commented that retention at this time of the year was very high.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
673.	<p>SCo commented that a very successful Curriculum Planning event had taken place in November. The process had been changed for this year and focused on context and disadvantaged. These two areas were very prominent in the new Ofsted framework and it was felt important that staff understood what context and disadvantage meant. Guest speakers had been invited in to talk about the NEET agenda (Not in Education, Employment on Training), together with an inspiring talk from CATCH (Leeds charity passionate about improving opportunities for the community and young people - Community Action To Create Hope).</p>	
674.	<p>SCo commented that a large proportion of the Study Programme students came from disadvantaged backgrounds and staff were encouraged to look at the students' starting points and take these into consideration when planning the curriculum.</p>	
675.	<p>SCo commented that the first Performance Review meetings were taking place later this week. SCo explained that these were designed to review student progress, to hold staff accountable and identify areas that required improvements. The process had changed significantly in that it was driven by the introduction of the Power BI Dashboard and the Strata platform. All managers were expected to be fully prepared as all relevant data was accessible to everyone.</p>	
676.	<p>CT reported that Adult attendance was 84.7%, which was slightly below last year at this point (89%). Apprenticeship attendance was 93.2%, which was above last year.</p>	
677.	<p>JD commented on the noticeable improvement by the English team during the recent PGOs. He asked how the process had been structured and questioned whether the improvements were sustainable. SCo explained that staff who had not met expectations were prioritised and felt this targeted approach explained the quick progress. DG commented that a structured mentoring programme had been implemented for the English team. Staff members who struggled last year received immediate support before observation and continued to receive weekly monitoring.</p>	
678.	<p>SCo explained that, due to the increase in the number of students requiring English and maths, a new Curriculum Manager had been appointed, to support the Heads of English and Maths in maintaining and building on these improvements.</p>	
679.	<p>JD commented on the withdrawals and questioned what more could be done between schools and colleges. JD commented that if schools and colleges could work together better some of the reasons for withdrawal could be controlled more effectively. JD commented that he would add this to the next LLA Careers Network meeting agenda.</p>	
680.	<p>PB commented on the significant increase in the number of students on English and maths and questioned why there was such a big increase from 200 three years ago to 700 now. SCo explained that the College's Study Programme provision had been expanded, student numbers had increased, and the number of students coming to the College without Grade 4 had also increased. SCo commented that less students appeared to be achieving at school, particularly in English.</p>	
681.	<p>SB commented that it was good to see the progress on the Curriculum Planning process. SB commented on the timeline and tasks involved and suggested that Employer Boards could be included in the planning process. SB asked if Employer Boards were held for all curriculum areas and if so, asked if they could be added to the timeline. SB commented that sharing the curriculum plans with Governors should be considered. SB explained that the Committee's current focus was on quality and performance but less on curriculum. This was agreed.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">SCo / RH Spring 2026</p>

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
682.	SCo commented that Employer Boards had been held recently for Construction Crafts and Sustainable Building Services but engagement had been lower than would be liked. The discussions had been valuable and employers had provided input on how they would like the College to deliver training and this would be progressed.	
683.	SB suggested that a brief update on Employer Boards could be included at the next meeting, together with employer feedback. CT commented that he could provide an update on Adult Courses and Apprenticeships at the next meeting and noted that a report on Apprenticeship Standards was already scheduled.	CT/SCo March 2026
684.	ND commented that a session for Governors was planned in March 2026 to focus on the College's long-term strategic direction, rather than the detailed 2026/27 curriculum plan. The aim would be to explore where the College was heading and how Governors could influence that vision. The session would emphasise the College's responsiveness to industry needs and provide an opportunity for new Governors and the Strategic Leadership Team to connect and start meaningful discussions about the future.	
685.	JT commented that the dates on the curriculum planning timeline were incorrect and needed to show 2026. SCo would amend as appropriate.	SCo Dec. 2025
686.	Resolved: Committee members received the Quality Report.	
QCP-25-183 – Sub-contracted provision update		
687.	ND commented that, following the email sent out regarding the sub-contracting partnership for wave 6 bootcamp, enough responses had been received to approve the Written Resolution. Some questions had been raised, which JTH had responded to. ND commented that the paper sent out had explained that the arrangement would be the start of a relationship with WYCA, linking to the College's CTEC status and a model that WYCA wanted to roll out longer term. ND explained that this was new for the College and sub-contractors would be brought in to supported by due diligence and performance monitoring whilst the College grew its capacity. ND was confident in the provider selected; they already worked with a number of the College's large employers and had done so for a number of years.	
688.	Resolved: Committee members noted the update on Sub-contracted provision.	
QCP-25-184 – HE update and OfS requirements		
689.	CT commented that the College had a significant Higher Education provision at the College and explained that all five of the College's Level 6 Apprenticeships were now delivered in partnership with London South Bank University (LSBU). CT commented that he and colleagues had visited LSBU in November for the annual Partnership Management Board. This had been very positive and further opportunities for collaboration on Level 4 Higher Apprenticeships were also explored. The possibility of LSBU validating a Transport Planning Degree was also discussed.	
690.	CT commented that the Joint Board of Moderators (JBM) risk-based submission for the new Civil Engineering Integrated Degree had been submitted; the first intake was planned for January / February 2026.	
691.	CT commented that at the recent Building Futures Awards, the College had won the best HE and FE Provider Supporting Careers in Construction Award, which was a great achievement.	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
692.	CT commented that regular meetings were taking place with DG and the Quality Team to review the College's compliance with OfS Conditions of Registration. Current priorities included improving IQA processes and standardisation of assignments, reviewing staff qualifications and professional registrations, enhancing transparency and access to data in line with the Higher Education and Research Act. CT explained that there was a requirement to publish various information on the College website and he was working with Marketing to progress this.	
693.	CT commented that OfS were consulting on changes for FE colleges to reduce duplication with DfE regulations. Key proposals included removing requirements for: A2 (Access and Participation Statement), D (Financial Viability and Sustainability) and E (Management and Governance). CT commented that the consultation would close on 10 February 2026, with implementation expected in summer 2026.	
694.	CT commented that a Higher Education Refund and Compensation Policy was required and this was being developed.	
695.	JT congratulated CT and SC on achieving the Building Futures Awards and urged the College to promote this widely.	
696.	Resolved: Committee members noted the update on HE and OfS requirements.	
QCP-25-185 – Ofsted Update		
697.	RH commented that preparations on the new Ofsted Toolkit were progressing as planned. The theme leads had aligned their work to the new Toolkit and presented updates to SLT in November, with a further session planned.	
698.	RH commented that earlier this year he had shared Ofsted updates with all staff during his QIP sessions, to ensure consistent messaging across the College. All staff emails regularly reinforced these updates. Working groups had been set up and action plans established to strengthen the evidence base for all areas outlined in the Toolkit.	
699.	Resolved: Committee members received the Ofsted update.	
QCP-25-186 – Draft Student Protection Policy		
700.	CT presented the Student Protection Policy and explained that this was a requirement of the OfS Conditions of Registration. SC commented that he was happy to support the Policy.	
701.	DR commented that, in support of the Student Protection Policy, he was familiar with the process and had written similar policies. DR commented that it would be appropriate to state the College was in a sound financial position and indicate the proportion of HE income within its overall revenue. This would demonstrate the College's ability to compensate and ensure students were supported effectively. It was agreed that this would be considered.	
702.	Resolved: Committee members approved the Student Protection Policy.	CT Dec. 2025

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
703. 704. 705. 706.	<p>QCP-25-187 – Draft Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy</p> <p>CT presented the Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy and explained that this was also a requirement of the OfS Conditions of Registration.</p> <p>SC commented that he was happy to support the Policy. SC commented that, from a business perspective, sexual harassment and misconduct issues were becoming a high priority, particularly regarding staff. SC questioned whether a process was in place to train all staff to minimise this risk and protect the College.</p> <p>ND explained that training for all staff on such issues was done through Smartlog. All staff had undertaken Sexual Harassment training, and this would be updated every two years.</p> <p>Resolved: Committee members approved the Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy.</p>	
707. 708. 709.	<p>QCP-25-188 – Consideration of Risks relating to the Committee</p> <p>JTH commented that a focused piece of work on risk management would be undertaken. This would include reviewing the Risk Register to ensure risks accurately reflected the College’s risks and were clearly linked to the Strategic Aims.</p> <p>JTH explained that the number of risks would be streamlined and they would be more focused and reviewed along with the risk appetite.</p> <p>Resolved: Committee members noted the risks relating to the Committee.</p>	
710. 711.	<p>QCP-25-189 – Matters to be reported to the Board</p> <p>Action for the Board to take</p> <p>Self-Assessment Report (SAR) – Incorporate Committee feedback before Board approval on 16 December 2025.</p> <p>Assurance to Board</p> <p>SAR & External Validation – Judged accurate, evidence-led, aligned with Ofsted’s 2025 Report Card model.</p> <p>Ofsted Readiness – Preparations progressing; staff briefed; working groups established.</p> <p>Student Experience – SPOC survey shows: 94% overall satisfaction (+2%). 97% feel safe (highest ever). Behaviour management improved to 96%.</p> <p>Teaching Quality – PGOs show 73% staff meeting expectations (up from 43% last year).</p> <p>Retention – EPYP retention at 99.7% (16–18) and 97% (19+).</p> <p>Awards – College won multiple national awards (Construction Apprenticeship College of the Year, Building Futures Award, Personnel Award for Well-being).</p> <p>HE Compliance – OfS requirements being met; consultation on regulatory changes noted.</p>	

Min. Ref.	Minutes	Actions
712.	<p>Alerts to Board</p> <p>Apprenticeships – Rated Red in SAR; achievement rates require urgent improvement.</p> <p>Inclusion – Amber rating; risk of undermining EPYP and High Needs if not embedded effectively.</p> <p>English & Maths – Attendance for 16–18 remains low (55.6%); improvement needed despite progress.</p> <p>QIP Risks – 6 of 9 targets rated high risk (scores 7–8); early-year evidence limited; suggestions for improved reporting to add year end forecast being considered.</p> <p>SPOC Survey Participation – Adult and Apprenticeship responses still below desired levels.</p> <p>Employer Engagement – Attendance at Employer Boards lower than expected; needs strengthening.</p> <p>Withdrawal Trends – 218 EPYP withdrawals; continued monitoring and school-college collaboration.</p>	
713.	<p>QCP-25-190 – Any Other Business</p> <p>RH provided an update on the recent awards the College had received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Apprenticeship College of the Year (Construction Apprenticeship Awards 2025). • Best Further Education and Higher Education Provider for Supporting Careers in Construction (Building Futures Awards). • UK Leader in Staff Health and Well-being (Personnel Awards 2025). RH commented that this was a major achievement considering the College was competing against several large organisations. • Gold and Silver Medals in Roofing (National Skillbuild Final). 	
714.	RH commented that these awards reflected the hard work and commitment across the college and acknowledged everyone’s contributions.	
715.	JTH referred to the Schedule of Business 2025/26 and explained that this detailed the Committee Work Plan for this academic year.	
716.	Resolved: Committee members noted the Committee Workplan for 2025/26.	
717	<p>QCP-25-191 – Date of next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 10 March 2026 at 4.00pm (North Street). This would be preceded by the additional Governors’ Strategic Session at 12.30pm. JTH would send out a diary invite for this.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">JTH Dec. 2025</p>