

**Barnet and Southgate College Corporation
Quality of Teaching & Student Experience Committee meeting
held on 24th November 2025
At 18:00 on Teams**

Present: Jenny Jarvis, Chair
Mark Taylor
Amy de Campos
Tulay Rashid-Grant
Neil Coker, CEO and Principal
Fitwi Kebede, Staff Governor

In attendance: Maxine Bagshaw, Director of Governance
Torcato Coutinho, Director of Teaching & Learning and Quality
Amy Cooper, Student Governor
David Howley (from 6.10 – 6.35pm)
Lorraine Herrity

Item	Description	Action
1	Preliminary items i) Apologies for absence There were no apologies for absence with all committee members present. Apologies were received from Victoria Cornwell-Lyons, Deputy Principal and Jasmine Walters Rosewell, Student Governor. Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and round table introductions were made. Chair particularly commented that it was pleasing to have both staff and student governors joining and advised that Jasmine, in her absence, has provided observations which have been shared and will be referred to during the meeting. ii) Declarations of interest No specific declarations were made and standing declarations were noted. iii) Notification of urgent business	

	Chair confirmed that no matters had been raised in advance of the meeting.	
2	Minutes of the previous meeting Committee reviewed the minutes of the meeting held on 6th October 2025 and it was agreed that they were an accurate record. AGREED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6th October 2025. There were no matters arising. In relation to the actions tracking summary, it was agreed that the Committee Chair, CEO and Director of Governance would meet outside the meeting to review and agree priority items to be discussed at the January 2026 meeting (Chair/CEO/Dir of Gov – November 2025).	*
3	HE Update and SED for 2024/25 Key matters highlighted were: • Report provides a summary of the 2024/25 academic year. • HE provision is 125 students and mainly consists of Business Management and Events Management • College is trying to grow this area. • College was recently validated to provide Foundation Degrees in Early year Education and a top up. College is looking to recruit to both in February and September 2026. • College has also been given sign off to provide HNDs and HNQs in photography. • These are the developing areas, but the focus of this report is 2024/25 i.e. Business and Events Management • College has received positive external examiner feedback. • There is also really positive student feedback i.e. the NSS survey results. Results were even better than the prior year. • Generally positive feedback from staff via staff liaison committee meetings, whilst accepting there are still some points to address. • Students feel supported and happy • Some students have progressed to complete masters, which has not been common in recent years e.g. project management and international management. • Strong relationships with Bolton University, now called the University of Greater Manchester. The acting Vice Chancellor attended the college graduation ceremony. • Staff development is going well. College is working with partner university on this. • Growth for the department is the big 25/26 action point. Chair commented that there is a lot of positivity within the information provided, particularly the student feedback position. She highlighted that there is more work to do in relation to completions and progression and asked if there were any specific	

	areas of concern. Staff advised that each year student recruitment is a concern. Whilst the college has been able to maintain numbers, this is built on word of mouth with friends and relatives etc. and that relying solely on this can be a worry. Staff advised that, when looking through the 'quality' lens, a lot of students are from the 'widening participation' pool which means they are not the traditionally academic and this does have an impact. College must get the offer and service right or it negatively impacts on completion and achievement rates. College is currently at benchmarks but wants to be above and this is a prime goal. He described the tutorial programme as very supportive. Challenge from the committee was, when looking at any new courses, to be confident re the content and offer and factor this against competition levels. Staff advised that, anecdotally the OfS relationship manager describes the BSC HE numbers as 'large' when compared to other London colleges. This does raise the question around what others are doing and how those courses are funded. This links into competition considerations. Committee all commented on the excellent NSS survey results and extended their congratulations. They also acknowledged the excellent professional development opportunities available to staff. One governor noted that completion rates, particularly for the top up in Business are below the threshold and urged the team to do whatever they can to 'edge this up'. This is because Business courses are known to be a focus for the OfS. Committee asked whether it is necessary to have a TEF and will the college be applying. Staff advised that the OfS are looking for all HE providers to have a TEF. This is still subject to an ongoing consultation process before they can send out further information. Staff advised that, because the BSC offer is franchised there are further additional requirements, including governance elements i.e. ensuring that all information is in the right place and right format etc. Challenge from one governor was to be mindful that, when applying for a TEF, college would currently be looking at a 'gold' for student feedback but a 'bronze' for outcomes as thresholds are not yet being met. It may be possible to secure a 'silver' if outcomes can be improved. Committee noted that any TEF is based upon three years' worth of past results and therefore there is little that the college can now do to change this. One governor asked what more the college needs to do to progress HE further and does this need to be part of the rebranding conversations currently taking place. Staff indicated that a key action for business related degrees is ensuring that staff keep abreast of what is happening in the workplace i.e. wider research to stay up to date. In relation to rebranding, CEO advised that there is not yet a formal plan for the future although he acknowledged that there	
--	--	--

	needs to be refreshed thinking for the medium to long term given LLE (Lifelong Entitlement) coming in as well as a demographic shift which may require more focus on Level 4 and 5 technical provision. Until there is greater clarity around these the college cannot determine how best to package the offer. One governor highlighted that it is possible for the college to call the area a 'University Centre' even though provision is franchised. One governor asked how the organisation can capitalise on the very positive student feedback and what the implications are for further improvement e.g. being above thresholds for progression (higher level study or employment), completion levels etc. Governors asked 'how big the HE pie is' and how much of a slice does BSC have and what is the vision and aspirations for the future. Where next? Staff advised that the college reputation with the partner university is strong and that they are also focused on growth. Now that the college has the extra offer in relation to Early years and Photography, recruitment must be the focus to get both off the ground. Part of the strategy is to try and recruit students who previously studied at Level 3. Once they are 'off the ground' it is expected that numbers will build up because of word of mouth as reputation is established. HTQs, HNDs and LLE are other opportunities. Modular based delivery rather than the traditional degree route should be attractive to many adults to match their skills need. This will require a cultural shift which will take time. There are also further opportunities to work more with local universities. Challenge from the committee was to ensure clarity of thinking when moving forward i.e. will it be all strands at the same time or more sequentially. Committee all agreed that they would like the opportunity to revisit the college's approach at a future meeting (Head of HE, 2026). Staff governor commented that it is fantastic to see such positive student feedback in relation to academic support as this is very hard to achieve. He noted that students come from diverse backgrounds and asked whether this means that support is personalised to meet different learning styles. Staff confirmed that this is the case and that survey questions are 'open' so that it allows student to share individual views. Support is very much based upon individual needs, and the team adapt where they can. One to one support in tutorials is important. In relation to future growth, CEO commented that there are several factors to consider, including: • Policy changes which are in the organisations favour re L3, 4 and 5, • LLE opportunities • Demographics – in recent years there has been an increase in 16–19-year-olds and they will soon become 19+ • This may mean that the balance of provision could shift.	*
--	---	----------

	AGREED to: A, Note the content of the report provided and B, Recommend that the board approve the 2024/25 SED as presented. (David Howley left the meeting at 6.35pm)	
4	Learner Voice Strategy Committee Chair took the opportunity to thank Jasmine, one of the student governors, for sending in her comments and observations on this report to be considered in her absence as she couldn't join the meeting this evening. Staff all agreed that it was helpful to have feedback based upon individual student experiences. Key matters highlighted from the report were: • Strategy only developed recently. • This meeting is an opportunity for governors to critique and provide feedback which will then support further refinement. • Strategy sets out how the organisation will enhance the learner experience. How the college will listen, then act/implement and ultimately measure impact. • A key goal is to really effectively demonstrate and measure the impact of actions i.e. how learner voice has led to improvements. Senior staff don't feel that, at this moment in time, the college is able to measure impact well and this can be improved. • Organisation needs to improve processes. • Intention is to establish a dashboard which shows learner voice captured and then progress against actions agreed. College would then be able to give feedback to learners to evidence that the college has listened and acted. • Team would like to introduce several new initiatives, including: - Learners walking the corridors with a member of staff to give feedback. - The same to potentially apply in the classroom, with learners giving feedback on the quality of the experience. - Learner Voice Week – where learners have a focus on particular themes e.g. wellbeing, tutorials, progress etc. - These would give students a wider opportunity to participate leading to more robust data/view of where the college is. • Organisation is striving to be a fully inclusive college and therefore learner voice needs to be captured from every group. To support this, surveys need to be less generic and there needs to be opportunities for 1:1 conversations e.g. with SEND learners.	

	• Aim is to have learners involved in every college forum so that they can share their views e.g. teaching and learning forums • What we want to do is 'close the loop'. Governors supported the mixed method model approach outlined and agreed it is important to have a range of ways to capture student voice. They acknowledged that it is important to listen but that even more important is action leading to impact. Committee Chair's challenge to the CEO was, how does he know what students think. What is working now and where are the gaps. The Student Governor present was invited to give her thoughts on whether she/learners feel they are listened to. She described it as a 'mixed picture', but personally she has not experienced any communication issues which is positive. Committee Chair referred to the comments provided by Jasmine which included a call for more tailoring and to make sure the college isn't using a 'one size fits all' approach. There should be nuancing, both the approach to gathering views and then giving feedback. Challenge from the committee was that transparency is important and closing the loop. They urged the college to be specific about what has been done and the impact, and that this should then be tested with students to see if they can see and/or feel a change. Committee agreed that it is right for governors to have a role to play in holding leaders to account but indicated that they would find it helpful to have a steer on where to dig deeper, particularly during the planned 'meet the students' sessions. One governor indicated that he had found student governor recommendations on potential areas of focus for future discussions helpful. He noted that she had raised technical issues with IT that needed to be more fully explored by staff. He suggested that it is important for governors to be able to 'join the dots' and use learner voice to inform some of the board discussions. One governor asked how the college will benchmark against external standards, given that no external provider e.g. QDP will be used. Staff confirmed that this is something to review as it is not currently clear and that it is important to be able to compare like with like. It is possible to reach out to colleagues in other colleges and share results, but this is a less structured approach. Committee then discussed the proposed approach to surveys. Key matters were: • Whilst micro surveys are useful, having a more in-depth survey once per term is beneficial. This would allow the college to get greater depth. • Micro surveys/straw polls would allow the college to explore particular aspects of provision e.g. the quality of teaching and learning in a specific area. • Suggestions from committee was to seek student governor views on the areas for feedback.	
--	---	--

	• Important to get a mix of 'individual' views as well as the 'views of peers'. Staff governor was invited to give his views on how learner voice is shared so that individual staff can contribute to improvements. He indicated that: • It is important to have a survey that uses different tools. • Current system is very generic and therefore does not give views on individual courses. • Answers to generic questions can be inaccurate for specific areas e.g. the use of IT. • Surveys need more differentiation. • Questions need to be tailored. Staff acknowledged that there is a need to tailor e.g. for ESOL and SEND students. They reminded that the college uses other mechanisms as well as surveys e.g. focus groups. These involve conversations which can be more tailored. They expressed the view that, in some areas there does need to be commonality of questions so that it is possible to compare e.g. views on support services, learning resources, teaching and learning etc. Challenge from governors was to design methods that pick up both the common themes and then the more tailored and nuanced approaches. Challenge from one governor was that headline surveys don't really allow in depth analysis on why individuals respond the way they do e.g. exactly why do they feel safe. Governors asked whether the dashboard proposed will be accessible to both staff and students. It was confirmed that it will. Closing the loop would then be a review with learners to check whether the actions implemented have paid dividend i.e. did the college genuinely listen to concerns and address them. Challenge from governors was not to lose sight of tracking the compliments as well as the concerns. All agreed that learner voice should be visible to all and be transparent so that the organisation can be held to account. Comments and observations from the CEO were: • Really good to see a structure proposed around learner voice as this has been lacking. • Implementation framework needs to have a clearer line of sight into ELT. Currently there is a gap. • CEOs line of sight is currently: - Seeing survey outcomes, and - A yearend review - There is more that can be done e.g. termly reports to ELT summarising termly survey results, course rep meetings (topics and themes emerging) etc - Termly reports to ELT to be added into the implementation framework (TC – December 2025) - Reports to highlight areas where students are 'highly satisfied' and conversely where they are 'most dissatisfied'. These will flag where ELT can look to extend as well as where to intervene.	*
--	--	----------

	• Ensure the plan is strongly connected to student services and the work that they do. Interface between student services and quality team needs to be clear and effective. • Supportive of a 'mixed menu' approach to gathering learner voice. • Course rep and course level meetings need to effectively feed into the curriculum areas. Survey information can be taken right back to course level so there is work to do to make sure this reaches the teaching teams. It includes a responsibility for CMs to make sure those conversations are taking place. • Curriculum response to be added to the implementation framework (TC – December 2025). • Look to introduce an annual student conference. This can be a mix of student voice and student development. Student governors can play an active part in shaping this. • 'CEO's time with students' to be added into the framework. If students are well prepared this provides a rich opportunity. These should have a focus on key matters. (TC – December 2025) • Document name should be changed from 'strategy' to 'plan'. • Consider whether it is possible to have targeted male and female group discussions. Director of T&L and Quality agreed that the links between quality, student services and the curriculum need to be improved so that they are well established and effective as this will ensure continuity and commonality. He gave an example of a 'Student professional development day' held at another college which was very well received. The day had no teaching and instead revolved around a series of focused activities. Challenge from one governor was to ensure that any student conference has a strategic element. This would empower students and ensure discussions are solutions focused. All agreed that, once a student conference has been organised, governors should be invited to attend (TC – 2026) AGREED to A, note the content of the report provided and associated discussions. B, update the plan in line with discussion points and suggestions made at the meeting	* * *
5	'You said, We did' – Governor's meetings with students in 2024/25 Key matters highlighted and discussed were: • Will be helpful to share this report with full board so that other governors involved in the sessions can see the impact. • Clear to this committee to see the links with previous discussions, particularly in relation to attendance strategy	

	implementation and measuring the impact of digital learning initiatives. • A clear link with the learner voice discussions earlier in the meeting. • Six common themes arising across the three meetings which took place in the year, including: - Attendance - High expectations - Timetabling - Communication - Support - Exams • These themes tied in closely with what the college already knew, which is reassuring, and initiatives underway. • Discussions were very much aligned to learner voice at college level • Actions to address are in the QIP • Data was also flagging similar issues. • All the above fed into the QIP developed. • Attendance strategy was developed and implemented, and the college is already seeing an impact. There has been a 1.4% increase overall and a 9% increase for maths and English GCSEs. The latter has been supported by the English and maths grids established. • Timetabling gaps have been addressed by the introduction of a 'skills network'. This makes sure that independent study opportunities are clearly identified. • There have been major developments in the digital learning team. Committee noted three key elements included within the feedback from Jasmine, the student governor: • More bespoke surveys needed and not just 'gathering the data'. More open questions to be included. • Feedback should lead to action. College needs to be able to demonstrate this. • Measuring success – how the college will do this e.g. improved levels of student engagement. Committee asked what more is now needed. Staff indicated that this is better triangulation in relation to when and where student feedback is gathered i.e. surveys, student rep meetings, meetings with governors etc. They suggested that, once triangulated, this information should drive QIPs rather than them being data driven. College also needs to consider feedback from a business support perspective as well as curriculum i.e. what are students asking for. An example given was that IT issues flagged up to governors are not really being picked up in student surveys. Staff did caution that a balanced approach needs to be taken re areas of focus e.g. in 23/24 student feedback to governors was a need to improve UCAS support, whereas in 24/25 students, albeit different ones, felt UCAS had too much focus. Staff must be careful not to lean too far one way.	
--	--	--

	Student governor at the meeting was asked to share her experiences. She advised that • Her personal timetable is evenly spread which makes it not feel overwhelming. The scheduled breaks work well so that she can come to subsequent lessons prepared, ready and focused. • She hasn't heard about the skills network yet. • No real clarity in relation to the student rep role and responsibilities. Committee asked what more she felt that the college could focus on. She suggested that more work was needed on tutorials, specifically greater clarity on the what and the why. Staff acknowledged that there is a need for a cross-college strategy that works well together as the current approach is too fragmented. The major recommendation is to 'pull everything together'. Committee chair asked for any governor reflections on the report. Those given were: • Really enjoy meeting with students. Always impressed with the level of preparation and enthusiasm. • The meetings are an opportunity to dig deeper through conversation. • It is important to be transparent in relation to what student contribution has led to. • Governors can have nuanced discussions. • It is important to be seen to respond. • There are lots of ways that action and impact can be woven in e.g. the student conference. • Meetings with governors are just part of the matrix • Important that students are representative and share both the negatives and the positives. Comments from the CEO included: • Director of T&L and Quality to add 'meet the governors' sessions to the learner voice plan (TC – December 2025). • College needs to try and get more students to participate in these sessions. • Would be helpful to have more structure for governors in the sessions e.g. a briefing note and suggested questions. CEO suggested that the views of student governors be canvassed so that the questions posed aren't too technical. Aim should be that the sessions are accessible. Committee requested that the sessions should be tailored to the thematic content to be discussed by board at the later meetings. • Suggested topics: - What students aged 16-19 think the about the college reputation. This could link in with planned branding discussions. - Community cohesion – the student perspective and lived experiences. Feedback from 16-19 students and adults - Link into the MSIs	*
--	---	----------

	Suggestion from the committee chair was to seek the views from full board at the December meeting. She indicated that she would be interested to explore student views on 'belonging' and 'EDI' AGREED to note the content of the information provided.	
6	2024/25 Annual Complaints Report Committee was happy to note the content of the report provided and move straight to questions. One governor noted that there were only 60 complaints during the year and felt that this was potentially low given the size of the organisation. She asked if there is confidence that everyone knows how to complain and are people confident to complain. Challenge from one governor was that, whilst the recommended actions look good, they would like to see more about what the college hopes to achieve. They asked that numbers and targets be included where possible. They urged greater clarity in relation to how the organisation will test achievement. Staff advised that the number of complaints year on year is similar and that this may mean that the college approach to complaints hasn't been tested to be reassured re processes. All agreed that complaints are not necessarily a bad thing as they present an opportunity to adapt and learn. One governor noted suggested staff training on 'attitudes and behaviours' and asked whether this would be targeted or generic given that it has been an area of concern for a little while. Staff advised that the intention is for it to be generic so that it applies cross-college e.g. on customer service and basic expectations. This should lead to a reduction in the number of complaints relating to staff behaviours. Challenge from the committee was to record compliments as well as complaints. AGREED to note the content of the report provided.	
9	Sector/Policy Briefing Committee noted the AOC update on Level 3 reforms. CEO advised that there would be more information on sector developments included in his report to board.	
10	AOB None for this meeting.	
12	Reflection of Committee Meeting Against Guiding Principles	

	Committee was content that meeting discussions and areas of focus aligned with the guiding principles set out in the 2030 Strategy. Comments made were: • Great to have additional governors join the committee. • Really helpful to have student and staff governor contributions. • A concise meeting but governors were really able to get under the skin of several related reports • Some really good feedback provided. • Recommendation to the board is that topics for the governors 'meet the students' sessions link to the MSIs and/or strategic themes. • More guidance to be given to governors on the approach to 'meet the students' sessions. • Committee would like to see more about the expected impact of the response to complaints approach planned. 	
13	Date and time of next meeting This was confirmed as Monday 12th January 2026 at 5.30pm. Meeting closed at 7.30pm.	