

REVIEW OF SCOTLAND'S COLLEGES

**WORKING GROUP: STAFFING, LEARNERS
AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS**

**Minutes of Meeting
held at 11am on 04 July 2006
at Europa Building, Glasgow**

Attendees:

Marian Healy, EIS (Joint Chair)

Col Baird, ETLLD-FAED (Review of Scotland's Colleges Team)

Peter Beaumont, ETLLD-FAED (Skills and Staffing Team)

Susan Bird, Stevenson College Edinburgh

John Bowditch, HMIE

Gordon Casey, AMICUS

Tom Craig, ETLLD-FAED (Skills and Staffing Team) (w/g Secretariat)

Gail Edwards, NUS Scotland

Bill Harvey, Scottish Funding Council

Jill Little, NUS Scotland (Substitute for James Alexander, Joint Chair)

Stewart McKillop, South Lanarkshire College

Penny Neish, ASC

Apologies:

James Alexander, NUS Scotland (Joint Chair)

Maureen Anderson, UNISON

Claire Bell, Scottish Funding Council

Victoria Beattie, ETLLD-FAED (Review of Scotland's Colleges Team)

John Ireson, Skill Scotland

John McCann, SFEU

Iain McCaskey, SSAScot

1. Chair's Introduction, Apologies etc.

- Apologies were recorded as noted above.
- The Chair welcomed Jill Little, the new Depute President of NUS Scotland, who was attending in place of James Alexander. Members introduced themselves for her benefit.

2. Note of Meeting of 01 June 2006, incl. update on Action Points

- The minutes were agreed to be a fair and accurate record.
- An update on outstanding action points was provided as shown below:

Description of Action	Update
The Executive to report back to a future meeting on whether its responsibilities under the 1993 regulations can be delegated to another body.	Peter Beaumont said that advice had been received from SE Solicitors to the effect that the responsibilities <i>could</i> be delegated. However, as outlined in a paper that had been endorsed by the Sub-group that morning, the Department was, for a number of reasons, not intending to pursue this course of action.
NUS and ASC to report back to the group on whether they think the joint audit idea would be worthwhile	Gail Edwards advised that this action point had been overtaken by the paper for discussion today.
John McCann to provide group with final Profiling of Staff report as soon as it becomes available.	The Chair referred to an e-mail which John had sent stating that good progress was being made and that a draft final report would hopefully be submitted to the ASC and STUC in August.
Funding Council to provide further evidence of the link between estates improvement and retention rates with a view to informing the group's recommendations	Claire Bell was not in attendance.
FAED to source central guidance, if available, on the format of Spending Review bids	Peter Beaumont undertook to inform the group whenever such guidance become available.
Amendment to be made to SFC discussion paper as suggested by Susan Bird	Claire Bell was not in attendance.
FAED to investigate issue regarding developing role of SSCs and report back to the group on this	Peter Beaumont advised that Jacqui Hepburn of SSDA was aware of the issue and had undertaken to provide him with a formal update in writing, although this had not yet been received.
FAED to circulate link to 'Langlands Commission' document (as referred to by the Accountability and Governance group)	It was noted that the link had been provided in the minutes of the last meeting.
FAED to revise Annex A of Paper 11 and circulate to members in advance of the next (04 July) meeting	It was noted that this had been done in the shape of Paper 12, which would be discussed today.
Natalé Craig to liaise with Student Association at Adam Smith College regarding production of case studies.	Gail advised that Natalé had contacted Adam Smith College, but that their student association had been unable to provide a second case study. Instead, this would be provided by Kilmarnock College, hopefully by the end of the week.

4. Recommendations on the Overall College Experience

- Peter Beaumont spoke to Paper 12, circulated in advance. He said that this was essentially a reworked version of Paper 11, with the addition of case studies, and that he hoped members could sign it off today. The intention was that the paper would go to the Core Group once it had been approved.
- Members endorsed the paper subject to a number of revisions being made and pending their approval of a second case study, which was due to be provided shortly. It was agreed that the revised version of the paper would be circulated to members before being submitted to the Core Group.
- NUS undertook to provide the second case study as soon as possible and hopefully before the end of the week.

ACTION

- **FAED to revise Paper 12 as suggested and then circulate it to members prior to its being submitted to the Core Group**
- **NUS to provide second case study for approval by members prior to its inclusion in revised Paper 12**
- **All members to review the second case study, in due course, to allow Paper 12 to be finalised and submitted to the Core Group**

5. Any Other Business

- Col Baird gave an update on the progress of the other working groups in the Review.
 - ✓ The Difference Colleges Make group had held a facilitated workshop the previous day as part of its new remit to consider the difference colleges *could* make. A series of papers would now be commissioned by the group for completion over the summer.
 - ✓ The research tenders for the Accountability and Governance group had now come in and would be considered later that day. The group was looking at student representation on Boards of Management and would consider the work of SLALE in relation to that.
 - ✓ The Strategic Futures group had held its last meeting the previous week. The Reviews Team, along with Laurence Howells from the Funding Council, would be meeting later that week with the SE Strategy Unit to discuss how their work on futures could feed into the work of the working group.
- Peter Beaumont gave a verbal summary of the matters discussed at the Sub-group meeting that morning. He advised that two main items had been discussed: a paper on the delegation of powers held by the Department and a paper which set out approximate costings for implementing the recommendations relating to the teacher training of new lecturers. In relation to the first item, the Sub-group had agreed with the paper's conclusion that the status quo should be retained. Regarding the latter, they had asked that the paper be discussed with, first of all, the SFEU's HR Community of Practice and then the Scottish Funding Council to ensure that its figures were as sound and realistic as possible.

List of Action Points

- **FAED to revise Paper 12 as suggested and then circulate it to members prior to its being submitted to the Core Group**
- **NUS to provide second case study for approval by members prior to its inclusion in revised Paper 12**
- **All members to review the second case study, in due course, to allow Paper 12 to be finalised and submitted to the Core Group**

**Tom Craig
ETLLD-FAED
13 July 2006**