

REVIEW OF SCOTLAND'S COLLEGES

WORKING GROUP: STAFFING, LEARNERS AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Note of Meeting held at 2pm on 09 November 2006 at Europa Building, Glasgow

Attendees

Marian Healy – STUC/EIS
James Alexander – NUS
John McCann – SFEU
Penny Neish – ASC
Peter Beaumont – Scottish Executive
Col Baird - Scottish Executive
Victoria Beattie – Scottish Executive

1. The above members of the SLALE group met briefly to discuss the shape and outline of SLALE's final report.
2. Members were informed that each of the workstreams will produce their own report containing their recommendations and evidence base. These reports will be presented to the Core Group for discussion and approval. Once this has been achieved the reports will be published in the form of a glossy document. It was noted that there will also be an overall glossy document which contains all the recommendations from the four workstreams.
3. It was noted that although the front cover of the reports will be similar in style to that of 'Unlocking Opportunity', the Difference College Make Working Group's report, they will all be a different colour.
4. Members of the drafting group recognised that comparisons with the final SLALE report will be made with that of the 'Competitiveness of Higher Education in Scotland' publication. It was agreed that the SLALE report should be laid out in a similar style to this HE report. This would mean that there would be an Executive Summary outlining the key findings and recommendations for staffing, learners and the learning environment and that would be a separate chapter for each of the three areas (staffing, learners and learning environments).
5. The drafting group thought it would be useful to produce a short summary leaflet – similar in style to the 'Unlocking Opportunity' leaflet.
6. It was agreed that the Executive should ask the ASC and the STUC for permission to quote and reference from the 'Profile of Staff' report.

ACTION POINT: Executive to write to ASC and STUC seeking permission to use the 'Profile of Staff' report.

7. The drafting group also discussed the structure of the report's chapters. It was suggested that the chapters could be structured along the following lines:

- Context
- Challenges
- Evidence
- Policy Issues
- Solutions – Recommendations
- Funding Implications

8. It thought that in order to keep the report succinct evidence of the variety of practices taking place throughout the sector should be briefly referenced to in the final report but should be made fully available via links to the Review's website.

9. The briefing group considered SLALE's workload of tasks. While it was agreed that the sub group and the main working group are on track with their tasks it was agreed that there is a need to start drawing out recommendations from the vast array of evidence which SLALE has gathered. It was suggested that the remaining meetings should concentrate on the development of recommendations.

10, Members were reminded that the recommendations regarding learners have already been discussed by the Core Group and that the final recommendations need to take into account the comments raised by the Core Group. It is hoped that some of the recommendations with regard to Staffing and Learning Environments will be ready to share with the Core Group at their December meeting but that realistically the majority of the recommendations would be presented to the Core Group at their January meeting.

11. To help members with the process of developing recommendations it was suggested that the Executive should produce a paper which outlines the tasks and the relevant sources of information which members could access.

ACTION POINT: Executive to produce a paper which outlines the tasks and the relevant sources of information which members could use to draft recommendations.

12. Members of the drafting team requested that the note of this meeting be shared with the full SLALE working group.

ACTION POINT: Executive to produce a note of the meeting and table the note at the November meeting.

ACTION POINT: Members were asked to consider a possible title for the report.

Review Team
9 November 2006