

---

## Board Meeting

Date of Meeting	Monday 15 December 2014
Paper Title	Curriculum and Estates Plan: Consultation Responses - Task Group Report
Agenda Item	4
Paper Number	BM4-B Appendix 4
Responsible Officer	Maureen McKenna, Board Member
Status	Disclosable
Action	For Decision

## **Task Group – to review evidence for the proposed future location of provision in Glasgow as outlined in the Glasgow College Region Curriculum and Estates Plan**

November 2014

### **Remit**

The Task Group was set up to clarify the rationale and evidence base supporting the curriculum and location proposals as outlined in the Glasgow College Region Curriculum and Estates Plan 2015-20. It was asked to review the evidence presented and assess its robustness in supporting the proposals in the plan to deliver the right outcome for curriculum delivery in Glasgow. The Task Group was asked to review within the same timescale as the consultation exercise (between 27<sup>th</sup> October and 21<sup>st</sup> November) and complete its report in time to report back to the Regional Board in December.

### **Membership of the Task Group**

Chair: Maureen McKenna (authorised by the Regional Chair and CEO SFC)  
Julia Henderson, GCRB  
Gavin Bruce, SFC  
Linda McLeod, SFC

### **Process**

The Chair convened two meetings of the Task Group.

#### ***The first meeting (6<sup>th</sup> November):***

- Clarified and scoped the task (considered the vision for learners in Glasgow, key asks for Glasgow' and the relationship between right provision and right place and map out areas for investigation); and
- Agreed key review questions for the Colleges (see below).

#### ***The second meeting (12<sup>th</sup> November):***

- Heard evidence presented from College representatives and asked supplementary questions; and
- Reviewed evidence presented and agreed position and recommendations.

### **Questions for the Colleges**

- Can you explain the rationale for the proposed movement of WSUMs between the three colleges and describe the factors that were considered in determining what provision moved in and out of each college?
- To what extent has the proposed movement of provision taken account of the following:
  - School/college activity and the recommendations from the Commission for Developing Scotland's Young Workforce
  - Articulation routes to University
  - Student mobility
  - Implications for the movement of staff?

## Responses from the college representatives

### Background

The Strategic Agreement, signed up to by all parties in April 2014, committed the Glasgow Colleges to the delivery of a plan for the development of the Glasgow curriculum and use of the estate which would try to ensure that across the Region the right colleges courses are offered in the right place and the best possible use of the three colleges' estates and facilities are made. The *Curriculum and Estates Plan 2015-2020* was presented to the Regional Strategic Board in October 2014 for its consideration, following broad endorsement by the individual Boards of the assigned colleges, although some concerns were raised by Glasgow Clyde College Board. It was then presented for wider consultation as ***A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015-2020*** and discussed at a stakeholder consultation event on 5<sup>th</sup> November.

### Rationale for the movement of WSUMs and factors impacting on what provision moves in and out of each college

There was agreement across all three colleges on the key drivers which were to:

- Establish the correct balance of portfolio to meet the needs of the economy and satisfy employer demand for skills, (based on a robust regional evidence base).
- Establish the correct balance of portfolio in terms of level of provision reflected in SCQF levels to meet the needs of the residents of the region, city-wide and locally, in particular to support improved access to entry level provision and the acquisition of skills for employment and social inclusion.
- Make the best use of all of the modern estate across the city and in this process provide learners with the best learning environment possible.

In their response Clyde College noted the following:

- Clyde College has a well-established process of curriculum review within the college and changes to curriculum and location of provision happen within individual colleges on an ongoing basis.
- Reconfiguration of the curriculum was focusing on reducing unnecessary duplication across the colleges and transferring a volume of activity to grow in required areas (and SCQF levels) – for example business, hospitality, tourism – in locations where this is accessible for students and a volume to decline.

In their response Kelvin College noted the following:

- The college recognises that it should increase the volume of introductory level provision (SCQF levels 3 and 4) to support learners with no or low qualifications in the north and east of the City. This responds to under provision recognised by the review and census data.
- Close its city campus – which the review identified would be the poorest quality accommodation in the region once the city centre new campus is complete.
- Reduce its volume of Creative Industry provision – recognising the region has more provision in this area than needed.
- Transfer some specialist provision to college locations/campuses which are closer to the main related employment opportunities and which may have specialist facilities.

In their response City of Glasgow College noted the following:

- The college recognises that many students will choose to travel to the city centre for certain provision, particularly higher level provision but not exclusively.
- There is an urgency to reach agreement on specific curriculum provision and location as the colleges need to be in a position in January 2015 to consider recruitment for AY2015-16.
- They recognise the need to focus on STEM provision at all levels, from school/college to higher level provision, and the Riverside Campus will have purpose built estate for STEM provision, although there was recognition that STEM provision would continue to be delivered in the other two colleges.

### **School/college activity and the recommendations from the Commission for Developing Scotland's Young Workforce**

Responses from the colleges confirmed that school/college activity is a priority for all three and all agreed that nothing in the proposals will impact adversely on schools provision. The colleges will continue to work collaboratively and independently with local education authorities to plan delivery in the most relevant curriculum areas at the most appropriate location.

The colleges' responses to the Commission have been referred to in the AY14-15 Glasgow Region Outcome Agreement (ROA) and the AY15-16 ROA will include a regional response signed up to by all partners. One example will be a commitment to developing a regional STEM Academy, with other potential academies to follow.

### **Articulation routes to university**

All three colleges clearly recognised the need, and the desire from students, for progression and movement across the colleges and on to university where appropriate. Where advanced level provision moves location consideration must be given to ensuring that the provision remains accessible to learners from across the region and that existing articulation agreements are not affected as they are attached to the provision/course. All three colleges have good relationships with their partner universities and have been working together to develop pathways to ensure an efficient and effective learner journey from college HN levels to university. The emerging curriculum hubs - reflecting eight subject areas across city – will look at progression pathways and articulation opportunities in these curriculum areas.

Articulation is a key priority in the ROA with the desired impact being more learners in Glasgow achieving qualifications and able to progress to further study and/or work. At a regional level, Glasgow colleges are continuing to work with universities to strengthen relationships to facilitate improved articulation levels with advanced standing.

### **Student mobility**

It was recognised by all three colleges that where higher level provision moves from one college campus to another that there was a need to ensure that this was still accessible to students who might previously have chosen this course of study. In addition the movement of provision should better match location of delivery with location of potential future employment opportunities. It was also recognised that the proposed changes would result in an increase in local, community-based access to entry level opportunities and an increase in overall community-based activity by 2.5%.

## Movement of staff

The colleges confirmed that the curriculum and estates proposals have been developed in response to the needs of the region's learners, the economy and wider stakeholders. They are aware that if implemented they will impact on staff in a variety of ways. For example, the plan proposes a reduction in some areas overall, in addition to some movement of provision. If endorsed, the colleges recognise that this could have retraining/severance implications for some staff. There are also key considerations around reductions or transfer of management and support staff linked to other provision that may be moving. All of this potential impact will require appropriate consultation and significant support, including potential financial support.

## Summary comments

- The colleges have been working effectively and resourcefully together through the GCSP to address the curriculum and estates issues and find appropriate solutions and options to ensure the right provision in the right place for Glasgow's learners.
- The evidence base for the proposed curriculum shifts in Glasgow has been well-researched by the colleges and proposals have been based on a collegiate approach to planning.
- From the evidence which was presented, there remains some unresolved issues across all three colleges, relating to the volume and location shifts of particular provision/curriculum areas. However, the three colleges are well placed to be able to address these issues and are continuing to work together positively, seeking the views of stakeholders to help shape their decision making.
- The Consultation headline message – *A Vision for Learning in Glasgow* – was misleading for partners. The document was written to a specific, narrower brief, namely a curriculum and estates review, that not all partners understood.
- The Glasgow ROA is a key driver for strategic change in the region through its focus on outcomes, priority impacts and outputs.
- Schools/college work is a priority moving forward, as confirmed in the SFC Outcome Agreement guidance, and will need creative solutions regarding curriculum and location to be well placed deliver on the recommendations in the ***Developing Scotland's Young Workforce*** report.
- The focus on smarter learner journeys from school to college on to employment or higher level study (through articulation to university with advanced standing), has gained in priority as a result of the regional approach.
- The colleges all recognise that the curriculum will need to be continually responsive to shifts in the economy and employment market.
- The colleges recognise that the proposals when finalised will need further detailed work to ensure that students' needs and staff's needs are taken into account, in so far as is possible.

- All of the colleges are committed to continuing to work together to plan a curriculum which delivers for learners in Glasgow's region.

## **Summary recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

The colleges should finalise their plans on the volume and location shifts in time to ensure they are ready for the recruitment phase for AY2015-16.

### **Recommendation 2**

The colleges should work closely with the local authorities in the region to ensure that school/college partnerships continue to be delivered effectively.

### **Recommendation 3**

Decisions around location of course provision should continue to place a priority on smarter learner journeys.

### **Recommendation 4**

The location of both higher level and access level provision should take account of the needs of students (for example the impact of caring responsibilities or disability). This was one of the less well addressed issues in the review and would benefit from further consideration in the next phase of work.

### **Recommendation 5**

The colleges should continue to engage fully with staff and the appropriate trade unions to ensure that redeployment plans take into account, as much as possible, the training needs and career aspirations of individual staff.

### **Recommendation 6**

The colleges should continue to keep the curriculum under review with ongoing engagement with stakeholders.

## **Membership of the Learning & Teaching Group (presenting evidence)**

Robin Ashton, Glasgow Kelvin College  
Janis Carson, City of Glasgow College  
Alex Craig, City of Glasgow College

Eleanor Harris, Glasgow Clyde College  
Alan Inglis, Glasgow Kelvin College  
Greg Irving, Curriculum Consultant