

## Board Meeting

Date of Meeting	Monday 15 December 2014
Paper Title	Curriculum and Estates Plan: Consultation Responses
Agenda Item	A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015 - 2020 4
Paper Number	BM4-B
Responsible Officer	Glasgow Colleges' Strategic Partnership Principals Lead - Brian Hughes, GCSP Development Co-ordinator & Vice Principal Glasgow Clyde College
Status	Disclosable
Action	The Board is asked to note the contents of the report and endorse the recommendations.

### 1. Report Purpose

**1.1** This report brings to the Regional Board an analysis of the responses that were received in relation to the consultation document "A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015-2020" and asks the Board to NOTE this analysis and endorse the recommendations below.

### 2. Recommendations

**2.1** The Board are asked to NOTE the contents of the attached report and

- Endorse the direction of travel by asking the Learning and Teaching Group of the Glasgow Colleges' Strategic Partnership to:
  - continue to refine the proposals, taking into account the key issues identified in the report and to reconsider the timescales identified for the transfer of activity between colleges;
  - ensure that the refined proposals are created in the context of the Regional Outcome Agreement;
  - continue to consult with stakeholders as the proposals are refined; and
  - Equality Impact Assess the proposals.

### 3. Background

**3.1** As a result of the Strategic Agreement between the Glasgow Colleges' Strategic Partnership, The Scottish Funding Council and the Chair of the Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board work

was undertaken to ensure that over the five years from 2015 to 2020, the Colleges will work together to ensure that, across the Region, the right college courses are in the right place and the best possible use is being made of the three Colleges' resources and facilities.

- 3.2** Throughout this process key stakeholders including students, staff and external agencies have been engaged in the review in a range of ways.
- 3.3** A consultation event was held in June 2014 in the Glasgow City Chambers, attended by a range of stakeholders, to consider the Initial Curriculum Review. As a result of that consultation event the initial proposals were revised and refined resulting in the Curriculum and Estates Plan, "A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015-2020".
- 3.4** At a further stakeholder event in the Trades House of Glasgow on 5 November 2015 the redrafted Curriculum and Estates Plan was introduced and the period of consultation began. That consultation period ended on 21 November 2014. A dedicated website was also established to allow respondents to enter their responses to the consultation directly in an electronic format.
- 3.5** A range of other consultation activities have taken place in relation to the proposals including a meeting between College Principals and Student Presidents on the 29 October 2014 and both formal and informal briefing sessions with Trade Union bodies in all three Colleges.

#### **4. Key themes emerging from the responses**

- General concern that the timescale for the consultation process was too short.
- General acceptance that the principles as expressed are sound.
- A number of concerns that the proposals are designed to fill a funding gap for the City of Glasgow's new build.
- Strong concerns that the needs of local communities and those furthest from employment must remain a focus for college delivery.
- A number of responses identified potential travel difficulties for students required to move across the City.
- Concern that the cuts identified for the creative and cultural industries are too great and that sufficient attention has not been paid to the nature of employment in this area.

It is our intention to publish all of the responses submitted, with the permission of the authors, on the GCSP website after this paper has been considered by the Board

#### **5. Risk Analysis**

- 5.1** Reputational / relationship: Failure to take into consideration appropriate views of stakeholders may result in poor relations going forward. To mitigate against this risk all further developments should be subject to consultation as appropriate.
- 5.2** Reputational: Potential disruption to students' learning as a result of curricular change that is not fully planned. To mitigate against this risk all proposals must be clearly planned to ensure continuity of programmes for students.

## **6. Legal Implications**

- 6.1** In the event that the curriculum proposals result in movement of course provision that requires the transfer of staff across the Colleges in Glasgow, the three Colleges, as employers, will require to undertake a full TUPE consultation with regard to their employees affected by transfer.

## A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015 - 2020

As a result of the Strategic Agreement between the Glasgow Colleges' Strategic Partnership, The Scottish Funding Council and the Chair of the Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board work was undertaken to ensure that over the five years from 2015 to 2020 the Colleges will work together to ensure that across the Region the right college courses are in the right place and the best possible use is being made of the three Colleges' resources and facilities.

Throughout this process key stakeholders including students, staff and external agencies have been engaged in the review in a range of ways.

A consultation event was held in June 2014 in the Glasgow City Chambers, attended by a range of stakeholders, to consider the Initial Curriculum Review. As a result of that consultation event the initial proposals were revised and refined resulting in the Curriculum and Estates Plan, "A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015-2020".

At a further stakeholder event in the Trades House of Glasgow on 5 November 2015, the redrafted Curriculum and Estates Plan was introduced and the period of consultation began. That consultation period ended on 21 November 2014. A dedicated website was also established to allow respondents to enter their responses to the consultation directly in an electronic format.

A range of other consultation activities have taken place in relation to the proposals including a meeting between College Principals and Student Presidents on the 29 October 2014 and informal briefing sessions with Trade Union bodies in all three Colleges.

The questions that respondents were asked to consider in the consultation document and website were:

1. How far do you agree that the underlying principles are appropriate?
2. Reflecting on the range of evidence reviewed within the Vision for College Learning, the Glasgow Colleges' Environmental Scan and the Initial Curriculum Review, are there any additional evidence sources that you feel we should consider?
3. In terms of the Curriculum Activity proposals, to what extent do you consider the analysis and proposals to be appropriate and in accordance with the underlying principles?
4. In terms of the Curriculum Location proposals, to what extent do you consider the analysis and proposals to be appropriate and in accordance with the underlying principles?
5. Are there any other issues related to the curriculum and estates proposals you feel we should consider?
6. Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

## RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION

- 1 Through the website:  
43 respondents, however 1 response was completely blank and 1 contained an email address only with no responses to consultation questions.

The 41 responses analysed therefore comprised:

31 College staff: (11 City of Glasgow)  
(2 Glasgow Clyde)  
(3 Glasgow Kelvin)  
(15 not identified).

9 – Other Agencies (8 identifiable)

Glasgow Disability Alliance	Equality Challenge Unit
Milnbank Housing Association	The Wheatley Group
Creative Scotland	Glasgow City Council elected members x 3

1 – Student Association (City of Glasgow)

- 2 Additionally, written responses were received from:

- EIS/FELA – Glasgow Kelvin College.
- EIS/FELA – Glasgow Regional Committee.
- Glasgow City UNISON.
- City of Glasgow Student Association.
- Glasgow Clyde College Student Association.

- 3 Further Evidence feeding into this analysis:

- (a) Output from the stakeholder event 5 November; and  
(b) meeting of GCSP Principals with Student Presidents and Vice Principals

## KEY THEMES EMERGING FROM THE RESPONSES

- General concern that the timescale for the consultation process was too short.
- General acceptance that the principles as expressed are sound.
- A number of concerns that the proposals are designed to fill a funding gap for the City of Glasgow's new build.
- Strong concerns that the needs of local communities and those furthest from employment must remain a focus for college delivery.
- A number of responses identified potential travel difficulties for students required to move across the City.
- Concern that the cuts identified for the creative and cultural industries are too great and that sufficient attention has not been paid to the nature of employment in this area.

## ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN RESPONSES

### **UNISON**

The format of the response did not address the specific consultation questions directly but a range of observations and comments were made. Whilst there was an acknowledgement that the principles around future delivery of FE were generally sound there were a range of concerns identified. These included;

Concerns                      a requirement for more information around the proposals staffing and student implications; financial and equality impact assessments; and a commitment to no compulsory redundancies.

Additionally Unison felt unable to fully consult with members due to timescale of the consultation, feeling that it was too short and that the consultation process was therefore rushed.

### **CITY OF GLASGOW COLLEGE STUDENT ASSOCIATION**

15 Focus Groups across 70 courses with 136 students taking part.

	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Question 1	85%	15%
Question 2	46%	54%
Question 3	64%	36%
Question 4	70%	30%

Key Issues:

- concerns around reduced choice – especially around creative industries;
- a number of responses identified potential travel complications;
- positives – better facilities and resources –make best of new buildings; and
- concern around potential disruption to courses.

### **GLASGOW CLYDE STUDENT ASSOCIATION**

1907 surveys completed. 10 focus groups – over 300 students. 102 email responses

Concerns

- a feeling that the proposals were driven by funding requirements of city centre building - “bums on seats” within City of Glasgow buildings;
- potential reduction in community based provision;
- strong feeling that reduction in creative industries not right – majority of work in creative industries is freelance – not

Report on the responses to the Curriculum and Estates Plan consultation:  
December 2014

- considered within C.E.R;
- concern that 1% increase in health, care and education should be higher; and
- reference to 2.5% increase in community locations but no detail.

### ***EIS FELA: KELVIN BRANCH***

The response from EIS/FELA was in narrative format and expressed a range of concerns and observations

- Concerns
- impact of proposals on staff and learners at Kelvin – greater impact on Kelvin – threatens sustainability ;
  - welcome small overall increase for FE in Glasgow. However, impact of further regional efficiencies would detrimental to both staff and students;
  - questions around VS scheme - whilst 64 FTE teaching post going at Clyde and Kelvin there's an increase of 95 FTE at City of Glasgow;
  - no opposition of closure of City Campus but concerns around process;
  - unsure of how TUPE would operate across independent organisations;
  - further detail on curriculum required;
  - resources/accommodation must be fully explored including advice from specialists – potential under use of specialist facilities in other areas of the City – questionable use of public money;
  - range of concerns around practicality of implementing all of the staff changes that would be required;
  - no clear educational rationale for proposals – driven by a financial imperative to fill, and pay for, City of Glasgow new build;
  - two tier system – poor opportunities in communities and decreased progression;
  - concerns around concentration of STEM subjects – geographically skewed; and
  - all proposals should be risk and equality impact assessed.

## **EIS/FELA – GLASGOW REGIONAL COMMITTEE**

The response from EIS/FELA was in narrative format and expressed a range of concerns and observations

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Concerns                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- consultation period too short;</li><li>- proposals driven by funding requirement of City of Glasgow build rather than educational considerations;</li><li>- serious concerns for community based provision and a reduction in opportunity – two tier system with less opportunity for FE provision closer to city centre and less opportunity for HE in wider geographical area – impact on communities in areas served by Kelvin – highest deprivation indices;</li><li>- some concerns around travel arrangements and parking in the city centre;</li><li>- concentration of STEM provision in the city centre will reduce accessibility opportunities in local communities;</li><li>- concern around overall reduction in provision for ASN; DPG18; lack of detail; and</li><li>- further information requirements around a range of detailed proposals on how these arrangements will be delivered.</li></ul>  |
| Estates related matters | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- concern specifically around City of Glasgow capability to replace the current estate in relation to the capacity of the new build;</li><li>- specialist areas in other Colleges may become under-utilised;</li><li>- ongoing reduction in the number of centres offering education and training opportunities;</li><li>- further information requirements around room usage;</li><li>- independent audit required of SFC's decision making processes and risk assessment around the funding of the new City of Glasgow buildings;</li><li>- mergers that created Glasgow Clyde and Glasgow Kevin were subject to significant due diligence – to which the SFC contributed – however impact of City of Glasgow building developments does not appear to have been factored in;</li><li>- attitude and culture – catalogue of issues directed at City of Glasgow College: EIS-FLA could not agree to proposals that would result in relocation of staff until issues are satisfactorily resolved;</li><li>- concern about the amount of money required for VS;</li><li>- further detail required around staffing arrangements; and</li><li>- questions around arms length foundations.</li></ul> |



## **STAKEHOLDER EVENT – WEDNESDAY 5 NOVEMBER**

Output from the stakeholder event was grouped around the 6 questions asked in the consultation document:

**Q1:** How far do you agree that the underlying principles (Section 1.2) are appropriate?

- It was generally accepted that the principles as set out are appropriate.
- need to emphasise more the continuum of educational provision: widen out to include secondary schools and Universities.

**Q2:** Reflecting on the range of evidence reviewed within the Vision for College Learning, the Glasgow Colleges Environmental Scan and the Initial Curriculum Review, are there any additional evidence sources you feel we should consider?

- acceptance that a wide range of sources have been used.
- questions around reliability and robustness of evidence.
- sources of data used to predict changes in curriculum – how convinced are we that these are accurate.
- occupations in creative industries versus creative occupations – could be significantly under-estimating the employment opportunities that creative brings: linked to freelance opportunities in most creative areas.
- need further detail on provision to support learners with disabilities and additional support needs.
- regional data versus national activity.

**Q3:** In terms of the Curriculum Activity proposals (Section 3), to what extent do you consider the analysis and proposals to be appropriate and in accordance with the underlying principles?

- Creative and Cultural Industries: difficulty of identifying exact requirements because of the nature of employment in this area. Have we considered all of the angles in the robustness of the data?
- if 48% of city population do not hold a qualification above SCQF level 5 is the balance of FE/HE correct?
- noted imbalance of course popularity to employment opportunities.
- need to take a fresh look at part-time/community based/adult learning provision.
- need to build in entrepreneurship training to courses where employment destination is likely to be non-traditional.

**Q4:** In the terms of the Curriculum Location proposals (Section 4), to what extent do you consider the analysis and proposals to be appropriate and in accordance with the underlying principles?

- locations should not exclude learners. Transport issues across the city in relation to the ways in which students travel – not always easy.

- need more information about where individuals want to learn.
- must not lose local level access as a result of centralisation. Community delivery very important to addressing needs of all region.
- could the development of specialisms in certain Colleges impact negatively on access?
- some concern that current estates strategy – new build in city centre – doesn't fit with principles.
- need to meet the needs of whole region – not just Glasgow City – take account of travel to study issues as well as deprivation.

Q5: Are there any other issues related to the curriculum and estates proposals you feel we should consider?

- concern over increasing centralisation.
- important to reduce unnecessary duplication.
- time allocated to consultation and considerations of responses is not sufficient.

Q6: Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

- Sector Skills Councils can help with some of this work.
- CIPD could help with some of the skills sets, work placements.
- tremendous opportunity for Colleges to get this right and show best practice.
- more active involvement with employers.
- concerns that further cuts to FE funding over the next four years will jeopardise the sustainability of Clyde and Kelvin.
- timescale for change is too short.

## WEBSITE ANALYSIS

The responses to the questions that were obtained through the website have been split into two categories of response; College staff and other agencies.

Q1: How far do you agree that the underlying principles (Section 1.2) are appropriate?

**Staff** – number of responses: 28

Supportive	Unsupportive	Neutral
21	2	5

Key Issues:

- “no evidence provided whatsoever to back up principles”.
- difficulties in defining necessary and unnecessary duplications.
- building a super College in the city centre won't address the needs of vulnerable learners.
- cut of 3% in creative industries ludicrous.
- too much focus on community; need to consider courses of national significance.
- increase in activity at access level good for potential students.
- geographical constraint is evident in the report.
- principles needs to explicitly address equality, diversity and inclusion.

**Other Agencies** - number of responses: 8

Supportive	Unsupportive	Neutral
8	0	-

Key Issues:

- key principle to support access and inclusion .
- will allow vulnerable people local access.
- partnership working is the key to success in delivering the benefits to all stakeholders.
- specific reference to communities linking into College resources and support to build capacity should be built into strategy.
- these principles could be used in future years to support the ongoing review of the curriculum in Glasgow.

**Q2:** Reflecting on the range of evidence reviewed within the Vision for College Learning, the Glasgow Colleges Environmental Scan and the Initial Curriculum Review, are there any additional evidence sources you feel we should consider?

**Staff** – number of responses: 29

Yes	No	Other
10	11	8

Key Issues:

- what do students want?
- ask the staff; they know best about what is important and how and where to deliver it.
- should have been attempt to link future skills and job prospects with specific project e.g. Future City; City Deal; Development of A9.
- a number of responses suggested that Creative Skills Investment Plan (not yet published) would lead to a different conclusion on creative and cultural decisions.

**Other Agencies** – number of responses: 9

Yes	No	Other
6	1	2

Key Issues:

- consider evidence from disabled people and those with additional needs; both those who have engaged with Colleges and those who have not.
- to what extent have local communities been consulted about their needs.
- greater emphasis on the priorities of the three local CPP Boards.

**Q3:** In terms of the Curriculum Activity proposals (Section 3), to what extent do you consider the analysis and proposals to be appropriate and in accordance with the underlying principles?

**Staff** – number of responses: 29

Agree Appropriate	Disagree	Other
15	7	7

Key Issues:

- almost all respondents who disagree cite the cuts in the creative industries as being wrong and out of line with industry needs.
- needs to be further engagement with employers.
- clear objectives across the Region for inclusion and creating an inclusive College should be set.

**Other Agencies** – number of responses: 8

Agree Appropriate	Disagree	Other
4	1	3

Key Issues:

- comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment of proposals required.
- support for digital skills should be embedded across all areas of the curriculum.
- would have been helpful to explain where community based access level provision would be delivered.
- commitment to delivering STEM subjects at all three Colleges would be welcomed.
- a clear statement to avoid academic drift towards HE provision would reinforce the proposed FE/HE split as set out in the document.
- reduction in the share of the creative and culture curriculum in Glasgow Colleges may have an impact nationally and hinder the Colleges in fulfilling specific stated principles.

Q4: In the terms of the Curriculum Location proposals (Section 4), to what extent do you consider the analysis and proposals to be appropriate and in accordance with the underlying principles?

**Staff** – number of responses: 26

Agree Appropriate	Disagree	Other
14	2	10

Key Issues:

- closing provision in one location will not automatically mean that students will move to another.
- a number of responses highlighted the travel issues associated with relocation of provision.
- Equality Impact Assessment should be undertaken in relation to the proposed location of curriculum.
- courses should be based in the best facilities.
- principles also highlight the need for continued learner centred provision within

local community College campuses.

**Other Agencies** – number of responses: 8

Agree Appropriate	Disagree	Other
5	1	2

Key Issues:

- comprehensive Equality Impact Assessments required, together with specific analysis of ethnicity and proposed locations. Potential that BME communities are not served by locations of provision.
- local community activity must be delivered universally to deprived communities across the city.
- need to confirm the need for a range of levels of qualifications in each of the three Colleges.

Q5: Are there any other issues related to the curriculum and estates proposals you feel we should consider?

**Staff** – number of responses: 31

No further Issues	Issues Identified	No response (blank)
6	19	6

Key Issues:

- need to provide local access level courses across the city.
- need to ensure that all estates are fit for purpose and used efficiently.
- planning is still at a high level leading to uncertainty for staff.
- comments around necessity to more fully investigate the creative industries data.

**Other Agencies** – number of responses: 10

No Further Issues	Issues Identified	Other
1	4	5

Key Issues:

- how will individuals with disabilities be engaged directly in the consultation.
- there should be a commitment to ensuring that campuses serving residents in the poorest communities in Glasgow will be maintained and appropriately resourced.
- key priorities of Glasgow's Single Outcome Agreement should be supported by providing sufficient resources to ensure that learners from the poorest communities in Glasgow have access to a range of programmes.

Report on the responses to the Curriculum and Estates Plan consultation:  
December 2014

Q6: Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

**Staff** – number of responses: 31

Yes	No
13	18

No clear Issues – a range of individual comments:

- some references to poor staff morale
- couple of comments in relation to creative industries and the opposition to the proposed cuts in this area

**Other Agencies** – number of responses: 10

Yes	No
5	5

Key Issues:

- more notice should be given to consultation events.
- larger, more centralised Colleges may not address the needs of local community provision. Existing campuses should be retained as these are essential community resources.
- Colleges must work in partnership with City Council, CPP Boards and other agencies to ensure the regeneration of deprived areas and address the consequences of poverty.
- Glasgow Regional Board should be accountable directly to the communities of the Region for the decisions that it makes with regard to the allocation of resources to the Assigned Colleges.