

AAG

Minutes of Meeting

Date	03/12/2020
Time	10:00am-12:00pm
Location	MS Teams Call
Present	Ruth Jennings – Sainsbury’s (Chair), George Brown – SQA Accreditation (Vice-Chair), Scott Baker - BT, Victoria Roberts – Scottish Government, Sheila Dunn – The SCQF Partnership, Stuart McKenna - STF, Alison Bucknell – FISSS, Dr Alison Eales – Quality Assurance Agency for Scotland, Tommy Breslin – STUC, Jennifer Tempany – Colleges Scotland, Elizabeth McGuire – Education Scotland, Michelle Gibson - SDS, Gordon Wishart – SDS

		Action
1.	Apologies & Guests	
	<p>Apologies: Joan MacKay – Education Scotland, Bethany Welsh – Balfour Beatty, Julia Stevenson - Scottish Water</p> <p>Guests: Terry Dillon – SDS, Frank Quinn – SDS, Paul Gibson – Scottish Government</p>	
2.	Welcome	
	<p>RJ welcomed all to the meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that the agenda had been reshuffled to accommodate a request from Frank Quinn to approve FA Care Amendments. Core Skills Certification conversations/updates would now take place in January.</p> <p>It was also noted that Environmental Discussions had been postponed until the next SAAB SFG.</p>	
3.	Minutes of Last Meeting	

	The minutes of the last meeting were read & approved.	
4.	Framework Reviews	
	<p>Project Management – TEG Developed</p> <p>Apprenticeship Approval Document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the new documentation layout is a huge improvement on what already exists, looks a lot more professional and easier to understand. • Concern that the Introduction from the TEG Chair was very similar across both documents. Members are keen that this doesn't end up as a cut and paste activity. MG aware of this concern and says there is plans to make the next developments' introduction more tailored to sectors. • The qualification is not yet credit rated as it hasn't been approved, feedback from members was to make sure it's clear that the level given is 'proposed'. There will be room for an amendment if after the credit rating process, it comes out a different level. • Members requested that Sub Group comments for each principle are built in to the documentation, providing extra assurance to AAG. *ACTION – Add Sub Group Comments to the Documentation when they come back for resubmission. • The view from the group was that the whole document felt a bit sanitised and didn't seem to show the full journey of the TEG's. MG noted that there is a 95 page stakeholder engagement document available to show journey. AAG Members suggested reflecting more upon key areas of discussion and disagreement, and generally giving more information when these are resubmitted. • Qualification not yet available however when it is will be sent to AAG Members. • Feeling that the document's do not set out why the need for apprentices in the sector is important. It sets out why Project Management is important to the economy but not why apprentices are needed in the sector. Need more of a specific explanation on this. • The Group noted that it is difficult to talk about pathway progression when no qualification is available. • Members asked for clarity on what a 'high standard of literacy and numeracy' meant. • AAG Members questioned why Career Skills were not used. MG informed them that it was simply that TEG were highly engaged in Metaskills and didn't wish to pursue other avenues. • Documentation seems to be very employer focused and doesn't include the apprentice voice which VR mentioned was strong at TEGs she attended. 	MG

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principle 2 – KSB’s, GB raised the question whether or not Training Providers are confident with assessing behaviours? – *ACTION - SM will get back to GB on this. *ACTION – Members unsure if the principle of assessment had been agreed. MG to check. • Disappointment expressed that only 2 TP’s had responded to consultation. Noted that there were more Training Provider’s on the PAG. Members suggested updating to include consultation methods with Training providers and rationale as to why there is only 2 responses. Also noted that there was no indication of response rate in general and this should be included. • Would be good to include NOS branding where they have been used. Especially under Principle 9 to make it clear that they are transferable and can be used across the UK. • Members suggested including a ‘TEG Summary’ to consolidate the story of the TEG and avoid reading a 95-page document at the introduction section? This would also help with previous comments that the document feels very sanitised. • AAG Members to circulate the rest of their comments to GW as discussions overran. <p>Occupational Profile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front page is incorrect and refers to Providing Financial Services, have to correct this. Also refers to SCQF Level 6 which has not yet been approved, has to include ‘projected’ • Occupational Standards developed by the TEG Group – NOS are independently developed and approved. Concerns expressed that there seems to be a bit of a conflict on interest on the TEG as Standards are TEG developed and approved. TD cleared this up explaining work situations are developed by the Technical Writer based on the SBA Workshops with current people in the role. No overarching group signing off the Occupation Profiles. Employers might know what they want, however may not be able to express it in a way which is assessable. *ACTION - TD to investigate this and explain the involvement of the PAG and the QDG. <p>Apprenticeship Final</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to GA should be changed to Graduate Apprenticeships and generally reduce use of acronyms. • Members expressed concerns over the inclusion of age 16 in this document. Was noted that these are not entry level jobs. No mention of age on PFS documentation at all. What is the consistent approach, to use ages or not use ages? This should be defined when resubmitting. 	<p>SM</p> <p>MG</p> <p>TD</p>
--	---	-------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to Levelling should be renamed. SD to propose text to use on front page of apprenticeship final and send to GW. *ACTION – SD to send GW/TD link and text to use for this section. • *ACTION - TD to return at next meeting to provide updates in the interim between now and the qualification being approved. • AAG Cannot approve as qualification not yet available. <p>Providing Financial Services – TEG Developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern from members that this appeared to look more like a Customer Services Qualification. • All other comments to be given to GW as discussions overran. • AAG Cannot approve as qualification not yet available. <p>Technical Apprenticeship in Construction at SCQF Level 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The framework was reviewed by the Group. • Everything seemed to be in order, however Members would like to know the rationale for the addition of the HNC. • Members approved this framework in principle to the rationale being provided. 	SD TD
5.	FA Care Adaptations	
	FQ presented on adaptation requests to be made to Care at SCQF Level 6. This was approved by AAG Members.	
6.	AOB	
	RJ thanked all those in attendance and closed the meeting.	