

AAG

Minutes of Meeting

Date	04/03/2021
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, Stuart McKenna - STF, Dr Alison Eales – Quality Assurance Agency for Scotland, Bethany Welsh – Balfour Beatty, Julia Stevenson - Scottish Water, Alison Bucknell – FISSS, Tommy Breslin – STUC, Jennifer Tempany – Colleges Scotland, Elizabeth McGuire – Education Scotland, Sheila Dunn – The SCQF Partnership, Michelle Gibson - SDS, Gordon Wishart – SDS

		Action
1.	Apologies & Guests	
	Apologies: Joan MacKay – Education Scotland Guests: Paul Gibson – Scottish Government, Terry Dillon – Skills Development Scotland, Jamie Hepburn – Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills	
2.	Welcome	
	RJ welcomed all to the meeting.	
3.	Minutes of Last Meeting	
	The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved, and all actions were marked completed.	
4.	FAQ’s & positioning on Project Management	

	<p>TD provided an update on the pages of FAQ's that were developed on Project Management and encouraged AAG members to provide any feedback necessary. There was a query regarding whether Core/Career skills conversations are part of the TEGs, and this was confirmed by TD to be the case, with VR confirming these conversations at a TEG she recently attended. Within the next couple of meetings, TD can share roadmap for TEG development for the next 2 years.</p> <p>*ACTION - Feedback on text in FAQ - Comments to be given back to GW to collate.</p> <p>TD also provided an update on commissioning for a video around the development process enabling anyone to have a look and find out more information – this along with the FAQs will provide content for app.scot enabling stakeholders to learn more about the process.</p> <p>It was noted that as part of the Environmental Review within the principles – it would be good to detail further changes surrounding the Development process. TD confirmed that broader discussion surrounding principles to ensure they are future fit will be tabled at SAAB in May.</p> <p>TD gave an introduction to the Project Management framework.</p>	
5.	<p>Framework Review – Project Management</p>	
	<p>General feedback was that the documentation was easy to read and told the story efficiently overall.</p> <p>Executive Summary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAG – SM raised concerns that only 1 of 5 Training Providers currently delivering Project Management had been involved in the consultation. • VR expressed it may be useful that after this TA is approved to undertake an exercise comparing the old framework and the new framework to form a 'from, to'. AAG Members agreed that this would be useful to them going forward. <p>AAG Subgroup Checklist;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified the challenge surrounding the qualification and accreditation. • Noted that this references the Occupational Profile and Qualification Design Specification, which only goes to the Sub Group. This document was intended to provide assurance that the Sub Group has referenced documents which AAG don't see, and that they have ensured they feed in to the main documents and provide coherence. Clarity was 	

given as to why Subgroup received documentation that AAG did not. There's an opportunity to further provide further assurance on this subject within existing documents and being able to give documentation to members who require it.

AAD;

- There was an ask from JS to provide more information on equalities in consultation, surrounding who was involved on TEG and responses received – in order for her to feed into SAAB EEG more effectively.
- It was noted that responses are quite short from SDS, especially on funding and consultation. TD responded that funding would not significantly change and in future there would be more detailed responses to these and other areas.
- There were concerns raised over the response rate to consultation. In the future it was suggested that representative sampling and representative responses from samples may be the best approach – with an opportunity to share this with the group in more detail to provide assurance particularly with Unions and Training Providers.
- Principle 8 – Why are GA's exempt from this? This will be taken back to the TEG Managers and response given to group.

Final S&F Document;

- It was noted that feedback from learning provider to employer is missing to form continuous improvement back in December – and it's still missing now. There was an ask to add in a section under learning provider to provide feedback to employer on their own performance, and for the apprentice to provide feedback. Focus on engaging all 3 parties.
- Clarity required on page 5 regarding leadership from an employer point of view. What does this mean with regards to the apprenticeship?

Decision;

AAG **approved** this framework with the following conditions;

- That the remaining Training Providers are consulted.
- Approval of the assessment strategy.
- Confirmation of credit rating.
- Accreditation of the qualification.
- Other minor grammatical/formatting amends.

6.	Meet the minister – AAG update and Q&A	
	AAG Members introduced themselves to the Minister and gave a brief presentation on AAG's remit and journey so far. The Minister positively endorsed the process and strategy and thanked all members for their input and commitment.	
7.	AOB	
	TB gave his apologies in advance of the next meeting. RJ closed the meeting, AAG will next meet on 18/03.	