

# AAG

## Minutes of Meeting

<b>Date</b>	15/04/2021
<b>Time</b>	10:00am-12:00pm
<b>Location</b>	MS Teams Call
<b>Present</b>	George Brown – SQA Accreditation (Vice-Chair), Stuart McKenna - STF, Julia Stevenson - Scottish Water, Alison Bailey-Bucknell – FISSS, Elizabeth McGuire – Education Scotland, Sheila Dunn – The SCQF Partnership, Tommy Breslin – STUC, Bethany Welsh – Balfour Beatty, Victoria Roberts – Scottish Government, Michelle Gibson - SDS, Gordon Wishart – SDS

		Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies &amp; Guests</b>	
	Apologies: Joan MacKay – Education Scotland, Dr Alison Eales – Quality Assurance Agency for Scotland, Scott Baker - BT, Ruth Jennings – Sainsbury’s (Chair), Jennifer Tempany – Colleges Scotland  Guests: Paul Gibson – Scottish Government	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	GB welcomed all to the meeting in RJ’s absence.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b>	
	The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved, and all actions were marked completed.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Framework Reviews</b>	
	<b>Pharmacy Services at SCQF Level 6</b>	

- AAG noticed there has been 54 starts in the past year for the Level 6 SVQ, showing the SVQ has been used but the framework has not. Rationale required as to why this is new SVQ will encourage use of the apprenticeship?
- Under Point 2 in the AAG Feedback from last meeting, *“Members noted that there was nothing other than the SVQ and embedded core skills in the SCQF Level 6 MA. Is there any added value to this apprenticeship other than the SVQ that could be detailed? Is there an opportunity to add any enhancements or optional outcomes?”* – AAG members asked for more clarity on the added value of the apprenticeship.

### **Pharmacy Services at SCQF Level 8**

- Enhancement codes are incorrect, AAG members requested that SQA 4&2 codes are used.

**AAG did not approve this framework and will come back for electronic approval.**

**\*ACTION - GW to inform developer of AAG Decision and obtain amended documentation and feedback for electronic approval.**

GW

### **Optical Practice Support at SCQF Level 7**

- The CBQ has not yet been accredited so this framework can only be approved in principle for now.
- AAG Members noted that no Training Providers are in place to deliver. More information is required on the progress of this.
- AAG queried the level of Core Skills consultation in the proposal. There were questions over whether levelling had been discussed and clarity is required in this area.
- Confirmation required that BII are committed to continuing with the SCQF Level 5 qualification for Optical Practice Support.
- Question around how will the SCQF Level 7 Framework offers progression from the SCQF Level 5 when there are so few doing the SCQF Level 5 (9 starts since 19/20).
- TB to check membership of Union Bodies detailed in the proposal.

**AAG did not approve this framework.**

**\*ACTION - GW to inform developer of AAG Decision and obtain amended documentation and feedback for electronic approval.**

GW

### **Providing Security Officer Services at SCQF Level 5**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AAG Members requested that all codes referring to a particular Awarding Body should be removed within the Enhancements.</li> <li>• AAG queried the level of Core Skills consultation in the proposal. There were questions over whether levelling had been discussed and clarity is required in this area.</li> <li>• AAG proposed Skills for Security come to an AAG Meeting to further discuss this framework.</li> </ul> <p><b>AAG did not approve this framework.</b></p> <p><b>*ACTION - GW to inform developer of AAG Decision and invite them to an upcoming AAG meeting.</b></p>	GW
5.	<b>Firefighting MA Query</b>	
	<p>GW was contacted a few weeks ago by Sharon Wilton at WDT on behalf of the SFRS, regarding the Firefighting Apprenticeship developed in 2018. They have their first batch of learners finished all aspects of the apprenticeship, except from IT and Numeracy Core Skills at SCQF Level 6 which are separately certificated. They asked if they could submit a new mapping exercise to show that these core skills were mapped to a mandatory enhancement. However, Core Skills must be mapped only to the mandatory outcome.</p> <p>This left SFRS in a position with no option but to separately certificate these Core Skills. They are not an approved centre to do this and are currently talking to TP's to contract this out. They may come back to AAG with a rationale to have Core Skills lowered. It would then need to be considered whether that can be used for future cohorts or if a revisiting of what the frameworks needs is sought.</p> <p>AAG advice is to revisit the Core Skills signposting to look for naturally occurring evidence where the learners may already have generated evidence for these core skills.</p>	
6.	<b>AOB</b>	
	GB closed the meeting.	