



Bridging Programme Advisory Group: Recommendation 7

Donaldson Room, Apex 1, Scottish Enterprise, 99 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh

Tuesday 29 October 2019

10am to noon

- | | Paper |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Welcome and introductions
Welcome to new members | Oral |
| 2. Note of 24 June 2019 meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question about credit bearing which will count towards RPL (use in university) – not ruled out but not focus.• Use of ALL – can we use this – there will be pupils who will be disadvantaged but may not need opportunities like this – resources – need to target – can this be used as an alternative.• Combining bottom two bullet points - interventions must be appropriate to learners not just given because students tick a box. | Note/240619 |
| 3. Relevant Policy Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recognition that this is not everything which is being funded by SFC and there are other programmes which feed into Bridging.• LEAPS – review of summer school – looking to moving Bridging into school year (influence from Top Up) – popular idea in schools. Build and test over next three years. Schools have school college partnership in timetables where they work or travel columns so these can be developed around that. Delivered in schools? Working with delivery partners. Could be done twice per year, may be some remoteness. Will work alongside other things running in summers. Likely to offer around 14 different courses, hoping to test delivery in new year.• Do alongside other Highers in S5/6?• Provision has to be able to evolve within the framework.• There is a need to be able to see the framework and the objectives of the different elements.• YASS – already delivering alongside school curriculum and universal offer – all but 1 LA taken up – positive feedback on | 19/05 |

skills preparation to enable easier segway into university study. Builds on existing infrastructure – curriculum. Work with school coordinators. Developments – conversations with SHEP to develop pipeline and avoid duplication. Looking at curriculum developments to offer what is most interesting to pupils.

4. Group Aims and Objectives

19/06

- Would be useful to set mapping against definition of issue we are trying to solve. Is it about gaps in provision? Recognition that pupils are not getting qualifications that enable access? How much is about depth and specificity? How much about broad academic skills. If we can come up with 3 sets of issues we are trying to work on and then map against mapping info. All issues become important when looking at how to set out framework. Not all credit bearing elements will be appropriate – need to make sure appropriate. What does scale up mean? What is potential? Is there a target? Meaningful based on flow through schools?
- What does success look like through different lenses? Use personas? What does it mean for teacher, pupils etc? Effective way to communicate with stakeholders. Force us to be tighter in success of bridging programme framework.
- Flesh out framework definition etc, not this aims and objectives documents. Need this for engaging with stakeholders
- Need a dialogue around this with admissions officers – what is effective and what is needed? Need to bear in mind that this will be different in different institutions admissions processes. Perception that this will never be good enough by some stakeholders.
- Evolutionary framework in first instance but building blocks to grow beyond initial point
- Need time to establish data and outcomes.
- Data framework around this – how do we build in feedback loops. (PF note – does this fit in with SCAPP?) Trust is a key issue. Individual bridging not ruled out but need degree of trust for national programme. Making this transparent – who is accepting what? Needs to be a degree of transparency if this is a public framework.
- We need to understand behaviour, supply pipeline, openness in what institutions are doing in bridging. Needs to be recognised in broader sense in OA's etc.
- Should there be a nominated sector rep in SCQF

conversations? Two people – one who has non-SCQF and one SCQF provision.

- What level are we looking at agreement wise?
- How will evaluation of model be funded?
- Partnership agreements – do we need any? All publish entrance reqs, all have entrants in OA's around access – acknowledge compliance with framework in either or both of these? Do things like this already. Options to level of signing up to framework? Collective organisations may have partnership agreement to deliver which is different to accepting into admissions processes.
- Credit has to be something you have to achieve, not just a participation requirement. There will then be recognition of value added over and above academic you get. Use existing channels – the more likely it will become embedded rather than an add on. Brings a strategic approach and parity with other elements of credit bearing. Efficiency and practicality – could not have so many agreements. Rewording of action to capture this (ACTION) – need to be careful around this – need to think holistically in terms of existing structures.
- Build in expectation of launch and when it will be adopted in terms of recognition. Recognised across piece for 2021 entry and then built up – manage expectations.
- What do we do when there is a new player? What happens when there is concerns?
- Framework design – governance structure developed around this at early stage. May be vested in practitioner group.
- Also needs to be timeframes around this. Wouldn't want people to be adding – would need a process. Governance has to be there with clear process and timeline who allows anyone who wants to put forward a proposal.
- Exploring incentives – mechanisms could be too much and don't want to be too – incentives and levers to want to be part of this.
- Create an environment where there is incentive to be part of it – institutions derive benefit – encourage more collaborative working. A lot happening in this space but individual working with a funding framework which forces this rather than true collaboration. Lighten the load for everyone if we incentivise.
- Beyond Nov 2020 – we capture something about need to be clear about implementation pathway and timelines associated with that.

5. Bridging Provision

19/07

- Want to avoid delving into what programmes are doing on the ground. Trust in practitioners.
- Series of actions – some of which are connected, some developed independently. Key question to Gov – what is the pipeline coming out of schools, scale and realistic ask of learners coming through Bridging programmes. Sits with Government – need data on this (SFC to gather) How many might be in a position where one grade bump can get them in? Band above lowest where targeted schemes can make a difference – collectively we need to understand potential pull and then with institutional framework how does this map scale to framework. Determines volume of framework. UCAS info on school leaver applicants who at end of cycle are unplaced? Want to create robust pathways which achieve success. May be groups who are not applying at all.
- Logical extension of framework – would need to ensure admissions processes look at this the same way.
- Qualifications are , volume, number.
- Not scale up but more transparent system?
- What might a recognition framework look like? – small number of programme managers with admissions officers? Or all programmes on spreadsheet? Elements of both – start with small number and then develop a focussed workshop. Include those who are in process of how new developments are working – what problems are they trying to solve which is not being covered by current provision.
- How do we define the small group.
- Message needs to be that this is first step and then we will add everyone to this – no exclusions.
- Three key themes to be included in first group – online/not online, SCQF/notSCQF, summer/non summer (incl. institution specific? But that makes it tricky for that person if national). Take 5 examples rather than going for big national programmes? Not everyone might want to be part of bridging framework. At least two or three should bring admissions people to so we can have conversation at same time.
- At end of this, institutions with very specific bridge – we should still acknowledge as part of the framework.
- Do we work in information on subject specific issues – e.g. access to Chemistry - use framework to create framework around this. Identify need across the sector.

- Suggestion for larger scale – innovation school in GSA facilitated – good views of distilling views. (EXPLORE THIS)

Actions:

- Problem trying to solve?
- changes to wording around agreements etc.
- Gov for statistics to understand the pipeline of learners which could benefit. Scale of national demand and how we understand. Done through UCAS too?
- Pamela to identify 5 institutions/programmes – how can we develop recognition across various programmes – deliver what's there, etc. Then use that to create a proposition to bring to wider group programmes identified and do bigger workshop. Then after this - consultation. (core content, is it regional?)
- Participants from small group then took to SCQF before we group
-
- Similar plan to APSG

6. Summary of Next Steps

7. Any Other Business

Communication around this – consciously thinking about who, how we communicate.

- Joint action – SFC and uni Scotland – briefing for the sector. (ACTION)