

<b>Apologies &amp; absences:</b> Donald Lumsden (SDS) Lindsay Hewitt (OU), Ernie Romer (Forth Valley College), Tracey Dalling (West Lothian College), Karen Murray (Oatridge College), Ian Cockbain/Kate Davidson (Stirling University), Ian Sutherland (Heriot Watt), (Fiona Gunn (Stevenson College), Antonia Palmer (Edinburgh College of Art),		<b>Sederunt:</b> Marian Docherty, Chair , (Newbattle Abbey College) Kerry Musselbrook (South East Forum), Ged Lerpiniere (LEAPS), Kathleen Hood (Edinburgh University), Alan McLachlan (Queen Margaret University) Jayne Gracie (Borders College), Gayle Henderson (Routes 2 Success), Myra McCabe (Telford College), Pat Garforth (Skills Development Scotland) for Donald Lumsden			<b>Minutes Taken By:</b> Eilidh Chalmers (SEF)
<b>No.</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies	The Chair welcomed the group to the meeting  Members did a round table of introductions; a warm welcome was extended to Pat Garforth from SDS who was attending the meeting on Donald Lumsden's behalf.			For information
2.	Draft Minutes of previous meeting (P1)	The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.			For information
3.	Matters Arising	College partners had agreed to investigate what an admissions pledge for college would like. GL informed the group that BL, MM and himself were arranging a meeting to discuss this in more detail.  GH also reported to the group that the Routes 2 Success Steering Group had discussed this and given that all College applicants are interviewed as a matter of course they were unsure how to add value	BL, MM, GL	Feb 2010	Ongoing



		<p>Inclusion Committee when it meets on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2010 will make recommendations on how to take forward work with communities and the role of the forums.</p> <p>Management Exchange is now nearing the end of their piece of work in developing SEF's community transitions strategy. They have met extensively, and produced a draft report. Management Exchange and KM are due to meet with the SFC on 5 Feb 2010 to share and discuss findings. It is hoped that this will help inform the AIC meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2010.</p>	KM/Management Exchange	5 Feb 2010	Ongoing
4.	<b>Future Direction</b>	<p>KM reported that the target schools had now been agreed with the SFC. These would be 19 schools across the South East. This will be discussed more fully under item 5.</p> <p><b>Forth Valley</b> KM up-dated the group on the work in Forth Valley, as it had previously been agreed that this post would be located in Stirling University. However, the Executive had sought the SFC's advice around this given the new national outcome agreements with the Forums and it was agreed that SEF needed a more integrated model. It was therefore agreed that the post should be based within LEAPS, subject to agreement with LEAPS and the support of the Forth Valley LEAs.</p>			<p>For Information</p> <p>For information</p>

		<p>KM informed the group that SEF and SFC representatives would be meeting with colleagues in the Forth Valley LEAs to discuss future plans and secure support.</p> <p>KM highlighted that the University of Stirling was a valued partner with a clear role for them to support and inform co-ordination and delivery of the programme.</p> <p><b>Staffing and costs</b> KM outlined that the Executive were looking at developing an integrated model and team. This would involve college and university partners working together. Future plans will not require a college-based officer, rather the Executive have identified a need for the whole team to extend their knowledge of the college sector.</p> <p>The Executive had agreed that SEF funding, with a total of £240k available, would be used to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>maintain the High Flyers activities, fund a Development Officer in the Borders and Forth Valley (subject to review after a year recognizing start up is more staffing intensive); cover the costs of activities; provide overheads to cover the costs of hosting staff. A model for how overhead costs is to be calculated is still to be agreed by</li> </ul>	KM, MD, LL & JG	Feb/March 2010	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p>
--	--	---	-----------------	----------------	--

		<p>the SEF Executive.</p> <p>The Executive have asked this group to look at the programme of activities SEF needs to increase progression to HE in college and university in target schools. They have also been asked to identify CPD needs for staff.</p> <p><b>Timescales</b> KM reported that the SFC requires the Forums to develop a proposal with target schools and the programme of activity by the end of February. This will be subject to recommendation and approval of the operational plan by SEF's college and university partners before it is submitted to the SFC by the end of March. This meeting will therefore be the last opportunity for this group to help inform the programme of activities required.</p> <p>GL asked for clarity in what would be needed and added that the LEAPS Management Group do not meet until mid March. This will then go back to the SEF Executive- Feb meeting date to be finalised.</p> <p>Forum Directors/Managers are meeting with Jon Gray to discuss timetables and Operational Plan requirements on 4 Feb 010.</p>			<p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

		KM and GL to meet to discuss costs to inform KM's development of SEF's Operational Plan.	KM/GL	Feb 2010	Ongoing
5.	SEF's target schools	<p><b>Target schools</b></p> <p>A paper outlining the progression rates for schools across the South East was distributed.</p> <p>KM advised of the way the target schools had been identified. There were 12 schools with 20% progression to HE or less over a 3 or 5 year period but there were a number of schools who were on the border of this %. In light of this, JG from the SFC agreed that all Forums could work with schools with progression rates up to 22% based on 3 or 5 year averages.</p> <p>There are 19 schools that SEF will work with across all local authorities except East Lothian. These have been agreed with the SFC.</p> <p>GL advised that LEAPs currently look at schools with rates up to 23% and would be scheduled to review their schools next year. KM advised that the SFC rule would mean that SEF could not support activity in any schools out with the 19 agreed schools.</p> <p>GL advised that the LEAPS service will continue in all other LEAPS partner schools.</p>			<p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p>

		<p>AM highlighted that not working within East Lothian was a loss, however there is added value that exists in the LEAPS model that brings in additional funding from LEAPS partners.</p> <p>There was discussion on what the forums would be required to report on. KM advised that we should report on activities delivered to target schools agreed with the SFC over a 3-5 year average. For SEF this would be the 19 schools agreed. It was recognised that, if the SFC report on schools in the lowest quintile on a yearly basis that there might not be an exact match. However, the SFC recognise that it is not sensible for the forums to review schools to be included in their programmes every year.</p> <p>GL reported that LEAPS would continue to work in LEAPS priority 1 schools.</p>			<p>For information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For information</p>
6.	<b>Forum programme of activities for 2010/11-</b>	<p>KM suggested to the group that they look at current LEAPS activities and highlight where any gaps are in meeting the new national outcome agreements with the forums. The group agreed that this was a useful way forward.</p> <p>AM highlighted to the group that the SFC paper outlines work should be with S3 onward and not S2 as previously thought. KM to clarify this and feedback.</p>	KM	As soon as possible	<p>For information</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

		<p>The group mapped the gaps in LEAPs current activities as follows:</p> <p><b>S2 &amp; S3 workshops</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These should be as broad as possible, covering all HE options in college and university, and a mix of college &amp; university elements.</li> <li>• Visit to a college campus should be added which would include HE course types.</li> <li>• There should be a balance across the programme of visits to college and university as opposed to doubling every element up in every year or school.</li> <li>• It is important that schools do not 'stream' the young people that are selected for these activities and limit their opportunities. This needs to be stressed to schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>S4 – S6 programme</b> As above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to build a volunteer base from across the colleges. GH highlighted the challenges in finding suitable college mentors. It was recognised that colleges had HND students for 2 years as opposed to 4 for degree students.</li> <li>• Link with ELRAH to identify students who have articulated to</li> </ul>			<p>For Information</p> <p>For Information</p> <p>For Information</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>university to widen the student volunteer base.</p> <p><b>S5 conference</b> - Need college input at conferences, include college financial information.</p> <p><b>S6 conference</b> -As above, may need a specific college workshop.</p> <p><b>S5, Typical student week</b> – Need to include college students and reflect diversity of HE courses.</p> <p><b>Pre- UCAS interviews</b> - Discussed how to add value to current interview process that takes place at colleges. College partners would need to support this process and would need to increase staff knowledge in running these.</p> <p><b>Art portfolio evening</b> – Should also include YP going to study art at college.</p> <p><b>Campus 09</b> – a college day should be added to this week-long residential event for the Scottish Borders students. Extend to Forth Valley also.</p> <p><b>Admissions pledge</b> – Group discussed this and agreed it needed to be joined up, however should be mindful of the expanding area that LEAPS will be working in and the effect this will have on Institutions that already have pressures on</p>			<p>For Information</p> <p>For Information</p> <p>For information</p> <p>For Information</p> <p>For Information</p> <p>For Information</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

	<p>their admissions.</p> <p><b>High Flyers</b> – It would be an aspiration to expand this to include one other school based on progression to HE rankings, namely Newbattle High School.</p> <p><b>Work with Parents</b> – LEAPS feels that it is successful at doing this through parents' evenings and events such as High Flyers.</p> <p>The group agreed that we should consider how to build links with community, CLD and CPP. Material for parents should also be considered. Could funding be diverted to community to deliver to hard to reach parents?</p> <p><b>Summer school</b> View expressed by college partners that pupils going onto HE in college would not be best served by the current LEAPS 8-week long Summer School. A shorter week long alternative should be explored. <i>(action for BL, MM, GL as noted earlier in this Minute).</i></p> <p><b>CPD needs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General CPD for college staff about university is needed.</li> <li>• The core LEAPS team would require support in increasing skills and knowledge of college sector and build contacts with key people. This identified as the initial number</li> </ul>				For Information
					For Information
					For information
					For information
					For information

		<p>1 priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build links with ELRAH</li> <li>• Disseminate key messages to teachers/ Guidance staff and link with SDS around doing this.</li> </ul> <p><b>These comments would be feedback to the Executive on the 16<sup>th</sup> February 2010.</b></p>	KM/MD	16 Feb 2010	Ongoing
7.	Any other business	<p>GH advised the group that she would feedback today's discussion to FG and BL who may have other comments to make and report back.</p> <p><b>SDS and Tracking</b> PG asked about the agreements that are to be formed with SDS around tracking and asked to be kept informed.</p> <p>KM highlighted that this would be discussed with JG and other forums on the 4/02/10. She advised that agreements in the South East through LEAPS were recognised as a model of good practice and that it was hoped that the SFC could broker a national agreement for all forum areas so that this could be rolled out. To her knowledge, the SFC had not discussed this with SDS yet.</p> <p><b>SDS website</b> PG highlighted to the group the new SDS website which contains specific information for each local authority.</p> <p><b>SFC's priority schools – info sharing</b></p>	GH	ASAP	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>For Information</p> <p>For information</p>
		<b>SFC's priority schools – info sharing</b>			

		<p>AM asked if the list of Forum/SFC target schools across Scotland was available. He felt this would be valuable to partners in demonstrating that they were working with the SFC and Scottish Gov's priority schools. KM advised that the other Forums are still in the process of agreeing their list of schools with the SFC, however, EC had analysed Scottish data over a 3 and 5 year period to identify all Scottish schools in the lowest quintile. KM added that this data can be provided, noting caveats on how calculations had been made.</p> <p>EC will send the details of the lowest quintile data, highlighting any caveats relating to how this was calculated.</p>	EC	February 2010	Ongoing
8.	Date of next meeting	Date of next meeting is scheduled for the 29 <sup>th</sup> April 2010, however will look to changing it the 28 <sup>th</sup> April to allow for a fuller attendance. EC will forward the date	EC	ASAP	Ongoing