

SCQF Recognition of Prior informal Learning (RPL) Draft Guidelines

Report on Consultation

**Ruth Whittaker
June 2005**

Contents

	Page
1. Purpose of the report	3
2. Scope of consultation	3
3. Structure of report	3
4. Summary of points for consideration by RPL subgroup	4
5. Summary of key issues: draft guidelines document	5
6. Summary of key issues: implementation of the guidelines	10
7. QAA RPL workshop for HEIs and Colleges	14
Appendix 1 Consultation Response Form A	17
Appendix 2 Consultation Response Form B	18
Appendix 3 QAA RPL Workshop list of participants	19
Appendix 4 Potential application of guidelines by responding organisations	20
Appendix 5 Types of organisations willing to share examples of RPL practice	21

SCQF RPL Draft Guidelines. Report on Consultation

1. Purpose of the Report

This report will summarise the outcomes of the consultation on the draft SCQF RPL guidelines. It will identify key issues in relation to:

- the nature and content of the guidelines themselves;
- the implementation of the guidelines by learning and training providers.

2. Scope of consultation

The draft consultation document was circulated widely to learning and training providers and other key stakeholder organisations across the post-16 education and training sectors in Scotland. The document was also available for comment on the SCQF website. The draft guidelines were accompanied by two response forms which are attached as Appendices 1 and 2.

In total, 50 responses were received. The number of responses from each sector is as follows:

Colleges: 11

Community Learning and Development (CLD): 6

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs): 11

Workplace Learning or Training providers: 1

Voluntary sector: 2

Other: 19

We are grateful to everyone who contributed to the consultation.

Additionally, the QAA ran an RPL workshop for HEIs and Colleges on 1 March 2005. The delegate list for this event is attached as Appendix 3. The focus of this workshop was the way in which RPL, and the guidelines, could be implemented within HEIs and colleges and the strategies that are required to support institutions in this process.

3. Structure of the Report

The report will initially list points for consideration by the SCQF Joint Secretariat and RPL subgroup which have emerged through the consultation. The key issues in relation to suggested amendments to the guidelines themselves and those associated with their implementation will then be summarised. The report will conclude with a summary of the main points which emerged from the QAA RPL workshop for HEIs and colleges. Appendix 4 indicates the number of organisations that stated whether or not they are likely to apply the guidelines in the work they undertake in the near future or in the long term. Appendix 5 lists the types of organisations that are willing to share examples of practice in RPL as part of the next stage of SCQF RPL development work.

4. Points for consideration by SCQF Joint Secretariat and RPL subgroup

4.1 The following suggestions emerged from the consultation in relation to the draft guidelines document:

- Specific amendments to the text of the guidelines;
- Agreement of terms to be used to describe the process e.g. *RPL*; *notional levelling*;
- Amendment to the Learner's Journey diagram to include a general credit rating route;
- Production of a summary version of the guidelines for staff;
- Production of a learners guide to RPL;
- Production of an employers' guide to RPL;
- Exploration of the process of notional levelling as an outcome of formative recognition: technical and quality assurance features;
- Consideration of the process of general credit rating as an outcome of formative recognition: via SCQF credit rating learning providers; or a centralised service; or collaborative partnerships between learning providers across the different sectors.

4.2 Suggestions and recommendations made by respondents and workshop participants relating to the implementation of the RPL guidelines include:

- A bid for centrally provided funding for RPL provision;
- Development funds and coordinated support at national/sectoral level;
- More explicit linking of RPL to other policy initiatives and enhancement themes, such as Personal Development Planning (PDP); Employability and Flexible Delivery;
- Development of nationally available training packages that can be tailored by providers;
- Establishment of national practice exchange network, or national RPL group, as a vehicle for the sharing of good practice at national level;
- Establishment of collaborative partnerships between learning providers within and across sectors;
- Standardisation of processes for formative recognition (notional levelling); fees for RPL claims (if any); proformas for recognition mechanisms to help ensure consistency in *professional judgement*;
- Closer working with sector skills councils in further SCQF development to ensure applicability of RPL processes to employers and workplace learning and training providers;
- Promotion and awareness raising activities at sectoral and national level including development of a Learner's and Employer's Guide to RPL;
- Investigation of relevance of RPL processes to the school sector;
- Explicit guidance by SQA in the use of alternative assessment processes to encourage greater opportunities for RPL;
- Exploration/ market research of the demand for RPL by learners.

5. Summary of key issues : draft guidelines document

5.1 Development of the guidelines

The consultative process employed to develop the guidelines was noted and welcomed by many of the respondents.

5.2 Nature of the guidelines

5.2.1 The non-prescriptive and inclusive nature of the guidelines is viewed positively. It was considered that this would encourage a range of approaches to RPL across the different sectors. Equally, the distinction between RPL for Personal/Career development (formative recognition) and RPL for credit (summative recognition) is welcomed by learning providers. Embracing a wider range of activities carried out within the context of further learning and development will potentially open up greater opportunities for recognition of prior informal learning by more learners across the different sectors. As it develops further, RPL could act as a gateway to all kinds of further learning opportunities. The majority of respondents considered the guidelines to be comprehensive, logically sequenced and written clearly.

5.2.2 The Qualifications, Curriculum and Assessment Authority for Wales (ACCAC) fully supports the approach for RPL for Personal and Career Development and RPL for Credit contained in the guidelines and considers that this approach is one that might be recommended for the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales (CQFW) to use as the basis for RPL developments in Wales.

5.3 Use of term 'RPL'

Respondents welcomed the use of the broader term *recognition*, rather than *accreditation*, to describe the process. It was agreed that with the introduction of the SCQF and the development of the RPL guidelines it is an appropriate time to replace the term *APEL*. However the acronym *RPL* was considered by some respondents as not indicating clearly enough the type of prior learning with which this process is concerned. Suggestions included the terms:

- *RUL/ RPUL* (recognition of prior uncertificated learning);
- *RIPL* (recognition of informal prior learning);
- *RPEL* (recognition of prior experiential learning).

5.4 RPL for Personal/Career Development (formative recognition)

5.4.1 The technical and quality assurance aspects of notional levelling need to be carefully explored and appropriate guidance developed for providers. Piloting of this process should be undertaken to explore:

- possible mechanisms;
- issues relating to the resources and staff support and training required;
- quality assurance;
- the usefulness of the outcomes of the process for learners; learning providers; and employers, in terms of:
 - confidence-building;
 - educational and career guidance;
 - and personal development planning,

5.4.2 Some HEI respondents, and some workplace learning and training provider representatives, would prefer the outcome of formative recognition to be the award of credit, rather than notional levelling, to reflect and appropriately reward the effort of the learner engaged in this process. This would also help to ensure the rigour of the process and the transferability of its outcome. General credit-rating might be a useful outcome of this process when carried out by learning providers which can award SCQF credit. Moreover some respondents were unconvinced by the idea of defining learning by the notion of 'distance travelled' rather than assessable knowledge and skills-based learning outcomes.

5.4.3 This view was not held by respondents from Community Learning and Development (CLD) and the voluntary sector, for example, who considered the value of notional levelling to be increased learner confidence and motivation as well as the facilitation of educational guidance in terms of identifying individual learning pathways within the context of the SCQF. The SCQF CLD Forum regarded the distinction between formative and summative recognition as helpful and as having general application to their area of work. Specifically the Forum considered that the process of formative recognition will inform the guidance process within community-based adult learning. Staff delivering learning programmes within community learning and development welcome notional levelling. Moreover, as it was pointed out by NUS Scotland, learners who may benefit from RPL may be deterred from the process if summative recognition is the only option. NUS Scotland considered that formative recognition is vital in providing a flexible and accessible process.

5.4.4 Colleges regarded the notional levelling process as a potentially useful means of preparing learners in their application to undertake formal learning programmes. This could be undertaken by a community learning partner or by Careers Scotland, for example. It was also considered by some colleges that the formative recognition process could support learners at points of transition, for example in the move from informal learning in workplace or the community to formal learning within a programme at college.

5.4.5 The Scottish Social Services Council welcome the inclusion of formative recognition as a clear way forward for professional development planning.

5.4.6 One of the HEI respondents, which recognises the potential value of the notional levelling process, suggests the term 'levelling' could be seen as educational jargon which may not be entirely helpful to learners, particularly if it is confused with its other meaning of 'flattening'.

5.4.7 Careers Scotland is supportive of the guidelines and would in principle like to see the development of RPL processes, particularly for personal and career development purposes. However, concern was expressed regarding the possible implications for staff development, as staff are currently involved in a high level of training activities.

5.4.8 In relation to levelling, one HEI requested the inclusion in the guidelines of a definitive statement on the nature of the learner's profile. It suggested that this could be a standard document that is recognisable and transferable across different sectors. The HEI also pointed to the need to identify how any levelling will be audited and quality-managed in terms of standards, consistency and comparability across different organisations. Further details are also requested on the procedures for levelling.

5.5 RPL for Credit (summative recognition)

5.5.1 The College sector has vast experience in matching students to the appropriate programme on entry, ranging from access and pre-entry provision through to degree and professional qualifications. Information gathered from the learner at pre-entry and interview stage informs these decisions and is agreed in partnership with the learner. One of the College respondents considers that the RPL agenda will provide a formalised and comprehensive framework against which these decisions can be validated and should help to ensure consistency of decision-making between centres. However clear guidance must be provided to centres and appropriate staff development offered in order to ensure consistency not only within but across sectors.

5.5.2. Within the HEI sector, the guidelines are welcomed and supported by all of the institutions which responded to the consultation. One university considers that the guidelines are a helpful, explanatory guide to the area and will provide a reference point when they develop their own institutional guidelines for APEL. It considered that the guidelines augment rather than duplicate the advice in the QAA APL guidelines. Another HEI considers that the guidelines for RPL for credit provide a thorough review of RPL and the university is confident that its own procedures are in alignment.

Another university believes that the document will prove very helpful for informing and enhancing institutional practice.

5.5.3 One of the HEI respondents particularly welcomes the learner-centred focus of the guidelines and the attempt to establish an enabling, rather than restrictive, process for recognition and accreditation of informal learning. The explicit link between the RPL process and curriculum development in terms of transparency of programme outcomes and the relationship between learning, knowledge and assessment has challenging implications, particularly for assessment. The respondent considers that further consultation with the HE sector on this point would be helpful. Scotland's focus on assessment and PDP as part of its enhancement agenda may present opportunities for synergy and raising the profile of RPL. Inclusion of the consideration of operational management of the RPL process was also requested. This request was made

in terms of the question of how this process can be integrated within an educational institution without dedicated resources for staff and educational development. This echoes the fundamental concern expressed by all respondents about the lack of resources for RPL.

5.5.4 One of the universities welcomes the fact that the guidelines are in harmony with both the QAA guidelines for APL and European developments. The university urges the use of less resource intensive processes for RPL for credit. Assessment mechanism for RPL claims should be an evolving process where more intensive mechanisms (e.g. portfolio building) move to less demanding ones such as oral presentations as confidence in RPL procedures is gained.

This HEI also requests that the guidelines should not imply there will be limits to the volume of credit available via RPL for credit within programmes leading to awards.

5.5.5 The National Union of Students (NUS) Scotland supports the outlined process of RPL for credit but requests the inclusion in the guidelines of reference to the need for a robust appeals process to protect the rights of the learner. The NUS are also concerned that the amount of specific credit a learner can be awarded within a particular programme is determined by the institution as a matter of professional judgement. It considers that this could lead to ambiguity and therefore could be open to misapplication or discrimination.

5.5.6 The SCQF Co-ordination group for Social Services suggests that the area of general credit could be explored in more detail. It recognises that while the recognition of prior learning for general credit is not at present frequently pursued, it is likely to become more popular as individual learners recognise the use of RPL and as employers and training providers recognise its validity.

5.5.7 One Sector Skills Council expressed disappointment that the guidelines focus on academic, rather than workplace, occupational and vocational requirements and proven best practices. It requests that *profiling*, reflecting existing work-based learning practices, should be included as an RPL mechanism. It suggested that the parameters of knowledge and skills identified in National Occupational Standards might provide a common credit currency between academic, vocational and professional qualifications against which learners could be profiled.

5.5.8 Volunteer Development Scotland is supportive of the guidelines and suggests the inclusion of another area of evidence gathering: a Record of Volunteer Learning and Experience. This encourages individuals to collect and maintain a record of informal learning to identify how and where they learn through volunteering. It could be used by learning providers to identify where learning occurs and could be utilised as a transferable evidence for an RPL claim.

5.5.9 The SCQF Early Education and Childcare group regard the guidelines as very useful for providers in this sector, some of which are experienced in some

forms of RPL and will welcome guidance on extending this further. The group points out however that in their experience the RPL route is not necessarily a quicker alternative to conventional credit-rated programmes. Employers will require to recognise the time commitment of the worker in undertaking the process.

5.6 Recognition of Learning not Experience

Some respondents, including the Association for Scottish Colleges (ASC), emphasise the importance of the key principle that the recognition process is concerned with the learning gained through experience rather than the experience itself. This distinction needs to be made clear to all users of the process. Equally a greater emphasis should be placed on the transferability of learning during the evaluation process. Learndirect scotland raised the question of whether or not all learning can be recognised within the SCQF system. It is clearly important that learning which cannot be credit-rated within the SCQF framework should not be undervalued.

5.7 Fees for RPL

5.7.1 Many institutions requested more guidance on the fees, if any, that should be charged for the RPL for credit process. Although others considered that the guidelines should not define the costing mechanism for RPL procedures as these should be left to institutions to determine.

5.7.2 One university points out that fees for RPL could deter learners on low income thereby undermining attempts at widening participation. RPL modules or units offered by learning providers should be highlighted more explicitly as a means of attracting funding through FTEs thus enabling part-time learners to access fee waivers.

5.8 Summary version of the guidelines

5.8.1 While it is acknowledged that the guidelines need to be detailed and comprehensive, many of the respondents consider that an additional shortened or summary version containing only the core principles and the guidance notes for the key features would be helpful. Not all staff will require the level of detail contained in the full guidelines document. This view was particularly emphatic from representatives of workplace learning and training who considered that the guidelines document to be too lengthy and discursive to be user-friendly from an employer's perspective. A short, manageable guide was requested for this sector.

5.8.2 A beginners guide to the process which explains the terminology clearly for the benefit of those who support learners in a variety of contexts who may be less familiar with formal educational discourse, is suggested by learndirect scotland as well as a number of respondents from the CLD sector.

5.8.3 A short guide to RPL for learners and to employers was requested by some respondents as a means of raising awareness of possible RPL providers.

5.9 Comments on Sections

5.9.1 Section one of the guidelines, containing definitions, the use of RPL within the context of the SCQF; potential users of the RPL process and benefits for RPL, was considered to be useful by most of the respondents. Some representatives of workplace learning and training considered this section, however, to be extraneous.

5.9.2 All respondents were supportive of the identified core principles and recognised their potential ability to ensure a consistent, effective and transparent approach to RPL.

5.9.3 The Learners Journey diagram, indicating the potential RPL routes for learners, was considered to be helpful by many respondents although some requested further clarification within the diagram, and the inclusion of a general credit-rating route as part of a continuum of recognition from formative recognition to general credit and specific credit.

5.9.4 Learn direct scotland points out that learners need to be clear about which part of the RPL process they are undertaking and this should be clearly emphasised when the guidelines are published.

5.9.5 The guidance notes on the Key features of RPL for Personal/Career Development and RPL for Credit were generally considered to be helpful with some suggestions for inclusion. While it was recognised that the Sections 4 and 5 were designed to be used discretely, the overlap between the two sections appears repetitive when reading the guidelines as a complete document. A summary version of the guidelines could address the issue of repetitiveness by utilising a single set of key features indicating the additional requirements of RPL for credit.

5.9.6 The glossary included as Section 6 is regarded as being both comprehensive and helpful.

6 Summary of key issues: implementation of the guidelines

6.1 Funding for RPL

6.1.1 All respondents express the need for centrally provided funding in order to support RPL provision. The ASC question how expectations arising from the promotion of RPL can be managed within current resource constraints. One college, for example, questions the ability of learning providers to support RPL initiatives to any great extent. While RPL sits alongside an inclusion agenda, the requisite support must be provided in terms of centralised funding if its identified goals are to be achieved.

6.1.2 One university suggests that progressing from development to implementation of RPL strategies would be most effectively facilitated at a national/sectoral level by providing institutions with development funds and coordinated support. This could perhaps be achieved through linkage between this consultation and the report of the Fair Admissions to Higher Education Review (Schwartz, 2004)¹ which included the recommendation for the development of a central source of expertise and advice on admissions (possibly based with the Higher Education Academy).

6.1.3 One college points out that promoting RPL will inevitably raise expectations which cannot be met within current resource constraints. This is an issue which must be tackled by the Scottish Executive as a matter of urgency.

6.2 Training and support of staff

6.2.1 The need for appropriate training and support for staff involved in RPL processes is expressed by all respondents.

6.2.2 The question of how training and support for staff engaged in formative recognition processes can be accessed was raised by a number of CLD respondents. It was suggested by the SCQF CLD Forum that training in the practical application of the guidelines should form part of both initial training and CPD for CLD staff.

6.2.3 One university suggests the development of nationally available training packages which providers could tailor as appropriate.

6.3 Collaboration

6.3.1 In the Consultation Response Form B (Appendix 2), the majority of respondents indicated their willingness to collaborate with other learning providers and organisations both within and across sectors.

6.3.2 It is considered by most respondents that collaboration should extend to the sharing of case studies and examples of practice across learning and training providers. One suggestion from the CLD sector is the establishment of a national practice exchange network.

6.3.3 One college points to the potential advantages of working in partnership with other organisations and institutions in the local community depending on the nature and volume of requests for this process. The value of collaborative partnership links is echoed by one of the universities, particularly where there are areas of institutional expertise, for example in credit-rating the outcomes of the procedures of partners offering RPL for Personal/Career development and RPL for credit in community learning and work-based learning programmes.

¹ Admissions to Higher Education Steering Group, (Chair, Prof.Steven Schwartz), *Fair Admissions to higher education: recommendations for good practice*, September 2004, www.admissions-review.org.uk

6.3.4 Another university emphasises the importance of HEIs developing links with colleges for the validation of RPL submissions and with employers to support them in processes of formative and summative recognition. RPL for credit needs to be seen as reliable and accessible by employers and other agencies as well as by the learners themselves.

6.3.5 One of the respondents, a large voluntary organisation, wants to enable staff to consider RPL for both continuous professional development as well as for credit. While this organisation has experience of providing flexible responsive and work-specific learning and training, RPL and how this relates to the SCQF is new to them. Consequently they would need support and guidance on how RPL processes could be used to maximum benefit for staff and service users.

6.3.6 One sector skills council respondent supports the embedding of RPL at programme design stage as a means of increasing its accessibility. It considers that the achievement of this could enable employers to have an input into the design of programmes.

6.4 Standardisation and Consistency

6.4.1 Standardisation is requested by many respondents in relation to:

- processes for formative recognition (notional levelling)
- fees for RPL claims
- proformas for recognition mechanisms to help ensure consistency in *professional judgement*, such as:
 - structured interviews
 - checklist for portfolio evidence

6.4.2 The SCQF CLD Forum recognises that there may be issues around ensuring a standardisation of approach to monitoring and quality assurance across sectors and geographical areas and suggests that this may be considered within the context of the review of *How Good is Our Community Learning and Development?* which is currently being undertaken by HMIE.

6.4.3 In terms of the implementation of the guidelines, one college emphasises the importance of the implications of RPL for quality assurance systems; the need for consistency of approach; the need to ensure the system is credible and that users have confidence in it; and the implications for ensuring that procedures are more robust in terms of guidance, recording, assessing, mapping and progression identification.

6.4.4 One local authority community learning and development provider points out that both Sections 4 and 5 of the guidelines use the phrase *matter of professional judgement* and that unless adequate training and support is provided there will be no consistency in *judgement* across the country.

6.5 Links to Personal Development Planning (PDP)

The explicit link between RPL and PDP processes is welcomed by many of the respondents across the different sectors. PDP can identify the possibility of RPL for learners as well as help to support them in the process of reflection, identification of learning and planning of further learning and development. As one university points out PDP can provide a framework for promoting (and recording details of) lifelong learning and highlights to HEIs that they can use established activities as a basis for RPL.

6.6 Case studies/Examples of practice

6.6.1 All respondents request the provision of case studies/examples of practice to illustrate the ways in which the guidelines could be implemented.

6.6.2 It is suggested that Sector Skills Council representatives are invited to future development and implementation SCQF workshops to help identify good learning practices suitable for work-based learners and their employers.

6.6.3 A vehicle for collating and disseminating good practice at a national level to support providers in developing, piloting and embedding innovative ways of recognising prior informal learning is strongly urged.

6.6.4 National workshops or localised events are also suggested as a means of sharing practice and increasing the confidence and ability of learning providers to implement the guidelines.

6.7 Learners' Guide to RPL

The suggestion of a toolkit of materials was made by one of the colleges which can be used both at pre-learner and learner stages to encourage ownership of the process on the part of the learner and help to minimise the resource implications for centres.

6.8 Promotion/Awareness raising of RPL

It is pointed out by one university that in terms of access to HE through RPL, the largest percentage continues to be the more confident professional seeking further advancement or a career change, rather than non-traditional learner groups. The SCQF should therefore consider a means of engaging a broader section of the population, and the formative aspect of RPL will be invaluable in providing much needed self confidence for many learners who would not otherwise consider HE. A flyer on the guidelines, one for learners and another for providers, would be helpful.

6.9 RPL within the school sector

While the post-16 focus of the guidelines is acknowledged, some respondents point to the potential relevance and usefulness of RPL for school-aged students. RPL could be an effective mechanism for recognising the skills gained by school students through extra-curricular activities. This sector should be brought into the scope of the guidelines too. Appropriate links should be made with the current review of the 3-18 Curriculum.

7 QAA RPL workshop for HEIs and Colleges

7.1 The QAA RPL workshop for HEIs and colleges held on 1 March 2005 in Stirling attracted 44 participants in total. The list of participants is attached as Appendix 4.

7.2 The purpose of the workshop was to identify the key issues surrounding the implementation of the RPL guidelines and to explore strategies that would support institutions in developing and operating RPL processes.

7.3 The workshop also included presentations from Napier University's Stewart Falconer and John Revuelta under the theme of sharing good practice. The presentations focussed on two approaches to RPL assessment, a reflective account and a structured interview which are more resource-efficient and streamlined than other forms of RPL assessment, such as the portfolio.

7.4 We are grateful to the presenters and to the workshop facilitators, Colin Mowat, Aberdeen College and Mike McDonagh, Napier University for their valuable contribution to the event.

7.5 Summary of key points

7.5.1 Implementation of RPL Guidelines within institutions

- Most participants agreed that there is a need for central co-ordination of the process, with devolved departmental development and operation. A central co-ordinating person or unit should act as a portal or central point of contact for both staff and students in terms of onward student referral; initial RPL guidance and/ or generic support to students; and support of staff in relation to RPL systems and procedures;
- There is a need for more effective and systematic staff development in the area of RPL. This should aim to raise the confidence of staff in the development and operation of RPL as well as encourage the use of more flexible approaches to support and assessment.
- RPL needs to be explicitly addressed at programme design stage rather than perceived as a marginal or add-on activity. A move away from intensive

paper-based methods of assessment is required , with a greater use of interviews combined with self-assessment and diagnostic tools;

- The use of SCQF level descriptors in making credit decisions for prior informal learning which does not relate to particular modules or programmes was supported by many participants;
- Dissemination of case studies of RPL processes across and within both sectors was strongly supported by all participants;
- The need to engage employers in the process was highlighted;
- The core principles of transparency, consistency and reliability were discussed particularly in relation to the role of external assessors; recording of RPL processes, such as interviews; fee charging; and credit limits;
- The difficulties in resourcing both the RPL process itself and the training requirements of staff was highlighted by all participants. The key message that emerged was not to underestimate the cost of RPL. While participants were supportive of the idea of extending RPL opportunities for learners, recognising its potential contribution to strategies of widening participation and social inclusion, central resourcing of RPL is regarded as essential.

7.5.2 Strategies to support institutions in the development and operation of RPL systems included:

- The provision of central funding to support RPL provision in colleges and universities;
- Inter- institutional and national dissemination of case studies and examples of good practice, including the learners' experience of RPL, to encourage dialogue across and within sectors;
- Institutional and national awareness raising and staff development in RPL;
- The establishment of a national RPL group for HEIs and colleges to act as a trans-sectoral link between HEIs and colleges to support the development of expertise and consistency of approaches;
- The development of generic audit tools for RPL to reduce administrative load;
- The explicit linking of RPL to personal development planning in colleges and HEIs;
- The establishment of collaborative partnerships between institutions and Careers Scotland for formative recognition process , linked to PDP

- Work with the school sector in relation to reflective approaches and personal development planning. It is considered important to address RPL at school level as well as post-16 level;
- The explicit linking of RPL to the government agenda of citizenship and employability;
- The incorporation of RPL in guidance provision in colleges;
- The exploration of the mechanics of the formative recognition process;
- Greater encouragement of and explicit guidance by SQA in the use of alternative assessment processes to encourage greater opportunities for RPL within the college sector;
- The systematic exploration/ market research of the demand for RPL by learners.

**Appendix 1
Consultation Response Form A**

Please provide your comments on the form below. If necessary, continue on a separate page. When completed, please return to the following address by Monday 28th February:

Rm 501 Cadogan House, c/o Hanover House, 24 Douglas Street, Glasgow G2 7NQ

Name:	
Organisation:	
Contact Details:	
Sector (Please select) Higher Education Institution Further Education College Voluntary Sector Community Learning Workplace learning or training provider Other (Please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> -----
Comments:	

Appendix 2
Consultation Response Form B
Market Research to ascertain the demand for RPL

Given the criteria set out in the RPL guidelines and the mechanisms as outlined in the main body of the consultation paper, a response to the following questions would be appreciated to allow us to ascertain the likely demand for the application of RPL in the future.

1	Please indicate below, the type of organisation you represent. <div style="text-align: center;"> Higher Education Institution Further Education College Voluntary Sector Community Learning Workplace learning or training provider Other (Please specify below) _____ </div>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
2	Would your organisation be likely to apply the guidelines in the work it undertakes? <div style="text-align: center;"> In the near future? In the long term </div>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Do you have any experiences of RPL provision that you could share as examples of good practice ?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Please indicate whether you would be likely to approach, or work in partnership with any of the following to develop or offer RPL provision; <div style="text-align: center;"> Higher Education Institution (HEI) Further Education College (FEC) Community Learning Organisation Voluntary Sector Organisation Workplace learning or training provider Other (please specify) _____ </div>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Please complete and return all responses by Monday 28th February 2005 to:

Rm 501 Cadogan House, c/o Hanover House, 24 Douglas Street, Glasgow G2 7NQ

Appendix 3
Recognising Prior Informal Learning (RPL)
within the SCQF
QAA Workshop for HEIs and Colleges
1 March 2005
Stirling Management Centre

List of Participants

Wilf Allsion	Central College of Commerce
Val Blair	Bell College
Fiona Brunton	University of Abertay Dundee
John Campbell	University of Strathclyde
Brian Casey	Motherwell College
Margaret Cockbain	Queen Margaret University College
Margaret Davis	Glasgow Caledonian University
Margaret Dundas	Scottish Funding Council
Patrick Edward	The Robert Gordon University
Stewart Falconer	Napier University
Beth Fleming	Bell College
Lorraine E Fraser	University of St Andrews
Lynne Hooton	SIESWE
Pamela Hosey	Cumbernauld College
John Hughes	Glasgow College of Building and Printing
Lorna Jenkins	West Lothian College
Margaret Rose Livingstone	Coatbridge College
Birgitta MacDonald	Edinburgh College of Art
David S McCall	Perth College, UHI
Mike McDonagh	Napier University
Graham McDonald	North Glasgow College
Lea McKay	University of Paisley
Brian McKenna	Bell College
Judith McLean	Reid Kerr College
David McVey	University of Paisley
Alison Millar	Perth College
Iain Morrison	UHI Millennium Institute
Colin Mowat	Aberdeen College
Ian Murray	University of Stirling
Andrew Nash	University of Glasgow
Patricia O'Brien	Edinburgh's Telford College
Nick Pollock	Aberdeen College
Gerry Reid	Glasgow Caledonian University
John Revuelta	Napier University
Alex Rougvie	University of St Andrews
Alan Runcie	QAA Scottish Office
Joan Smith	Edinburgh College of Art
Martin Speller	Glasgow Caledonian University
Maggie Sproule	Edinburgh College of Art
A E Stalker	University of Paisley
Tracey Stewart	University of Aberdeen
Helen Stimpson	James Watt College
Frances Thom	Langside College
Ruth Whittaker	SCQF

Appendix 5

Potential application of the RPL guidelines by responding organisations

Of the 43 organisations that responded to question 2 on Response Form B (Appendix 2) , 40 indicated that they are likely to apply the guidelines. Of that 40, 22 are likely to apply them in the near future (and in the long term); 18 are likely to apply them in the long term only. The three organisations that indicated that they are not likely to apply the guidelines were a professional society; a professional body and learndirect scotland.

The breakdown is as follows:

1. Numbers of organisations likely to apply the guidelines in the work it undertakes **in the near future**

Colleges	4
Community Learning	3
HEIs	9
Voluntary sector	2
Workplace learning and training providers	1
Other	3

2. Numbers of organisations likely to apply the guidelines in the work it undertakes **in the long term**

Colleges	6
Community Learning	4
HEIs	
Voluntary sector	
Workplace learning and training providers	
Other	8

Appendix 5

Types of Organisations with examples of RPL practice

Colleges:	2
Community Learning:	1
HEIs:	4
Professional and Statutory bodies:	2
Sector Skills Council:	2
Voluntary sector:	1
Workplace learning and training providers:	1