

**PROPOSED SCHOOLS (RESIDENTIAL OUTDOOR EDUCATION)
(SCOTLAND) BILL – LIZ SMITH MSP**

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

This document summarises and analyses the responses to a consultation exercise carried out on the above proposal.

The background to the proposal is set out in section 1, while section 2 gives an overview of the results. A detailed analysis of the responses to the consultation questions is given in section 3. These three sections have been prepared by the Scottish Parliament's Non-Government Bills Unit (NGBU). Section 4 has been prepared by Liz Smith MSP and includes her commentary on the results of the consultation.

Where respondents have requested that certain information be treated as “not for publication”, or that the response remain anonymous, these requests have been respected in this summary.

In some places, the summary includes quantitative data about responses, including numbers and proportions of respondents who have indicated support for, or opposition to, the proposal (or particular aspects of it). In interpreting this data, it should be borne in mind that respondents are self-selecting and it should not be assumed that their individual or collective views are representative of wider stakeholder or public opinion. The principal aim of the document is to identify the main points made by respondents, giving weight in particular to those supported by arguments and evidence and those from respondents with relevant experience and expertise. A consultation is not an opinion poll, and the best arguments may not be those that obtain majority support.

Copies of the individual responses are available on the following website www.schoolsresidentialbill.org have been numbered for ease of reference, and the relevant number is included in brackets after the name of the respondent.

A list of respondents is set out in the Annex.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Liz Smith MSP's draft proposal, lodged on 28 April 2022, is for a Bill to:

ensure that young people have the opportunity to experience residential outdoor education.

The proposal was accompanied by a consultation document, prepared with the assistance of NGBU. This document was published on the Parliament's website, from where it remains accessible:

[Proposed Schools Residential Outdoor Education Scotland Bill | Scottish Parliament Website](#)

The consultation period ran from 29 April 2022 to 22 July 2022.

The following organisations and individuals were sent copies of the consultation document, links to it or were spoken with directly. The consultation was also widely shared on social media.

The following organisations and individuals were sent copies of the consultation document, links to it or were spoken with directly. The consultation was also widely shared on social media.

- Abernethy Trust
- Ace Adventures
- Active Highs
- Active Outdoor Pursuits
- Adv RMS (Adv-RMS provide the inspection element of the licensing process on behalf of The Health and Safety Executive)
- Adventure Aberdeen
- Ancrum Outdoor Centre
- Ardentenny Outdoor Centre
- Ardmay House Activity Centre
- Ardroy Outdoor Centre
- Badaguish Outdoor Centre
- Biggar Adventure
- Blairvadach Outdoor Education Centre
- Camas Outdoor Centre
- Compass Christian Centre
- Connect (An Independent Scottish charity that supports parental engagement in education)
- COSLA
- The Council for Learning Outside the Classroom
- Craikhope Outdoor Centre
- Duke of Edinburgh Award Scotland
- Education Scotland
- EIS
- The Field Studies Council
- Fimbush Outdoor Centre
- Galloway Activity Centre

- Glencoe Outdoor Centre
- GosfordBay Outdoors
- HMIE (His Majesty's Inspectorate of Education)
- Hostelling Scotland
- In Your Element
- The Institute of Outdoor Learning
- The John Muir Trust
- Jordanhill School (A mainstream Grant Aided School directly funded by the Scottish Government)
- Learning Through Landscapes
- Loch Insh Outdoor Centre
- Manor Adventure
- Mountaineering Scotland
- The National Network for Outdoor learning
- The National Parents Forum Scotland
- NatureScot
- Ocean Youth Trust Scotland
- The Outdoor Council (an umbrella organisation representing the views of the Association of Heads of Outdoor Education Centres, The Outdoor education Advisers' Panel; British Activity Providers Association, Young Explorers' Trust and the Youth Hostel Association)
- Outward Bound Trust
- Parenting Across Scotland (A partnership of charities which offers support to children and families in Scotland)
- PGL Activity Centres
- The Prince's Foundation
- Raasay House Hotel and Activity Centre
- Ridgway Adventure
- Rock UK-Outdoor Activity centres
- SAPOE (The Scottish Advisory Panel on Outdoor Education, representing all 32 local authorities)
- The Scaladale Centre
- The Scottish Canoe Association
- SCIS (Scottish Council of Independent Schools)
- Scottish Outdoor Education Centres
- The Scottish Youth Parliament
- Scouts Scotland
- Scripture Union Scotland
- Sportscotland
- The Wild Outdoors
- Venture Scotland
- Whitewave Outdoor Centre
- Wiston Lodge Outdoor Learning and Education Centre
- Dr Beth Christie, Senior Lecturer / Programme Director: Learning for Sustainability programme, Edinburgh University.
- Dr Greg Mannion, senior lecturer in education, University of Stirling, Scotland.
- Professor Chris Loynes, Professor in Human Nature Relations, Institute of Science and Environment, Centre for National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA) & Outdoor Studies, University of Cumbria

- Professor Peter Higgins (PFHEA, FRGS), Chair in Outdoor Environmental & Sustainability Education, Director of the United Nations University Regional Centre for ESD (Scotland), Director of the Global Environment & Society Academy, University of Edinburgh.

[Gaelic](#) and [BSL](#) versions of the consultation were also provided.

The consultation exercise was run by Liz Smith MSP's parliamentary office.

The consultation process is part of the procedure that MSPs must follow in order to obtain the right to introduce a Member's Bill. Further information about the procedure can be found in the Parliament's standing orders (see Rule 9.14) and in the *Guidance on Public Bills*, both of which are available on the Parliament's website:

- Standing orders (Chapter 9): [Standing Orders | Scottish Parliament Website](#)
- Guidance (Part 3): [Part 3: Stages of Bills – special cases | Scottish Parliament Website](#)

SECTION 2: OVERVIEW OF RESPONSES

Summary of Smart Survey responses:

In total, 535 responses were received via Smart Survey, and four organisations submitted their views separately by email.

The Smart Survey responses can be categorised as follows:

Organisations:

- 30 (58% of all responses by organisations) described themselves as third sector bodies;
- 11 (21%) were from public sector bodies;
- 7 (12%) were from commercial organisations;
- 3 (6%) were from representative organisations, and
- 2 (4%) were from other types of organisations.

Individuals:

- 146 (30% of all responses by individuals) categorised themselves as teachers or school employees;
- 126 (25%) were from members of the public;
- 97 (21%) were from parents or carers;
- 78 (16%) were from professionals with relevant experience;
- 15 (3%) were from providers of third sector, private sector or local authority residential outdoor services;
- 10 (2%) were from pupils or students;
- 6 (1%) were from academics with relevant experience;
- 3 (1%) were from council employees in another field, and
- 2 (1%) were from politicians.

There were also

- 169 (32%) submissions, which the respondent asked to be published anonymously, and,
- 45 (8%) submissions that were marked “not for publication” by the respondent.

Summary of non-smart survey responses

Of the four non-smart survey responses, YouthLink Scotland, the national agency for youth work, indicated that it supported the main aim of the proposed bill, and the charity Connect, which is a parents’ organisation that supports parental engagement in education, advised that it had surveyed its members on the proposal, and that 98% of the 322 respondents to this said that they wanted “their child to experience residential education provided through their school”.

SAPOE, (the Scottish Advisory Panel for Outdoor Education) took a neutral position on the first question and, because it was unable to consult its Children

and Young People's Board due to the local elections, COSLA said in its email that it could not give support or opposition to the proposal.

Overview

As highlighted above, there were 535 responses to the Smart Survey that accompanied the consultation document, with 60 coming from organisations and 476 from individuals.

Of these, 511 (just over 95%) indicated that they supported the proposal: 457 fully, and 54 partially.

In a number of cases, those that offered partial support did so on the basis that, while they backed the general thrust of the proposal, there were some areas that they felt might be revisited or developed further.

These included **the suggested age range** of pupils that the proposed bill is targeted at (12- to 16-year-olds). Several suggested that this age range was perhaps too narrow, and that it should be widened to include children in primary schools, particularly P6 and P7 pupils.

This should be caveated by noting that just over half of respondents (52.91%) indicated that they were "fully supportive" of the suggested 12 to 16 range, with many commenting that this would be the optimum time in young people's school careers for this to be provided.

The consultation document suggested that this specific statutory right to outdoor education be limited to pupils in **local authority and grant-aided schools** only. Just over 48% supported this, 196 fully and 61 partially. Around 25% took a neutral position. Among concerns raised, it was noted that some pupils in independent/private schools might be attending on a bursary or scholarship and that, as such, their parents might not be able to afford any residential classes organised by these schools.

Some respondents asked about what consideration should be given to pupils in **Gaelic-medium education**. Including whether they should have the right to attend facilities that operate specifically in Gaelic and/or be taught by Gaelic-speaking instructors. In doing so, many of these respondents pointed out however that such resources are very limited at present. The consultation made no specific commitment regarding this issue.

Other concerns raised included: how the **quality** of the outdoor education provided could be guaranteed, whether there would be adequate **financing and resources** to fully implement the proposal and what impact this proposed bill, if enacted, might have on the provision of **other services provided by schools**.

In response to other questions in the survey, around 88% of respondents either fully or partially supported the **proposal for a quality framework to ensure the quality of the education provision of outdoor centres**, 82%

expressed support for the suggestion that there should be an **obligation to ensure that residential outdoor education is provided would fall on those who are responsible for arranging the provision**, and just over 63% believed that the **funding for the provision** of the proposal should be met in full by the Scottish Government, with 11% suggesting that local government should be responsible for this, a similar number suggesting that parents/carers should make a contribution in some way.

SECTION 3: RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

This section sets out an overview of responses to each question in the consultation document.

General aim of proposed Bill

Page 5 of the consultation document outlined the aim of the proposed Bill and what it would involve. Respondents were asked:

Question 1: Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposed Bill (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / etc.) Please explain the reasons for your response.

535 respondents (100%) answered this question. The table below provides a breakdown of support for, and opposition to, the question. The tables below break these statistics down further by responses from individuals and organisations.

Fully Supportive	456	85%
Partially Supportive	54	10%
Neutral	2	1%
Partly Opposed	13	2%
Fully Opposed	9	2%
Do Not Wish to Express a View	1	1%

Individuals

Fully Supportive	413	87%
Partially Supportive	39	8%
Neutral	2	1%
Partly Opposed	11	2%
Fully Opposed	9	2%
Do Not Wish to Express a View	1	1%

Organisations

Fully Supportive	43	72%
Partially Supportive	15	25%
Neutral	0	0%
Partly Opposed	2	3%
Fully Opposed	0	0%
Do Not Wish to Express a View	0	0%

Fully supportive – individuals

The individuals who expressed their **full support** for the proposed bill provided a variety of reasons for doing so, such as:

- their personal experience from attending residential outdoor education courses in their childhood;

- what they saw as the positive impact that attending these courses has had on their own children;
- what those working directly in the sector or through another related professional capacity have observed regarding the impact of these courses on young people, including its potential impact of building self-confidence, health and personal wellbeing and providing opportunities for non-academically gifted children.

These included, for example, members of the public, Katie Small, (response 192975352) and Dani Carr (192202609) who stated:

“I believe it is a hugely important part of any child's education, and fully agree it can be life changing for some children. I was lucky enough to experience it, my children were also lucky enough to experience it and I strongly believe all children must have the same experience.” (Katie Small)

“I believe part of who I am today is because of the experiences I was lucky and privileged enough to have received as a child. I both attended school activity programmes and paid summer outdoor programmes. I was able as a child to develop resilience, trust, perseverance, communication skills, bravery, problem skills, lifelong friendships, and many other benefits from these experiences. They were invaluable to my education and enjoyment of school and beyond.” (Dani Carr)

A student teacher, who wished to remain anonymous, (response 190655980), reflected on personal experience as a school pupil:

“Outdoor education allowed me to achieve in secondary when I felt academically, I was not performing as well as my peers. The residential weeks I went on gave me confidence, and a space to develop skills I wouldn't have had the chance to as I lived in a city. All children should have these opportunities available to them, this bill will also help to protect our outdoor residential centres which have been at threat since the pandemic.”

Nigel Williams (response 192239148) who is a member of the Royal Institute of Navigation¹, the Polar Academy² and the National Navigation Award Scheme³, and has served in the past as a member of several bodies relevant to outdoor education, including SAPOE, observed that:

“Residential experiences had a great impact on me as a young person. Then later as someone delivering residential outdoor education I have and still do witness growth in confidence, Co-operation, communication, respect, concern and valuing the environment,

¹ [Royal Institute of Navigation](#)

² [The Polar Academy](#)

³ [National Navigation Award Scheme](#)

developing a sense of adventure and risk management. In a more technical field there is increasing scientific evidence that exploring outdoors develops our spatial awareness and cognitive navigation skills.”

Alexander McHugh (response 191301473), who is a chief instructor in outdoor education, reflected on his experiences as a child with dyslexia attending residential outdoor education:

“I recall how the activities acted as a leveller to my peers. Those who were perceived as ‘academically bright or sporty’ would find difficulty in tasks that others had the opportunity to excel. It was at that point I began to understand that your worth as a person wasn’t limited to your academic prowess, but we all excelled at different skills, and being able to understand or work with others was as, if not more beneficial than a score on an exam paper.”

Observations from other experts in the sector included the following comments from a professional, David Sanderson (response 191481132), an outdoor instructor, Peter Robert Cleghorn (191304839), and a teacher (response 196149435), who asked to remain anonymous. All three drew attention to the wider benefits of outdoor education (emphasis added):

“Outdoor experiences, especially in a residential context, are the most powerful tool I’ve seen in 20 years as an education professional for giving young people an opportunity to make **positive changes** in their **current life and future contentment.**” (David Sanderson)

“Working with the target age group of this Bill, I have seen first-hand the effect outdoor education can have on young people, benefits I have seen included **building confidence, resilience, teamwork, physical, emotional and mental fitness and connection to nature.**” (Peter Robert Cleghorn)

“Many of my pupils hugely benefit from any outdoor education and this is true for all young people I have worked with. I have seen first-hand the **phenomenal impact** that outdoor education settings can have on young people if they get the chance to go.” (Anonymous)

Other comments from professionals included the following points made by teacher, Andrew Wilson (response 193190246) outdoor learning consultant, Andy Taylor (196170418) and an anonymous respondent (195541072), who said that they had an experience in a relevant subject:

“I have witnessed many positive transformational changes in young people from simply enjoying a residential experience that I believe it should be available more often. Young people themselves, from young to older teenagers always testify and feedback when asked that’s they’ve had an amazing, oftentimes life-changing experience on a residential activity.” (Andrew Wilson)

“The proposal sets out quite powerfully both the benefits of outdoor learning and the significant declines in opportunities in Scotland. Outdoor learning providers in all their forms are important employers in often rural locations. The proposal would, in addition to the very well-expressed benefits for young people, be supportive of an important sector of the economy.” (Andy Taylor)

“I have seen at first hand the difference a residential week improves children's confidence and interaction skills, especially those from a poorer background, or inner city, where access to our beautiful great outdoors is not an option. In a previous life I was an outdoor pursuits instructor, so I comment from experience.” (Anonymous)

Alison Thomson (response 192068470), who is a modern studies teacher, and who also coordinates her school's Duke of Edinburgh Awards' programme and teaches an outdoor education programme for pupils with behavioural and learning additional support needs, argued that:

“...if all children were afforded this opportunity during their time at secondary school, the mental health benefits of time away from the classroom surrounded by nature would far outweigh the class time lost in terms of improving attainment.”

Ms Thomson also acknowledged the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the ability to organise school trips, but commented:

“Even prior to the pandemic, the number of schools able to offer residential outdoor education trips was falling due to the closure of outdoor centres and other factors. This is a missed opportunity for young to build resilience, develop peer-relationships and gain an appreciation for our beautiful country. I therefore believe that it is critical that young people are afforded this opportunity during secondary school.”

Kathy Murgatroyd (response 192393995), who is a retired outdoor education teacher, and Paul Platt (192399185), who is Head of Outdoor Education at Windermere School in Cumbria, both used examples of the positive impact that they believed outdoor education can have on individual young people:

“Outdoor education changes the lives of the children who are lucky enough to partake. For some, it is the only time they will get to have a week away from their family and area. They will be introduced to a whole new world, make new friends and try activities that could stay with them for life. A quote from one of my pupils, ‘Miss, this is like a calendar, but we're in it’.” (Kathy Murgatroyd)

“I have seen the benefits of outdoor education so many times. On a recent residential trip...one child, so shy she hardly spoke, gained the

confidence to speak and now walks around school talking, smiling, laughing and confident.” (Paul Platt)

Fully Supportive – Organisations

As noted, 71.67% of organisations that responded to the Smart Survey stated that they **fully supported** the proposal. A number of reasons were given for this support. For example, several organisations considered that outdoor residential education enhanced the overall learning experience of pupils, that it built resilience and self-confidence among pupils and that it could spark long- term interest in the outdoors, nature and the environment.

- **Enhancing the overall learning experience**

A number of organisations argued that the provision of outdoor education plays a part in enhancing the overall learning experience that a pupil has. For example, Universities Scotland (response 196118878), which represents all 19 of the country’s universities, highlighted the longer-term positive impacts on young people of outdoor education, noting (emphasis added):

“helpful evidence of the educational and wider benefits that outdoor education offers young people across Scotland. We see this **enhancing the learner experience** whilst at school and we also see strong complementarity between the benefits that accrue to pupils whilst at school and how this would assist them as school-leavers to move onto university, as one possible positive destination.”

Dòmhnall MacNeill of Comunn na Gàidhlig, (response 190333385), which delivers extra-curricular opportunities for pupils pursuing Gaelic medium education, also drew attention to the wider benefits of outdoor education:

“We wholeheartedly agree with the benefits of outdoor education as outlined in the Bill consultation paper - the contribution it can make to young people's confidence, their ability to work with others, their appreciation of the outdoor environment, the health benefits and so on. An introduction to this at a young age can have life-long benefits for young people. The decline in these opportunities should be a matter of national concern.”

- **Building resilience and self-confidence**

A similar argument made by a number of respondents was that outdoor education helps to build resilience and self-confidence among pupils. For example, the Scottish Adventure School (response 191474458), which is a residential outdoor centre that is based on the grounds of Ardvreck School in Crieff, stated:

“The power of residential outdoor experiences to allow children to see their classmates and teachers in another environment cannot be underestimated. As we emerge from the Covid pandemic, residential

experiences are a great way to facilitate resilience and self-confidence. Also, for those children who are not the highest achievers in the classroom, this is a great opportunity for them to shine in front of their peers or for the confident individuals to encourage their friends as they stretch their own comfort zones.”

The charity, Venture Scotland (response 192481769), which offers young people an outdoor-based personal development programme, observed that:

“The contribution that the outdoors residential experience has on young people is profound. Even working with young people for whom school has not been a positive experience...many of the young people reflect that the outdoors residential experience they had was a positive one. The connection between nature and human being mental health is well proven...having this experience early in life can help to build coping strategies for the rest of their lives.”

Love Outdoor Learning (response 192670431), which aims to help schools to take learning into the playground and beyond, commented that:

“For many children, school camp is the first time they experience any degree of independence. For others, it can be a key opportunity to understand there is a wider world out there. The skills and beliefs developed throughout camp, as well as the relationships, stay with a person for life.”

The Association of Sail Training Organisations (response 195435957), which is an umbrella body for organisations that provide residential activities for young people on board large sailing vessels and has three members in Scotland, Ocean Youth Trust Scotland, the Swan Trust in Shetland and Gordonstoun School, considered that:

“This is an excellent proposal that will ensure that even more young people will benefit from the fantastic positive experiences provided by residential outdoor education, that can have a life-long impact on young people...Often young people who are initially reluctant will gain the most from such an experience.”

Wild Tree Adventures (response 193077688), which delivers outdoor experiences for children contended that:

“Outdoor educational experiences are vital for the full development of children wellbeing, aspirations and access of the outdoors. Across the board provision will help break down barriers to accessing nature and the outdoors across society.”

- **Long term interest in the outdoors**

A further point made by supportive organisations was that the provision of outdoor residential education can lead to a long-term interest in nature, the environment and the outdoors among pupils, which can have wider benefits.

For example, the social enterprise, Inspiralba (response 192914305), which provides employability and pre-employability support for young people facing barriers to work, stated that:

“A residential outdoor experience can be the spark that ignited a lifelong interest in the outdoors. It can also be the place where a young person who struggles with the daily challenges of academic work in school can shine or where a young person to step beyond their comfort zone and feel proud for their efforts, learning lifelong lessons in resilience. These kinds of experiences are so important for our young people at a time where mental health challenges are increasing and confidence levels diminishing - the outdoors is a gateway to mental, physical and emotional health benefits which are often on our doorstep but unknown to many young people and adults due to lack of exposure and support to enjoy the incredible natural assets that Scotland has.”

The Field Studies Council (response 195914496), which is an outdoor learning charity that offers residential and day courses across Great Britain, argued that:

“High quality outdoor learning has multiple benefits for both academic development and personal growth. Connecting to nature has health and wellbeing benefits, giving learners a chance to develop their confidence outdoors which can develop into a beneficial lifetime habit.”

Partially supportive responses

Although broadly in favour of the proposed bill, just over 10% of respondents indicated that they were only **partially supportive** of it at this stage. A variety of reasons were given, but among the key themes were:

- **Gaelic-Medium Education**

Concerns were raised regarding how the proposal might impact on pupils in receipt of Gaelic-Medium Education. It was argued that there was a need for the provision of specific outdoor learning for these pupils. For example, Ross Christie (response 194748331), who works and researches informal learning settings for young people in Gaelic, noted that:

“The proposed bill makes for great reading and I hope its policies are eventually implemented, however there is a considerable oversight in regards to Gaelic Medium Pupils - the bill does not make reference to Gaelic language outdoor education, suggesting that although all pupils may have a right to residential outdoor experiences, this may not

extend to Gaelic Medium pupils receiving a continuation of their immersive Gaelic language experience, as the bill makes no reference to ensuring the provision of Gaelic language outdoor education for those who need it.”

Although he considered the proposed bill to be “an excellent idea”, Donnchadh Mac Guaire (response 191202349), commented that he would:

“be more supportive of the proposal if it included the possibility that this education can be delivered in all three indigenous Scottish languages (Scots, Gaelic and English) as these all represent the human environment that the country is composed of...as a Gaelic speaker, I would also argue that Gaelic is inextricably and profoundly associated with the environment (the Gaelic alphabet is related to tree species for example) and so it would be very ironic if Gaelic speakers only had access to this education via English.”

A parent/carer who asked to remain anonymous (response 191175389) asked:

“Will there be specific provision for Gaelic-medium provision for children in Gaelic-medium education? This should be a requirement, not optional.”

Beth Frieden (response 191177358), who taught in primary school for seven years, stated:

“I would like any legislation about outdoor education to specifically entitle pupils in Gaelic medium schooling to outdoor education in Gaelic.”

This issue was also highlighted by some individuals who took a **neutral** stance. For example, Donald Morris (response 190546599), the manager of Spòrs Gàidhlig, who has worked with young people for 25 years in both Gaelic and English and is believed to be the most experienced Gaelic-speaking outdoor instructor in Scotland, argued that it was “imperative that a Gaelic medium, standalone, centre is created” on the basis that:

“Young people benefit from a residential experience at an outdoor centre. However, traditionally Gaelic-speaking young people have been ignored with the general attitude being that young people and schools should adjust themselves to the lack of any Gaelic medium provision. This has had a direct and real effect on the standard of Gaelic which young people use. If high quality experiences are offered in English only, it is only natural that the participants link those positive experiences with the language in which they take place.”

- **Resources**

Concerns were also raised by some other respondents who were partially supportive regarding whether there would be sufficient financial and human resources available for aspirations behind the proposal to be met. These included:

High Life Highland (response 193729779), which is a charity that was formed by The Highland Council to develop and promote opportunities in culture, learning, sport, leisure, health and wellbeing for residents and visitors to the area, stated that, while it supported the principle behind the proposal and fully-supported outdoor education provision it had concerns about the level of human resource required to deliver the appropriate service levels:

“there are limited options for this to take place within Highlands on a residential basis without long travelling times/distances, and so we would like to see the scope of this bill widened to include outreach delivered. [The] Highlands has no shortage of outdoor venues locally, we do have a shortage of qualified professionals employed to deliver to schools.”

The John Muir Trust (response 194097282) noted the risks that there were in respect of capacity and also funding:

“We recognise risks to successfully implementing the provisions of the Bill, primarily risks of funding and capacity, therefore we believe there is a need to carefully consider:

- Capacity of Education Authorities to implement duty
- Number of centres available to cope with increased demand created
- Availability of staff to deliver residential Outdoor Education.”

Learning Through Landscapes (response 191686367), which is UK-wide charity that aims to help children and young people to connect with nature, become more active, learn outdoors and have fun, noted:

“We have a small concern that the provision of a residential experience may reduce focus or funding for other areas of outdoor learning provision, and are keen that any residential experience is carefully integrated to the rest of the curriculum and overall learner journey.”

The Loch Insh Outdoor Centre (response 192171246), which provides residential activities for schools, expressed concerns about sustainable funding levels:

“We support the introduction of a mandate but we have concerns about how this will be sustainably funded either by schools or local authorities. Cost saving measures could alter the structure of the industry - as a private company, we often have no central person within the local authority to contact and this means our contracts are made directly with schools, though the local authorities make the payments.

This makes for a complicated legal interaction often frustrated by local authority payment dates and is an obvious inefficiency.”

Marion Boyle (response 192224186), who is a retired teacher, argued that, given scarce resources in respect of finance, staffing and time, the opportunity for outdoor education should be limited to those who were willing to take it up:

“I have seen the beneficial results of outdoor activities for those who are keen to participate and those who are a little uncertain, but have also seen how some (not all) troublemakers can spoil things for others. I feel that sending these youngsters on outdoor activities could be a serious waste of resources ...I know how scarce resources are. 30 pupils per year going on an outdoor course is one thing - 150 is something else! As well as finances, you have to consider staffing - achieving even a basic Summer Mountain Leader Award requires commitment in time as well as money.”

Simon Fraser (response 192477249), a member of the public who is a former mountain rescue team member, argued that government at all levels would need to commit to resourcing the proposal for it to be effective:

“I agree totally with the benefits as presented by Liz Smith. This bill, however, commits local government to providing a service which, like so many, it isn't funded to provide. Unless much more commitment is given to local government, by both Westminster and Holyrood, this is a hollow proposal.”

Alan Millar (response 196159231), who is a teacher/school employee commented that he had:

“questions about how this will be staffed at a school level without simply becoming something extra that teachers are expected to do”.

Age-range

The consultation document proposed that provision of outdoor learning should be restricted to 12- to 16-year-olds only. In answer to this, a number of respondents offered only partial support on the basis that they felt that the scope of this could be widened to include some primary school pupils. Among these responses were:

The Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), which is a charity that works with schools in Fife, provided partial support expressing that it had:

“reservations about this entitlement only being open to 12-16 year olds. We partly understand the reasoning why, but this action (if it goes ahead) will exclude the opportunity for any children in the Primary sector to benefit from meaningful residential experiences. We strongly believe this entitlement should also be open to P6 & 7 children. This

comprises a large part of the current attendees in [outdoor education centres] in Scotland, at a very formative time in their lives. We have a huge amount of anecdotal and quantitative evidence of the benefits of residential in the primary sector”.

The Loch Insh Outdoor Centre (response 192171246) expressed a related concern that an indirect consequence of the proposal being restricted to 12- to 16-year-olds might be that P7s miss out on experiencing outdoor education:

“mandating all students [to] attend from 12-16 could change the local education authority funding and some children could lose out from experiences at around P7 who fill the majority of places at present. This could lead to an industry re-set and we could lose our existing custom.

The Centre proposed an alternative approach, namely mandating:

“that the local education authority decide upon the year or age group and could therefore make smaller adjustments to meet their obligations rather than incurring additional pressures on teachers who might not have previously organised such trips”.

The Glencoe Trust Ltd (response 192218087), which owns and runs the Glencoe Outdoor Centre was partially supportive, arguing that the proposed age bracket should be extended to cover primary pupils on the basis that:

“during the past 30+ years, the great majority of young people attending courses at our Centre have been P6/7 age groups, and it is the primary schools who arrange the majority of such trips.”

A similar point was made by respondents which were opposed to the proposal. For example, East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (response 194630299), which manages East Lothian Council’s HSE Adventure Activities Licensing Authority (AALA) licence and was partly opposed to the proposal, noted that it had:

“concerns about how this will impact [outdoor learning] provision across primary schools. If all high school pupils are to be accommodated there leaves no spaces available for primary pupils with our current number of centres...in our opinion targeting Primary pupils in this way has greater positive impact and outcomes”.

Note, question 8, specifically dealt with this issue, and a more detailed breakdown is provided in the analysis to the responses to that.

Other issues

Other issues raised by respondents offering partial support included (emphasis added):

- “Whilst a residential outdoor learning experience undoubtedly provides a varied and exciting opportunity for many young people to try new things and develop new skills, they **can often be viewed as a tick box exercise for schools** to provide their responsibilities in relation to Outdoor Learning within the curriculum.” (Scottish Borders Council – response 190919150)
- “[there is a need for] **confidence** from Education Authorities and teachers that the Bill will provide **quality and impactful education experiences** for young people.” (John Muir Trust – response 194097282)
- “**connecting people to their environment** is crucially important, especially given the pressing need for action on climate change and a far better understanding of the environment we live in, and the impacts we have on it (both positive and negative). I would like to see a **stronger emphasis on sustainability, ecology and an understanding of ecosystems** (something which we as a species are profoundly ignorant of).” (Donnchadh Mac Guaire - response 191202349).
- “It is important to **consider curriculum outdoor learning in its entirety**, rather than one part/component in isolation. This ensures that schools, local authorities, partners and Scottish Government can **review holistically the opportunities and risks across all types of experiences**. Updated national guidance can then be delivered to ensure schools deliver high quality progressive experiences.” (non Smart Survey response)
- “There is **insufficient detail** at this stage for SAPOE to be reassured that implementation of this Bill would not be to the detriment of other components detailed above, including supporting the frequent and effective use of schools’ grounds and local resources. There is a **risk that resources may be redeployed/diverted to delivering a discrete statutory requirement**, whilst any new resources could be targeted on improving other aspects of outdoor learning; not just residential.” (non Smart Survey response)

Reasons for opposing the proposed Bill

Twenty-two respondents were opposed to the proposed Bill. The reasons given included the level of resources available to give effect to the proposal, the potential impact of the proposal on staff, staff time and the concomitant impact on face-to-face teaching, and the impact on other extra-curricular activities, such as music and language trips.

Nine individuals expressed **full opposition** to the proposal, including three anonymous responses.

One of those individuals (response 191175389), stated that, from personal experience, “I found that no benefit from staying away from home” and that school “outdoor bound days with **returning home each day seem to be far more enjoyable** and the children seem to enjoy this more and still get the chance to bond and find enough independence with day trips” (emphasis added). Another (response 196129765), commented that “I do not think that it’s a priority that local authorities of schools should be compelled to do this when their **limited resources and budgets are already stretched**” (emphasis added) and another (response 196136892) stated that “schools should be a place of education. These experiences place **undue stress on all school staff**...it also places time pressures on staff and students [and] **reduces the time in face-to-face teaching**” (emphasis added).

Among the 11 people who were **partially opposed** were Ross Fairlie (response 196134150) who said that he was “generally opposed to political interference in schools’ curricula” and expressed concerns regarding “**what would have to give way to accommodate**” the proposal, and a professional working in the sector (response 192319646), who wished to remain anonymous, who contended that, while outdoor education and residential experiences were both valuable they were “not the same”, arguing that linking them is “**is less likely to succeed due to cost.**”

No organisations indicated that they were fully opposed. However, two did express **partial opposition**:

The Highland Council (response 194334657) indicated that, because of the geography of the area that it serves, it was:

“fortunate enough to be able to offer outdoor education experiences for ... pupils without necessarily having to take them on residential excursions. The proposal for schools to travel long distances to residential facilities would have a negative environmental impact. It would be better in many cases for Highland schools to make use of the outdoor environment we have on our doorstep.”

Additionally, the council noted in its response that:

“Decision[s] on outdoor education excursions presently lie with Head Teachers. Local Authorities are not resourced to provide such a function, which in any case would run counter to the HT [Head Teacher] empowerment agenda.”

East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (response 194630299), provided four reasons for it being partly opposed:

1. The potential impact that this proposal could have on primary schools’ access to outdoor learning:

“We have concerns about how this will impact [outdoor learning] OL provision across primary schools. If all high school pupils are to be

accommodated there leaves no spaces available for primary pupils with our current number of centres”.

2. The possible effect on organisations such as itself of local authorities passing on to them the responsibility for the provision of centres:

“We are very concerned that local councils will pass the responsibility for this provision onto centres, such as ourselves, meaning that we can no longer continue our work with nursery, P1-P7, High schools and staff training.”

3. The possible repercussions of teachers having to be paid to attend courses:

“Teachers currently go on trips out of goodwill, if it is enshrined in law issues will arise around pay to be away from home.” and,

4. Whether the wider provision of these courses might have ramifications for other types of residential visits:

“We believe there is a danger of this making other residential trips (which hold equal validity) such as music, languages etc more challenging to arrange/ undertake.”

Additionally, it argued that it might be better for the provision of such courses to be aimed at primary school pupils instead, as it believed that this would have “greater positive impact and outcomes.”

Question 2: Do you think legislation is required, or are there are other ways in which the Bill’s aims could be achieved more effectively? Please explain the reasons for your response.

This was an open-ended question that was answered by 460 (85.82%) of respondents. The majority of those responses took the view that legislation was required.

Supportive of legislation

Reasons given for taking the view that legislation was required included:

- taking a legislative approach would be the best way of ensuring that a consistent, safe and regulated approach is taken to helping young people receive opportunities to experience outdoor residential education,
- alternative approaches, such as using existing inspection frameworks or relying on schools or local authorities to decide to provide outdoor residential education opportunities, would be (and had been) ineffective,

- some respondents took the view that the provision of outdoor residential education by schools had been in decline for a number of years, and that the only way of ensuring its provision was through a legislative approach.
- **Ensuring a consistent, safe and regulated approach**

The importance of legislation to ensure a safe, consistent and regulated approach to enable young people to experience outdoor residential education was highlighted by a number of respondents.

The Harmeny Education Trust (response 196100189), which is a grant-aided special school that provides care and education to children and young people who have experienced early years trauma supported a legislative approach, commented:

“We do believe that legislation would be the best way to ensure opportunities are provided for the children and young people of Scotland in a safe and regulated manner. It would also encourage and enable settings to support children and young people's participation in residential experiences which are crucial for improving their mental health and wellbeing which we know is causing a huge concern across the country at present, particularly following the pandemic.”

Others who favoured bringing forward legislation included Andy Beveridge (response 196145568), a retired teacher with over 20-years' experience managing one of the country's largest council-run residential outdoor education centres, who stated that:

“It is difficult to see alternative ways to ensure the opportunity is open to every child. Strengthening the Education Scotland Inspection and Review framework and guidance to schools to make residential weeks to be seen as a 'essential component' may be one way, but it would not address the fundamental financial issue of how schools could ensure that all pupils could be included.”

- **Non legislative approaches would not be effective**

Some respondents took the view that leaving provision for young people of outdoor residential education to the discretion of education authorities, schools or teachers would not be (and had not been) effective for a number of reasons, including resources and consistency of provision. For example, Dòmhnall MacNeill, (response 190333385), noted:

“Within the current (and foreseeable) financial climate, we believe legislation is required. The sad fact is that local authorities are cutting expenditure on many services. Anything which is not statutory has to be seen as under-threat. Any alternative recommendations which did not have legal backing, and depended upon 'goodwill' would be vulnerable. Another advantage of legislation is that it would achieve consistency of

provision - a 'goodwill' underpinning for this provision would be highly likely to lead to very different levels of service in different areas. Legislation, with clearly set out standards and targets would make sure that young people across Scotland had access to as near as possible, the same level of opportunity.”

The John Muir Trust (response 194097282) highlighted the need for accountability and reporting in addition to legislation to ensure entitlement for every young person:

“We believe that a number of channels could be explored to ensure an entitlement for every young person to have an opportunity to experience residential outdoor education. This entitlement could, for example, be part of:

- Schools Inspections
- Learning for Sustainability Action Plan
- Initial Teacher Education
- COSLA reporting

However, all these channels will require each education authority to share data on their residential experiences provision. We believe that accountability and reporting is as important as legislation.”

- **Historic decline in the provision of outdoor residential education**

A number of respondents with experience of providing outdoor residential education highlighted their concern that there had been a decline in provision of such education, and that legislation was required to secure its future. For example, Giles Trussell (response 194616618), who is a professional with experience in delivering residential outdoor education, also expressed support:

“I believe legislation is required. I have watched over the last 30 years the erosion of provision of Outdoor Education for young people and would like to see a reversal of this. It is not something that will be achieved by 'asking' education authorities to do something about it. Finance will need to be ring-fenced and applied in a fair and equitable way.”

The Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632), which is one of the country’s oldest providers of residential outdoor education observed:

“access to the benefits of outdoor residential experiences is very patchy currently, with local authorities not consistently recognising the value. There is not parity between other parts of a child’s education and outdoor education. For there to be universal entitlement legislation is required.

Jamie MacManaway (response 193246861), who is an academic, noted:

“I believe that legislation is essential as the steady decline in provision of outdoor residential experiences is a direct result of there being no statutory requirement to offer such provision.”

Unsupportive of legislation

A number of respondents took the view that legislation in this area was not required or were unsure. Reasons given were similar to those given by respondents who favoured a legislative approach, but from the diametrically opposite perspective. Namely that adopting a legislative approach would remove discretion from education authorities and Head Teachers or that embedding it within the inspection framework would be a more appropriate and effective approach. A further reason given was that focussing on providing sufficient funding to enable outdoor residential education to be universally provided to young people would be more effective than legislation.

- **Greater discretion for education authorities and head teachers / embedding within inspection framework**

The Highland Council (response 194334657) and East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (response 194630299), which were partially opposed to the overall proposal, were among those **less supportive** of legislation. The council expressed the view that “decisions on this matter are **best left to Head Teachers.**” (emphasis added)

A further argument advanced by respondents who were not in favour of legislation was that embedding outdoor residential education within the inspection framework would be more effective. This was an argument made by, for example, East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (response 194630299) which advanced the argument that a more appropriate approach would be to embed outdoor residential education within the inspection framework:

“We believe legislation is not the way to go. Rather providing this funding to support all residential trips to pupils throughout their education (Nursery-Primary-High School). It could be **embedded within the inspection framework** to encourage schools to engage with Outdoor Learning in ways that meet the needs of their individual school/pupils in their context.” (emphasis added)

- **Increased funding and greater collaboration more important than legislation**

Other respondents argued that improving the levels of funding for outdoor residential education might be more appropriate than introducing legislation, with others stating that greater collaboration between authorities would be a better way of addressing this issue.

For example, Alison Paterson (response 191227157), who is a teacher/school employee, commented:

“It would be sad to have to make it legislation, I think more encouragement and funding and investment into outdoor centres would make people want to go as opposed to feeling forced to go.”

An anonymous teacher/school employee (response 192191515) stated that it should be ensured that school funding was available and that schools should be supported:

“in finding appropriate residential centre and in completing required paperwork.”

Kenneth Bell (response 192657965), who is a South Ayrshire councillor and has been a volunteer youth worker for the last 17 years, stated that he was “not sure” about the need for legislation, but he believed that, if was introduced that:

“it would force some local authorities to include Outdoor Learning into their curriculum and ensure that there is a consistent approach across Scotland.”

Councillor Bell also noted that:

“Additional funding and collaborative working between Local Authorities (LA’s) would be important also, particularly for supporting LA's who do not have current facilities/provision for residential Outdoor Learning. There are also opportunities to tie in with DofE and John Muir Award schemes.”

Question 3: The proposed Bill will cover residential outdoor education provision for local authority and grant-aided schools only. Which of the following best expresses your view that independent schools or any other education establishments should not be covered by this obligation. (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / etc.) Please give reasons for your response.

533 respondents (99.44%) answered this question. The breakdown of those responses is shown in the following table:

Fully Supportive	196	37%
Partially Supportive	61	11%
Neutral	138	26%
Partly Opposed	48	9%
Fully Opposed	62	12%
Unsure	28	5%

Fully supportive

Among the key arguments expressed by those that said they were **fully supportive** of this approach were that independent schools already enjoyed sufficient financing, that most already offered residential outdoor learning

opportunities and that there was a more pressing need for local authority schools to receive money to support the proposal:

The Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), stated:

“generally speaking independent schools are well funded. The greatest need is in Local Authority and Grant Aided schools.”

Scottish Borders Council (response 190919150) observed:

“The disparity between opportunities in independent schools and those available to many pupils in local authority schools is already visible. To divert what will likely be limited funds to support independent schools would likely widen the equity gap.”

The School of Adventure Studies, West Highland College, University of the Highlands and Islands (response 193987324) commented:

“This is an example of public money being spent on public resources. The number of independent schools which seek this opportunity without having access to it will be relatively low in number.”

Alison D’Arcy (response 191187512), who is a teacher/school employee said:

“Local authorities (LA) have had their budgets decimated, which has led to LA schools losing out on even the most basic of resources. It would be unfair for fee-paying schools to benefit from this support as they already have too much of an advantage in comparison with LA schools.”

Partially supportive

Sixty-one responses were partially supportive of the approach proposed in relation to this question. Reasons given by those who were partially supportive were similar to those given by respondents who were fully supportive, but were caveated slightly.

For example, in recording **partial support** for this approach, Scouts Scotland (response 194921060), indicated that it did not have a problem with the proposal being extended to include independent schools but expressed the view that provision should be targeted where it is most likely to be required, namely in the state sector:

“We feel there is no problem with the requirement for independent schools being legally required to provide the same minimum provision as part of a universal provision, yet we would not support any funding being directed to the independent sector. We feel strongly about equity but feel most independent schools will already be providing this level of provision and funding would be better placed where required.”

Andy Taylor (response 196170418) made a similar point, arguing that the best way to draw a line in respect of provision would be to target the proposal towards the state sector:

“Targeted support such as that in the proposal is a realistic and somewhat reduces costs. If affordable it would be better to extend to all, but if a line has to be drawn, this is a generous and realistic place to draw it.”

Neutral

A significant proportion (25.89%) of respondents provided a **neutral** response to this question. Many of those responses noted that independent schools already provided for outdoor residential education within the curriculum, so would not be greatly affected by the proposal, and legislating to require them to provide it may be otiose. However, some responses also argued that placing a legislative requirement on independent schools might ensure that they contribute towards best practice in respect of outdoor residential education across the education sector.

This was an argument made by the John Muir Trust (response 194097282), which stated that:

“We believe that independent schools follow and can contribute towards best practice, and that residential outdoor education provision will be part this.”

Inspiralba (response 192914305), advanced the argument that it is not guaranteed that all independent schools provide access to outdoor residential education observing that:

“Many fee-paying schools already have incredible outdoor experiences built in to their curriculum, however if there are instances where they don’t, they should be obliged to offer this as all young people deserve to benefit.”

Dòmhnall MacNeill, (response 190333385), similarly highlighted that outdoor residential education opportunities were more prevalent in independent schools, but took the view that this meant that there was less of a need for legislation to be targeted towards this group:

“Our understanding is that independent schools have not cut back on residential outdoor education opportunities to the same degree as the local authority sector. Why legislate for something which is not a problem? The greatest majority of children within Scotland go through the local authority sector and it is here where the greatest benefit would be had, and where legislation should be focussed.”

The Scottish Adventure School (response 191474458), advanced a similar argument:

“most independent schools already provide varying levels of outdoor provision to their pupils. This should continue but there is no need for legislation for these schools.”

The Abernethy Trust (response 195147083), which runs centres that provide outdoor learning and activities, highlighted the fact that independent schools have a fee charging structure that embeds outdoor learning opportunities in the curriculum:

“Many independent schools already have significant outdoor learning programmes and in some cases full time outdoor staff. Choices have already been made on behalf of learners at these establishments with regard to programmes, activity options and affordability. A fee charging structure allows more flexibility to include outdoor learning opportunities that is not possible within the Local Authority structure.”

Similarly, Euan James Thomson (response 192672513), who is a primary school teacher with specific interests in outdoor education, observed that through his work as a volunteer, he had “seen the level of provision already in place among independent schools” and therefore argued that:

“ If we were to consider this to be legislation aiming for equity as opposed to equality of opportunity, then I don’t believe it necessary to include non-state schools, though equally I am not opposed to the idea.”

Partially or Fully Opposed

Of the 20% of respondents that expressed **partial** or **full opposition** to this approach, a significant number considered that there should be no distinction between establishments and that the statutory provision of residential outdoor learning should be universal rather than targeted towards pupils at state schools. Furthermore, as highlighted in section 2, several respondents expressed concern that, if the proposal is targeted towards state schools, pupils attending independent schools on bursaries may slip through the net if their parents were unable to afford to pay for the provision of outdoor residential education.

In relation to the issue of targeting provision towards state schools, Peter Robert Cleghorn (response 191304839) argued:

“I feel whilst money should be targeted towards local authority and grant-aided schools, all schools should ensure that children have access to residential outdoor education.”

And an anonymous respondent (response 191269551), who is a school Duke of Edinburgh Award manager, observed:

“It does not matter whether schools are state funded or privately funded, what does matter is that all children and young people should have access to meaningful, organised outdoor education.”

Others who were opposed to the proposal being limited to local authority and grant aided schools noted that the parents of some pupils who attend fee-paying schools on bursaries or scholarships might not be able to afford any residential experiences offered by the establishments:

For example, Learning Through Landscapes (response 191686367), noted that:

“In choosing a privately funded education, parents and learner have opted out of significant state support for their education. Our concern is around pupils on a full scholarship, where they have been granted a place through personal achievement. We do suggest there should be a bursary that they can apply to pay for an equivalent experience, with a simple means test and confirmation from a school that they are on a full bursary.”

A teacher/school employee who wished to remain anonymous (response 193584122) stated:

“Parents choose to send their children to a school setting that is appropriate for their needs as well as their child's. No young person should be excluded - they may be at an independent school with an assisted bursary.”

Another anonymous respondent (response 196155900), who is a parent/carer reinforced the argument that attending an independent school does not equate to family wealth, noting that:

“Not all children attending independent schools come from a wealthy background. Many children attending independent schools are supported by way of bursary funding.”

Question 4: The intention is that the obligation to ensure that residential outdoor education is provided would fall on those who are responsible for arranging the provision, e.g. education authorities and managers of grant-aided schools. Which of the following best expresses your view of this proposal? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / etc.) Please explain the reasons for your response.

534 respondents (99.63%) answered this question. The breakdown of those responses is shown in the following table:

Fully Supportive	320	60%
Partially Supportive	123	23%
Neutral	36	7%
Partly Opposed	25	5%

Fully Opposed	17	3%
Unsure	13	2%

Fully supportive

As highlighted above, nearly 60% of respondents were fully supportive of the proposal that there should be an obligation on education authorities and managers of grand-aided schools to ensure the provision of residential outdoor education for young people. The principle reason given for this support were that the education authority is best placed to ensure this provision as they know the context of their area, including local rules and requirements, the schools and pupils in their area, staffing levels and already responsible for the general allocation of resource in their area. This was an argument advanced by, for example, Scouts Scotland (response 194921060), which stated that:

“It is vital that **someone is ultimately responsible** and should be identified. We feel the **education authority are best positioned** to provide the statutory provision in line with local rules and requirements for each educational provision.”

The charity, High Life Highland (response 193729779), considered that responsibility resting with the education authority would:

“enable a **fair and consistent** approach across all schools.”

Roger Antony Scrutton, who is an academic, (response 191434303) expressed a similar view:

“**Education authorities are in the best position** to know how to most effectively place their pupils in residential outdoor education. This might lead to re-establishing local authority residential centres if that is seen as cost-effective and knowing that financial support will be sustainable.”

Some respondents who were fully supportive, argued for even more devolution of responsibility for ensuring provision. For example, Love Outdoor Learning (response 192670431) argued that it:

“should be **up to schools** to organise as **they know their staffing and needs** better than the [local authority].”

Similarly, Alison Paterson, who is a teacher/school employee (response 191227157), and was fully supportive of education authorities being responsible for ensuring provision, commented that:

“Schools know the children and their needs the best.”

Partially supportive

Of the 23% of respondents who were partially supportive, a number of respondents argued that in order to ensure consistency and best practice

across Scotland, there would require to be a national approach as well to ensure the provision of residential outdoor education. For example, NatureScot (response 196134454) offered partial support to this question, noting that:

“a **coordinated national effort will be needed** in order to ensure there are enough ‘beds’ where and when they are needed and to assure a consistency in quality of practice and places. **Quality assurance across ALL residential centres is essential** to ensure high standards and equity of provision for all children and young people across Scotland, whatever their background or school location. There are also benefits to national level sharing of good practice and lessons learned.”

Dòmhnall MacNeill (response 190333385), was also partially supportive, advancing a similar argument in respect of consistency of approach to that advanced by fully supportive respondents that:

“Ultimately the responsibility for this provision should lie with the education authorities. However...it would be important to **ensure consistency of provision across Scotland**. Consideration ought to be given to a co-ordinating body (either within existing local authority or education structures, or newly-established) to seek to ensure this consistency of provision and to intervene/engage if particular provisions fell short of the agreed standards.”

Neutral

Of the 36 responses which took a neutral position in relation to this question, a number did not give reasons why they were neutral. However, those that did generally highlighted complexities in respect of practicalities and delivery that meant that the education authority should not have sole responsibility for ensuring the provision of residential outdoor education, along with concerns around resourcing for education authorities.

This was an argument advanced by education authority, Scottish Borders Council (response 190919150), which provided a **neutral** response to this question due to its concerns regarding the practicalities of education authorities being responsible for delivering this policy. It argued that:

“The level of obligation would need to be firmly drawn to indicate who, within the local authority, had responsibility for ensuring the experiences were provided - i.e. would it be the central Education Team? Would it be the school head teachers? Would it be the class teachers? The level of work needed to plan and execute, and the programming implications this would have on school staff teams, are likely to be most acutely felt at school level, and as such I would suggest that this would be where the obligation would ultimately have to be placed. Conversely, without rigid and centralised guidance, the onus placed on schools could be interpreted in different ways depending on the support for the proposal within schools, and as such some high-level criteria and management

would likely need to be advised and overseen by centralised Education teams within Local Authorities.”

Citing practical concerns in respect of provision, Loch Insh Outdoor Centre (response 192171246), advanced the argument that provision may not currently always be arranged exclusively by the education authority, stating:

“the education authority is not the one currently arranging the provision in every case - this is an assumption and changing the system so this is the case could be detrimental to some industry participants”.

Similarly, outdoor private sector provider, Euan Jarvis (response 192258098), took the view that provision should not necessarily be for the education authority, arguing that:

“there should be an external body that oversees this to ensure that the outdoor educational needs of every child are met to the best of the countries ability”.

Taking a neutral position, Margaret-Ann Mackellar (response 193093425), who is a parent/carer, expressed a practical concern that there may not be “enough residential outdoor education centers available for education authorities/managers to meet this obligation”.

Similarly, Juliet Robertson, (response 193607789), who is a retired education consultant specialising in outdoor learning and play, expressed a similar concern about the ability of education authorities to resource a requirement to provide residential outdoor education, expressing concern that:

“many local authorities have outsourced or downsized or removed their outdoor education services. Many simply focus on approving school excursions - visits advisors. Also how do we ensure that with the tight LA budgets and pressures, the outdoor residential pot is robbed by Peter to pay Paul?”.

Partially opposed

Just under 5% of responses were partially opposed. Similar issues around the need for a consistent nationwide approach in respect of outcomes and what is meant by the successful provision of residential outdoor education to young people, and the requirement to ensure that sufficient resourcing was provided to make it happen were raised.

For example, in respect of the School of Adventure Studies, West Highland College, University of the Highlands and Islands (response 193987324), which is based at West Highland College, University of the Highlands and Islands, stated that it was partially opposed as:

“Education authorities and managers should hold some responsibility for the provision of outdoor education. However, a broader understanding

of the term 'provision' should be adopted. A contention with the original proposal is it sets out an assumption that attendance on a five-day outdoor education residential predicts the achievement of learning outcomes such as concern for the natural environment, self-esteem and resilience. If provision is understood as attendance, then it provides an opportunity for a lowest common denominator approach and does not enforce the inclusion of solid educational practice. We contend that how the experience is delivered is central to the emergence of these outcomes. For a local authority to satisfactorily state that they have provided outdoor education, there needs to be rigorous consideration of what is being delivered and how these outcomes will be derived. This area has been omitted from the proposal and we envision issues in delivery becoming a blame game between different stakeholders."

A number of partially opposed respondents argued that due to limited resources at education authority level and the diverse nature of the 32 local authorities, the obligation should be on the Scottish Government. These included East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (response 194630299), which said that that it believed that responsibility for delivery:

"should fall to Scottish Government because [otherwise it] will squeeze other provision at local authority level."

Ron Bulmer (response 192178488), a professional, who stated that:

"Local authority managers may not possess the skills to manage effectively, and can, at worst be highly detrimental to the professionals providing services. Quality leadership is far more effective."

and an anonymous teacher/school employee (response 196136752), who observed that local authorities:

"have different levels of overhead available to ensure management of this e.g. Shetland is a small authority. It may be better managed centrally or by regional collaborations eg Northern Alliance."

Fully opposed

No organisations stated that they were fully opposed to education authorities and managers of grant-aided schools being responsible for implementing this proposal. However, 17 individuals were fully opposed. Some of those responses, including from schoolteachers, opposed the obligation falling to education authorities on the grounds that, in practice, responsibility for implementing this the provision of residential outdoor education would fall to individual class teachers, who were already subject to significant workload pressures.

For example, one teacher, who wished to remain anonymous (response 196145534), expressed concern that:

“This will NOT be done by senior managers this will as usual be delegated to class teachers who are already under enough stress and pressure with workload.”

Similarly, teacher Annum Imran (response 196151969), contended:

“There needs to be third-party consultation service to help plan and implement an event with teachers. In practice, this is a big job which teachers do not have the time, resources, or knowledge-base to handle alone. There is a serious need to think about the recruitment of outdoor learning teachers or transition teachers with expertise in outdoor learning policy and practice to take on such a role.

Question 5: Which of the following best expresses your view of how residential outdoor education experiences should be funded? (In full by the Scottish Government / In full by local authorities (for local authority-run schools) / By parents/carers, with costs being covered by public funding where children meet criteria for financial support (e.g entitlement to free school meals) / By parents/carers, with costs being covered by public funding where children meet criteria for financial support (e.g entitlement to free school meals) / In some other way) Please explain the reasons for your response. (If you consider Scottish Government funding should be provided to local authorities, please set out the mechanism for such funding, for example through block grant, ring fenced funding etc.)

529 respondents (98.69%) answered this question. The breakdown of those responses is shown in the following table:

In full by the Scottish Government	335	63%
In full by local authorities (for local authority-run schools)	59	11%
By parents/carers, with costs being covered by public funding where children meet criteria for financial support (e.g entitlement to free school meals)	62	12%
By parents/carers meeting food and accommodation costs, and all other costs being met from public funds	28	5%
In some other way	45	9%

In full by the Scottish Government

Nearly two-thirds of respondents to this question indicated that this funding should be provided in full by the Scottish Government. Those indicating that the Scottish Government should provide this support in full argued that it should do so to ensure consistency of approach and due to concerns about capacity at a local level. These included responses from, for example, the Abernethy Trust (response 195147083), which argued that for consistency funding should be administered centrally (emphasis added):

“Despite the value and high profile of Outdoor Learning in recent years **some Local Authorities have demonstrated a lack of understanding and support for Outdoor Learning.** For this reason and for consistency

we believe funding needs to be **created and administered centrally by Scottish Government.**”

The Highland Council (response 194334657) argued that, due to resourcing issues at a local authority level, funding should be provided in full by the Scottish Government:

“Local authorities have no financial capacity to fund the proposed activity, and given the current cost of living crisis a presumption that parents should pay presents challenges also. Any Scottish Government funding should be via block grant.”

An anonymous respondent (response 191188143), who is a parent/carer, argued that, for consistency across the country, the Scottish Government should fund this in full, noting that, in their opinion:

“Central funding will ensure no postcode lottery.”

In full by local authorities

Fifty-nine respondents stated that they believed that local authorities should be providing funding in full. These respondents made the argument that local authorities were best placed to make funding decisions **based on their own circumstances**. These responses included this response from an anonymous respondent (response 191638407), who stated (emphasis added):

“Local authorities will be **best placed to consider local approaches** to this; e.g. whether to run their own centre, train their own staff, use qualified staff in other roles (e.g. I teach in a classroom but have Mountain Leader and Rock Climbing Instructor qualifications). They can then apportion appropriate funding for this and **make funding decisions based on their own circumstances**. There would however have to be some form of uplift to the block grant to allow this to happen.”

A third-sector organisation that asked to be anonymous (response 192547491), stated that:

“it should be funded by the local authorities...limiting it to only children eligible for financial support is not the right way to go as stated in the consultation document it is not always accurate at capturing individual poverty levels.”

An anonymous teacher/school employee, (response 191638407), believed that local authorities would:

“be best placed to consider local approaches to this; e.g. whether to run their own centre, train their own staff, use qualified staff in other roles (e.g. I teach in a classroom but have Mountain Leader and Rock Climbing Instructor qualifications). They can then apportion appropriate funding for this and make funding decisions based on their own

circumstances. There would however have to be some form of uplift to the block grant to allow this to happen.”

Gordon McPhee, (response 194416738) who worked in outdoor education and experiential/management development in the 1970's and 1980's stated that:

“No child should be excluded because their parents are poor. The local authority is best placed to provide the experience.”

However, Mr McPhee added that “they must be adequately funded by the government to do so”.

By parents/carers

28 respondents that suggested parents/carers should provide funding tended to caveat this view by stating that, where parents/carers were unable to provide funding, support should be offered. For example, the Scottish Adventure School (response 191474458), stated that there should be:

“Means tested support with the bar set fairly low so that all families are able to access the provision would be a realistic solution is full government funding is not an option.”

The Glencoe Trust Ltd, which owns and runs the Glencoe Outdoor Centre, (response 192218087) noted:

“Our experience is that funding can be an issue, which is why we offer a bursary fund to help subsidise costs where there is need. Bus transport from the school to the outdoor provider is also a cost issue. Perhaps this could be met by public funds.”

Daniel Gete Garrido (response 191535011) who is a teacher/school employee who has been involved with the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme and has contributed to outdoor opportunities for students in the Highlands, argued that to ensure full commitment and support from parents and carers for residential outdoor education:

“It should be partially funded by parents/carers, unless meeting the criteria for full financial support, so that parents and young people are invested in the opportunity. The state (Scottish Government) should finance 50% of the cost.”

Other ways

Forty-five respondents indicated that they considered that there should be other ways of funding residential outdoor education. Those respondents who added comment argued for a partnership or blended approach to funding, including central government, local government, and participants or their parents/carers.

This was a case made by Ron Bulmer (response 192178488), who suggested:

“Perhaps partnership funding could [be] explored, allowing a wider and inclusive demographic. Where possible, participants should make some contribution (and it doesn't have to be financial).”

The Council for Learning Outside the Classroom (response 196185977) also commented on a partnership or blended approach, observing that:

“A ‘blended’ approach perhaps utilising some kind of means testing may offer a realistic solution, though ultimately the cost will be relatively low and will have a high social return on investment.”

The Association of Sail Training Organisations (response 195435957) stated that (emphasis added):

“To ensure provision the funding should be from the government to local authorities and grant aided schools. The money should be ring fenced and sufficient to provide five days residential for every young person within the scope of this proposal. **A blended funding model should also be considered** (parents/carers where they can afford it, supplemented by the government for those who can't).”

The Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), also argued that wherever funding comes from, it must be ring fenced, as:

“It is our opinion that expecting the Scottish Government or local education authorities to fully fund residentials is too aspirational, and unlikely to be feasible. Equally, some form of subsidy which is assessed only by Free School Meals or the like is too far in the other direction. Perhaps if a fixed amount (eg £200) was available for all children, regardless of their means, but this could then be augmented to potentially the full cost where a child was entitled to free school meals. Any funding where Local Authorities are involved **MUST** be ring fenced. We are of the opinion that Headteachers are best placed on where to spend this money, rather than it disappear into Local Authority budgets.”

Question 6: Any new law can have a financial impact which could affect individuals, businesses, the public sector, or others. What financial impact do you think this proposal could have if it became law? (a significant increase in costs / some increase in costs / etc) Please explain the reasons for your response, including who you would expect to feel the financial impact of the proposal, and if there are any ways you think the proposal could be delivered more cost-effectively.

517 respondents (96.46%) answered this question. A breakdown of those responses is shown in the following table:

a significant increase in costs	69	13%
---------------------------------	----	-----

some increase in costs	316	61%
no overall change in costs	99	19%
some reduction in costs	29	6%
a significant reduction in costs	4	1%

As the above table shows, a significant majority of respondents considered that there would be an increase in costs, with over 60% believing there would be some increase in costs. Very few responses (33 in total) considered that there would be a reduction in costs.

Significant increase

69 respondents considered that there would be a significant increase in costs. Those respondents highlighted the increase in demand for services, and the concomitant increase in need for a larger workforce, additional outdoor centres and wider costs such as transportation and sustenance. Some of those respondents expressed concern that this may lead to greater use of private sector providers to meet demand, and the possible implications of the proposal in respect of teaching staff terms and conditions. Other respondents highlighted potential hidden costs falling on parents of carers who may be required to buy outdoor clothing for their children.

- **Impact of increased demand on workforce, number of centres and wider costs**

Among the respondents that considered that there would be a **significant increase** in costs was High Life Highland (response 193729779), which argued that, from its perspective as a service provider, there would be significant costs arising from the increase in demand for services:

“We would likely be the service provider, and we would therefore need to manage a larger workforce, equipment costs and potentially the need to build and manage a facility to accommodate the demand.”

A Doward (response 192207731) made a similar point, noting that the Scottish Government:

“has fixed budgets with limited ways of raising new money. Investment in centres, land, equipment, staff, catering, insurances, teachers comes at a cost.”

However, it also argued that offsetting these costs would be reductions in disruptive behaviour, mental health issues and the use of NHS resources, and improvements in education system through behavioural improvements.

Three teachers/school employees (responses 192319646, 196132090 and 196145667), who wished to remain anonymous, highlighted concerns about wider costs arising from increased demand. One anonymous school employee observed that (emphasis added):

“Not all schools currently access this kind of experience. As they all have this opportunity costs will obviously increase. More importantly, there is not currently capacity to provide this. If this becomes compulsory, the supply demand issue will drive up costs. **As commercial providers fill the gap this may force out of the market the remaining [local authority] providers (very few left).** I have mixed views as to whether or not that would be a good thing.” (192319646)

Another highlighted the impact on staffing terms and conditions, along with transport costs:

“Costs associated with residential are huge and if it becomes something that staff are made to do this has contractual obligations also. Costs for pupils is large, staffing needs to be paid for, transport costs are large.” (196132090)

And another noted:

“We cannot find an overnight provider for less than £75 per pupil, including transportation costs and sustenance. Multiply that by the number of children and the cost is significant.” (196145667)

Neil Smith, who has 30 years professional experience working in residential outdoor education (response 191409560), argued that there would be a significant increase on the basis that:

“If it was made a statutory entitlement for 12-16 year old to go on a residential, I think the private centres costs may go up.”

Mr Smith observed however that:

“if local authorities could somehow re-establish their own residential outdoor education centres and cap the price or subsidise it from other budgets, then the price may go down and with the added benefit of possibly improving the professionalism within the sector of instructor/teachers in outdoor learning.

- **Hidden costs for parents/carers**

Potential hidden costs for parents/carers who would be required to spend money on, for example, clothing and shoes was highlighted by some respondents. For example, two anonymous respondents highlighted what they saw as potentially significant costs for parents/carers.

Respondent 196135679, a member of the public, noted:

“For myself as a parent there would be as would need to ensure my children had all the appropriate clothing & footwear.”

and Respondent 196142294, who is a parent/carer, argued that there would be a significant impact on:

“Single parent, non-working families [and] families who have caring responsibilities and are on benefits.”

Some increase

Over 60% of respondents to this question considered that there would be some increase in costs. Similar arguments were made to those made by respondents who considered there would be a significant increase in costs, namely that the increased costs would be in respect of additional staffing being required to provide residential outdoor education. However, a number of respondents who considered there would be some increase in costs considered that these costs would lead to longer term benefits to society in respect of future health benefits.

Those suggesting that there would be **some increase** in costs included:

NatureScot (response 196134454), which made several points in suggesting that this might be the case:

- It noted that, to allow residential facilities to follow good practice in sustainability, some might “need financial support to bring them up to standard”.
- It suggested exploring whether residential staff could provide outreach services for schools that “could take place with pupils/ teachers in school grounds or local greenspace as a precursor to their residential experience”, although this might add to costs.
- It observed that, as noted in the consultation paper, many outdoor professionals have left the sector, “so investment will be needed to attract and train new staff.”, and
- It stated that “some families may face high costs in attending a residential”, depending on what funding mechanism is used.

Others suggesting some increase in costs included, Learning Through Landscapes (response 191686367), which stated:

“We believe there will be a slight increase in costs, these though centre around quality of provision and support to maintain quality of provision...Some costs will be for outdoor centres, ensuring high quality of staff being recruited, trained and retained. This is vital to an industry with huge issues around low pay, low experience, short-term careers at one end, and high-quality, highly experienced and trained staff at the other end.”

Scouts Scotland (response 194921060) argued that:

“There may be costs upfront depending on the level of provision requested and requirements to expand equipment stores to meet demand an ensure sustainability in line with business increase”.

The Field Studies Council (response 195914496) added that to make provision more cost effective, there would need to be early engagement with the outdoor learning sector as:

“Ensuring universal provision will increase costs. Early engagement with the outdoor learning sector in Scotland will be essential as they will be able to advice cost effectiveness, for example making use of the times of year when there is less demand, exploring the idea of a number of providers working together under a national contract.”

The Glencoe Trust (response 192218087) suggested that there would be some increase:

“if bus transport and provision for deprived children is provided by the state.”

The Abernethy Trust (response 195147083) stated that “although costings have been done as part of the research for the consultation:

“it is likely that costs will be higher than current estimates for a number of reasons including: rising cost of living, increased transport costs, increased energy costs, full cost of transporting groups.”

The Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632) noted that there might be an increase in the unit cost of outdoor residentials “depending on what the resulting quality framework requires for providers and schools”, however, it stated that “as much of the provision is currently of a good standard this should not be a significant increase.”

It also observed that “if the Government is funding a residential for every young person during their school career then there is an additional cost to the public purse. However as laid out in the consultation document this might amount to £24m, a mere 0.67% of a overall Scottish Education budget of £3.57 billion.”

- **Longer-term benefits**

Although arguing that there would be some increase in costs, a number of organisations considered that short term costs would lead to longer term benefits, particularly in respect of health benefits. This was a point made by the Lochranza Centre CIC (response 191183214), which argued that a short-term increase in costs would represent investment, and may lead to:

“savings in mental health and social care or at least a reduction in the rise of these costs”.

Similarly, Martin Amos, who is an outdoor education instructor at the Lagganlia Centre for Outdoor Education (response 191249850), which is a City of Edinburgh Council centre that is based at Feshiebridge in the Cairngorms National Park, stated that:

“If government funded, this may increase costs to the tax payer, but feel that the benefits out way the additional costs”.

Countryside Learning Scotland (response 194426967) highlighted wider benefits to young people and society as a whole, arguing that a:

“negligible increase to the taxpayer would be offset by the benefits to society and our young people. Residential experiences produce more balanced, confident and engaged young people with better self esteem in the long run will mean less social disturbance, less crime, more productivity, more higher skilled content people”.

The Brathay Trust (response 191300015) also considered that there would be some increase in costs, but highlighted that it would also bring economic benefits:

“In terms of this legislation, the cost of providing residential flows back into the economy, supporting jobs and local business, as well as supporting the education and development of our young people”.

No overall change

Just under 20% of respondents to this question argued that there would be no overall change in costs. Many of those respondents did not comment on why they considered this to be the case, and some argued that they currently did not have sufficient information to comment on whether there would be an increase or a decrease in costs. However, many who took the view that there would be no overall change advanced the same argument as those who considered there would be an increase in costs, namely that there would be an increase in costs in the short term that would result in longer term benefit.

For example, Active Outdoor Pursuits (response 192883719), which is based at the Craigower Lodge Outdoor Centre, in Newtonmore, believed that there would be **no overall change**, stating:

“the financial impact would be fairly small if even at all... the health benefits that will come from the implementation of this bill will offer long term savings to the Governments health budget.”

Similarly, the School of Adventure Studies, West Highland College, University of the Highlands and Islands (response 193987324), drew attention to research demonstrating that there is a link between investment in education experience and longer-term benefits to society:

“We would like to highlight the significant amount of research which demonstrates that money spent in quality educational experiences reduces the need for Government spending in other areas such as health (especially mental health) justice and social services. We suggest that a net saving would result if this Bill was set out appropriately”.

Si Tinley (response 191218365) commented:

“Like any investment, there is outlay initially and then a return in the future. This is investment in our people.”

Reduction in costs

33 respondents considered there would be a reduction in costs (29, some reduction; four, a significant reduction). Again, the key argument advanced by those respondents was that there may be short-term costs but that these would be outweighed by longer-term benefits or savings.

For example, Inspiralba (response 192914305) argued that in the longer-term, there would be a reduction in costs:

“There would be a cost to the public sector but with an increase in numbers the cost of delivery would reduce slightly as numbers of courses throughout the year and numbers attending would ensure outdoor centres were well utilised and used efficiently.”

Among others suggesting that there would be some reduction in costs was the Scottish Environmental & Outdoor Education Centres (SOEC) (response 1961156117), which commented that:

“A clearer understanding and an increase in numbers will improve the quality of the experience and may lead to an initial reduction in costs although this might be short-term given inflationary increases. This suggests that absolute figures for costs of a cohort of young people be index linked in future years.

There are also cost benefits from considering the wider financial impact. The residential can trigger positive changes in mental health and well-being that may result in current costs addressing a wide range of issues from dietary health, bullying, obesity etc.”

The Inverurie Community Campus Duke of Edinburgh (DofE) DLC (response 191427533) reflected on a possible reduction in costs to itself:

“currently we have to fundraise a license fee of £1,200 each year in order to provide DofE at the school. If there was a legal requirement then school budgeting may alter to fulfil this.”

David Sanderson (response 191481132) stated that:

“This bill will not have a large cost of implementation but the potential for change is massive. Think of the future savings in physical and mental healthcare, justice, legal and probation services. There is also potential for this to kickstart a shift in teachers' attitudes to young people and therefore their workplace. It may actually result in reducing costs of supply teachers etc.”

Richard Oakes (response 191195048), who is the manager of an English local authority residential education service, believed that there could be a significant decrease in cost as the issue needed:

“to be seen in the longer term re socio-economic benefits. Increase in short-term costs to the public purse and families, offset by long term socio-economic gains (e.g. employment skills, learning attitudes) and savings (e.g. mental and physical health, crime and disorder). The question is time-dependent; I'd view the costs as an investment with good return prospects.”

Question 7: Which of the following best expresses your view on the proposal for a quality framework to ensure the quality of the education provision of outdoor centres? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / etc.) Please give reasons for your response, including whether this should be done by HMIE using a quality framework as part of their inspection of schools and the extent to which, if any, it should be statutory.

535 respondents (99.81%) answered this question. The below table shows the breakdown of responses to this question:

Fully Supportive	376	70%
Partially Supportive	97	18%
Neutral	30	6%
Partly Opposed	9	2%
Fully Opposed	10	2%
Unsure	13	2%

As the above table indicates, the vast majority of respondents supported the proposal for a quality framework to ensure the quality of the education provision of outdoor centres.

Supportive

Of the responses to this question that were fully supportive of the proposal for a quality framework to ensure the quality of the education provision of outdoor centres, most reached this view on the basis that a quality inspection regime would result in consistency and quality of approach across the country and a shared experience for all pupils, and many advocated that His Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) would be the appropriate body to deliver this. A further point that was made by supportive respondents was that to implement

this would require development and training for staff at different levels, and input from young people and other bodies.

- **Quality inspection regime leads to consistent approach across country**

This point was made by Scottish Borders Council (response 190919150), which considered the introduction of a quality framework to be the “pivotal aspect” of the entire proposal, arguing that (emphasis added):

“The last 30 years have seen a marked ‘dumbing down’ of the outdoor education residential experience, whereby many pupils now simply swap their school and its playground for a centre and its grounds for a week, and do not get to actually take part in any activities that are truly outdoors, and in many cases have questionable educational benefit. **Without a solid and inspection-based set of criteria for what constitutes an educational residential outdoor experience, the equity of provision could vary hugely between schools and Local Authorities due to the simple logistics of what centres or providers are used or able to deliver the programme.** The experience one group of pupils will have if being led by a new instructor barely out of school themselves, taking part only in on-site activities and challenges, where they are whisked through 4 or 5 different sessions a day, will be starkly different to the experiences of a pupil group led by a qualified, trained, experienced Outdoor Instructor.” (emphasis added)

A number of respondents who were fully supportive of this aspect emphasised that HMIE would be the appropriate body to deliver this.

For example, Countryside Learning Scotland (response 194426967), which is a rural education charity that aims to deliver rural awareness participation training and career opportunities to secondary pupils, stated:

“Every new programme needs a clear set of outcomes and delivery mechanisms to achieve those outcomes and ensure national standards. HMIE would seem the relevant body to deliver this.”

Similarly, the Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), stated:

“We fully support ensuring a quality framework, and HMIE would appear to be best placed to assess this, once suitable criteria was agreed and conversations had between HMIE and the industry.”

The Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632) added:

“We agree HMIE should review the quality of this part of education given their responsibility for ensuring the quality of all other aspects of education.”

In offering **partial support**, NatureScot (response 196134454) agreed that HMIE would be best placed to provide the inspection regime:

“We are not aware of an organisation that is better set up to do this than HMIE. As outlined in the paper, HMIE has a proven, tried and tested approach to inspecting a range of services. However, they would need support in developing their understanding of a range of aspects of outdoor learning and residential provision”.

- **Quality framework is good but will require training and should be developed with service users**

A number of respondents argued that to deliver an effective quality framework there would need to be training and upskilling for staff, in particular inspectors, and that this should be developed along with young people themselves and other stakeholders. The requirement for training for inspectors was developed by, for example Roger Antony Scrutton (response 191434303), who agreed that HMIE should be the appropriate body, but highlighted the need for specialist training for inspectors to enable them to conduct fair assessments:

“Although I think HMIE is the best vehicle and agree with the suggestions in the proposal, having sat in on an inspectors meeting with school OE [outdoor education] teachers it is clear that inspectors need the specialist training needed to conduct a fair assessment. Inspectors should ideally see the teaching and learning in action at the outdoor centre used by the school. Most OE centres now claim that they instruct in a curriculum-friendly way, and in some cases schools design the week programme in collaboration with the centre (so called 'Brilliant residential'). However, my experience is that local authority centres and organisations like the Field Studies Council are better at meeting the needs of the curriculum. To maintain standards this should be a statutory requirement.”

NatureScot (response 196134454) advanced the argument that a new system would require to be developed with input from young people and other relevant stakeholders:

“with input from the environmental sector and young people representative of the range of young people that will be accessing this service. Care would need to be taken to ensure that it is not a tick box exercise. Could a progression of outdoor learning in school grounds, local greenspaces and places further afield be incorporated into this framework?”

Opposed

Twenty-eight respondents indicated that they were opposed to there being a quality framework to ensure the quality of the education provision. Many of those expressed concerns in respect of the complexities and the costs that may be involved in adopting a quality framework.

For example, Dòmhnall MacNeill of Comunn na Gàidhlig, (response 190333385), indicated that it was in favour of the principle of a quality framework, but did not consider that it should specifically assess the quality of the education provision. Rather it believed it should:

“Undoubtedly a quality framework is needed, though we are **not necessarily convinced that it should assess the 'quality of the education provision'**. If a law was passed to ensure access to outdoor education, and it set out appropriate standards and objectives which were consistently applied, perhaps the education element of delivery could be addressed in this way.

A much more significant question would be that of **proper safety standards during activity delivery**. Part of the developmental benefit associated with outdoor education is that there is a degree of 'mild peril' involved, some risk of injury, no matter how carefully managed. For the young people, addressing and overcoming these perceived risks and challenges, whether abseiling or gorge walking develops their self-confidence. It would be critically important to ensure that under an expansion of provision as proposed here, safety standards were not compromised. A quality assurance framework already exists for commercially provided outdoor education; AALA (The Adventure Activities Licensing Authority)- currently delivered by the Health and Safety Executive. Local Authority or any statutory provision may not be 'commercial', and may not come under the auspices of AALA, but they should categorically adhere to at least the same standards of safety and delivery.” (emphasis added)

A Doward (response 192207731) was also partially opposed on the basis of cost:

“The cost of a quality framework is too high currently. Needs to be simplified to avoid high cost of entry.”

No organisations indicated that they **fully opposed** this, however nine individuals were fully opposed. Concerns among those respondents included that an additional framework would lead to additional bureaucracy. For example, an anonymous school Duke of Edinburgh Award manager (response 191269551), stated:

“There is already a lot of paperwork or outdoor centres to complete and regulations that they have to comply with. There should be no need to duplicate any of it.”

Neutral/unsure

Forty-three respondents indicated that they were either neutral or unsure in respect of this question. Of the few who commented, a number expressed concern about additional bureaucracy arising from the introduction of a quality framework or highlighted that appropriate frameworks already existed. For example, Alison Thomson (response 192068470) stated:

“I am unsure if adding an additional layer of bureaucracy to the provision of outdoor education is necessary. Outdoor instructors already have to constantly update their experience with organisations including Mountain Training. I would argue that the focus should be on young people having positive experiences in the outdoors and I'm unconvinced as to whether ensuring there are direct links between what they do on these trips and CfE will genuinely enhance the benefit to young people”.

Similarly, Active Outdoor Pursuits (response 192883719) argued that (as highlighted above by Dòmhnall MacNeill) a relevant framework for quality and safety standards already exists:

“A framework already exists within all or most local authorities to ensure that Outdoor Centres meet quality and safety standards. The main standard being set by the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations 2004 which is administered through HSE and is a requirement of all Outdoor Centres”.

Question 8: Which of the following best expresses your view that the age range of 12 – 16 is appropriate for participation in the residential outdoor education experience? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / etc.) Please give reasons for your response, including whether you think other age ranges would be more appropriate.

533 respondents (99.44%) answered this question. The breakdown of responses is shown in the following table:

Fully Supportive	282	53%
Partially Supportive	142	27%
Neutral	31	6%
Partly Opposed	52	10%
Fully Opposed	19	4%
Unsure	7	1%

The issue of whether the age range covered by the proposal should be 12 to 16 is covered in detail under “age range” in relation to responses to question 1. Although, as the above table indicates, nearly 80% of respondents were supportive of this age range, as rehearsed under question 1, a significant number of responses highlighted the importance of provision of outdoor education for primary 7 pupils, who would mostly fall outwith the 12 to 16 age group.

Supportive

Over half of all respondents were fully supportive of the proposal that residential outdoor education should be available to all in the age range 12-16. A further quarter of all respondents were partially supportive. The principle reason given for supporting it applying to this age group was that this is the key point in a young person’s life for developing confidence, developing interests, and

developing emotionally. Equally, even among those who were partially supportive of this age range, there were some respondents who advocated extending it, both to include primary 7s, and to increase the age range to 18. Some of those responses are highlighted below.

Inspiralba (response 192914305), fully supported the 12-16 age range on the basis that (emphasis added):

“This is a critical time for **developing or losing confidence** as well as **forming interests** (or losing interest) and the value of encouraging young people to explore the outdoors and their connection with the outdoors (and the challenges of the outdoors) can be a life changing experience encouraging positive life choices at a time when young people can be getting taken down a road of antisocial or self-destructive choices.”

Countryside Learning Scotland (response 194426967) expressed a similar view:

“This is a **key age in a young person’s development**. Self-esteem and confidence building are key to supporting the decisions a young person has to make at this stage in their development, including subject choice. Providing residential opportunities at this stage, across outdoor activities from traditional land use to recreation Adventure and the environment will **help them find out their interests and potentially their chosen career route**. It is also our experience through Pathways to Rural Work initiative that secondary schools struggle to make this provision due to the subject based nature of the timetable.”

In the same vein, Martin Amos of the Lagganlia Centre for Outdoor Education (response 191249850), observed that:

“This age range will form the best demographic as it targets the key ages where children develop **social emotional and health and wellbeing skills** that are the foundation of outdoor education.”

As referenced above, a number of respondents were only partially supportive of the proposal as they considered it could be extended to include a wider age range. For example, High Life Highland (response 193729779) suggested widening access to include upper-primary school pupils:

“We recognise that 12-16 is the most impactful age range to do this with, but it brings with it some challenges for particular individuals. Aiming the residential towards P7 in Highland where we have geographically dispersed communities and schools it works well as a transitional process for many clusters, where many children find moving up to High School a difficult process.”

Similarly, Scottish Borders Council (response 190919150), contended:

“With the vast majority of primary schools delivering a Primary 7 residential experience, there may be merit in considering any new legislation to focus on S2/S3/S4 age range, rather than S1. There may also be merit in settling on a single year group, rather than an age range, in that this would likely be more stable for schools to enable planning and development of programme into the future. Another area to consider will be the ability of centres to cater to a higher number of participants across a much wider age range - many centres are predominantly set up currently to work with P7 aged/sized pupils, so to cater for a big increase in secondary pupils may require significant spend to buy larger/more resources such as harnesses, buoyancy aids, bikes etc.”

Although partially supportive, Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), argued that:

“entirely excluding the primary sector is a mistake. Most Scottish school children attend a residential in their upper primary years, usually P6&7, at a formative time in their lives. We do not oppose 12-16 year olds having this opportunity as well, but believe in addition it should be extended out to P6 & 7's.”

Freda Fallon (response 195881926), who has 20 years' experience working for the Outward Bound Trust, while noting that 12 to 16 was a “good age range for young people to have a variety of experiences available”, also suggested opening this up to older pupils:

“in S6 we see another transition/ Leadership experiences open up as young people prepare to leave school so perhaps an upward extension to 17 might be helpful for senior pupil leadership programmes.”

Neutral

Thirty-one respondents indicated that they were neutral in relation to this question. Several of these responses were neutral on the basis that there would be benefit in extending the proposal to include primary school pupils (as rehearsed above). For example, the Field Studies Council (response 195914496) commented that:

“Ideally, learners would have already experienced a progression of experiences throughout their early and primary years as part of Learning for Sustainability, making the age range 12-16 an appropriate one for a residential, which would also allow them to undertake fieldwork, outdoor science and ecology as part of their curriculum courses. However, it would be sensible not to automatically discount the benefits of a residential for younger primary learners too and this is where individual schools and teachers would be well placed to make those decisions.”

Opposed

71 respondents were opposed to this age group. These generally broke down into two groups: those who considered that it should be extended to include primary school aged pupils, and those who considered it should be offered to 17- and 18- year olds.

- Primary school pupils should be included

Responses that advanced the argument that the age range should include primary school pupils included responses from outdoor centres. For example, Loch Insh Outdoor Centre (response 192171246):

“This could fundamentally shift the industry. A large portion of our schools are P7 and as a result they may stop coming, with a new administrative burden on both teachers and centres to engage with schools who have never previously run such visits. In addition younger age groups who cluster with other Secondary feeder schools offer the residential opportunity to meet new secondary peers for the first time. It would be better to require the education authority to run at least one residential for every pupil in the P5 to S4 range or demand it of P6/7.”

A similar argument was advanced by the Glencoe Trust Ltd (response 192218087), which argued that there was an evidence base for extending the age range:

“the majority of pupils currently attending these courses are in the 10-12 age bracket, and there is an abundance of evidence that this age band benefits a lot from these courses.”

East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (response 194630299) was fully opposed to the proposed age range, stating that:

“We believe this is a significant flaw in the proposed bill. In our experience primary pupils are impacted to a greater degree with such experiences than the 12-16 bracket. There is also the danger that high schools see this as their Outdoor Learning in its entirety, which flies in the face of existing Scottish Government guidelines.”

St Patrick’s Primary School in Troon (response 193809269) drew on its own experience to argue in favour of extending the provision to include primary 6 and 7s:

“Primary 6 and 7 for a residential experiences have always been highly successful at St. Patrick’s. The P6 experience is often the child’s first experience out with the family unit and really helps build their resilience and growth mindset. The P7 experiences is a fantastic transition event as we always go with another school from our Cluster so that pupils can get to know each other in a more relaxed setting.”

Euan James Thomson (response 192672513), expressed his full opposition to this age range, on the basis that it should be aimed at younger children instead:

“I believe that these should begin as early as possible, ideally while children are in first, or early second, level. Through my voluntary work I have seen children as young as 8 camping, cooking on a fire and engaging in highly adventurous activities. They learn to measure risk, cooperate and communicate in ways that are just not achievable in a 6 hour school day.”

- **Age range should be extended upwards**

At the other end of the age spectrum, some respondents argued that the age range should be extended upwards, to include 17- and 18-year-olds. For example, Ela Gillies (response 192207575) was partially opposed on the basis that the age range needed to be narrowed:

“I think 12-14 is too young. I think it should be aimed at older pupils who will potentially get more out of it and may keep the activities going into adulthood, as I have.”

While supportive of the proposed bill overall, YouthLink Scotland (non Smart Survey response) questioned the age range of 12-16, arguing that the proposal might benefit from being extended to include up to 18 year olds:

“a significant question arising over whether the age range of 12-16 is appropriate for maximum uptake in the residential outdoor experience.”

It argued that there might be scope to expand provision to pupils aged 17 and 18, stating that:

“We believe the upper age of 18 would be more suitable, ensuring no one misses out on a residential outdoor education experience.”

It also commented that its members had:

“discussed the crucial transition phase between primary and secondary education. There is existing infrastructure at primary school for outdoor residential experiences we can build upon and learn from... connecting existing primary school experiences and in consideration of the additional infrastructure that will be required to successfully implement the Bill”.

Question 9: Any new law can have an impact on different individuals in society, for example as a result of their age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership status, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. What impact could this proposal have on particular people if it became law? [If you do

not have a view skip to next question] Please explain the reasons for your answer and if there are any ways you think the proposal could avoid negative impacts on particular people.

This was an open-ended question that was answered by 226 (42.16%) of the responders. Key themes that were raised by respondents were the importance of ensuring provision for pupils in Gaelic Medium Education, the potential impact of the proposal on LGBT+ pupils and the impact on pupils with disabilities and pupils who require additional support.

- **Ensuring provision for pupils in Gaelic Medium Education**

A number of respondents highlighted specific issues around provision for pupils in Gaelic Medium Education, particularly in respect of the delivery of outdoor education in Gaelic medium. For example, Dòmhnall MacNeill of Comunn na Gàidhlig, (response 190333385), commented (emphasis added):

“The development of the Gaelic language is a priority for the Scottish Government, and something which has cross party support in the Scottish Parliament. An important element of this development effort is Gaelic Medium Education (GME) where children follow the national curriculum, but where much if not all of their education is delivered through the medium of Gaelic...

At the moment there is NO formal residential provision for [GME]. No established centre has any internal capacity to deliver a Gaelic language programme. We are not aware of any centre with a Gaelic-speaking instructor. **Gaelic speaking school pupils cannot take advantage of residential outdoor activity provision in the language of their education. This has to be seen as a significant inequality.**”

It also commented on the experience of its company, Spòrs Gàidhlig, which aims to provide outdoor education through the medium of Gaelic, and ultimately to manage and run a residential facility:

“This has been extraordinarily challenging. The demand for our services is there from schools and parents, but there is insufficient funding available to put Spòrs Gàidhlig on a stable and sustainable footing to allow us to plan beyond the short term. We have received some public funding, primarily to establish the project in 2017-19, and since then from Bòrd na Gàidhlig - however it does not cover all our costs...If legislation is passed to ensure the provision of residential outdoor opportunities then it ought to include provision for GME education. It should stipulate that, where local authorities deliver GME, the residential outdoor opportunities should take place in a Gaelic speaking centre/setting.”

Donald Morris (response 190546599) observed that:

“The Gaelic Language Act 2005 (Scotland) must be included in any new legislation. An equal entitlement to Gaelic outdoor education must be included in the legislation with all authorities offering GME required to offer residential in Gaelic. Not bilingually as that just means English with a bit of Gaelic.”

Steven Ritchie, a member of the public, (response 194546386) expressed concern that:

“Gaelic-medium pupils would be forced to use English despite requiring the same activities fully in Gaelic to help their educational needs and attainment in said language.

An anonymous respondent, who is a teacher with experience of delivering outdoor education, (response 191183355) commented:

“There must be Gaelic language provision for GME pupils. Otherwise GME is being weakened and these pupils are getting the message that Gaelic is not important.”

- **Impact on LGBT+ pupils**

The anonymous 191183355 also made comment on the potential impact of the proposed bill on LGBT pupils, particularly in respect of the prevention of bullying and discrimination:

“LGBT pupils and their needs must be taken into account when dealing with how rooms are allocated - for example, a lesbian pupil may experience bullying and discrimination if placed with either boys or girls, so there must be some freedom given to make sure everyone is safe and secure. A high level of adult supervision and pupil choice in sleeping situations would be beneficial and also allow trans pupils/LGB pupils to be included without anyone feeling uncomfortable.”

Hugh Maclean (response 196100189), who is a member of the public, noted that:

“All groups should be provided for, including LGBTQI+.”

Anne J McEwan (response 193896935), who is a primary school teacher in South Ayrshire, commented that:

“our outdoor centre is fully inclusive of all learners and their needs. Adaptations are made to include those with different diets, require medical care, treat learners who identify as LGBTQI+ with respect and compassion” and on that basis, Ms McEwan believed that the proposal would have “no negative impact” on pupils attending that centre.

- **Impact on pupils who are disabled or have additional support needs**

A further issue that was raised in response to this question related to the potential impact of the proposal on pupils who are disabled or who have additional support needs. For example, Juliet Robertson (response 193607789), expressed concern that the proposed bill ran “**the risk of inadvertently excluding those learners who are most vulnerable**”, adding that she believed that there was a need for a clause that would ensure “**the entitlement of all**” and that “**the quality framework must report on this.**” (emphasis added)

She noted her particular concern for “children who are deemed badly behaved or who have severe and profound multiple learning needs, commenting that “every effort will need to be made to ensure any marginalised group or learner has equity of access and opportunity.”

To achieve this, Ms Robertson commented that “some creative thinking” might be required, including:

- residential centres being given support to provide gender-neutral toilets and showering arrangements and flexible sleeping options.
- having family-friendly residentials for some groups.
- providing the option of nurture-group type residentials.
- considering whether residentials could be provided close at hand (for example, do pupils from Glasgow have to travel to the Highlands if there centres more closer to them?).
- where students have multiple allergies, the cook should have direct conversations with the child and parent/carer in advance of attending (with meal planners and ingredients sent in advance and double-checking that every item was safe to eat).
- taking care during Ramadan and Eid to avoid bookings from schools with Muslim students, and
- setting aside some time for outdoor play in an agreed space so that the pupils can have time to themselves without having adult-directed activities or jobs to do.

Scottish Borders Council (response 190919150) also highlighted the importance of centres considering how they work with young people with complex learning issues, along with other pupils who may have specific requirements:

“This proposal could significantly increase the need for centres to think about how they work with young people with complex learning issues, if the offer is to be seen as fully inclusive. In schools with high levels of pupils who have specific religious beliefs, thought may be needed in relation to how young girls take part in residential activity, and whether/how parental involvement is managed.”

SOEC (response 1961156117) stated that:

“Residential Outdoor Learning should be wholly inclusive. There is no reason for anyone to be excluded from the experience. In support the funding of all children, the Bill goes a long way to ensuring equality. Young people with extreme disability will be better placed going to specialists such as the Calvert Trust. However, we should not underestimate the potential for all young people in mainstream education including those with additional needs, to benefit from a residential experience. They should all be accommodated at an outdoor education centre and benefit from an outdoor activity programme with their peers.”

The Outdoor Council (response 195345166) commented:

“Access for all would be an essential principle and would require close cooperation with the residential outdoor education provision. Some providers do specialise in order to service the needs of those with a range of disabilities, while others will need to ensure they can accommodate a wide range of other requirements in terms of sexual orientation, gender reassignment and religion or belief, for example.”

Claire Mcgrouter (response 196132313), who is a parent/carer, reflected on her own experience in highlighting the importance of residential programmes ensuring that pupils with disabilities:

“One of the most important parts of outdoor education for myself was being part of a team therefore students with disabilities should be integrated into the programs on offer.”

Question 10: How might equity of provision for all be ensured, regardless of socio- economic status? Please give reasons for your response.

This was an open-ended question that was answered by 388 (73.29%) of the responders. A number of respondents who commented expressed the view that funding would be required to ensure that individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds would not face barriers to participation (such as not possessing relevant equipment). Others highlighted the importance of ensuring that provision takes account of specific cultural or individual needs of pupils.

- **Importance of removing financial barriers to participation**

The importance of ensuring that there would be no financial barriers to participation among pupils (for example, by ensuring that free equipment was available to pupils at outdoor centres) was highlighted by a number of respondents, and that this may be best provided by universal provision to avoid an undue burden being placed on schools, or even parents/carers who may be unable to afford it.

This was an argument advanced by, for example, Scouts Scotland (response 194921060), which commented that:

“A universal provision would ensure all young people benefited. Step should be taken to ensure centres had equipment to borrow and all participants were given all the provision and support needed be able to take part.”

The Whitewave outdoor centre in Skye (response 192544887) stated that residential outdoor education should be “completely funded through the schooling system (but also available to home schoolers)”, noting that “issues might be with young carers” and that “there may have to be provision for funding those who care/work to keep a family going.”

Active Outdoor Pursuits (response 192883719) suggested that:

“a provider framework could be drafted to ensure that all schools were accessing similar provision in terms of content and cost. Funds should not be offered to top up other funding sources allowing a particular school the opportunity to buy into a more expensive or longer provision than the traditional 5-day residential experience.”

A teacher, with experience of delivering outdoor education teacher and who asked to remain anonymous (response 191183355) commented:

“This should require no payment from parents at all. It is also important that family finances should not affect it, and we all know that many parents who aren’t on benefits or eligible for free school meals are struggling to pay for the basics, let alone this. It must be offered free at point of use to pupils, including food.”

Claire Mcgrouter (response 196132313) suggested that:

“A flexible mix of Government local authority and where possible parents should be available...funding should not be based on an ‘average cost’ as cost could be variable across the country.”

Deborah Cook (response 191194340), who is a provider of residential third sector outdoor education, stated:

“With a system to ensure high quality provision is recognised and prioritised, there should be opportunity for all young people to take part in a residential that will be meaningful and with appropriate learning objectives, Funding needs to be identified to ensure that in areas of low income, these opportunities are available to all, and schools are not forced to choose lower quality provision due to funding pressures.”

- **Provision must take account of cultural or specific needs of pupils**

A further argument advanced in respect of ensuring equity of provision was that provision must take account of specific cultural needs of pupils.

This was an argument advanced by NatureScot (response 196134454), which noted that, for some people, these residential courses might provide them with a completely new experience. NatureScot expressed concern that this novelty should be considered when arranging residential outdoor education:

“It might be a barrier (as well as a great opportunity) for some young people to have an outdoor experience somewhere very different from where they live. This barrier could be reduced by offering a progression of residential (as part of a progression of outdoor learning), e.g. having one-night camping in the school grounds (or sleeping in the school hall with lots of outdoor experiences) in the Infant department, and so on. A range of outdoor centres (as options as part of this progression) could be offered, including some in/close to cities/disadvantaged areas. This progression would also help better support young people with specific physical or cultural needs.”

The Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632) commented that planning of residential outdoor education should factor in that:

“some young people and families will require support to ensure that young people who are anxious, or where there are cultural or religious concerns, are addressed.”

Question 11: Any new law can impact on work to protect and enhance the environment, achieve a sustainable economy, and create a strong, healthy, and just society for future generations. Do you think the proposal could impact in any of these areas? Please explain the reasons for your answer, including what you think the impact of the proposal could be, and if there are any ways you think the proposal could avoid negative impacts.

This was an open-ended question that was answered by 324 (60.45%) of the responders. Overwhelmingly, respondents to this question considered that the proposal would have a positive impact in creating a sustainable economy and a strong, healthy and just society for future generations. The following are some of the comments that were made by respondents, broken down by theme.

- **Sustainable economy**

A number of respondents considered that the proposal would have a positive effect in creating a more sustainable economy.

For example, the Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632), considered that the Bill would have a “positive impact” on economic sustainability, as it would enable pupils to:

“develop the skills and attributes to be effective in the workplace, and will help contribute to a sustainable and thriving economy.”

Dòmhnall MacNeill (response 190333385), argued that there would be a more direct and positive economic impact due to new facilities being established in rural areas:

“this proposal has the potential to see new outdoor education facilities established or re-established in, by their very nature, rural and non-urban settings. Providing high-quality employment opportunities within these communities would make the Scottish economy fairer and more sustainable”.

A similar argument was advanced by Matt Robinson - Learning through Landscapes (response 191686367):

“If the investment and provision remains in Scotland, we will invest in a vibrant and stable provision of residential centres. This will maintain jobs, often in rural areas.

If the centre estates were seen as part of Scottish Learning Estate, then long-term investment and re-building would create first class, fit for the future, low carbon and biodiverse sites that benefit many in Education”.

- **Protecting and enhancing the environment**

Similarly, a number of responses considered that the proposal would have a positive effect in respect of protecting and enhancing the environment. For example, the Field Studies Council (response 195914496) argued that (emphasis added):

“This proposal can only enhance the environment by giving all young Scots a school experience **that connects them to nature by first hand**. We cannot expect them to care about something that they have not experienced, but by spending time enjoying and exploring nature can increase the desire to protect it. Green skills and STEM skills will be a vital part of Scotland’s economy, both of which can be developed on residential where learners get used to working and studying in a more unpredictable environment than a laboratory, becoming familiar with equipment and data gathering in the outdoors, overcoming practical problems and designing and redesigning experiments in the real world. Residential for those with little experience of spending time in nature may for the first time be able to see their horizons expand into possible careers in conservation and habitat management.”

Andy Beveridge (response 196145568) argued that that proposal would lead to young people having a greater appreciation of the natural environment:(emphasis added):

“I think this policy would have nothing but positive impacts on the areas outlined. In particular the environmental impact should be very powerful for many of the pupils from urban environments who do not currently

get to visit real and wild places will gain an **appreciation and understanding of the importance and sheer beauty of Scotland's countryside**. To quote, 'No one will protect what they don't care about; and no one will care about what they have never experienced' - Sir David Attenborough."

Similarly, the Scottish Borders Council (response 190919150) argued that:

"The need for young people to actively experience the various environments and habitats that are in their own area and their own country has never been greater, and the learning and understanding of why these areas are important, and how protecting them ties into the bigger picture of environmental sustainability, must be a key reportable aspect of any proposed programme. Whilst outdoor activities in their own right are important personal development opportunities for young people, the environment they take place in is just as, if not more, important for them to see and feel and smell and experience. Done well, this proposal could only increase and improve the engagement of young people in relation to the natural world around them".

The Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632) added that outdoor residential courses:

"develop young people's **environmental awareness and pro-environmental behaviours**. The starting point for environmental sustainability is for people to **emotionally connect with the natural environment**, and outdoor residential experiences provide a perfect learning environment to achieve this. Whilst there is environmental impact of travel to/from a residential experience this is far outweighed by the resulting increased pro-environmental behaviour" (emphasis added)

- **A healthy and just society for future generations.**

The Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), stated that (emphasis added):

"There is a huge body of evidence (much of which is cited in the consultation document) that a life changing, transformative experience such as a five day **residential improves children's well being, enhances their environmental understanding.**"

Martin Amos, of the Lagganlia Centre for Outdoor Education, (response191249850), argued that the provision of residential outdoor education would help build resilience among young people:

"there is a great benefit socially and for the health and well being of future generations. It has been evident post pandemic of the need to build confident, resilient children that can face society and thrive".

The Outward Bound Trust (response 191832632) made a further comment

“foster positive wellbeing and help young people become more physically active. Physically and emotionally healthy citizens help lead towards a strong, healthy and just society.”

A Doward (response 192207731) stated that, from personal experience:

“children leave a week’s outdoor learning with new and deeper friendships, new skills, new responsibilities, a respect for the outdoors and each other (teamwork is key outdoors). In other words the children transform as we push them from self centred to self aware”.

Similarly, the Glencoe Trust Ltd (response 192218087) drew attention to the “considerable long term health and skill benefits” for young people of residential outdoor education.

Question 12: Do you have any other additional comments or suggestions on the proposed Bill (which have not already been covered in any of your responses to earlier questions)?

This was an open-ended question that was answered by 177 (33.02%) of the responders.

A number of responses to this question reiterated comments that were made in response to earlier questions. However, the following additional comments were made, and are broken down by theme below:

- **Wider wellbeing benefits of residential outdoor education**

A number of respondents used this question to highlight the wider benefits in respect of wellbeing and resilience among young people. For example, Inspiralba (response 192914305) highlighted what it considered were the benefits that outdoor learning can bring, based on its experience (emphasis added):

“We work with many young people who are failed by the standard education system who can hugely benefit from outdoor experiences. Through experiences like an introduction to the outdoors and outdoor activities young people can gain confidence, self-esteem and recognition of strengths and abilities that are often difficult to see in a classroom environment yet can be of huge value in the world of work, for life and wellbeing. **For some young people this can create an introduction to a life changing experience which shapes their ongoing love of the outdoors or highlights their ability to shine, overcome barriers and recognise their capabilities which they didn’t know they had.**”

An anonymous professional (response 192319646), with 40 years-experience of delivering outdoor education in the third sector and in local authority settings, said that pupils accessing outdoor learning centres over time:

“progressively creates a belief that the environment and adventurous experiences are theirs for life.”

David Mark Thorley (response 192673065), who also had 40-years’ professional experience in the sector and is currently a local authority outdoor advisor commented on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, stating that it was:

“About time that this is addressed - those professionals within this field of work know the benefits it has to offer young people... the last two years living with the Pandemic has shown that there is the desperate need to get young people out from learning within four enclosed walls!”

Wild Tree Adventures (response 193077688) also reflected on the effect of the pandemic and how the proposed bill might mitigate this:

“This will fulfil both the educational needs of school learners and also support all aspects of communities providing adventure provision across Scotland. The closing of outdoor education centres as a result of Covid-19 was very sad to see and if left unchecked will have a considerable negative impact on our communities and young people going forward.”

- **Complexities of delivering the proposal**

Several respondents used this question to highlight or restate complexities around delivery of the proposal, for example in respect of existing capacity and how to ensure the proposal fits into the wider curriculum.

For example, Learning Through Landscapes (response 191686367) stated that “overall this is an excellent proposal”. However, it also noted a number of wider issues to consider:

“it is a more complex proposal than a simple grant for a residential experience. The proposals ought to incorporate wider Scottish policy such as Climate Change, Biodiversity, Equality, Education, Learning Estate and more.

In providing an experience that meets the aims of Scotland being the best place to grow up, a lot more support is required. This is at Government & Local Authority level, and a huge partnership with providers and partners to design a system which meets the aspirations we hold.”

In respect of capacity, the Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (response 195833136), said that it had “a slight concern about capacity”, noting that:

“The overall number of [outdoor education centre] OEC beds in Scotland has stayed largely the same since 1982, which implies there is approximately the correct, sustainable amount of provision to meet the current level of demand. Centres not operating at a profitable capacity would soon go out of business. A significant increase in the numbers attending five-day residential may mean there is not enough provision - and in addition some Scottish schools go to England for a residential. We would assume this funding would only apply to residential occurring in Scotland.”

Scouts Scotland (response 194921060), in stating that it supported “the principles of the bill and what it is trying to achieve”, commented that:

“care needs to be taken in some areas to prevent [the proposal] being manipulated to fit the current provision and ensure it keeps to its principles.” [and that] “to be successful there needs to be continued work across the political spectrum for cross party agreement on this subject area and not to allow this to become a party-political issue. The bill has potential to have long lasting and meaningful impact on the lives of young people across Scotland and give our young people a step up in life when it is most vitally needed. Value needs to be placed on the wider life skills gained from residential experience and the understanding of other pupils values-based decisions which may differ to the students personal values.”

- **Learning from the private sector**

The need to learn from the experience of the private sector was highlighted by Roger Antony Scrutton (response 191434303). He suggested that more could be achieved through learning more from the experience of the private education sector (emphasis added), noting that:

“The bill quite rightly focuses on state-funded and grant-aided schools, but it should not shy away from using the evidence of benefit from fee-paying schools, nearly all of which run residential OE courses for their pupils. These schools almost universally see residential OE as an **essential ingredient of a young person's education**. Why shouldn't pupils outside the private sector also have this opportunity?”

SECTION 4: MEMBER'S COMMENTARY

Liz Smith MSP has provided the following commentary on the results of the consultation, as summarised in sections 1-3 above.

Firstly, may I thank everyone, both the individuals and all the organisations, for taking the time to participate in the consultation on my proposed Member's Bill aimed at giving young people in Scotland an entitlement to a residential outdoor experience.

I would also like to thank the staff at the Scottish Parliament's Non-Government Bills Unit for all the advice and support they have provided throughout this process.

It is clear from the **539** replies that I received that there is overwhelming support for the proposed legislation. Over **95%** of individuals and organisations either fully- or partially-supported my proposed Bill.

This level of support is extremely encouraging. The passion and thoughtfulness of the responses, many of which were very personal, indicates to me that there is a clear consensus that this proposed legislation is both necessary and will be hugely beneficial to young people across Scotland.

The consultation gathered input from a diverse group of stakeholders, and I will use this feedback to guide my decision-making about the proposed Bill.

Given this input, I will revisit the following issues raised throughout the consultation process:

- The **suggested age range** within the proposed Bill is currently **12- to-16-year-olds**. Many felt this should be widened to include upper primary, mainly **P6 and P7**. Despite **53%** of respondents supporting the 12-16 age range, I am not fixed on this and agree that including upper primary aged children in the proposed legislation could bring many benefits. Not least, is the opportunity for an enhanced transition across primary school clusters during a critical time and the positive impact this would likely have on pupils' academic and personal growth.
- I initially proposed that the statutory right to an outdoor educational experience would be limited to pupils in **local authority and grant aided schools**. **This was based on extensive evidence that independent schools already provide outdoor residential experiences, including for those pupils on bursaries support.**
- I will however, seek further guidance from the independent schools sector and obtain further advice on this matter. I remain committed to finding a way to make these opportunities available to all pupils regardless of their background.

- I can assure the small number of respondents who are concerned about **Gaelic-medium education** provision within the proposed legislation that I will carefully consider how to address the issues they have raised, specifically the lack of qualified Gaelic speaking instructors. While I understand this is a concern for some members of the Gaelic community, it is clear this is a wider issue affecting the whole outdoor sector in Scotland. This sector is a very important part of Scotland's economy and culture, and it is crucial that it has the resources and support it needs to thrive. I am grateful to the Gaelic community for providing valuable input on this issue, and I hope that we can work together to find a solution to the shortage of Gaelic speaking instructors and the other challenges facing the outdoor sector across Scotland.
- It is very encouraging to hear that **88%** of respondents either fully or partially supported the development of a **quality framework** in conjunction with **HMIE** (His Majesty's Inspectorate of Education in Scotland) and the residential outdoor sector. This level of support shows a strong desire to improve the educational quality of the residential experience. Many wanted a closer integration of the residential experience into the learner journey, from local places to special places, and more focus on learning for sustainability. The development of a quality framework, as proposed within this legislation, is I feel, an important step towards this goal.
- I understand that costs, particularly in the current climate, are a concern for many. In the responses, **61%** felt that **costs** may increase because of the proposed legislation. This is something I take very seriously. However, as was also pointed out by many of the respondents, I am confident that the **long-term benefits of this legislation on the health and wellbeing (improved mental and physical health, increased social skills and resilience, and a deeper connection to nature and the outdoors) of our young people will outweigh any negative effects.**
- On the issue of who should pay for this proposed legislation, the majority of respondents (**63%**) in the survey believed that the Scottish Government should fully fund the proposal, while a smaller number (**11%**) thought that local government or parents should be responsible for funding. Ultimately, the decision on how to fund this proposal will be up to the Scottish Government and Parliament and it will be at the forefront of my discussions with the Minister.
- **82%** of respondents supported the **obligation to ensure that residential outdoor education is provided would fall on those responsible for arranging the provision.** I agree with many of the respondents that a coordinated effort, particularly at the local authority level, would be the best approach to implementing this legislation. Regional collaboration may also be necessary to ensure its effective and efficient implementation

across the whole of Scotland. It is a complex issue on which I will consult further and seek expert advice.

I would also like to share my excitement about recent developments in other legislative bodies. Specifically, I am referring to legislation introduced by Sam Rowlands MS in Wales and similar moves being considered by some MPs in the UK Parliament. The proposed legislation in Wales is very similar to my own. It represents a crucial step forward and I am glad that we are working together.

Finally, thank you again for participating in the consultation and providing valuable feedback. I assure you that I will do my best to take your concerns and suggestions into account as we move forward with the proposed legislation in Parliament.

ANNEXE

Smart Survey responses: Individuals
Abel, Julia Karen (Response 195541915)
Aldridge, Andrew (Response 191766803)
Amos, Martin (Response 191249850)
Anderson, Amy (Response 192761153)
Anderson, Gordon (Response 196142234)
Anderson, Helena (Response 196141260)
Andy (Surname not provided) Response (195586786)
Angus, Muriel (Response 193948013)
Appleby, Elaine (Response 196154983)
Armstrong, John (Response 192221055)
Asbridge, James (Response 193566091)
Atiyah, David (Response 193019827)
Baird, Andrew (Response 196184328)
Baxter, Stephen William Adamson (Response 196187308)
Bell, Kenneth (Councillor) (Response 192657965)
Beveridge, Andy (Response 196145568)
Beverly, Kate (Response 196136124)
Blackstock, Louise (Response 195548362)
Bleach, Ronnie (Response 192474318)
Blundy, Jack (Response 192198989)
Bouse, Eileen (Response 1961142148)
Boyd, Morag (Response 194280859)
Boyle, Marion (Response 192224186)
Brown, Hazel (Response 196184153)
Brown, Mathew (Response 191252355)
Brown, Nicky (Response 193052065)
Brown, Timothy (Response 194563212)
Brunet-Laing, Marlene (Response 191147708)
Brunton, Kirsty (Response 192804957)
Bryce, Fiona (Response 193179651)
Buchanan, Matt (Response 193512640)
Budge, Lynsey (Response 196137389)
Bulmer, Ron (Response 192178488)
Burke, Hazel (Response 192899763)
Bushby, Rob (Response 196187001)
Cairns, Chris (Response 192227303)
Cameron, David S (Response 196133380)
Cameron, Irene (Response 192316153)
Cameron, Tracie (Response 192529215)
Campbell, Peter James (Response 194940120)
Campbell, Shelagh (Response 191261209)
Carr, Dani (Response 192202609)
Carter, Alistair (Response 196046224)
Castle, Mark (Response 191996035)
Cawthorne, Graeme (Response 196128700)
Centeno, David (Response 192210877)

Chamberlain, Kellie (Response 196157799)
Chisholm, Scott (Response 192396323)
Christie, Ross (Response 194748331)
Cleghorn, Peter Robert (Response 191304839)
Cochrane, Melissa (Response 196151108)
Cockburn, Ann (Response 194318849)
Connell, Alisdair (Response 196177840)
Connell, Josie (Response 193854142)
Cook, Deborah (Response 191194340)
Cooper, Catriona (Response 196180201)
Craig, Kirsty (Response 192299521)
Crosbie, Garry (Response 192866056)
Curran, Mandy (Response 192777373)
Currie, William James Gellatley (Response 196161356)
D'Arcy, Alison (Response 191187512)
Davidson, Irene (Response 196139233)
Degnan, Jack (Response 196170588)
Delaney, Julie (Response 196134310)
Dick, Karen (Response 196182222)
Dickie, Alastair (Response 192905301)
Dorward, A (Response 192207731)
Dowse, Sheena (Response 193126518)
Dreeling, Michaela (Response 192199511)
Drennan, Olivia (Response 1961148116)
Duffy, John (Response 193164009)
Elder, Aileen (Response 196129685)
Fairlie, Ross (Response 196134150)
Fallon, Freda (Response 195881926)
Farmer, Mark (Response 190355457)
Fleming, Alan (Response 191286660)
Fraser, Margaret (Response 196128958)
Fraser, Simon (Response 192477249)
Frieden, Beth (Response 191177358)
Garrido, Daniel Gete (Response 191535011)
Gascoyne, Kevin (Response 192684542)
Geddes, Alexander (Response 196149983)
Gillies, Ela (Response 192207575)
Glover, Kim (Response 196136667)
Goodbourn, Jonathan (Response 192198132)
Gourley, Lorna (Response 1961149186)
Grant, Deborah (Response 191975775)
Greenock, Rachael (Response 192569885)
Groves, Matthew (Response 192670360)
Grubb, Andrew (Response 192800113)
Halldorsson, Ingthor (Response 196137900)
Halliday, Debbie (Response 193517351)
Hamilton, Fiona (Response 193061680)
Harrison, Judith (Response 196145539)

Hay, Andrew (Response 194184719)
Higgins, Ailsa (Response 193072759)
Hodge, Iona (Response 196168703)
Holborn, Dr Andrew (Response 192281038)
Howell, Nicky (Response 191248871)
Hunter, Katie (Response 196137598)
Hutchison, F (Response 196061216)
Imran, Annum (Response 196151969)
Jackson, Neil (Response 193199809)
Jarvis, Euan (Response 192258098)
Johnson, Mark (Response 194280320)
Jones, Robert (Response 191958245)
Keith, Helen (Response 196145160)
Kennedy, Ali (Response 190662715)
Kennedy, Nancy (Response 196191483)
Killeen, Helen (Response 192726631)
Kinloch, Claire (Response 192756819)
Kirkpatrick, Lindsey (Response 196185217)
Klym, Paul (Response 194561114)
Laird, Bill (Response 193191880)
Lamont, Joanne (Response 196188471)
Laverock, Alan (Response 193057414)
Lawrie, Jordan (Response 190539864)
Leckie, Danielle (Response 192596860)
Leitch, Paul (Response 193276198)
Lloyd, Carol (Response 196139913)
Lockens, Lauren (Response 1919560850)
Logan, Amanda (Response 195971523)
Logan, Ian (Response 196137040)
Low, Barbara (Response 196188640)
Low, John (Response 196186357)
Lukas, Harry (Response 195922762)
Mac Guaire, Donnchadh (Response 191202349)
Macdonald-Home, Catherine (Response 196131875)
Machin, Diane (Response 192298932)
Mackay, Hugh (Response 192769952)
Mackay, Kirsty (Response 191067331)
Mackellar, Margaret-Ann (Response 193093425)
Mackenzie, Gavin (Response 192219193)
Maclean, Hugh (Response 196054023)
Macleod, Innes (Response 191645322)
MacLure, Claire (Response 196137468)
MacManaway, Jamie (Response 193246861)
MacNeill, Dòmhnall (Response 190333385)
Macpherson, John (Response 194333943)
Main, Peter Response (194467874)
Maltman, Wendy (Response 196128798)
Marshall, Nigel (Response 196172288)

Martin, Stephen (Response 193019056)
Mason, Mike (Response 192481382)
McAllan, Wendy (Response 196188715)
McBride, Alison (Response 193053077)
McCall, Lorraine (Response 193052796)
McCamley, Sheila (Response 193133247)
McCarron, Louise (Response 196035570)
McDonald, Craig (Response 192259737)
McDougall, Tracey (Response 196114882)
McEwan, Anne J (Response 193896935)
McGovern, John (Response 190315436)
McGowan, A (Response 196148524)
McGrigor, Sir James (Response 196080754)
Mcgroarty, Claire (Response 196141731)
Mcgrouter, Claire (Response 196132313)
McHugh, Alexander (Response 191301473)
McInroy, Rhona (Response 196130080)
Mckay, Ian (Response 194274986)
McKellar, S (Response 196191462)
McLaughlin, Aidan (Response 192900260)
McLean, Bob (Response 196129822)
McMillan, Kerry (Response 193047987)
McMillan, Wilma (Response 193811926)
McNeice, Ewen (Response 192639428)
McNeill, Gavin (Response 194219040)
McNulty, Stephanie (Response 196136287)
McPhee, Gordon (Response 194416738)
McVey, Lara (Response 196130270)
Megaw, Irene (Response 196136050)
Millar, Alan (Response 196159231)
Millar, Pamela (Response 192290581)
Miller, Anuschka (Response 196064877)
Milroy, Drew (Response 196139754)
Mitchell, Alison (Response 196171700)
Mitchell, Michelle (Response 196137653)
Mitchell, Susan (Response 193184979)
Mochan, Nick (Response 191477155)
Moir, Lynn (Response 194388829)
Moore, Helen (Response 192347538)
Morris, Donald (Response 190546599)
Morris, Marie (Response 193790943)
Morrison, Brian (Response 193167578)
Moxley, Janet (Response 194228584)
Murgatroyd, Kathleen (Kathy), (Response 192393995)
Nasmyth, Alastair (Response 194383642)
Neil, Morven (Response 196139365)
Nelson, Chris (Response 192568689)
Noble, Rebecca (Response 191248099)

O'Brien, Kate (Response 191169736)
O'Donnell, Lisa (Response 196138183)
Oakes, Richard (Response 191195048)
Ogilvie, David (Response 191287910)
O'Hare, Steve (Response 196153886)
Owbridge, Kelsey (Response 193047486)
Park, Deborah Jane (Response 194468033)
Park, Ibrahim (Response 194351598)
Paterson, Alison (Response 191227157)
Paton, Carolyn (Response 196143851)
Paton, Kate (Response 196140570)
Penny, Alastair (Response 195412862)
Pescod, Michael (Response 192195552)
Pirie, Clara (Response 190474970)
Pirrie, Karen, (Response 196131047)
Platt, Paul (Response 192399185)
Reid, Bridget (Response 196190982)
Reid, Kristopher (Response 191242307)
Repova, Suzie (Response 192814324)
Ritchie, Louise (Response 1961143860)
Ritchie, Steven (Response 194546386)
Roberts, Fiona (Response 192409484)
Robertson, Juliet (Response 193607789)
Rofe, Elizabeth (Response 193156773)
Rogerson, Iain (Response 192822923)
Ross, Kayden (Response 190330851)
Rowbottom, Rachael (Response 196140324)
Rudden, Andy (Response 192223053)
Sanderson, David (Response 191481132)
Sandison, Amy (Response 196045968)
Scrutton, Roger Antony (Response 191434303)
Service, Fiona (Response 196154638)
Shand, Ann (Response 192823123)
Shaw, MaryAlice (Response 196137460)
Sheridan, Adrienne (Response 192326567)
Siddall, Karen (Response 196035784)
Simpkins, Carol (Response 194002386)
Simpson, Leslie (Response 192401806)
Sims, Simon (Response 191151740)
Small, Katie (Response 192975352)
Smith, Aileen (Response 192391147)
Smith, Rachael (Response 196152884)
Smith, Richard (Response 195576407)
Somervail, Kate (Response 193006347)
Spence, Jack (Response 193143024)
Spillane, Niall (Response 195563742)
Standen, Jodie (Response 192251095)
Sterritt, Caroline (Response 191091451)

Stevenson, William (Response 193172240)
Stewart, Alan (Response 192915938)
Stewart, Donald (Response 191284944)
Szypczynska, Marta Mari (Response 193795760)
Taylor, Andy (Response 196170418)
Taylor, Lesley (Response 193054186)
Thomson, Alison (Response 192068470)
Thomson, Euan James (Response 192672513)
Thomson, Rona Jane (Response 192199567)
Thomson, Steven (Response 191243461)
Thorley, David Mark (Response 192673065)
Thorley, Hannah (Response 193922857)
Tinley, Si (Response 191218365)
Tollick, David (Response 192788546)
Torrie, Robin (Response 195615600)
Trussell, Giles (Response 194616618)
Twomey, Max (Response 191410678)
Valentine, Dave (Response 194608154)
Vince, Kirsteen (Response 196144505)
Vincent McWhirter, Vincent (Response 192709669)
Walker, Monica (Response 196180902)
Walters, Gemma (Response 196136803)
Ward, Robin Response (194277606)
Warren, Emma (Response 192208214)
Watson, David (Response 193818028)
Watson, Gregor (Response 193033310)
White, Pete (Response 191239347)
Wightman, Stephen (Response 191220933)
Williams, Nigel (Response 192239148)
Wilson, Andrew (Response 193190246)
Wilson, Neil (Response 191218552)
Wilson, Ruth (Response 196069312)
Winkler, Sarah Jane (Response 192443691)
Young, Tracy (Response 196190969)
Zecevic, Patricia (Response 193829288)

Smart Survey responses: Organisations
Abernethy Trust (Response 195147083)
Active Outdoor Pursuits (Response 192883719)
Ardroy Outdoor Education Centre (Response 195833136)
Association of Sail Training Organisations (Response 195435957)
Brathay Trust (Response 191300015)
Council for Learning Outside the Classroom (Response 196185977)
Countryside Learning Scotland (Response 194426967)
East Lothian Outdoor Education Services (Response 194630299)
Field Studies Council (Response 195914496)
Harmeny Education Trust (Response 196100189)
High Life Highland (Response 193729779)

Inspiralba (Response 192914305)
Inverurie Community Campus Duke of Edinburgh DLC (Response 191427533)
John Muir Trust (Response 194097282)
Learning through Landscapes (Response 191686367)
Loch Insh Outdoor Centre (Response 192171246)
Lochranza Centre (Response 191183214)
Love Outdoor Learning (Response 192670431)
Mount Cook Activity Ltd (Response 191178830)
NatureScot (Response 196134454)
Ocean Youth Trust Scotland (Response 195923635)
Paths for All (Response 195884104)
Reach4Reality SCIO (Response 192187439)
Rock UK Adventure Centres (Response 193068227)
School of Adventure Studies, West Highland College (Response 193987324)
Scottish Borders Council (Response 190919150)
Scouts Scotland (Response 194921060)
Scottish Environmental & Outdoor Education Centres (SOEC) (Response 1961156117)
Sportscotland (Response 196164016)
St. Columba's Primary School, West Lothian (Response 193570975)
St. Patrick's Primary School, Troon (Response 193809269)
SU Scotland, Gowanbank (Response 195511672)
The Glencoe Trust Limited (Response 192218087)
The Highland Council (Response 194334657)
The Institute for Outdoor Learning (Response 193068349)
The Outward Bound Trust (Response 191832632)
The Scottish Adventure School (Response 191474458)
The Swan Trust and Sail Training, Shetland (Response 196058181)
Universities Scotland (Response 196118878)
Venture Scotland (Response 192481769)
Wild Tree Adventures (Response 193077688)
Wishaw Academy PS (Response 192206513)
Whitewave Skye's Outdoor Centre (Response 192544887)

Non-Smart Survey responses: Organisations
--

Connect

COSLA

The Scottish Advisory Panel on Outdoor Education (SAPOE)
--

Youthlink Scotland

Anonymous responses: Individuals

Individual anon (Response 191181192)

Individual anon (Response 193584122)

Individual anon (Response 193605186)

Individual anon (Response 193627126)

Individual anon (Response 193657744)
Individual anon (Response 193814337)
Individual anon (Response 193819427)
Individual anon (Response 193826263)
Individual anon (Response 193829963)
Individual anon (Response 193833636)
Individual anon (Response 193866169)
Individual anon (Response 194040588)
Individual anon (Response 194165498)
Individual anon (Response 194195702)
Individual anon (Response 194240180)
Individual anon (Response 194302322)
Individual anon (Response 194435157)
Individual anon (Response 194490925)
Individual anon (Response 194492715)
Individual anon (Response 194626737)
Individual anon (Response 194778855)
Individual anon (Response 194989625)
Individual anon (Response 195532430)
Individual anon (Response 195541072)
Individual anon (Response 195556217)
Individual anon (Response 195557370)
Individual anon (Response 195558479)
Individual anon (Response 195568003)
Individual anon (Response 195890718)
Individual anon (Response 196000193)
Individual anon (Response 196028018)
Individual anon (Response 196062764)
Individual anon (Response 196100557)
Individual anon (Response 196113819)
Individual anon (Response 196114843)
Individual anon (Response 196149435)
Individual anon (Response 196129109)
Individual anon (Response 196129765)
Individual anon (Response 196129840)
Individual anon (Response 196130996)
Individual anon (Response 196132090)
Individual anon (Response 196132427)
Individual anon (Response 196132892)
Individual anon (Response 196133646)
Individual anon (Response 196134534)
Individual anon (Response 196135679)
Individual anon (Response 196135918)
Individual anon (Response 196136076)
Individual anon (Response 196136293)
Individual anon (Response 196136752)
Individual anon (Response 196136867)
Individual anon (Response 196136892)

Individual anon (Response 196137069)
Individual anon (Response 196137088)
Individual anon (Response 196137773)
Individual anon (Response 196137915)
Individual anon (Response 196138355)
Individual anon (Response 196138372)
Individual anon (Response 196138627)
Individual anon (Response 196140940)
Individual anon (Response 196141258)
Individual anon (Response 196141435)
Individual anon (Response 196142294)
Individual anon (Response 196142450)
Individual anon (Response 196143192)
Individual anon (Response 196143433)
Individual anon (Response 196143709)
Individual anon (Response 196144390)
Individual anon (Response 196144955)
Individual anon (Response 196145534)
Individual anon (Response 196145667)
Individual anon (Response 196149372)
Individual anon (Response 196150781)
Individual anon (Response 196151997)
Individual anon (Response 196155303)
Individual anon (Response 196155400)
Individual anon (Response 196155900)
Individual anon (Response 196156796)
Individual anon (Response 196156809)
Individual anon (Response 196159469)
Individual anon (Response 196159921)
Individual anon (Response 196163550)
Individual anon (Response 196172052)
Individual anon (Response 196172368)
Individual anon (Response 196175411)
Individual anon (Response 196175646)
Individual anon (Response 196176061)
Individual anon (Response 196176182)
Individual anon (Response 196176423)
Individual anon (Response 196178103)
Individual anon (Response 196178529)
Individual anon (Response 196181239)
Individual anon (Response 196184902)
Individual anon (Response 196185503)
Individual anon (Response 196188929)
Individual anon (Response 196190484)
Individual anon (Response 196190516)
Individual anon (Response 196190724)
Individual anon (Response 190342864)
Individual anon (Response 190351199)

Individual anon (Response 190357844)
Individual anon (Response 190373748)
Individual anon (Response 190387836)
Individual anon (Response 190440154)
Individual anon (Response 190499280)
Individual anon (Response 190637305)
Individual anon (Response 190655980)
Individual anon (Response 190965460)
Individual anon (Response 191129093)
Individual anon (Response 191174025)
Individual anon (Response 191175389)
Individual anon (Response 191177186)
Individual anon (Response 191183355)
Individual anon (Response 191188143)
Individual anon (Response 191250914)
Individual anon (Response 191269551)
Individual anon (Response 191418489)
Individual anon (Response 191447154)
Individual anon (Response 191508261)
Individual anon (Response 191540084)
Individual anon (Response 191638407)
Individual anon (Response 191914754)
Individual anon (Response 191937890)
Individual anon (Response 191950315)
Individual anon (Response 192158095)
Individual anon (Response 192191515)
Individual anon (Response 192193680)
Individual anon (Response 192199021)
Individual anon (Response 192199719)
Individual anon (Response 192204736)
Individual anon (Response 192209152)
Individual anon (Response 192265637)
Individual anon (Response 192268548)
Individual anon (Response 192275082)
Individual anon (Response 192285631)
Individual anon (Response 192291376)
Individual anon (Response 192313243)
Individual anon (Response 192315884)
Individual anon (Response 192319646)
Individual anon (Response 192334780)
Individual anon (Response 192336043)
Individual anon (Response 192402562)
Individual anon (Response 192501211)
Individual anon (Response 192673616)
Individual anon (Response 192760056)
Individual anon (Response 192788028)
Individual anon (Response 192798972)
Individual anon (Response 192830837)

Individual anon (Response 192867190)
Individual anon (Response 192930167)
Individual anon (Response 192943821)
Individual anon (Response 193020487)
Individual anon (Response 193031001)
Individual anon (Response 193040172)
Individual anon (Response 193040606)
Individual anon (Response 193071008)
Individual anon (Response 193076868)
Individual anon (Response 193119253)
Individual anon (Response 193126726)
Individual anon (Response 193145637)
Individual anon (Response 193161363)
Individual anon (Response 193162708)
Individual anon (Response 193279526)
Individual anon (Response 193432942)

Anonymous responses: Organisations
Organisation anon (Response 192547491)
Organisation anon (Response 193124231)