

WORKING PAPER 457

FURTHER EDUCATION AND POLICY 1974-1985

C I RAMSDEN

School of Geography
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT

March 1986

Contents

1. Introduction

2. The Oakes Report

- 2.1 Criticisms of the existing system
- 2.2 Recommendations made by the Oakes group
- 2.3 Response by government to Oakes

3. Oakes and the eighties: an examination of the 1981 Green Paper

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Aims and provision in non-university higher education
- 3.3 Management of higher education outside the universities
 - 3.3.1 Course approval
 - 3.3.2 Allocation of financial resources
- 3.4 The central body question
 - 3.4.1 The need for a central body
 - 3.4.2 Which type of central body?
 - 3.4.3 The two models as described in the 1981 Green Paper
 - 3.4.3.1 Model A
 - 3.4.3.2 Model B
 - 3.4.4 Government appraisal of the two models in the Green Paper
 - 3.4.4.1 Effectiveness of the new body
 - 3.4.4.2 Planning by the new body
 - 3.4.4.3 Composition of the new body

4. The National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB)

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 The creation of the central body
- 4.3 The Further Education Unit (FEU)
- 4.4 A future amalgamation?

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 The HMI findings on NAFE and AFE; 1983 and 1984
- 5.3 The 1985 Green Paper on higher education
- 5.4 The future
- 5.5 Summary

References

Appendices

- I Students in higher education 1980-81, 81-82, 82-83, 83-84, 84-85
- II Ministerial appointments at the DES announced 6.9.85 (THES)
- III Relevant governmental publications 1978-85
- IV Acts, circulars and administrative memoranda 1977-85

1. Introduction

This paper is the second of two, which collectively deal with finance and policy in further education. This paper is concerned with the control of further education by policy as determined by the Department of Education and Science and also by the government. Much of the present thinking on further education is a direct result of the findings of the Oakes Report released in 1978, and the nature of this document and the implications in terms of management and control are followed from its birth in 1978, to its death and re-birth in 1982. The reader may find it useful to consult the first paper 'Further education and finance 1974-1985' (Ramsden, 1986) and the paper 'The development of further education since 1956' (Ramsden, 1985).

In this paper the emphasis is upon policy, but much of that policy has to be made within various economical constraints. Included in this paper is a brief summary of the present situation in further education and a discussion of future possibilities in the light of the recent green paper (Cmnd 9524). The full implications for the future of further education have yet to be realised and much of the debate and discussion is still being generated and published as a result of this document. Recent publications, so far, have been very critical of its findings, (see THES 22.11.85, 'Scathing attack by UGC on green paper', and THES 6.12.85, 'V-cs return to the offensive').

As mentioned in the Introduction to the paper 'Further education and finance', further education has changed and is still changing, so that it is not easy to explain the position of all the component parts. This is especially true of vocational education, which is still developing and the position of sixth forms which is as yet unclear. These are both covered in brief in that Introduction.

2. The Oakes Report

2.1 Criticisms of the existing system

The Oakes Report was in response to the criticisms of the financing

and control of the public sector in higher education. In the case of Advanced Further Education (AFE) this largely meets a national need Fowles (1979), in part a regional need, and to a lesser extent a specific local need. Public sector institutions which run higher education courses are the responsibility of their supporting LEA, and as such the responsibility of management lies at a local level for what is regarded as a national or regional provision. However as outlined in the paper, "Further Education and Finance", the LEAs themselves do not pay for courses of higher education being run in their colleges. Instead 'the pool' requires contributions from all participating LEAs. An objection to this system is that in the distribution of the AFE pool note is taken of industrial and economic activity within particular LEAs, but this is not related to the national position of such industries Fowler (1979). Criticism has also been made of the inadequate regional co-ordination of advanced further education. The Regional Advisory Councils (RACs) themselves are advisory bodies only, but many authors, including Cantor and Roberts (1979), argue that they should have a much greater voice in the control and planning of resources. Since the RACs have been relatively weak, ultimate decision making has been resident elsewhere. In this situation power lies with the Department of Education and Science working through the inspectorate system. Furthermore the inspectorate has had the power to close or continue courses which failed to attract an adequate number of students. Since 1967, in general, a course has needed a minimum of 15 students in year one to run and 24 each year thereafter. Where these criteria have not been met, the Regional Staff Inspector (RSI), under the direction of the DES, has terminated or been permitted to continue a given course. In addition a RSI has also the power to advise an LEA to move students elsewhere to produce sufficient numbers for a course to run. As Fowler (1979) points out, moving students because numbers are insufficient does not always make economic sense. Only marginal savings may be made if the course under consideration uses the same staff and physical resources as similar courses at the new location, since it will be at the cost of underutilization of buildings, equipment and staff.

In the case of courses which stand in isolation from other academic fields, costs may prove to be very uneconomic, although it may well be oversubscribed many times. It is therefore argued by Fowler (1979) that 'course control' is not an adequate tool with which to manage the AFE system.

2.2 Recommendations made by the Oakes group

The report of the Oakes group was released in March 1978. The group was largely comprised of representatives of local authority associations and of those teacher associations whose members were employed in both further and higher education. There were also two representatives of the Committee of Directors of Polytechnics. In short most of the recommendations from the report were to produce dispute, especially the recommendation to establish a National Body which would be charged with responsibility for advising upon all available resources for maintained higher education, together with responsibility for the determining allocation of national funds between the institutions and the various authorities. In this sense the 'body' envisaged would be one of 'considerable authority'. Many were to argue that such an authority would be undesirable since local control would be lost, together with the 'social responsiveness' of the public sector institutions, whilst others argued that the recommendations of the report were not strong enough since it gave too much power to the LEAs within the framework of the envisaged National Body. There were other criticisms such as the need to keep the financing and the control of local colleges entirely distinct from those being financed and controlled to serve regional or national needs.

The criticisms outlined above were all tackled by Oakes, by looking closely at the elements of management responsibility which were then clearly identified and isolated. It was envisaged that the new National Body would coordinate the areas of advanced further education by advising both the LEAs and the Secretary of State by consideration of national need, the consideration and examination of proposed educational programmes (submitted by LEAs and institutions) and also the consideration of relevant costs. By use of fund allocation regarding recurrent expenditure the body would be able to exercise a negative control over advanced further education by restraining colleges and particular LEAs which had particularly ambitious and expensive plans. Conversely, the positive role of this body would arise in the encouragement of LEA through the provision of cash.

Therefore at the National level the National Body would be comparable to the University Grants Committee, whilst at a purely local level the LEAs themselves would retain overall responsibility for the 'good management' of their colleges but they themselves would have 'maximum freedom to manage their own affairs'. It was envisaged that each college would have much greater financial freedom without unnecessary recourse to their LEA, but would still have to work within a 'closed budget'. Under this system efficiency could be rewarded, whilst inefficiency would be penalised.

With regard to the problems of the expenditure 'pool' it was recommended that LEAs should be made directly responsible for initially 5%, then 10% and later 15% of the cost of higher education within their colleges. It was then held that this would remove the main weakness of the pooling of costs since the burden of LEAs, funding their own education institutions, from their own funds would be relatively heavy. Hence pooling would continue but it would be more in proportion to an authority's own provision, yet the remaining 'faults' within the system would remain until there was a way of devising a fairer one. It was noted in addition that any major changes made quickly could perhaps penalize some authorities.

The problem of regional coordination was to be tackled and entrusted to a new form of RACs. These would remain essentially advisory bodies, but would have greater strength due to having financial control. Hence LEAs and the colleges would come under greater control. The main idea here was that the onus would be upon colleges themselves to sort out their various differences and competing claims at the regional level, otherwise, the decisions would be made for them at a national level. It was also held that both in service and initial teacher education could be integrated with AFE as a whole since it would no longer be separable. It was hoped by the Oakes Committee that universities in their regions would cooperate to achieve 'cross-binary' coordination although no means of achieving such a position was suggested.

Course control was regarded as a problem of the existing system of AFE management. The National Body which would be able to allocate finance

would remove the need for course control, because that body would also be able to examine and approve submitted courses or educational programmes. A further aspect of finance would be that relating to LEAs actually feeling the burden of finance upon themselves. In this sense the new 'closed budget' system would be a powerful reason to remove or chop courses which attracted a small number of students and thus could not be justified. The most obvious question that appears at this point is that which relates to the duty of an LEA to provide courses in response to demand, and furthermore, are all demands when seen nationally being satisfied. This latter question is one which clearly needs much more examination.

2.3 Response by Government to Oakes

The main points and recommendations were accepted by the then Labour government at the time of publication. However, no action was taken on the direct change of 5, 10 or 15% of providing education provision within an LEA's own boundary, since such action would have to await legislation. The required legislation was encompassed in an Education Bill put forward at the end of 1978. This was lost with the change in government in 1979. Also in the Bill was the legislation required to form the new National Body. Seen in the context of devolution, and decentralization of power and responsibility, the legislation actually sought to establish two bodies. These were to be the new Advanced Further Education Councils for England and Wales respectively. These Councils would have been given the authority to advise the Secretary of State and any LEA on any aspect or concern relating to the provision of advanced further education in the institutions which were 'maintained or assisted by such authorities'.

The Oakes Committee made recommendations as to the composition of these Advanced Further Education Councils or National Bodies. The total number forming the body would be around 25-28 and all persons would be appointed by the Secretary of State after such appointments had been discussed and consultations had taken place with local authority associations and various other bodies. The report itself actually suggested that Local Authority Members would be nominated by the local authority associations. Institutional representatives would be recommended by appropriate bodies such as the National Association of

Teachers in Further Education (NATFHE) plus 3 members nominated by the Secretary of State. In addition there would be 'others' which would number around 8-10; these would also be nominated by the Secretary of State. In general therefore as Fowler (1979) points out, there is no reason to suggest that the composition of such Councils would be any different from that suggested by Oakes. Omitted from the Bill were details which were concerned with how the new system would operate since this did not require legislation. What was included however was the proviso that Councils should advise the Secretary of State about the proportion of their own higher education expenditure which must be directly carried by the maintaining LEAs in any year, and also regarding the breakdown of pooled finance and its apportionment amongst them.

The Bill that was presented as a result of the Oakes findings had a particularly important aspect to it regarding the future of AFE. Fowler (1979) notes that the Bill required Councils to advise the Secretary of State 'as he may require' on anything concerned with AFE beyond colleges maintained by LEAs. This provision was aimed at the voluntary colleges, in historical terms, essentially concerned with teacher education but facing the transition into 'general' higher education which would be linked into a new system, concerning the national coordination of AFE. This makes the first time that a possible, single national system of AFE in England and in Wales might emerge under one central body but including elements of both LEAs and voluntary bodies regarding their running and their financing.

3. Oakes and the Eighties

3.1 Introduction

The DES paper, Higher Education in England outside the Universities : policy, funding and management, a consultative document, was published in July 1981 and it represents the Conservatives' view of 'policy alternatives' and was intended to 'open a period of consultation on possible changes in management and funding to enable higher education better to meet the challenges of the 1980s and beyond'. The introduction reflects the government's thinking as represented to the DES, and this is clearly stated as 'The Government came into office committed to reforming the arrangements for the organisation of higher education outside the

universities'. The key word in this section appears as 'reforming' and the entire paper 'considers the purposes of this sector of higher education; how policies for its development might be determined and how it might be managed and funded'.

This paper is worthy of considerable investigation since it is obviously meant to be a guide to future directions within higher education. It is important to note that the concern of this consultative paper is higher education, but the exact nature is spelled out; "Higher Education is commonly equated with degree-level courses. Outside the universities it has a far broader meaning and covers any course, full-time, sandwich or part-time, of a standard higher than GCE 'A' level. It thus embraces research, degree-level courses, higher diploma and higher certificate courses and courses leading to a wide variety of professional qualifications". The paper therefore includes what is commonly referred to as 'Advanced Further Education' courses but does not include elements of post-16 education, such as the New Training Initiative (although this was introduced in 1983) or its predecessors, nor does it include such things as adult education or link courses. As used in the consultative paper, higher education in 1981 was available in 396 different institutions outside the universities. The majority of these were supported by the LEAs within the entire Further Education framework but it also included 37 voluntary and direct grant colleges. It provided for around 184,000 full-time and sandwich course students including around 30,000 students aiming for teacher status. In 1980/81 the total cost was around £400 million and it is therefore argued that this sector is an important part of educational provision and further it is an important source of qualified manpower. This latter point is tied to 'the country's economic well-being' and as such it strongly reflects the thinking of the post war years and the emergence of the polytechnics.

The current emphasis on economies and efficiency is seen in Section 3 of the Introduction. Dissatisfaction with the system of funding and managing is obvious since it is stated that the existing arrangements for funding and managing this widely dispersed sector of education served satisfactorily during a period of rapid growth. This in itself suggests that the system was so inflexible in concept so that it could not operate satisfactorily in a period of no growth or even economic decline. The system has largely survived therefore because efficiency and economics were

not regarded as top priorities. In a sense this is correct because the actual benefit of education was an even greater priority for the perceived well being of the country. Bearing in mind that the emphasis is now upon what the country can afford, then any examination carried out (Cmnd. 8139) would show that the 'pool system', that is of 'unrestricted sharing' by LEAs 'collectively of the expenditure on higher education incurred by LEAs individually did not satisfy the principle of accountability'. Further, the system 'provided little incentive for financial control and discipline; and represented an open-ended commitment of national resources to maintained higher education'. It was realized that the country's bill for maintained higher education was a result of 93 separate decisions from each (English) LEA, which in turn was concerned with educational provision in the 359 LEA institutions. Hence central coordination of provision has always been almost impractical or even virtually impossible. Such problems had obviously been under examination before the publication of the Consultative Document. In this sense the paper presents a statement of problems to be tackled by the 1980 Education Act.

The Education Act of 1980 included powers which were agreed after Secretary of State and Local Authority Association consultation 'to determine in advance for each year the amount of expenditure on higher education which LEAs could pool and to determine how that amount should be distributed amongst the LEAs engaged in the provision of higher education'. Also in the act were new standards or guidelines 'by which new advanced courses requiring his approval were to be considered'. All in all this legislation was aimed at bringing the control of courses into line with 'conditions of tighter expenditure constraints'. Having done this the government immediately attacked the problems of unrestricted expenditure and control of courses. Furthermore the effect of the Act was to give the government a breathing space in order that a careful analysis be made of the policy options for maintained higher education for the medium and longer term. A further aim (above) was that of stimulating discussion.

3.2 Aims and provision in non-University Higher Education

In the section headed 'General Approach' in the Green Paper the current thinking behind AFE provision is explained, with its purpose defined as 'to preserve, enhance and transmit learning; to yield new

knowledge through research and contribute to its application; to teach students at 'advanced' levels; to meet the country's needs for highly qualified and professional manpower. The contribution which non-university education makes 'lies in its provision of courses specifically designed to reflect the opportunities and requirements of the country's employment market'. The paper makes reference to the White Paper of 1972 regarding the expansion of education and quotes that 'the continuously changing relationship between higher education and subsequent employment should be reflected in the institutions and in individual choices'. The paper reiterates the government's belief that this is true and that this can be seen in the emphasis of vocational education in the non-university sectors, especially in regard to professional and technological courses. A 'hall mark' of this sector is seen as the 'ability to offer such courses part-time, and to serve the needs of individuals and industrial and commercial concerns locally and regionally'. It is at this point that questions really arise as to the government's full understanding and control of the system, in so far as it is really true that 'the needs of individuals and industrial and commercial concerns locally and regionally' are really being served. This is a crucial question and one that cannot readily be answered simply at this stage. Furthermore the government appears to be reticent in attempting to answer this question since what follows is: 'experience has clearly shown that detailed forecasting of manpower needs, and hence central determination of a required output from the system, to be impracticable', and also that it is not possible to 'attempt to operate a precise manpower plan'. It is stated that the vocational element should be reflected in the approach and the quality of the education provided, but the whole area seems to be the wrong way round. What is presented seems to be a concern of the type of education provided for satisfying the number of students required by industry and commerce and not satisfying the number of students coming forward for education.

The shift of emphasis is placed upon the individual institutions within the system, and not upon the centrality of government control. This is seen in the following, 'The chief responsibility rests on institutions, and on those within them, who can be effectively in touch with employers, to take account on the one hand of expected opportunities and on the other of manifest student demand'. 'Institutions

must be strong in themselves, staffed with people of the right abilities and competence, and in as large measure as possible free to decide their own patterns of activity'. From the point of view of individual institutions there is something very appealing about being free to 'decide their own patterns of activity', but this freedom exercised by a possible 396 institutions is unlikely to produce a coherent whole in achieving a rather vague goal, unless central government states exactly what the goal is.

Paradoxes abound in this section. As explained above each institution receives directly or through local authorities public finance, and as such, each is required to be responsive to public expectations. However, whilst placing emphasis upon the institutions, we next get 'involvement and guidance from a central point is unavoidable', 'main contacts with the employment market are likely to be chiefly local and regional; a central focus could help to stimulate an awareness of national employment needs'. Surely both aspects here are important. The local and regional contacts are needed to establish both the demands of commerce and industry, and hence the employment market, but also to establish the demands for this type of education. If such information is passed upwards to a central level, then this may be co-ordinated centrally and then information may be passed downwards back to the institutions in order that they may then best fulfil their local function, but a function within a national framework.

The award system for students is designed to ensure that the catchment area for students in higher education is national. In theory this is fine, but the award is always at the discretion of the LEA concerned, and there is always the student who does not wish to move from their local area. This obviously concerns the provision of courses at both the local, the regional and the national scale. It is a problem riddled with economic concerns and one to the possible extent of overshadowing the concern of education and the concerns of those to be educated.

In the case of educating and training teachers, the Secretary of State with assistance from the (ACSTT) Advisory Council for the Supply and Education of Teachers has the responsibility for 'ensuring that the planning of the education and training of teachers, an integral

part of non-university higher education, is carried out on a national basis to meet the future needs of schools. Again there emerges the problem of the number of students who come forward offering themselves for training, and the number of places being available as dictated by government policy after a consideration of the number of teachers needed. Again the emphasis is upon economics, since the paper continues, 'in the expected circumstances of continuing restraints on expenditure, some national oversight of the distribution of resources to assist rationalisation of provision and the disposition of resources to meet new and emerging needs is necessary'. The central problem seems to be, as to the exact nature of the national oversight and how it may operate. To this end mention is made of the expected sharp decline in the 18-21 age group and also of the danger of a, 'widely dispersed and varied national provision' not being 'haphazardly affected by decisions taken in the local context'. This is amplified by an explanation of when the sector was expanding, individual LEA's and institutions responded to demand as they themselves saw it. Now it is held that as the sector has to respond to new demographic and population movement pressures there is a 'critically important' need that 'provision continues to match need, not least the country's need for the supply, training and retraining of skilled manpower'. Again an economic response may be made in so far as how can the provision continue to match need, and produce the manpower, if the country cannot afford to fuel the provision. Furthermore there is the problem of how to really assess the 'need' and to establish its exact nature. There may, for example, be a need for training individuals, from individuals themselves. There may be a need for supply of individuals from industry in some areas. There may be a need to retrain people in an attempt to give them skills which would then enable them to re-enter the employment market, in so far as this would possibly make it easier to reduce unemployment figures. This entire area of need, as presented, is considered to be necessarily determined at a national and strategic level and that some form of body to do this is now needed, a re-echoing of the findings of the Oakes Committee in 1978.

3.3 Management of higher education outside the universities

The 1981 document is useful in providing a breakdown of student

numbers for various educational institutions. As noted in Section III during the year 1979/80 with the exception of the universities, there were 137,000 full time, 47,000 sandwich and 149,000 part-time students in higher education (see Appendix I). The distribution of this provision varies from institutions devoted to entirely or largely advanced work, to colleges which provide mainly non-advanced work, but also include a few advanced courses.

Using 1980 prices the 1981 document indicates the estimated net recurrent cost of higher education in England outside the universities during 1980/81 was £400m. Of this around £235m was earmarked for polytechnic use and £115m for use by other establishments of further education, whilst £50m was deemed for the use of voluntary and direct grant colleges. (The universities, including student support cost £1,480m (DES Annual Report 1980)). The 1981 document indicates the government's concern together "with all those engaged in this field, a responsibility for ensuring that higher education is as efficiently and cost effectively organised as possible", in order that full value may be obtained from the 'substantial commitment of funds'. It is pointed out that the pool capping and course control measures of 1980 were short term measures designed to partly achieve this aim. Following these measures it was deemed desirable to consider both existing funding and control mechanisms in the light of "potential to be developed", or, to be developed and refined into 'a more satisfactory management structure' so that they might be better suited to meeting the needs of the 1980s (as outlined in 5.2 Aims and provision in non-University higher education, above). In order that this may be carried out, the document looked at the existing mechanisms of the advanced course approval process and the allocation of resources through a pre-determined pool.

3.3.1 Course approval

The provision of advanced courses is controlled by subordinate legislation which is revised over time to meet given circumstances, by circulars and memoranda. All courses in further education establishments have to be approved by the Secretary of State. Such courses may be given conditional approval rather than unconditional approval, or a course may be discontinued under his direction. This system of control pre-'80 was aimed at reducing a wide and unnecessary duplication of courses during a period of growth, which might otherwise have been the result of 'unfettered

and uncoordinated offerings of institutions'. The document considers the reasons for adjusting the course approval process. "The system has the inherent failings of an essentially reactive process". This means that the selective approval of courses is made on proposals which are received, and hence attention is focussed on these new course proposals so that in total the focus of attention is upon the new expansionist edge and not on the whole or older facets of provision. This is deemed to be important, since if the objectives of the "vocationally orientated sector" are to be achieved there must be both positive and negative control so that an institution's provision is considered from a broad perspective, rather than that of an individual course. The pre-'80 system is attacked since it "deals in these isolated units of provision and forestalls such consideration", it also remains "insufficiently positive in encouraging the non-university institutions to respond, as rapidly and effectively as they should to changing demand whether these call for the rundown of existing courses or for the introduction of new or adapted ones". This later point is obviously of great importance in the light of unemployment and new technology. Regulations regarding course approval were revised in '81, '82, '83 and '84 (see Appendix IV).

3.3.2 Allocation of financial resources

As already pointed out, the use of the block government grant via the UGC has for many years been the method by which this body has been able to influence both the balance and the development of provision within the university sector. Having obtained their grants, the universities are largely free to spend their allocations as they see fit. This is similar to the voluntary and the direct grant colleges who may also use their grant 'in pursuit of agreed purposes', but their freedom is limited by use of the course approval process. In this sense, as the green paper points out, both the university and the direct grant sector provide 'management models', where 'resource allocation plays the central part'. The Education Act (1980) provided the ability to use resource allocation as a "mechanism of educational management" for the maintained sector, since as long as there was no limit on LEA's right to pool their expenditure on advanced work, there was no way in which this tool could be used.

During early 1980 a study group (see DES Annual Report 1980, 6.3; THES 1.2.80) formed of DES officials, local authority representatives and

those from the maintained institutions was set up to investigate the use of unit funding methods for distributing a predetermined pool. The belief behind the purpose of the group was that in due course better understanding of the financial and cost characteristics relating to the institutions providing higher education would enable a better system of funding to be devised. Having done this, then it would be possible to make distinctions which could then be reflected in the resources allocated to individual maintaining authorities along the lines of subject areas, levels of work, differing institutions and types of attendance. The Green paper notes that 'such a funding system, apart from leaving local authorities free in the ultimate to spend whatever they chose on their institutions, could never on its own be more than a management tool', and that it could only be used when the 'objectives and criteria for its use had been set and agreed'. The Green paper however does note the need for matching "the technical competence of financial allocation" to a 'capability for making educational judgements', and it is noted that there is no 'machinery' for bringing together these two capacities. This is seen as a major problem since without it none of the ideology as outlined above will be possible.

3.4 The central body question

3.4.1 The need for a central body

The need for some term of central machinery has been already acknowledged following the Oakes' Committee findings in 1978. Such a body of machinery could be in various forms but any form must obviously be suitable for the kind of operation which would have to be dealt with by that body, 'in the light of education and other objectives' already outlined. Such a body would 'work to combine educational excellence with cost effectiveness'. The 'broad educational aims' of the present government 'expressed through the central body would accord a high priority to maintaining and reinforcing the non-university sector's emphasis on vocational provision and responsiveness to the requirements of the employment market, including teacher supply'. From these objectives it may well be safely concluded that the government has two broad aims, the first being economic and the second educational. The educational aims will embrace maintaining the current prominence given to provision at higher technician level, to part-time, sandwich and short course provision

and to continuing education of all kinds. They will also embrace the area of higher education, beyond the university, where a 'vital part' of their contribution is in the courses which they provide for this area. More 'general educational aims' will include the 'development of excellence, the encouragement of initiatives in specific fields and rationalisation of the system'. It seems rather odd that 'rationalisation of the system' appears in general educational aims, since rationalisation seems to imply ideas of efficiency and reform in both costs and aims of the entire system.

The 1981 Green paper states quite clearly that the central body 'would have responsibility for ensuring that these general aims determined provision in the institutions' and that this would 'entail examining and endorsing the educational programmes proper to different institutions'. In order that this might be so it would seem that the dangers of the selective course approval method must be avoided and that one must see the system as a whole (together with its collective aims) and not simply at a number of individual facets of the system. The government sees the central body working along the lines of the UGC's specialist sub-committees where membership would be largely drawn from the individual institutions, industry and commerce. Such committees would make judgements based upon a number of 'key criteria implicit in the general aims', which have been identified and hence the advice given would be geared to solving such aims. Again there seems to be a danger that such aims could be static, for example, solving the needs of manpower requires an awareness of the changing needs of industry. Similarly, if the aims of the system were to be fulfilled, would this result in a type of self fulfilling institution?

Key criteria as identified in the paper include academic standards, the avoidance of duplicating provision made by universities and other institutions (one presumes that an individual will still be able to gain admission to the course, despite the institution in which it is offered) and the 'anticipated demand (local and regional as well as national) for highly qualified manpower'. The paper also points to the need "to pay regard to the relative strengths and weaknesses of an institution, the relationship between different elements of its overall provision and its overall cost effectiveness". At this point in the paper, there is no

mention of overall provision at local and regional levels. Whilst attention is drawn to strengths and weaknesses it is rare to find one institution where excellence is found in all areas. Indeed a lack of demand for some subjects, a lack of financial provision or incentive can undermine standards of provision by discouraging good staff and resources. There would appear, therefore, a need to obtain a balance of provision which considers student and commercial or industrial demand, together with resource availability.

The document talks of concentrating 'certain high quality provisions in a limited number of centres and to preserve where necessary a specialist minority provision'. If this is to be one of the aims of a new further education system then it must surely be one that is based upon a hierarchy of provision at central, regional and local levels. It is presumed that the idea of maintaining an overall minimum level of educational provision is not seen as important as providing high quality provision in a limited number of centres. The specialist minority provision is also presumed to be provided at a limited number of centres. Could it be that the two centres might turn out to be the same, whilst other less fortunate centres are eventually informed of their closure? Whatever the idea, the belief is that any central body would in some cases need to 'focus on the individual course' in order that the various types of provision would be provided for. To this end the central body, whilst having to deal with a large number of widely dispersed institutions, would need to build in stages towards some form of overall planning system. The first priority is seen as full time and sandwich courses where 'student demand and subsequent employment' extends 'beyond local authority boundaries over the country as a whole'. This is the first time in the paper that mention is specifically made of the relationship between student demand and that of employment whilst noting that both aspects extend across the country as a whole. The problem is not only one of the right type of provision at differing scales but of matching student demand and employers demands, whilst in addition not omitting the needs of the unemployed. The paper at this stage makes no reference to the needs of the unemployed and so it might be concluded that these needs are to be left to the Department of Employment to deal with. The central body is viewed initially as concentrating upon institutions which engaged primarily in providing full time and sandwich courses for a wide geographical area, which in some cases may be the entire country.

3.4.2 Which type of central body?

In attempting to define the type of central body required, it is regarded as necessary that the government's intentions can be fulfilled by that body, and in addition, the process of 'resource allocation' will also be satisfied. Furthermore, such effectiveness would have to be coupled with a degree of flexibility for each individual institution. The government considers that this individual flexibility for each institution, is a main criteria, 'by which proposals for the management of higher education outside the universities must be judged'. As stated in the paper, the government is not alone in its decision that a new type of machinery is required for central control for this area. Such proposals were made not only in the Oakes report in 1978 but also in 1980 by the House of Commons Education, Science and Arts Committee, (HC 787-1). Paragraph 51 of the report (HC 787-1), 'The funding and organisation of courses in higher education' includes some of the aims of the new body's function; 'The title reflects our desire to restate the objectives of higher education in terms appropriate to the 1980's and 1990's rather than those of the 1950's and 1960's'. 'We have concluded that distinctive roles for institutions and courses within an inter-related higher education system ought to be maintained: they constitute a crucial strength of that system'. It is also noted that there is a link between further and higher education and again this is seen as a strength and that 'some institutions', should, 'retain courses at both levels'. This later point (together with paragraph 9), simply appears to confuse, yet again, the division between further and higher education in so far as the report states 'We hope to cover further education in a later inquiry'. Therefore we are still left with the question as to whether further education includes higher education, as in general useage, meaning all education beyond age 16, or, is the idea to provide both types of education in parallel but available in various institutions (bringing into question duplication of resources), or will we see a new inter-related higher education system? Paragraph 28 states, 'the system as a whole and the particular institutions are inaccurately perceived by the public, we see colleges, polytechnics and universities as a spectrum of institutions and more of a plural than a binary system the time has now come both to plan the system as a whole and to make the role of each institution more explicit'. In order that the explicit role of each institution, with its degree

flexibility should emerge within a new scheme, the report makes several recommendations. In order to develop arrangements for the funding and administration of maintained sector higher education;

'we recommend that negotiations be immediately set in hand to establish a national body' (para. 65).

'that a committee for colleges and polytechnics (CCP) should be set up by the Secretary of State to give advice and make recommendations about the finance, administration and planning of institutions in the maintained sector engaged in Advanced Further Education' (para. 67).

'those institutions maintained or grant aided by local authorities and those grant aided by the DES should come under the CCP for planning purposes' (para. 67).

'that clear and detailed guidelines should be drawn up governing financial and administrative relationships between institutions, local authorities and the DES' (para. 74).

'that the CCP, together with the UGC, should set up a joint secretariat with DES observers to co-ordinate planning in higher education' (para. 75).

Such recommendations are clearly aimed at establishing some form of body quickly and they were noted, as outlined, in the preparation of the 1981 document. However the proposals and recommendations for a central body did not prove acceptable to the government, since their initial judgement was that 'the Working Group's proposals were unwieldy and unlikely to prove effective', and the national body 'would ... have occupied an uneasy position between the Secretary of State with his responsibility for determining total financial provision nationally, and the individual local authority with its responsibility for determining the funding of its institutions of higher education'. It was also felt that the national body, 'would have been mediated through individual local authorities, and in the last analysis would have been unable to guarantee the implementation of either a general strategy or specific initiatives', because, whilst the body would

determine provision and where it should be, together with allocating resources, there was no described method of how this should or could be done within the context of the Rate Support Grant. A major problem would have been the question of control by the national body, since it was not held that the body would have 'power to direct local authorities in relation to their higher education provision' and thus local authorities providing higher education, would be free, 'to depart substantially from national judgements about the balance and direction of provision and to spend more or less on their institutions as they thought fit.

In short the government felt (following the lines of the 1981 document) that the effectiveness of the national body would be in question. They did feel that the 'underlying reasoning' of the reports was in general agreement to their own, but, no report offered a workable blueprint, since both bodies 'fail to convince at the point where it is necessary to achieve the effective exercise of national priorities over a locally administered and widely dispersed system performing a primarily national service'. If local authorities are to retain their interest in higher education, then it is important that they 'will not distort the central body's perspective', or, there must be a relationship under which, 'the institutions become directly accountable to the central body' (a new form of higher education as mentioned above). Two choices, therefore emerge, as to the type of management body that is envisaged.

3.4.3 The two models

3.4.3.1 Model A

In this case, a small central body would be formed, comprising 'representatives directly engaged in the provision of the higher education in question', and not, as recommended by the Working Group or Select Committee, by nomination of interest groups. This model is that put forward by the Council of Local Education Authorities (CLEA) in July 1981. Under this scheme, local authorities would be in a majority on the central body, since they have distinct legal and financial responsibilities. In addition there would be a minority

group comprising and representing principals and teaching staff from the various authorities. It is also proposed in this scheme to have other interests from industry and commerce, but membership of the body by the same, may not be offered. Provision for assessment by the DES would be included and there would be some form of relationship to be worked out with voluntary and direct grant colleges. Since the body would be formed with a local authority majority, then it would be assumed that it would be empowered to exercise 'collective authority' over individual local authorities, and hence such individual authorities would surrender some 'degree of local autonomy and discretion'. This sort of body would therefore have the ability, and might be given the power, 'to insist that the traditional discretion of individual authorities be waived in acknowledgement of overriding national priorities agreed centrally by the new body'. This would seem a good way of achieving common aims and goals, but the problem would surely be in determining such goals and in the choice of who is going to set them. It is envisaged that the existing pooling arrangements would continue, together with the Secretary of State retaining his statutory responsibility for determining the size and the method of its distribution. Resource allocation (see section 3.3.2) is seen as an important part of the central body's function, and its accountability is stressed by the CLEA. The actual mechanism of resource allocation is viewed as that covered above. One of the strengths of this model is that the relationship between maintained institutions and their local authorities would continue more or less unchanged, but a weakness recognized by the CLEA is that if full control is to be gained over individual institutions, then it is likely that it will be necessary to amend the Articles of Government. However the model does note the 'intermixture of advanced and non-advanced further education', which are offered in most institutions outside the universities. In using the 'single management framework' for both advanced and non-advanced courses then it is hoped that a close relationship between these levels of provision can be maintained.

3.4.3.2 Model B

This model envisages, that a new sector of higher education would be created, formed of the major non-university institutions, which would receive finance directly from central Exchequer funds through a

central body. Under this scheme, a 'direct line of accountability' would be drawn between a central body and institutions, 'with a predominant commitment to the provision of a primarily national service'. The central body would be appointed by the Secretary of State, thus acknowledging the wide range of interests of concern. Whereas the body in model A is seen to be quite small, this scheme may well have a Chairman and at least twenty members (academic and non-academic), with considerable weight given to industry and commerce. It is envisaged that assessors would be appointed to the body from the DES, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Industry, the U.G.C. and the CLEA.

This new sector of higher education might comprise institutions which already receive central funds and those maintained colleges which are predominantly engaged in higher education, those providing initial teacher training and those making a major national provision in certain specific subject areas. Using these criteria and estimating that 80% of the advanced student population would be in this new sector, then around 90 of the 396 institutions would move into this area. This would mean that the excluded institutions, receiving finance in different arrangements would carry around 15% of all full and sandwich students, and around 20% of all students on advanced courses. Funds for the central body, to support higher education responsibilities would be formed by the relevant proportion of the current advanced further education pool, and funds from the Department's direct grant and voluntary college vote. Through allocation the central body would follow implementation of the aims mentioned above (3.3.2). Legislation would be needed to 'define the relationship with the Secretary of State and with the institutions' in receipt of a grant. Legislation would have to confer corporate body status on most maintained institutions which had been transferred, determine the composition and method of appointment of governing bodies for the newly incorporated institutions, and secure, when established, properly, responsibility for staff and other responsibilities such as liability. There would also be the problem of agreement of conditions, 'under which formerly maintained institutions would pass into new ownership'.

3.4.4 Government appraisal of the two models in the Green Paper

The document points out that either model A or model B might be

modified or, alternatively, new models could be introduced and developed in turn in order to form the basis of a central body. However the present government have stated in this paper that certain features must be adopted by the body and certain characteristics must be 'capable of being measured against certain criteria. These may be examined in three ways, effectiveness, planning and composition.

3.4.4.1 Effectiveness of the new body

It is clear in the paper that the government places a very high importance 'on the decisions of the central body being executed by the local education authorities or the institutions'. In model B the central body and the institutions share a direct relationship which in operation should present no problems of effectiveness. In model A effectiveness can only be maintained if the local education authorities give up their powers with regard to finance and distribution, whilst also acknowledging a need for sanctions if they depart from the allocations specified by the central body. The local authority majority of model A might persuade the authorities to accept such arrangements.

It is also held that the individual institutions must remain effective within themselves. That is to say that their own initiatives and enterprises must be allowed to continue, and not become stifled by power from above. Therefore such colleges must be able to work without the limits and the guidelines as stated by the central body but they must still have freedom within their own walls. The type of financial system under which they work and their individual approaches as dictated by their governing bodies will largely have, 'an impact over and above the quality and skills of their academic and other staff'. Freedom is therefore paramount. It will be seen here therefore, that there is a very thin dividing line between effectiveness through control by dominance, or control by guidance. How each institution relates to the central body either directly or indirectly (Model A and Model B) needs careful consideration. Effective control must not be so effective that it leads to tight 'detailed control of every aspect of an institution's budget', and, whilst there will be some curtailment of an institution's programme or development under a financial system of

constraint, there must remain, under the given budget, enough freedom (in the light of guidance from the central body) to determine their own programmes of expenditure.

3.4.4.2 Planning by the new body

The government believes that one of the tests of any model adopted must be, 'the scope it affords for national planning', especially in the light of the diversity and number of institutions of higher education'. Two issues arise here, the first concerning the position of the voluntary colleges, and the second, 'the provision of a central focus for teacher training'. It is argued that since the Secretary of State has particular responsibility for the education and training of teachers, it would be a major planning advantage for the country if the central body were, 'to have oversight of all such provision in the non-university institutions (both maintained and voluntary).

The position of the direct and voluntary colleges is unclear since their precise role in a new system would need to be negotiated. Since there is little doubt that such colleges would wish to be involved in the planning of higher education and the allocation of resources, then model B, which has no one sector of dominance in its composition would seem the most appropriate for this purpose. Model A was designed around the local authority colleges, including the polytechnics, but the CLEA have shown a willingness to consider bringing in the direct and voluntary colleges into this scheme. Such action would no doubt need careful negotiation between the representatives of the direct and voluntary colleges in order to maintain local authority majority. This majority would be required since without it, there would be no central focus for teacher training in the non-university sector, and, diversified courses provided by the voluntary colleges would also be outside the scope of the central body.

A further important planning consideration involves the number of institutions that may be placed under the control of the central body, whilst having regard to the desirable size of that body and its secretariat. It must be noted that the large majority of maintained institutions providing higher education also provide non-advanced further education. Whilst Model A assumes control by the central

body of those maintained institutions offering some higher education, Model B restricts control to the 90 or so institutions which are substantially engaged in higher education. The government argues there are strong educational and organisational reasons for not separating advanced and non-advanced work, and Model A would satisfy this belief. In using Model B arrangements would have to be made for the funding of non-advanced work, whose advanced work was directly funded by the central body. Similarly arrangements would have to be made for limited advanced work in those institutions which did not come under the central body. The document acknowledges that the decision on whether to use Model A or B, or neither, brings into question the amount of control which is really desirable with regard to the type and amount of advanced work being done by the various institutions. Again there is a problem of which criteria to use when selecting the various institutions for inclusion in Model B, and also which procedures should apply for advanced work being carried out by other institutions. It is also argued that in the case of part-time work consideration must be given to the, 'close relationship between part-time and full-time provision', in given institutions, due to the use of common resources. However, it is not deemed desirable to regulate part-time provision as this mostly serves a local need (and one which is likely to increase in importance) or a regional need. It is suggested that part-time work be funded through the central body, in the form of an agreed student loan basis and that its detailed regulation should be managed locally or regionally.

3.4.4.3 Composition of the new body

With regard to the nature and form of the central body, a strong emphasis is placed upon public confidence in that body, in being able to 'undertake the heavy responsibilities' as examined under Aims and Provisions in Non-University Higher Education (3.2). The Secretary of State's relationship in constitutional terms with the central body will depend upon whichever model is chosen. In both models body members will be appointed by him, so that in Model A this is largely determined with regard to nominations from specific parties, and in Model B all appointments are made by him. Finance in both models will be determined by the Secretary of State, so that the total sum for higher education is set by him. In Model A allocation of the set sum will be subject to advice from the central body (rather like the UGC)

whilst under B the central body would allocate funds to the given institutions, and would have an 'Accounting Officer'.

Each model assumes that the central body will need to establish a 'secretarial and an academic sub-structure', 'determine its working relationship with the validating bodies, discuss the part which HM Inspectors might play and decide how to involve employers and industrialists in its work'. It is noted that there are in various professional fields, national bodies which have responsibility for co-ordination and planning, and also in some cases validation of courses, but such responsibilities are not to be affected as such, yet the central body will have to establish relationships with these various bodies. It is also seen as necessary, that the central body enters into 'early dialogue' with the UGC, so as to consider higher education as a whole.

The composition of the body is envisaged as depending upon scope and function. In model A, a small body, with a local authority majority with 'standing machinery or assessorships for outside consultation', will emerge, reflecting the need to maintain the confidence of the local authorities, whilst academics will have a minority, yet substantial representation. The relationship with voluntary colleges would need consideration. Model B sees the central body dealing directly with the 'new incorporated institutions', which will allow the body to be formed, not of representatives, 'but of nominees appointed in their own right, academics and non-academics, people from commerce, industry, local government and the universities'. In short, this is a much wider base than that of Model A. Clearly consideration of the two models serves to find strengths and merits in each and leads to new proposals but the paper emphasised that whilst this would be the case, public confidence and public interest must be reflected in the final form of central body chosen.

4. The National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB)

4.1 Introduction

Following the release of the Oakes Report in 1978, much of its

impetus, as we have noted, was lost in the change of government in 1979. It is clear from the Green Paper of 1981 that no final decision concerning the type of body had been made, which led to a belief seen in various THES articles (e.g. 15.2.80 The Case for a National Body) that the government had no real intention of creating any body at all, (see DES Annual Report 1981, Local Authority Higher Education 3.3.2 and 3.3.3). However, as economies were demanded by central government, and put into force by polytechnics and colleges, the local authorities began to push for such a body. This is seen in the publication by the Council of Local Education Authorities (CLEA) of 'The future of higher education in the maintained sector' in 1981. The following section 4.2, looks at the period from the findings of Oakes to the final establishment of the National Advisory Body in 1982 and considers the events and pressures of that period.

4.2 The creation of the central body

The release of the Oakes proposals in 1978 rather expectedly produced mixed reactions. From this point, the Times Higher Educational Supplement contains a continual set of articles all concerned with the Oakes aftermath. The first reaction (THES, 25.8.78) came from the Centre of Institutional Studies headed by Tyrell Burgess at the NE London Polytechnic which was to claim that the proposals of Oakes would destroy public sector further education. There should be no national body to finance the polytechnics and the colleges and the advisory councils and 'the pool' should be scrapped. Furthermore LEA's should decide how to fulfil their obligations in consultation with other LEA's if necessary. The new national body as proposed would undermine public control by removing accountability if LEA's for decisions of their own institutions. The Institute also claimed that if such a body had to be formed then it should not be responsible for the distribution of resources but it should be an entirely advisory body which would embrace the university and public sector. The proposals as put forward by Oakes were seen by the Polytechnic of North London as failing to provide a sound model for future management of the polytechnics. With regard to degree work, such policy should be based upon national and not local factors and therefore the regional advisory councils should lose their responsibility for approving such courses. This would mean that individual LEA's would

be unable to directly influence degree work in their polytechnics.

Following this initial reaction the DES was suddenly forced to change its future plans for higher education into the 1990's since DES figures revealed a shortfall in recruitment to courses by 9,000 in polytechnics and colleges (THES, 24.11.78). The figures used as a basis for the discussion document for the 1990's therefore became untenable. The growth target for 1981 (560,000) was pushed back to 82/83 and the distribution between university and the public sector was maintained at 310,000 and 250,000 respectively. It is interesting to note that the UGC considered itself to be on target at 310,000 'if not several thousand students ahead', at this point. If this was the true position however, the question arises as to why there was a shortfall in recruitment to courses outside the university sector?

The Oakes plan received little attention after this, mainly because there was a change in government on 3 May 1979. As a result the Secretary for Education (M Carlisle) put 'Oakes on ice'. By the end of 1979, over a year since the Oakes report, there were renewed calls for a national body to take central control of polytechnic finances and some form of machinery to distribute the appropriate funds (THES, 28.12.79). In February of 1980 there were renewed calls yet again for the national body, directly resulting from a new, and tougher set of guidelines on all courses in polytechnics and colleges. At the same time (15.2.80) there was presented in the Times Higher Educational Supplement the case for a national body. This call was reflected in the preparation of the 1980 Education Act where labour MP's attempted to bring in an amendment which would have obliged the Secretary of State to create the national body. In debate, this call was defeated by a majority of 64. However, at the time Dr Boyson stated that the government had not made up its mind whether to create a national body or not. There were no plans for the long term, and the government was neither for nor against, but the government did want long term planning for all higher education.

Following this non-appearance, the Council of Local Education Authorities (CLEA) considered ways in which to achieve a fairer share of funds and also the formation of a national planning committee to advise the Secretary of state on the distribution of around £400 million

to polytechnics and colleges, (THES 14.3.80). The CLEA concluded that some advisory body was essential to avoid crisis in the yearly budgets and to achieve a fairer sharing of the pool. Consequently the CLEA approved the formation of such a body (21.3.80) which would be formed from LEA's and would work with the DES. An initial task was to be in the controlling of funds, but later it would become a fully fledged planning body able to make financial and educational judgements.

Whilst no obvious policy moves were made by the DES at this time it is obvious that it had not been resting. On 23.5.80 the DES announced a re-shuffle which was aimed at easing binary planning, (THES, 23.5.80 DES re-shuffle to ease binary planning). It was a radical re-organisation to allow planning across the great binary divide of higher education which would achieve better management and stability during the 1980's. Implemented on 21.11.80 the three sectors of higher education within the DES were re-organised. HFEI was merged with HFE3 so that non-university higher and further education (HFE1) was merged with university policy (HFE3) to produce a new 'super branch'. HFE2 further education for industry and liaison with Manpower Services Commission became involved with adult and continuing education. These moves were also aimed at 'filling the vacuum' of a non-Oakes policy, and were seen as a result of rate capping. For example, Kingston Polytechnic then received a 15% cut to its budget whilst North London Polytechnic was untouched.

At the start of 1981 the DES announced the first planning links across the binary divide, (THES 2.1.81). Six transbinary committees were to be established to discuss the problems in the higher education sector, with three being established initially with priority given to two of them, with the remaining three to follow on later. The first group would consider the question of student numbers and their distribution between the university and public sector together with a study of numbers in particular subjects and the overall balance in subjects within the system. The second group was to examine how spending on students differs within and between institutions. This was seen as a landmark for LEA planners since it would be the first time it would be possible to compare the unit cost of their colleges with the 'unit of resource' of the UGC. The third group was to

examine teacher training and the co-ordination between its providers. The remaining groups as announced were, one to deal with fees policy, one with catering and residence and one of particular spatial interest; the general regional co-ordination of higher education.

As noted earlier late 1980 saw the publication of 'The funding and organization of courses in higher education' from the parliamentary select committee on education, in which the DES was challenged, 'on its right and competence to be responsible for higher education planning' (THES, 23.1.81). Such attack was difficult for the DES due to the combined effects of spending cuts, since they were causing 'new and complicated initiatives' on the DES agenda. Amongst items in the agenda were the need for a new management structure for public sector higher education, and, some mechanism to introduce some kind of manpower planning concept. However the implementation of the DES re-shuffle helped to ease some of the criticisms.

Further information on this re-shuffle was released in January 1981. The new transbinary 'superbranch' HFEI was to be headed by John Thompson and would be subdivided into three divisions:

- (a) Higher education finance and policy across the binary line, under Hugh Jenkins,
- (b) Management of public sector higher education and the affairs of polytechnics, under Stephen Jones,
- (c) Fees policy and voluntary colleges, under Ivor Jones.

The FHE2 branch was divided into four divisions and headed by Roy Walker, as follows:

- (a) Liaison between education and industry, especially engineering and youth policy, under Barney Baker,
- (b) Vocational and industrial training and Department of Education and Science and Manpower Service Commission, under Anthony Woolard,
- (c) FE examinations, TEC policy and policy for 16-19 provision, under Richard Chattaway.

- (d) Adult and continuing education, Art and design and agricultural areas, under Carol Chattaway.

Whilst FHE3 under Noel Thompson also had four divisions:

- (a) Student affairs, international activity on higher education, and the Open University, under John Melhuish,
- (b) Institutional government and legislative matters, under Colin Graham,
- (c) Policy on student awards, under Josephine Gilbey,
- (d) Secretariat for the Computer Board, under Henry Norton.

(Source: New top brass close ranks against critics, THES 16.1.81.)

Much of this re-organisation can be regarded as an answer to the call of the select committee for a national body to oversee polytechnics and colleges. Whilst the re-shuffle had been accomplished there was still doubt over any national body emerging. Mark Carlisle in January 1981 stated there was a need to tackle 'fundamental' issues of the management structure for the public sector but it was well known that the government wished to remove quangos, not create them. The Standing Conference of the college principals' organization drew up their response to the Select Committee on education (above) and called for a stronger body than that being envisaged by the Conservatives National Advisory Committee on Education (THES, 16.1.81). On 23 January 1981 the government replied to the select committee and welcomed the 46 recommendations. No government action was predicted and all plans for a national body were put back until a later date. (THES, 23.1.81.)

At the end of January 1981 the DES took everyone by surprise and revealed plans for a revolutionary new body to oversee polytechnics and colleges and bring an end to LEA control. Devised by Stephen Jones it was regarded as the second part of the answer to the select committee, in which direct funding of advanced further education would emerge, (see, THES, 30.1.81). The body would have a minority LEA membership and would simply oversee individual institutions and not courses in higher education. The most important element of the plan was seen in the severance of local authority control of non-university

education, and indeed the local authorities were quick to claim that the motive of such a plan was to impose greater financial control overspending. Angela Rumbold of the AMA (Association of Metropolitan Authorities) Education Committee claimed it could be 'seen as a grab for power by central government', THES (30.1.81). Following the announcement of the national body plan Mark Carlisle announced the full plans in an internal ministerial memorandum, where it was revealed that higher education must contract in the 1980's and this would need some central control (see THES, 6.2.81). All polytechnics and colleges were to come under direct exchequer funding distributed by some type of UGC body. There was to be no compromise between local government control and a national body, legislation would be enacted during 1982/83 and a committee formed in early 1983 would take full control in late 1983. The new sector was to have 175,000 students, in 98 institutions (29 polytechnics, 38 LEA colleges, 24 voluntary colleges and 7 direct grant). The plan moved to cabinet level (THES, 13.2.81), received treasury approval and the DES was then suspected of using the committee's study of higher education as a cover to introduce a pre-determined scheme. On 20.2.81 the national body plan was checked in cabinet since there was a failure to achieve overall agreement (THES, 20.2.81). The decision in principle of adopting a centralized system was deferred and Mark Carlisle was given permission to prepare a consultative document (Higher education in England outside the universities: policy funding and management). The government then waited for reactions and received proposals from the Council of Local Education Authorities (CLEA) in July 1981, (The Future of Higher Education in the Maintained Sector) who pointed out that takeover of the given institutions would mean a loss of £400 million of LEA property (THES 13.3.81). Just as the government appeared at the point of abandoning the scheme a new compromise was announced (THES 29.5.81) with colleges being under direct exchequer finance and educational control, but still under individual LEA's. The new body was to be like the UGC but with very powerful central government representation. Following several meetings with civil servants and local authority representatives it was expected that the final proposal would be put forward in July 1981. On the 10.7.81 the cabinet gave the go ahead to the central body in a draft green paper (Higher education in England outside the universities: policy funding and management) setting out two alternatives as put forward

by the DES and the CLEA, but the Committee of Directors of Polytechnics stated they would only accept either plan providing its composition was left to the discretion of the Secretary of State (see THES Cabinet gives go ahead to national body, 10.7.81). Immediate opposition came from the CLEA and the government sought ways of avoiding any confrontation at this point. This apparent compromise adopting stance by the government led to criticism from Gerry Fowler, former minister of state at the DES, who called for a single body as being the only answer for all higher education, including the universities. 'The failure to resolve the problems of the control and funding of public sector higher education, ... is now a longrunning saga worthy of Hollywood'.

At this stage all might have gone as expected, but Sir Keith Joseph was appointed Secretary of State for Education, and then asked local authorities to consider proposals for short term machinery which was seen as a DES climbdown. On 23.10.81 details were disclosed of plans for interim arrangements for polytechnics and colleges, which once again led LEA's to believe that hopes of a new body were fading (see THES, 23.10.81 One-man-band national body). This new outline was much smaller than the original as put forward, with a two tier system and a single secretary being its basic composition. On 29.10.81 local authority leaders agreed to the establishment of a national body to take at least temporary control of funds along the lines of the interim proposals (THES, 30.10.81). These interim proposals were finalized in November of 1981 (THES, 6.11.81) with the DES and the CLEA having exclusive membership with an offer of representation for the CNAAB. The new body was to be called 'The Interim Committee for Local Authority Higher Education' (THES, 'Interim' body deal finalized, 13.11.81). Having established this interim body Sir Keith Joseph, at the North of England Education Conference in January 1982, said to those who had doubts about the new system, 'make it succeed on your own terms' (THES, 8.1.82), which seemed to imply that having created this body the colleges and polytechnics were lumbered with it, and the DES had now lost interest. He stated that, 'the committee would be left to devise its own ways of working', but, 'the aim was to produce a smaller but even better system of higher education'.

At this time a new threat was posed to the new body since the Director of The Managerial, Professional and Staff Liaison Group asked Sir Keith to consider nominations for a larger body (THES, 8.1.82). This threat was then averted when the Under Secretary for Higher Education agreed to extend membership of the proposed officials. Having done this the way was then open for what became the final phase.

On 29.1.82 it was announced that Mr John Bevan had been appointed secretary to the new interim committee for local authority higher education and also the second tier National Advisory Board, this being a separate entity within the framework of the interim committee for local authority higher education.

Composition of the NAB

The National Advisory Body (NAB) comprises ..

- 1st tier Interim Committee for Local Authority Higher Education
- 2nd tier National Advisory Board.

Mr Bevan rather interestingly was a member of the Jones group which devised the new funding system for polytechnics and colleges, (THES, 29.1.82). Meanwhile Mr Christopher Ball was to chair the National Advisory Board. On 1.2.82, after nearly four years of debate and changing position the new National Advisory Body (NAB) was launched being the then recognised interim committee for local authority higher education, (THES, 5.2.82). However there was to be no permanency regarding the NAB since it was given three years to prove itself, it was to consider various transbinary links and there was to be contact at the 'highest level between the UGC and the NAB'. Various subject groups were to be formed to undertake reviews, the first being pharmacy, and, art and design, with other groups being established to examine the data base for decision making in the public sector and possible regional structures.

Following its launch, there were doubts cast upon the viability of the NAB as formed (THES, 19.2.82). Fowler once again expressed fears over its membership stating that a lack of experience among its members would threaten its work, furthermore the new system might destroy the type of higher education intended by Crossland. However, the NAB

pressed ahead and named the chairmen of the new working groups (THES, 26.2.82). Nominated by Ball they were

Dr Nuttgens	Art and design, to assess the local authority provision
Mr Hall	Engineering, advise which branch to study first
Sir Hartley	Pharmacy, in light of UGC cuts
Mr Ball	Regional structures
Mr Bevan	Data base for decision making

Despite the inevitable criticisms (THES, 19.3.82) the NAB soon moved into positive action and following examination of the DES survey on courses, announced 7.5.82 (see THES, NAB considers closure of 400 unpopular college courses, 7.5.82) that it was considering the closure of various courses. A week later it announced its intention to influence the cuts for 1983/84 with regard to the Advanced Further Education Pool and would take over Mr. Jones' group by a merger of the NAB board and pool committee.

The NAB has continued since its creation to affect policy and make comments in the area of local authority higher education. On 1 February 1985 the NAB was reconstituted, on a permanent basis, as the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education. This coincided with the transfer of the majority of voluntary colleges to direct NAB control. In addition the NAB was expanded so as to include a greater representation of industrial and commercial interests. (DES Annual Report 1984.)

4.3 The Further Education Unit (FEU)

The Further Education Unit was formerly known as the Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit (FECRDU), which was announced in December 1976, and inaugurated in January 1977 under the direction of an independent Board of Management, appointed by the Secretary of State. Its primary focus of attention was upon the immediate post-school stages of education, assisting with the development of pilot schemes of unified vocational preparation, working on education elements of the new (then) Programme for Unemployed Young

People, with the Manpower Services Commission and the education services, and reviewing various curricula for young people of average or below average ability, with no strong vocational or academic commitment.

In 1979, following the purge upon quangos, the unit narrowly missed being scrapped, but the publication of the Oakes report, together with increasing youth unemployment seem to have been causes for its retention (THES, 7.1.83). As noted, four years elapsed between the findings of Oakes and the eventual establishment of the NAB. The work of the unit since 1979, can be regarded as a form of substitute for the lack of a national body which would have taken control of all areas of higher education, including curriculum design and vocational training, whilst also dealing with overall policy and budgets. Therefore, whether part of deliberate policy or not, the DES was partly able to deflect certain criticisms of a lack of a central body by pointing to the increasing importance and recognition of the then development unit.

During the units first year (1977) work was continued on the immediate post school stages of further education, and four publications, including an annual report. The first publication 'Experience, reflection, learning' was a package of suggestions for organizers of schemes of unified vocational preparation, whilst the remainder included findings of a postal survey of further education provision for the young unemployed, and a review of research into aspects of the education and training of young part time students. (DES Annual Report 1977.)

From this point the unit has continued to make major contributions in the area of pre-vocational education and also in the area of youth training especially with regard to the links between the further education service, and the work of the Manpower Services Commission. The unit therefore can be again regarded as a buffer between the Manpower Services Commission and the DES, whilst being under DES control financially and staff wise. The units prominence has largely been brought about due to its work on 16-18 education, and the proposals for a certificate of pre-vocational education (17+ certificate). In 1978 the Waddell report was published (Cmnd 7281) and a white paper (Cmnd 7368) which considered a single system of examinations to

replace the GCE 'O' level and CSE systems, to be introduced in the mid-1980's. At the same time (December 1978) the Keohane report group published 'Proposals for a certificate of extended education' (Cmnd 7755) which concerned those aged 16 with CSE grades 2-4, with no clear career intentions but with a wish to continue in full time education. These people were recognized in the report as being very similar to those studying pre-employment courses in further education, and consequently the connection was made with the Further Education Units work on pre-employment and vocational preparation. The Unit's publications 'A basis for choice' and 'Supporting YOP' surveyed post-16 full time pre-employment courses and recommended a nationally recognised curriculum structure.

The downturn of the economy in 1979 brought into the vocational arena, the work and position of the Manpower Services Commission in relation to the education service. This is probably one of the main sources of the debate between 'education' and 'training'. In 1979, as mentioned, the unit published, 'A basis for choice' which was a report of a study group on post-16 pre-employment courses, in which, the nature of the curricula for such courses was outlined. The unit envisaged three areas or components to each curriculum, these being job specific studies, vocational studies and core studies. It is the latter which is seen as the overlapping link between the courses of the further education institutions and the courses of the Manpower Services Commission (such as the then, YOP, Youth Opportunity Programme). In addition these two institutions are now involved heavily with vocational preparation which is a combination of education and training which is aimed at smoothing the transition from school to work. However, it is in the area of vocational preparation, that criticism of education and training have been directed, especially with regard to the position of the DES and the Manpower Services Commission. Farley (1982) wrote in the Times Higher Education Supplement of the danger, 'that because many of the new initiatives associated with vocational preparation emanate from the Manpower Services Commission and because much of the provision is from outside formal education, another variant of the 'two nation' theory will emerge'. 'Both the MSC and the education service must show themselves aware of these dangers and be seen to take positive steps to overcome them'.

Criticisms of this kind have been made of both the Manpower Services Commission, and the DES in the Times Higher Educational Supplement. Santinelli (1983) writing in her article, 'Unit makes the most of its new freedom', states that since the DES, 'decided to strengthen the unit' much of the 'persistent criticisms' have been answered. Such persistent criticisms were that the DES had been leaving all 16-19 developments to the Manpower Services Commission and thereby appearing to lose control.

On 1 January 1983 the Further Education Unit became independent of the DES (the strengthening referred to above) with limited company status. Its budget was to be doubled by 1985/86 to £3 million, being set at £2 million for 1984/85 (THES 7.1.83). Such funding, however, was not to be the total responsibility of the unit. Furthermore, its first director, J Mansell, was given very limited funds with which to work in comparison to the £1,000 m. for the Manpower Services Commission for 1984-85 (THES 7.1.83).

The unit's work on pre-employment courses as outlined above is regarded by many, including Santinelli, as the DES's answer to the MSC's increasing influence in the vocational arena. Since 'A basis for choice', the unit has continued to spread its influence across the further education scene, moving into adult education, new technologies, staff development and students with special needs. This is a reflection of Mansell's views that he believed there was a need for a new philosophy in further education, and that this may be achieved by pulling together the strands of this area. The four strands were identified as:

- (a) Vocational preparation
- (b) Adult education
- (c) Special needs
- (d) New technology

The unit has made distinct contributions to each of these areas before reshaping in 1983, having spent around 50% of its resources on vocational preparation, whilst carrying out major research projects such as developing a 'Personal guidance base', 'Progressing from

vocational preparation' and 'Teaching skills' being a strategy for further training and the development of staff in further education, involved in vocational programmes.

Santinelli (1983), however, considers that one of the 'greatest problems' for the FEU is to restrain the Manpower Services Commission in attempts to take control of the further education curriculum, through the Youth Training Scheme (now Youth Training Initiative) in the life and social skill courses. The main questions seem to be that of control or influence. The problem therefore for the FEU, is to decide whether to stop the MSC or rather to influence the MSC in a 'gentle' but 'positive' manner. Indications are that the FEU prefers to influence, as seen in the agreement with the MSC on joint guidelines for the New Training Initiative, (THES, 7.1.83).

The unit though has continued its work in the four main areas outlined above, in adult education, the unit, as the agent of the DES, has carried out much curriculum development for PICKUP the continuing education scheme. In the area of special needs, especially 14-19 year olds, a learning pack for slow learners has been the main aim. In new technology a major contribution has been 'Computer aided design in FE' which took as its lead, the widespread use of computers in industry. In total the unit would like to see all colleges take on all four areas, and not merely one or two scattered here and there.

More recently (1984) the unit has published work on computer literacy, information technology, robotics, physical education and core competencies for engineers. Of more interest though was the announcement in 1984 that the network of Regional Curriculum Bases (RCB's) was completed, each of which was linked to each of the 10 Regional Advisory Councils (RAC's). The RCB's are to provide a focus for the FEU's curriculum and staff development work. (DES Annual Review, 1984).

It is likely that the influence of the RCB's will gradually extend the work of the FEU across the further education sector to the extent of playing a large part in the Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative. How important the RCB's and the RAC's will become is difficult to assess at present and it is an area which will

probably require examination later, especially with regard to local influences of industry, commerce and the LEA's themselves.

4.4 A future amalgamation

The examination of the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB) and the Further Education Unit (FEU) gives rise to certain questions concerning the future of these two bodies. As noted, the NAB has recently been established upon a permanent basis, and its influence has steadily grown since its creation. For example, the NAB's plans for 1984-85 regarding student numbers and financial allocations for the local authority sector of higher education were accepted in full by the Secretary of State, together with recommendations for a significant shift towards science provision and various vocational studies (DES Annual Report 1983). Clearly then, this body is now the controlling influence in terms of policy and finance for all public sector higher education outside the universities.

However, whilst the NAB has called for more rationalisation in the system, and has gained a strong control over course control, it does not, as yet, seem to have made any recommendations regarding course content or general curriculum composition. Instead, such work has been increasingly taken over by the FEU. Examination of the FEU shows that this unit has gradually but effectively widened its influence both upon and across subject areas. The FEU now appears to have a much wider brief than in its previous form, as is witnessed in the description of the unit in publications since 1983, but its influence extends only across further education and not secondary education. However, it is worth recalling that further education covers a very wide area, including, sixth forms, continuing education for adults, vocational education (in conjunction with the MSC) as well as providing the many courses in the colleges and institutes of further education.

It would seem, therefore, that what has been created, are two distinct halves, each dealing with distinct areas of policy, which are part and parcel of the whole. The NAB is now largely controlling policy, both financial and governmental, and putting this into effect

by overall control of the further education sector. The FEU is increasingly influencing policy by control of the curriculum, and staff development. Is it right then to ask, if in the future, these two units may combine to form a kind of super control branch of education for further education?

There are several reasons as to why this may be the case. The recent 'revamping' of both units on a permanent basis, suggests that further education will continue to receive as much, or indeed more attention. The restructuring of each unit may therefore become an intermediate period of preparation before a new further education branch is established that may deal with all policy, and may eventually regain areas of control in the vocational field, which have been 'lost' to the Manpower Services Commission.

In the meantime, the establishing of the network of Regional Curriculum Bases (RCB's) being linked to the 10 Regional Advisory Councils (RAC's) may be an indication that the government wishes to establish some form of national network of control over further education, which is independent from the Department of Employment. In this case the Regional Curriculum Bases could be seen as a buffer between the Departments of Employment and Education and Science respectively, if the bases are used as links between the two departments.

Such speculation however, could be substantially incorrect in view of the decision in August 1985 by the Secretary of State, to reject his officials' advice to cut the FEU's budget by £1 million by 1988. The Secretary of State has instead decided to review the units funding on an annual basis. In July 1985 Sir Keith Joseph became aware of the wide range of work undertaken by the unit (THES, 9.8.85). This awareness may indicate that the unit has deliberately set out to make itself indispensable by covering such a wide range? Sir Keith Joseph has acknowledged that the FEU has been 'saved' due to its work on the PICKUP programme, which the government wishes to continue.

Meanwhile in March and April (1985) Mr Roy Walker, under secretary at the DES further and higher education branch 2, exchanged letters

with the Chairman of the FEU, Mr Joss Owen, concerning running down the unit in view of work being carried out by the Further Education Staff College, the HMI and the Manpower Services Commission. The board of the FEU have pointed out to Sir Keith Joseph that its reduced funding will bring cuts in work on information technology, multicultural education, and vocational work. All of which the DES and the Secretary of State wish to build up (THES, 9.8.85).

The future of the FEU is therefore very unclear, and any overall policy extremely difficult to determine, especially in the light of recent changes affecting the FEU.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

The current continuing emphasis upon value for money, efficiency and upon financial aspects, as highlighted in the Times Higher Educational Supplement (24.5.85, 7.6.85) demands attention, with regard to the future of further education. The entire sector of further education (including the universities) is characterised by the binary system of control with regard to finance, but the government appears now to treat both further and higher education as two parts of a whole, yet still appears reluctant to control both parts under one control system, (THES, 24.5.85). Furthermore the government appears to have a tendency in its publications to refer to higher education, whilst at the same time almost forgetting that advanced and non-advanced courses fall into this area, as taught within the polytechnics and other institutes of further education, (THES, 24.5.85). Therefore, despite the publication of the recent Green Paper (Cmd 9524), the question remains as to whether there is a real policy for further education, or whether Command 9524 is simply part of a greater whole, yet to be unveiled. Before considering the likely effects of Command 9524, an overview of the findings of Her Majesty's Inspectors for the last two years (1983, 1984) is presented. This is included so as to illustrate that there are still problems which need to be tackled.

5.2 The HMI findings on NAFE and AFE; 1983 and 1984

Information presented in this section, is based upon the Report by Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI's) on the Effects of local authority expenditure policies on education provision in England for 1983 and 1984. Each of these annual reports is published in May of the year following the study, therefore, the report for 1985 is not available at the time of writing. However, the information which is available for 1983 and 1984 is sufficient to indicate general trends, but it cannot be used to illustrate fully the state of non-advanced further education (NAFE) or advanced further education (AFE). The reports state that for advanced further education, 'the information collected is no more than illustrative'. Firm conclusions cannot therefore be drawn, rather further areas needing investigation may be highlighted.

During 1983 a total of 390 visits by HMI's were made to various institutions of NAFE and AFE including the polytechnics. These visits were to assess the quality of the work and to attempt to identify the factors which influence this work. Various factors have been identified in the report including, 'levels of resources', 'the quality of the teaching', 'leadership and management', 'student response', and 'the organization of the teaching and learning'. The report notes that none of these factors may be effectively 'isolated' or 'disentangled'.

In summary the 1983 report indicates that the work in NAFE institutions was not as good or satisfactory as in the AFE institutions although most of the work was satisfactory. There was, however, a large amount of unsatisfactory and variable work carried out in part time day release for NAFE and also for evening only classes. This latter unsatisfactory work could be due to a shortage of 'appropriately experienced lecturers' who seemed to experience difficulty 'in adapting their teaching methods' to individual students' requirements, providing suitable courses for the Youth Training Scheme and also in acquiring knowledge which would be appropriate to new technology. The HMI's found there was a mismatch between initial qualifications and experience, and the present demands of the job.

In NAFE, accommodation was identified as a factor contributing to

poor work, since it was 'seriously' hampering the development and provision of quality work. A shortage of classroom accommodation was a major concern, and this was highlighted by the large number of temporary classrooms in use, together with the poor state of repair and maintenance of other buildings. Such findings may be an indication of the way NAFE has been regarded as the 'poor relation' of AFE. Where institutions have been unable to offer AFE courses the lower financial provision forced upon them by exclusion from the 'pool' or due to lower rateable values, or scarcity of populations, may have significantly affected the ability of the local authority to maintain buildings at an adequate standard.

The 1983 report also notes that where vocational preparation was undertaken by the FE sector, experience and qualifications were both lacking and insufficient. Consequently there was identified a need for more staff development courses for YTS and also for the 16-19 age group, together with more support for the release of lecturers into industry and commerce in order to acquire up-to-date information. Furthermore the use of old and worn out equipment and shortages has also effected the quality of work in several instances.

Shortages of resources, in the form of books and of library accommodation was found in nearly one third of all institutions that were visited in 1983. The lack of funds meant charges being levied for materials, made to students, and also to student employees. In addition, financial constraints have forced many LEA's to increasingly operate a policy of funding students 'out county', but only where there was no similar course available locally or where such a course was full. The HMI's suggested that the policy of 'out county' was restricting access to some students according to their need, age, ability and aptitude. This suggestion is particularly important in terms of equality of geographical provision and further work using some form of performance indicators will need to be carried out in order to make a clearer assessment. Sub-standard performance was found where some courses that were aimed at satisfying local employment demands were failing. This failure of performance in meeting the needs, abilities and aptitudes of students tends to reflect the lack of some form of co-ordinating agency at a national level working through regional centres, in order to satisfy national demand and

provision. The NAB as yet, does not appear to have such a mechanism, although it has moved into the area of course control (THES, 7.5.82).

In the AFE sector, the situation, not unexpectedly, was better in 1983 than the NAFE sector. This finding seems to reinforce the view that much valuable NAFE work is lost at the expense of AFE in certain institutions, where prestige and finance become the overriding considerations. HMI's considered much more work done in AFE to be more satisfactory or better, whilst the influences contributing to poor work were not identified with a lack of resources, but with the use of inappropriate teaching methods, and an unclear understanding of students' needs. The use of performance indicators could therefore be a substantial contribution to understanding such relationships in this area.

The report for 1984 was again based upon various visits made by HMI's to certain institutions, in an attempt to assess 'the extent to which the resource needs of education are being met, in the light of present expectations and when institutions are being called upon to improve the overall quality of education'. Identification of the factors which appear to contribute to the work seen, are highlighted, and the observed effects are seen as being central to the report. However, the report again notes that the effects found by the HMI's are not to be taken as statistically representative, but rather, an indication of trends and issues, and a guide to the general picture in further and higher education.

The observed effects are seen as reflections of the LEA expenditure policies for 1984-85, past expenditures, falling roles, reorganization changes and management policies. The relationship between expenditure and provision (in terms of education quality) is seen neither as simple nor direct, and it is obvious that the relationship is very complex. In section 3.2.1 (Ramsden '86) it was noted that in 1979 the committee for administering 'the pool' set various 'norms' which were related to performance. However, it could be argued that in order to meet the 'resource needs of education', 'there are needed forms of norms not for performance alone, but also for provision to operate at the LEA level and across all LEA's. Such a system would probably need clearer standards and costings to be uniformly applied.

In comparison to 1983, the findings for 1984 show a considerable change with regard to the relationship between AFE and NAFE. The resources available for NAFE are deemed sufficient for a continual adaptation to the needs of training, of employment patterns, and the student population. In AFE, resources are considered sufficient to absorb further increases in student numbers and a change of emphasis in the courses offered.

Discrepancies between standards in NAFE and AFE seem to have been reduced considerably, which may be connected to the number of voluntary redundancies in NAFE, together with early retirements and initial compulsory redundancies. The 1984 report notes the need for more appropriate teaching styles and better matches between qualifications and expenditure, especially in the area of vocational courses and the Youth Training Scheme. The previous discrepancy between NAFE and AFE has obviously been reduced, but there remains the long standing suspicion that NAFE has missed out, at the expense of AFE. This situation seems to have been reversed, possibly as a result of large capital sums being paid by the Manpower Services Commission to colleges and institutions of further education in order to provide courses for the Youth Training Scheme.

Of the actual courses, seven-eighths were regarded as satisfactory in the LEA's. In the remaining eighth, a limited range of courses, a lack of finance and inadequate accommodation were all factors which made provision unsatisfactory. In only a few LEA's (not specified) did course provision not match the, 'perceived needs of the local community and employers', which is an improvement upon the previous year. Most LEA's attempted to provide appropriate courses in their own colleges, but some did make the of these provided in neighbouring authorities. Restrictions on provision were noted by 11 authorities, whilst 76 made no change on policies for travel, mode of study, or academic choice of students wishing to study outside their LEA. Of the 11, they introduced more restrictions, such as funding for students' access to courses outside their authority. These restrictions were intended to reduce 'out county' expenditure and keep students within LEA boundaries. It is unclear if such policies apply only

when a course is available within a given LEA. Such policies raise questions regarding the uniformity of provision of certain courses across different LEA's, together with a lack of enterprise and change for course directors, and the effect upon employment possibilities for given students. AFE, however, is still better provided for than NAFE with better matches in lecturers' qualifications and experience, together with better course provision. The 1984 report calls for a significant improvement in both the management and the deployment of teaching resources at the institutional level. This would appear to be unsatisfactory since there remains the question of management and deployment of resources at both local and national levels.

The HMI's summarize their 1984 report by stating that, most of the further and higher education institutions (HFE's) have adapted well to new demands, but the LEA's themselves are not managing the FHE system well. This is believed to be due to a lack of information resulting from a lack of advisory support for FHE. It is further believed that this may, 'impede their ability to manage necessary changes both within NAFE and between NAFE and schools'. This issue concerning management generates considerable interest, since it highlights the problem of managing the non-university further education sector, and reflects the entire Oakes issue. Therefore, despite the eventual emergence of the NAB, together with the recently re-organized FEU, the LEA's are still autonomous enough, to manage their own colleges and institutions. It will remain to be seen how far the NAB is allowed to go before individual LEA's begin to rebel, if at all. The NAB is still a new creation and its relations with the LEA's are liable to be strained even further whilst economies and financial constraint remain major policy issues in government.

5.3 The 1985 Green Paper on higher education

The previous section (5.2) illustrates areas in which difficulty or attention is needed, in the FHE system, especially with regard to management of NAFE and AFE courses. In the light of these findings by the HMI's the awaited Green Paper, 'The development of higher education into the 1990's', was expected by those involved with this sector of education, to point the way ahead to better management and provision, especially with regard to the NAB and the UGC's

involvement. The 1985 paper is a precursor to firm proposals to be published in 1986, but one of the main themes of the 1985 paper is that of education contributing more effectively to the economy, together with raising standards and achieving value for money. The paper is mainly concerned with higher education, but there are important issues which relate to further education (THES, 24.5.85).

The green paper states that numbers are expected to drop during the 1990's (a view not shared by the NAB and the UGC) and as a consequence, institutions will have to amalgamate or close. The paper therefore calls for planning now, in order to 'assess on educational and economic grounds where capacity should be reduced'. This reduction exercise bears remarkable similarities to the changes found in further education during the seventies. Various statistics are included which show that since 1980 there has been in real terms, a reduction of around 3.5% in funding for higher education, whilst student numbers rose. On average universities have lost one member of staff in seven, but the colleges and polytechnics have lost one in twelve, however due to a 30% increase in student numbers in the latter, staff-student ratios are worse than the 10.1 found in universities. Disappointingly, the green paper rejects the NAB's call for a common unit of resource for teaching purposes, since given the differences between institutions, any re-allocation of resources between sectors would have to produce 'a net benefit to higher education as a whole, and hence to society'. This is very disappointing from the view of ease of comparison between sectors, and also rather curious. There is a suspicion that the use of such units could actually reveal far more about funding methods of the binary system, together with differences between polytechnics and institutes of further education than is really known (THES, 24.5.85).

The DES report 'Higher education: funding comparisons across sectors' reveals that in the public sector, student funding fell after 1980-81. During 1980-81, LEA institutions received £200 more per student after allowing for research than the universities. In 1984-85 LEA funding was £300 behind the universities. Estimates show cuts of 24% for LEA and 3% for universities per student since 1981. The discrepancy is explained in terms of the differing policies on student numbers, each side of the binary divide, since in real terms

LEA funding rose faster during the seven year survey span, but per capita funding showed a decrease due to a rise of 30% in student numbers. During this period of seven years, the universities have tended to reduce recruitment. The figures help to explain the position on each side of the binary divide, but they do not help to explain why or how there should be such a wide discrepancy (see THES, 24.5.85, £1,000 funding gap revealed). This constant difference in funding per student each side of the divide, has led many 'leading local authority members' to be suspicious of the move by several polytechnics to become universities. In the same way colleges are 'busy scrambling to become polytechnics'. (THES, 10.5.85.) The change of status to university would free polytechnics from local authority control and increase their funding, whereas colleges becoming polytechnics would receive greater funding.

The above figures clearly show that the suspicion regarding differing funding levels per student across the binary divide has been well founded. Griffiths (1985) reviewing the 1985 Green Paper points to various statistics included in the appendix among which are those which show that, 'in the public sector students, staff and institutions 'enjoy' an inferior funding level compared to the university sector'. It remains unclear how or why this situation has emerged, but it does have important connotations for indicators of provision and performance.

The entire question regarding funding per student and changes of status has, however, now come to light. The NAB announced in April 1985, that the polytechnics will lose the funding advantage they have received over other public sector higher education during the last two years (THES, 23.8.85). Furthermore the NAB is now working on a new funding system to replace that which has guaranteed a higher level of funding for the polytechnics. The option of treating all institutions equally is one which the NAB board wishes to keep open at least until 1986-87. If the new system does this, then the polytechnics will lose several million pounds, but keeping back a larger share of the advanced further education pool to help research and also linking the pool to the proportion of advanced work, would aid the polytechnics. Meanwhile since many colleges are dependent upon extra support from their local authorities, such a new system of equal funding may mean authorities being unable to keep up their contributions.

Meanwhile, Peter Knight (1985), a past member of the board of NAB, has investigated the whole question of funding. In his article, 'Unfair helpings?', he states that the NAB has devised 'a complex and bewildering system for allocating the £617 million of the advanced further education pool' but this system is an improvement over previous methods, since the unit costs of colleges are now closer together than they have been in the past. In 1985-86 the unit of resource (humanities) is as follows:

Polytechnics	£1,477
Major colleges	£1,261
Minor colleges	£1,199

indicating that the polytechnics receive £216 per student more than the colleges. Two problems are highlighted. Firstly, there is the question of equality, a view held by several interests on the NAB, who do not wish to differentiate between institutions. These are political overtones, since one view is that local authorities may feel that 'equality' may encourage polytechnics to become 'distinct'. Secondly, there is the differential in teaching costs between universities and the public sector. This differential is so large that it would take a considerable time to achieve a balance yet there is the still remaining differential in teaching costs among public sector colleges which could be a potential embarrassment for the NAB.

Knight (1985) also includes other interesting information regarding attempts to justify enhanced funding for polytechnics, i.e. their degree work and their research. In the case of degree work, polytechnics do not have a monopoly here so that a change in the system might well disadvantage the polytechnics. Furthermore teaching at non-degree level, such as Business and Technician Education Council (BTEC) certificates is more expensive than degrees due to greater pupil-teacher contact time. This is clearly an unfortunate result for the polytechnics. Research at the polytechnics is a requirement of the Council for National Academic Awards. However, the cost of this research is not included in estimates of staff-student contact time, but still has to be met by the polytechnics. Whilst much of the research is aimed at supporting teaching, it is very hard to assess quantitatively how

much teaching is research dependent.

The question therefore remains as to why polytechnics receive more money than major colleges and, why major colleges receive more than minor ones. Knight points out that in 1983-84 despite receiving more money per student, the polytechnics were cheaper than the major colleges. This was also the case in 1981-82. He concludes that despite receiving more from the 'pool' polytechnics are cheaper than colleges (in terms of the cost of educating a student) which could be because local authorities do not provide any additional money for polytechnics but do help their major colleges. It seems then, that polytechnics are more efficient than colleges since they receive less from the local authorities, spend less on teaching costs and absorb additional costs arising from research.

The question of funding arrangements is one which is unlikely to be settled quickly. Questions of provision and performance are again highlighted within the constraints of the given economy and it may be that colleges will have to be re-organized on the basis of what they provide and not how well they perform in terms of economics.

The relationship between the economy and education is emphasised throughout the paper, together with the ability of the economy to meet the cost of that education. Consequently the green paper includes, 'opportunities for education should be available throughout life, especially at a time of increasing technological change', and therefore supports continuing education, but 'employers should be expected to pay the cost of courses which meet their requirements and mature students in work should also make a 'substantial contribution', towards course costs, whether career advancement or personal satisfaction is the motive for enrolment'. The paper argues that initial education is not sufficient for the entire working life and therefore, as in other countries, employers should support their staff financially in order that they may return to education. This may be fine in theory, but problems arise, such as obtaining release from employment in some form (day or block) providing that one has a sympathetic employer, or, providing the funds to send an employee on a course in the first instance.

The costs of higher education are to be linked to the benefits to society and to the individual. Formal qualifications will become less important than, 'the ability to benefit' in determining criteria for entrance qualifications. The green paper summarises this point, with, 'So long as taxpayers substantially finance higher education, however, the benefit has to be sufficient to justify the cost'. Whilst this is very consistent with 'education permanence', problems are evident in assessing benefits in some way to somebody. This seems a dangerous situation since it leads to value judgements about areas which do not lend themselves to quantitative analysis. Benefits may not necessarily be immediately apparent for certain courses which may reflect badly upon those courses and those who provide them. The issue concerning relevance is well known to geographers, but it might well become a central point for many other disciplines? Future demand for places is liable to be affected by the level of fees and student demand, and this may be moderated by using a 'greater financial engagement' on the part of students. Furthermore this 'financial engagement' may produce more care over student choice of study especially if student loans replace some part of the student grant, as postulated in the green paper.

5.4 The future

Despite the publication of the 1985 Green Paper, the future for further and higher education remains unclear. Bocock (1985), writing in the THES, states that the paper has failed to address the question of a coherent policy framework for higher education (THES, 24.5.85). He is not alone in his criticism of the paper; Smith (1985) also writes, 'The most substantial flaw in the Green Paper is its failure to articulate any positive model for higher education in the 1990's' (THES, 7.6.85). Parkes (1985) has also made several telling comments including, 'Command 9524 begins with the sentence: 'This paper presents the government's thinking on higher education'. 'The most careful perusal can only lead one to the conclusion that those thoughts are very few in number and very shallow in character'. He also states, 'the paper does (not) present the government's thinking, but the government's wishes', and 'what higher education needs is some realistic governmental forward planning'.

The outcome of the above comments seems to be twofold. Firstly, despite the green paper there is no real policy statement of the direction, changes and aims for higher (and further) education in the 1990's. The supposition remains (as stated in 5.1) that as yet there is no new realistic policy for the future, or, the green paper is simply one small part of a greater whole. Secondly, the machinery for controlling the entire higher education sector is still not complete and running. Following the NAB's three year initial existence, this body was made permanent (Section 4.2), but despite expectations this permanent footing did not coincide with the creation of one single body for higher education. The green paper states that the government has now ruled out the creation of a single planning body which would encompass both the NAB and the UGC. It seems, therefore, that the present binary system is to continue, and each side will have to adapt to changing circumstances as dictated by their relevant controlling bodies. As the same time the NAB and the UGC will have to work together to achieve balance and economy, whilst striving to keep autonomy in their relevant sections.

Meanwhile the NAB is not to 'suffer changes', but has been asked to examine the association between advanced and non advanced further education, 'in terms of the necessary geographical spread'. This request is of crucial importance to this present work on further education, since it impinges upon the question of equality of provision of such education, and the factors which affect that provision. Whilst considering such factors, it is intended to introduce measures or indicators of performance which should enable further insights to be gained in the nature of further education. Such work, if undertaken by the NAB, is liable to have implications in the area of course provision, especially as the green paper notes that advanced work (degree) is better done where there is a concentration of provision and that this consideration should 'prevail over the claims of easy access'. It can probably be stated now, that this work is liable to indicate serious conflicts between equality and economics. The expectation from the green paper is that differing types of work (advanced and non advanced) are liable to be found in the future in a few selected institutions. This could well result in effects upon student intake, such as the distance-decay effect upon applications by students and problems of individual LEA's being unwilling to

finance their own students 'out county'.

The whole issue of performance measures is liable to receive increasing attention in the future. O'Leary (1985) writes in the THES of the annexe to the green paper, concerning value for money and the performance factor. In addition he mentions the Jarratt report which was produced in 1985 having being conducted by the Steering Committee for Efficiency Studies in Universities appointed by the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals. This report is likely to serve as the basis for more efficiency studies to be carried out across all sectors of education. The most important indicator is seen as the 'social rate of return' where the main concern is assessing institutional costs in relation to student output. The DES has produced a formula which balances 'the cost of educating a student against the value to society, measured through his or her salary'. This is a very rough measure, but it does allow some attempt at measuring productivity. Difficulties are liable to be found in obtaining data and the DES acknowledges that there is 'a paucity of information', which will make transbinary comparisons impossible until data has been collected. O'Leary (1985) cites the work of ProfessorSizer who has pointed out that 'many of the most common indicators are actually process measures of institutional performance, rather than measures of outcome. They measure the efficiency of institutions, not their effectiveness'. This later comment is particularly important since in consideration of the equality of provision of further education it will be necessary to consider the effectiveness of their provision, not the effectiveness of their efficiency. With regard to further education within polytechnics, such institutions are not 'fully understood' by the public. The green paper having made this observation, does not however go on to suggest how this situation may be improved. As noted, there is to be no one single planning body for the universities and public sector education but the green paper encourages planning across these sectors, together with 'collaboration between institutions on either side of the binary line'. The advisory bodies (NAB and UGC) have been urged to promote joint access to libraries, equipment and laboratories and in some cases joint teaching arrangements. The NAB has been given a year to consider these issues and produce some proposals. Behind these ideas lie the economic constraints which have brought about such considerations, but if such proposals as joint

Library use are to be successful then thought will have to be given to per capita allowances which at present are unequal and areas of responsibility for planning and equipment use. The whole issue of joint useage of buildings and equipment could be seen as a precursor to the amalgamation of nearby institutions or given departments. This is reinforced in the green paper in the section on influences on future government policy on higher education, where there is 'scope for increased economy and efficiency in and between institutions, including further rationalization of provision and consideration of the optimum distribution between sectors'.

Economies may come in the length of various courses which may enable more resources to be channelled in certain directions. The NAB proposed an experimental two year degree for high fliers, but it did not favour any extension of general two year courses such as diplomas. These proposals were accepted in the green paper, but the NAB's proposal to expand the DipHE was rejected since this qualification is regarded as a failure 'as a terminal qualification' (THES, 24.5.85). Most of the colleges and institutes of higher education are involved with such courses and the removal of the DipHE is likely to create a vacuum. However, the green paper suggests developing the DipHE as a more suitable alternative to a social sciences or a general humanities degree. Whilst such a proposal may be financially sound, the lack of prestige would be a serious barrier to its success. Following the proposals of the two year degree the NAB consulted the UGC since it was considered necessary for universities to engage in this scheme for reasons of prestige and success. The green paper gave approval for a limited pilot scheme and invited participants, so that the demand could be tested and the feasibility of reaching given standards quicker, ascertained. Chairman, Sir Peter Swinnerton-Dyer of the UGC, reported that there was 'no support at all' and the UGC effectively killed the whole scheme. The NAB has now announced (THES, 15.11.85) its intention to press ahead with the scheme and envisages that the degrees will be closely associated with industry and commerce and maybe restricted to sponsored students.

This working paper has largely left unconsidered the area of vocational education and training which is associated with the Manpower Services Commission. The green paper contains the following 'The

government confirms its intentions to maintain a distinct emphasis on technological and directly vocational courses at all levels', but the emphasis is concentrated upon these courses at polytechnic and university level, although it is acknowledged that, 'some public sector institutions have a graduate output superior in quality and fitness to that of the universities'. The concern over vocational education is thus largely concentrated at the top of the higher education system, where emphasis is placed upon encouraging innovators and entrepreneurs together with providing vocational courses where there is a market need. Identifying the market need is a major problem but the green paper does acknowledge again that higher education (including vocational?) 'does not always respond sufficiently to changing economic needs'. This seems to imply that there is a failure of provision at various ability levels and the economies need for vocationally educated individuals. Future work will therefore look critically at these speculations. The green paper also states that there is a difficulty in attempting to meet these needs, which seems to be a result of a lack or a failure in communication between institutions and employers, and an overdependence on public funding. Therefore, there appears to be a lack of suitable output for employers' needs, and this is due to poor information flows between students, institutions, employers, industry and various governmental agencies. Changes in public funding of students on courses is undoubtedly liable to opposition, but if it could be shown that this is a disincentive to change then this type of funding might be changed in some way. Yet even within the field of vocational subjects it would seem desirable to be clear about disincentives in specific subject areas in order to remove or ease them.

The green paper calls for greater involvement by employers such as that found in the Technology Skills Agency. Whilst here there is good collaboration, it does not mean the government is whole heartedly wishing to become involved in this area. Rather the government seems to prefer to detach itself by placing some body in an acting capacity, but does not specify how to achieve better results with or among agencies. Perhaps these agencies are seen as being potential centres of information dispersal since evidence is provided in the green paper that information concerning vocational training is not being transmitted effectively. Additional places in science and technology were approved

and provided by the NAB, but they have not been taken up despite an increase in such job prospects and youth unemployment. Nothing is suggested on how to improve this situation apart from urging employers to give assessments of the importance attached to science and technology, recruitment and pay, for use at national level.

The green paper does not give detailed consideration to vocational education at the AFE level, or the NAFE level. The NAB's report of 1984 'A strategy for higher education in the late 1980's and beyond', states, 'vocationalism is an imprecise term which has led to a confused debate' and calls for students with a wide range of skills and abilities. The report goes on to state, 'the economy will not be well served by providing too narrow a specialist focus in initial higher education provision' and, 'a policy which identifies one side of the binary line as more vocational than the other is neither accurate nor helpful', before offering, 'the public sector's strength may be best defined as providing courses which are work related but not necessarily job specific'. It is probably in this light, that it is easier to understand the future trends for NAFE and the MSC's YTS schemes. It has already been noted that institutions have been encouraged to share facilities and that this may lead to the amalgamation of certain institutions or departments. This could therefore evolve into a new system of comprehensive higher education offering what is currently recognised as AFE and degree work in the colleges and polytechnics, and universities respectively. This would then leave NAFE and the YTS schemes. Command 9482, 'Education and training for young people' notes that the introduction of the Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education' (CPVE) will provide courses of general education with a strong vocational bias for those who stay on for one year after age sixteen. The CPVE has been developed for use in FE colleges and schools where, 'it is intended to replace a range of existing courses including the pre-vocational courses of the CGLI, BTEC and the Royal Society of Arts, and the Certificate of Extended Education offered by most CSE and GCE boards'. (Cmnd 9469, Better Schools). Therefore, there is a new 'flow of courses' in NAFE both nationally and locally available and 'further impetus' to this trend, 'will come from the involvement of the MSC' (Cmnd 9482). The MSC, therefore, is being encouraged to take an increasing part in the NAFE sector. The government's expenditure plans 1985-86 to 1987-88 state that for NAFE, colleges

should continue to offer a wide range of full-time and part-time courses with emphasis on vocational provision and that £62 million will be transferred in the year 1985-86 and £105 million in year 1986-87 to the MSC to enable it to 'purchase a proportion of work related non-advanced further education and so have a significant say in what is provided'.

In working towards this the government has given the go ahead to the two year Youth Training Scheme for April 1986 which is intended to 'become a permanent feature of vocational education and training provision in this country'. (Cmnd 9482). In July 1985 the new joint link working group from the Department of Education and Science and the MSC met to consider if they should recommend the establishing of a new council to oversee vocational qualifications (THES, 19.7.85). Meanwhile the THES considered if this proposal was a natural development of the present situation or a separate action plan for the MSC. The establishing of links between the DES and the MSC formally with their new joint department could be a disguised governmental way of curbing the MSC's influence in the arena of youth training and education.

The setting up of the DES/MSC link department followed a report (THES, 5.7.85) that the colleges of further education were to keep two thirds of the training involved in the YTS scheme, under its director, Mr K Atkinson. It was stressed that there was to be great importance placed upon linkages and free movement between education and YTS since this would be essential. In total the colleges of further education would be providing two-thirds of the 13 week period off the job training.

The whole area of NAFE was given a boost in August 1985 by the decision made by the government to approve plans for work related NAFE agreed between the MSC and the local authorities (THES, 2.8.85). Tom King gave approval and ended the speculation of nearly 18 months concerning who should control NAFE and produced a transfer of 25% of NAFE funds from the local authorities to the MSC. This, of course, is in line with Command 9482 'Education and training for young people'. The Chairman of the MSC, Bryan Nicholson stated at this time, that before better planning could take place, there would have to be agreement and understanding between the MSC and the local authorities

at a local level and not as at present just nationally. The role of the regional advisory councils was therefore under discussion as a potential means of achieving an important regional framework, together with considerations for producing a framework based upon them to produce a national body to oversee NAFE. It could be that the new joint MSC and DES department will become such a national body in the not too distant future.

5.5 Summary

The previous section (5.4) has attempted to show that there are policy moves which will or which are influencing the whole higher and further education sector, largely determined by various government agencies, but which have largely been produced as a result of economic considerations. The most obvious point to note is that all sectors (higher and further) are in transition and therefore it is very difficult to describe or explain the present state of any. The green paper (Cmnd 9524) has not really been an explanatory document since it does not adequately explain future policy. As previously noted, the real policy on higher education may not have been finalized or decided. At the NAFE level, the increasing involvement and joint ventures between the MSC and the DES, reveal government policy in action and the continuing stress on vocational training. It is an area which is clearly going to develop and expand and which may produce a new reformed NAFE system. The AFE level is characterised by the binary divide under the increasing control of the NAB, which has greatly increased control of public sector education at the national level, whilst weakening control at the local level, by reducing the influence of the individual LEA's. The whole AFE system has been tightened up financially and administratively, by increasingly determining courses available at the national level. It is therefore at this point that economics come into conflict with provision. Whilst the system of finance and control examined in this paper is unlikely to change significantly in the future, the whole issue of provision and performance is likely to attract increasing attention. The publication of the Audit Commissions report, 'Obtaining better value from further education', is an indication of the government's increasing concern with economies and efficiency. Future work to be undertaken must therefore consider both indicators

of provision and performance in the light of this report and in the context of the economies being demanded by central government. The present situation is clearly unsatisfactory since it is neither satisfying demand by students or employers and the demands made by economics. There is, therefore, an apparent need to attempt to satisfy these demands or to approach them by use of varying indicators. Future work will, therefore, most likely be concentrated in this area.

References

- Audit Commission (1983) *Obtaining better value from further education*, London, HMSO.
- Bocock, J (1985) Problems of working in isolation, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 24 May 1985.
- Cantor, L and Roberts, I (1979) *Further education today*, Routledge Kegan Paul, London.
- Council of Local Education Authorities (1981) *The future of higher education in the maintained sector*, London.
- Department of Education and Science (1977) *Annual Report*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1978) *Report of the Working Group on the Management of Higher Education in the Maintained Sector*, Cmnd 7130, London, HMSO. (Oakes Report.)
- Department of Education and Science (1978) *Higher education into the 1990's: a discussion document*, Chesham, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1978) *Annual Report 1977*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1979) *Annual Report 1978*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1980) *Annual Report 1979*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1981) *Annual Report 1980*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1981) *Higher education in England outside the universities: policy, funding and management, a consultative document*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1982) *Annual Report 1981*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1983) *Annual Report 1982*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1983) *Report by Her Majesty's Inspectors on the effects of local authority expenditure policies on educational provision in England 1983*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1984) *Annual Report 1983*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1984) *Report by Her Majesty's Inspectors on the effects of local authority expenditure policies on educational provision in England 1984*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) *Academic validation in public sector higher education: the report of the Committee of Enquiry*, Cmnd 9501 (Lindop Report).
- Department of Education and Science (1985) *Annual Report 1984*, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) *Better schools*, Cmnd 9469, London, HMSO.

- Department of Education and Science (1985) Education and training for young people, Cmnd 9482, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) The development of higher education into the 1990's, Cmnd 9524, London, HMSO.
- Farley (1982) Time to repair a history of neglect, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 2 July 1982.
- Fowler, G (1979) *The control of education in Britain: Unit 13 Higher Education*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit (FECRDU) (1979) *A basis for choice*, London, HMSO.
- Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit (FECRDU) (1979) *Supporting YOP*, London, HMSO.
- Further Education Unit (1983) *Computer aided design in FE*, Hayes, Silverdale Press.
- Further Education Unit (1985) *Supporting YTS*, Hayes, Silverdale Press.
- Griffiths (1985) Call a halt to green paper 'barbarism', *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 19 July 1985.
- House of Commons (1980) Fifth Report from the Education, Science and Arts Committee Session 79-80: The funding and organization of courses in higher education, Vol. 1, Report HC 787-1, HMSO.
- Knight, P (1985) 'Unfair helpings?' *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 30 August 1985.
- National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB) (1984) A strategy for higher education in the late 1990's and beyond, London, HMSO, includes 'Higher education and the needs of society: a joint statement', UGC.
- O'Leary (1985) The performance factor, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 7 June 1985.
- Parkes (1985) Three views of Command 9524, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 7 June 1985.
- Ramsden, C I (1985) The development of further education since 1956, Working Paper 420, School of Geography, University of Leeds.
- Ramsden, C I (1986) Further education and finance, Working Paper 456, School of Geography, University of Leeds.
- Santinelli (1983) Unit makes the most of its freedom, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 7 January 1983.
- Smith (1985) Three views of Command 9524, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 7 June 1985.
- Steering Committee for Efficiency Studies in Universities 1985 (Jarratt Report) Committee of the Vice Chancellors and Principals, London.
- Times Higher Educational Supplement*
- | | |
|--|------------------|
| Oakes would destroy public sector | 25 August 1978 |
| DES forced to reduce 1990's forecasts as recruitment falls | 24 November 1978 |
| Plans revived for control of poly finances? | 28 December 1979 |
| New public sector funding scheme comes under scrutiny | 1 February 1980 |
| New calls for national body | 15 February 1980 |

The case for a national body	15 February 1980
Authorities plan fairer share out	14 March 1980
National body gets go ahead from CLEA	21 March 1980
DES re-shuffle to ease binary planning	23 March 1980
DES forges first planning links across the binary divide	2 January 1981
New top brass close ranks against critics	16 January 1981
National Body in jeopardy	16 January 1981
Government reply to Select Committee report in higher education	23 January 1981
DES plans revolutionary new body	30 January 1981
National body plans are 'a grab for power'	30 January 1981
National body: worst suspicions confirmed by ministers' memo	6 February 1981
National body plan goes to cabinet	13 February 1981
Ministers defer national body decision	20 February 1981
Councils pre-empt national body	13 March 1981
Councils hostile to national body plans	13 March 1981
National body: Carlisle near deal	29 May 1981
Cabinet gives go-ahead to national body	10 July 1981
One-man-band national body	23 October 1981
Way cleared for national body	30 October 1981
Body about to be unveiled	6 November 1981
Interim body deal finalized	13 November 1981
Call for a bigger body	8 January 1982
Joseph wants to bury the hatchet	8 January 1982
ILEA chief gets top post on new body	29 January 1982
'Open' national body aims to strengthen university links	5 February 1982
Fowler voices fears on NAB membership	19 February 1982
NAB names group leaders	26 February 1982
NAB runs into its first row	19 March 1982
NAB considers closure of 400 unpopular college courses	7 May 1982
Units makes the most of its new freedom	7 January 1983
The game of the name	10 May 1985
Problems of working in isolation	24 May 1985
Government stands firm on 'value for money'	24 May 1985
£1,000 funding gap revealed	24 May 1985
Computers before culture	24 May 1985
Tuning in to the economy's needs	24 May 1985

Continuing support in principle	24 May 1985
Balancing act is advocated	24 May 1985
Door opened under for those able to benefit	24 May 1985
Two-year degree goes ahead	24 May 1985
'Start planning to reduce' message	24 May 1985
UGC review - but no single body	24 May 1985
Three views of Command 9524	7 June 1985
The performance factor	7 June 1985
What Society gets for its money	7 June 1985
Colleges keep lion's share of YTS	5 July 1985
New council planned for youth training	19 July 1985
Call a halt to green paper 'barbarism'	19 July 1985
NAFE settlement gets government go ahead	2 August 1985
FE Units £1 million cut rejected	9 August 1985
Poly's lose out as NAB scraps funding system	23 August 1985
Unfair helpings?	30 August 1985
Two year degrees go ahead	15 November 1985
Scathing attack by UGC on green paper	22 November 1985
V-C's return to the offensive	6 December 1985

Summary of main courses available in Further Education Establishments

'O' and 'A' levels
(GCSE) for 'O' level 1988/89

CPVE : Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education on approval will replace : GGLI foundation course (8 schemes in school and college), GGLI vocational preparation (general), BTEC General Award, General Cert/Dip in Business Studies (to be withdrawn when CPVE schemes are validated), BTEC Nat. Cert/Dip and BTEC Higher Nat. Cert/Dip (by subject). Royal Society of Arts clerical/basic clerical procedures may remain

YTS : 13 weeks of job training/education in 1 yr. schemes. YTS acts as managing agent for some schemes. May obtain national award BTEC general, CPVE or GGLI special schemes for YTS or a credit gain(s).

Operative and semi/specific skills (eg. Iron and Steel/Chemicals) : for production workers in particular industries; in overlap with craft/tech training, 1/2 stage course, over 1/2 years administered by GGLI or regional exam boards/bodies.
Also 'specific skill' schemes by GGLI, eg. Cert. in Construction (General Operatives), Hotel and Catering (Room Service, Cooking)

Technical/Craft Skills : GGLI and Regional Exam. Bodies in consultation with body responsible for training in the industry (eg. Training Board). Each scheme is broad based and 3 staged. Schemes are grouped, eg. Electrical and Electronics. Can devise own local schemes using bank of topics from GGLI, are links into technician training. Part D of 3 stages gives entry to BTEC cert; also GGLI career extension level courses.

Technician Qualifications : high/low grade BTEC awards, ie. Nat. Cert. Dip; Higher Nat. Cert. Dip. BEC have courses, TEC have programmes, each has 3 levels general, national and higher national, certs and diplomas at each level. General Dips. and Certs. to be merged into CPVE schemes. There are some BTEC 'one off' schemes, eg. Post 'A' level award in retailing.

Old Style Technician Awards : mostly replaced by BTEC but are few Higher Nat. Cert. in Technical subjects and GGLI in business style, eg. travel agency management

Professional level courses : insurance, banking, chiropody, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, full/part time. Graduate conversion for accountants

Graduate level : 1st Degrees : 2 yr. Dip. H.E.'s

Continuing Education Retraining : TOPS by MSc : Industry based schemes and distance training by Open Tech.

Post Graduate : PGCE : Advanced courses at colleges of music
COSM : speech and movement

Post Experience : ATC/D and drama

Appendices

- I Students in Higher Education 80/81. 81/82, 82/83, 83/84, 84/85
- II Ministerial appointments at the DES : announced 6.9.85 (THES)
- III Relevant Governmental Publications 1978-85
- IV Acts, Circulars and Administrative Memoranda 1977-85

Appendix I

Total students in Higher Education (000's) (Degrees, Diplomas, etc)

<u>Universities</u>	<u>80/81</u>	<u>81/82</u>	<u>82/83</u>	<u>83/84</u>	<u>84/85</u>
Full time	299	300	295	292	290
Part time	33	32	31	31	34
Total	331	332	329	326	325
Open University	68	71	75	76	76
Buckingham	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6

Non-University Institutions (Polytechnics and Colleges and Institutes of Higher Education)

Full time	187	204	218	231	238
Part time	159	165	166	172	172
Total	346	368	384	403	410

Source : DES Annual Report 1984

Appendix II

Ministerial appointments at the DES : announced 6.9.85 (THES)

Mr. Christopher Patten : Minister of State at the DES

responsibility for : school and further education teacher policy
issues other than pay
education of 16-19 year olds
all non-advanced further education

Mr. Peter Brooke : Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (replaced
22.11.85 by Mr. George Walden)

responsibility for : higher education (University and Public Sector)
Civil Science Policy
Research Councils
Adult and Continuing Education
The Open University

Mr. Rob Dunn : Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

responsibility for : proposals for school organization under
sections 12-16 of the 1944 Act
relations with the voluntary sector,
falling roles, school government, independent
schools, special education work of the DES
architects and building group, youth and
community service, drug abuse and educational
research.

Appendix III

Relevant Governmental Publications 1978-85

- Department of Education and Science (1978) Higher Education into the 1990's : a discussion document, Chesham, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1978) Report of the Working Group on the Management of Higher Education in the Maintained Sector, Cmnd. 7130, London, HMSO (Oakes Report)
- Department of Education and Science (1978) Secondary School Examinations : a single system at 16 plus, Cmnd. 7368 , Welsh Office.
- Department of Education and Science (1978) School Examinations : report of the steering committee established to consider proposals for replacing the General Certificate of Education Ordinary-level and Certificate of Secondary Examinations by a common system of examining, Cmnd. 7281 - I, II, Sir James Waddell (Chairman), Welsh Office.
- Department of Education and Science (1979) Proposals for a certificate of extended education : report of the study group established to consider the School Council's proposals, Cmnd. 7755, Welsh Office (Keohane Report).
- House of Commons (1980) Fifth Report from the Education Science and Arts Committee Session 79-80 : The Funding and Organization of Courses in Higher Education : Vol.1, Report HC 787-I, HMSO.
- Education, Science and Arts Committee (1980) The Initial Government Observations on the Fifth Report from the Education, Science and Arts Committee, Session 1979-80 : The Funding and Organisation of Courses in Higher Education, Cmnd. 8139, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1981) Higher Education in England outside the Universities : Policy, Funding and Management, a Consultative Document, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1981) Education for 16-19 year olds, a review undertaken for the government and the local authority associations by the DES, London, HMSO.
- House of Commons (1981) First report from the Education, Science and Arts Committee, Session 1981-82, Expenditure cuts in Higher Education : the effects on the "Robbins Principle" and on the Universities, HC82, HMSO.
- House of Commons (1983) Education and training 14-19 year olds. The new technical and vocational initiative, Christopher Price (Chairman) Manpower Services Commission, HC133, HMSO.
- House of Commons (1983) Higher Education Funding : Christopher Price (Chairman); University Grants Committee; National Advisory Body for Local Authority Higher Education, HC293, HMSO.

- HM Treasury (1983) The Government's Expenditure Plans 1983-84 to 1985-86, Cmnd. 8789, HMSO.
- HM Treasury (1984) The Government's Expenditure Plans 1984-85 to 1986-87, Cmnd. 9143, HMSO.
- National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB) (1984) A strategy for higher education in the late 1990s and beyond, London, HMSO.
- Audit Commission (1985) Obtaining better value from further education, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) Academic validation in public sector higher education : report of the Committee of Enquiry, Scottish Office, Cmnd. 9501 (Lindop report).
- Department of Education and Science (1985) Better schools, Cmnd. 9469, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) Education and Training for Young People, Cmnd. 9482, London, HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science (1985) The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s, Cmnd. 9524, London, HMSO.
- HM Treasury (1985) The Government's Expenditure Plans 1985-86 to 1987-88, Cmnd. 9428, HMSO.

Appendix IV

Acts, Circular and Administrative Memoranda

- 1972 A Framework for Expansion (Cmnd. 5174) DES.
- 1977 Tuition fees in further education 1977-78, Circular 1/77, DES.
- 1977 The Government expenditure plans (Cmnd. 6721) : implications for local authority expenditure 1976-79, Circular 37/77, Department of Environment.
- 1977 Tuition fees and admissions to further education establishments and awards : Race Relations Act 1976, Circular 8/77, DES.
- 1977 Approval of equipment purchases at establishments of further education, Circular 13/77, DES.
- 1977 Further education for unemployed young people, Circular 4/77, DES.
- 1977 Links between the training and further education services, Circular 12/77, DES.

- 1978 Rate Support Grant Settlement 1978-79, Circular 1/78, DES.
- 1978 Tuition Fees in Further Education 1978-79, Circular 2/78, DES.
- 1978 Tuition Fees and Admissions to Further Education Establishments and Awards : Race Relations Act 1976, Circular 8/78, DES.
- 1978 Further Education for Unemployed Young People, AM 4/77 (Amendment No.1).
- 1978 Report of the Working Group on the Management of Higher Education in the Maintained Sector, Cmnd. 7130, DES.
- 1978 Higher Education into the 1990's : A Discussion Document, HMSO.
- 1978 Non-advanced Further Education, Report No.94, DES.

- 1979 Rate Support Grant Settlement 1979/80, Circular 1/79, DES.
- 1979 Tuition Fees in Further Education 1979/80, Circular 3/79, DES.
- 1979 Tuition Fees and admissions to further education establishments and awards 1979/80 : Race Relations Act 1976, Circular 5/79, DES.
- 1979 Proposals for a certificate of extended education, Cmnd. 7755, DES.

- 1980 Education Act 1980, Circular 1/80.
- 1980 Procedure affecting proposals made under Sections 12-16 of the Education Act 1980, Circular 2/80.

- 1981 Block Grant (Education Adjustment) (England), Regulation 1981, Statutory Instrument 1981/312.
- 1981 Block Grant (Education Adjustments) (England) (Amendments) Regulations 1981, Statutory Instrument 1981/1840.

- 1981 Education (Schools and Further Education) Regulations 1981, Statutory Instruments 1981/1086.
- 1981 Rate Support Grants (Adjustment of Needs Element) (Agreement) Regulations 1981, Statutory Instrument 1981/311.
- 1981 Initial government observations on the fifth report of the Education, Science and Arts Committee 1979-80, Cmnd. 8139, DES.
- 1981 Higher Education in England outside the universities : policy, funding and management. A Consultative document issued by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, HMSO.

- 1982 Approval of advanced further education courses in England, Circular 1/82, DES.
- 1982 Approval of advanced further education courses in England : revised arrangement, Circular 5/82, DES.
- 1982 The Youth Training Scheme : implications for the education service, Circular 6/82, DES.
- 1982 Further education for unemployed young people, AM 2/82.
- 1982 Block Grant (Education Adjustments) (England) Regulations 1982, Statutory Instrument 1982/267.
- 1982 Rate Support Grant (Repeal of Enactments) October 1982, Statutory Instruments 1982/208.

- 1983 Block Grant (Education Adjustments) (England) Regulations 1983, Statutory Instrument 1983/261.
- 1983 Education (Fees and Awards) Regulations 1983, Statutory Instrument 1983/973.
- 1983 Education (Schools and Further Education) (Amendment) Regulations 1983, Statutory Instrument 1983/1262.
- 1983 Arrangements for the approval of advanced further education courses in England, Circular 4/83.

- 1984 The Block Grant (Education Adjustments) (England) Regulations 1984, Statutory Instrument 1984/224.
- 1984 Education (Grants and Awards) Act 1984.
- 1984 Arrangements for the approval of advanced further education courses in England, 1985-86, Circular 5/84.
- 1984 Education support grants, Circular 6/84.
- 1984 Further education for unemployed young people under the '21 hours rate', AM 3/84.
- 1984 Training for Jobs, Cmnd. 9135, DES. (Jointly with Department of Employment).
- 1984 Demand for higher education in Great Britain 1984-2000, Report 100, DES.

- 1985 Further Education Act 1985, HMSO.

Source: DES Annual Reviews
Government Publications of 1984, 1985, HMSO.