learning and skills development agency

Key issues in the deployment of teaching staff in FE

Fiona Neathey

research report

Published by the Learning and Skills Development Agency

www.LSDA.org.uk

Feedback should be sent to:
Information Services
Learning and Skills Development Agency
Regent Arcade House
19-25 Argyll Street
Tel 020 7297 9144
Fax 020 7297 9242
enquiries@LSDA.org.uk

Registered with the Charity Commissioners
Printed in the UK

Copy editor: Susannah Wight

Cover design: Joel Quartey

Printer: Blackmore Limited

041938RS /2/2005/1600

1-84572-152-7

Further information
For further information about the issues discussed in this publication please contact:
Peter Davies
Research Manager
Learning and Skills Development Agency
01480 468 178
pdavies@lsda.org.uk

This publication was supported by the Learning and Skills Council as part of the Learning and Skills Development Agency's strategic programme of research and development.

Contents

Introduction

This report brings together research conducted on behalf of the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) by the Institute for Employment Studies (IES). The study aimed to investigate the most effective and efficient ways for colleges to organise the curriculum, in order to maximise the benefits to learners, while minimising teaching and administration workloads on teachers. It explored:

- the allocation of teaching, preparation and administration hours
- management of the variables affecting the allocation of hours
- the quanta of the allocation of hours.

The project had a number of elements including a literature review, interviews with informants in key bodies, surveys of senior curriculum managers and human resources (HR) professionals in colleges, and case studies of good practice in colleges.

Executive summary

This report provides a range of data and analyses that explore key issues in the deployment of teaching staff in further education. The summary covers the findings of a literature review, surveys of HR directors and curriculum leaders in colleges, and case studies of relatively successful colleges.

Contractual teaching hours

The contractual working hours of teachers in general further education colleges (GFECs) are determined at the level of the college. Local contracts commonly set a weekly figure for total working hours and a weekly or annual figure for learner contact. The literature review for this project did not uncover a source to show the range of contractual hours for full-time main grade lecturers. Discussions with key informants from the sector suggested that usual annual contracted contact hours were about 800 to 900 a year, with a typical maximum in any one week of around 24. The common figure for total weekly hours was thought to be 37. The survey of college human resources directors conducted for this project found that full-time main grade lecturers were contracted to work 34 hours a week on average, of which 23–24 hours were learner contact hours. Average annual contact hours were around 820 hours a year.

The level and content of teacher workload

Findings from the survey of curriculum leaders suggested that main grade teachers actually work around 40 hours a week on average. Case study data suggests that at certain points in the academic year teachers will often work considerably more hours than this. Sources cited in the literature review indicated that the non-learner contact element of teacher workload appeared to have grown considerably over the decade since the incorporation of colleges, and that this was a major contributor to growth in teacher workload.

There have been a number of national initiatives in recent years aimed at tackling the bureaucracy burden on further education (FE) teachers. These include the changes recommended by the Bureaucracy Task Group, set up by the government in response to concerns in the sector, and the establishment of the Bureaucracy Review Group to monitor change. However, most curriculum leaders surveyed said that the number of management and administration tasks of teachers had actually increased rather than decreased recently. The main reasons given for these increases by respondents to the survey and case study were the (changing) requirements of awarding bodies, the bureaucratic workload caused by preparing and responding to inspections by the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI) and Ofsted, changes in the level of courses taught and the devolution of management responsibilities to some main grade lecturers. Curriculum leaders participating in the survey considered that main grade lecturers spent too much time on management and administration tasks and too little on preparation and marking.

Activities by colleges to address teacher workload issues

The range of potential solutions to the increase in FE teacher workload identified in the literature included the greater use of support staff, information and communications technology (ICT), and the review and reengineering of administrative and other systems. However, the evidence available on the first two of these options indicated that such changes do not always serve to limit the burden on teachers. The research for this project largely confirms this earlier evidence. The survey of HR directors found that just over one-third of college administrators said that they were taking measures to address issues of

teacher workload. However, in only a minority of cases were they proving effective in reducing the level of management and administration work undertaken by teachers.

The case studies, which were of relatively successful colleges, suggested that some initiatives, particularly in the area of changing skill mix and the greater use of non-teaching staff to undertake the administrative duties previously undertaken by teachers, had helped to contain workload growth. However, this was in the face of the still increasing demands of funding and regulatory bodies, so the overall impact was to stabilise, rather than reduce, the management and administrative burden on teachers. In addition, a number of respondents in the case study colleges were less convinced of the benefit, in the short term at least, of changes linked to the greater use of ICT, often seeing the introduction of ICT initiatives as associated with an increase in teacher workload.

Effective interventions

The case study colleges were asked whether there were any aspects of their approach to the organisation of teacher workload and management of the curriculum that they would recommend as best practice exemplars to other institutions. The approaches used varied considerably with the circumstances of each institution. However, three kinds of intervention were seen as particularly effective: measures to control teacher workload, the removal of those aspects of the teaching role that could be done by non-teaching staff and imaginative timetable organisation.

Conclusion

The demands of external organisations continue to exert an upward pressure on the non-teaching workload of lecturing staff within FE colleges and these pressures may be limiting the ability of college managers to control the workload of their staff. Nonetheless, the findings of this research suggest that making active responses to these external pressures can have positive advantages. In the longer term, proposals to reform and reduce the assessment of learning – as contained in the report of the Tomlinson Review of 14–19 Education – should present opportunities for reductions in teachers' administrative workloads.

1. Research approach

This section summarises the primary research methods used for this project.

The surveys

In April 2004 the LSDA distributed a survey pack to 394 colleges, which included a set of questionnaires for curriculum leaders and one for the senior HR professional in the institution. The survey covered college practice in the deployment of staff. A total of 118 colleges responded to the survey by the cut-off date for responses, a participation rate of 30%. Of these colleges, 83 returned a questionnaire for the HR director or equivalent and 113 returned at least one curriculum leader questionnaire. The largest number of curriculum leader responses from any single institution was 11 and the average number of returns per college was four. Curriculum leaders in the survey were responsible for areas staffed by 20,817 full-time equivalent FTE teachers – 28% of FTE teachers in the sector, based on the 2002–2003 Staff Individualised Record (SIR) – delivering learning to 380,492 FTE learners.

Institution type

Over three-quarters (77%) of the institutions that took part in either or both surveys were general further education colleges (GFECs), a further 19% of institutions were sixth form colleges (SFCs) and 3% were agricultural colleges (table 2.1). Thus the response rate for GFECs was somewhat higher than for any of the other kind of institution.

	Number invited to participate	% of those invited to participate	Number participating	% of those participating
General FE college	267	68	91	77
Sixth form college	101	26	23	19
Art college	6	1	0	0
Agriculture college	20	5	4	3
Total	394	100	118	100

Table 1.1 Numbers participating in surveys by types of institution

Curriculum areas

A total of 455 curriculum leaders took part in the survey. They were asked to specify which single area of learning covered their main area of responsibility. A broad spread of curriculum areas was represented in their responses, ranging from science and maths (10%) to work-based learning (less than 1%) (table 2.2); 11% of respondents did not specify a single curriculum area as their main area of responsibility. In addition, the large number of categories and small number of responses in most of the categories mean that it has not been possible to undertake a statistically valid analysis of differences in survey response by curriculum area.

	Number	%
Science and maths	47	10
Land-based provision	19	4
Construction	17	4
Engineering, technology and manufacturing	35	8
Business administration, management	46	10
Information and communications technology	33	7
Hospitality, sport and leisure	15	3
Hairdressing and beauty	19	4
Health and social care	41	9
Visual and performing arts	43	9
Humanities	33	7
English, language and communications	19	4
Foundation programmes	36	8
Work-based learning	3	<1
No learning area specified	49	11
Total	455	100

Table 1.2 Main area of responsibility for curriculum leaders who took part in survey

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Case studies

An important part of this project was a series of case studies of colleges. These were designed to identify aspects of effective work organisation in relatively successful institutions and to provide qualitative material to support the survey analysis. The colleges were selected on the basis of their success against Learning and Skills Council (LSC) student outcome measures for 2000 - 2002. Selection was also determined by the aims of:

- having at least three GFECs in the sample
- including some examples of colleges in relatively disadvantaged areas.

Descriptions of the colleges participating in this study are given in table 2.3. There were interviews with a total of 30 individuals; in each institution they were held with the head of HR (or equivalent), a number of curriculum leaders and where applicable one or two lay trade union officials representing teaching staff.

In line with the survey stage of this project the aim was to explore how the three main components of the work of FE teachers, defined in detail earlier in this report (see section 4.1), are distributed and controlled in the institutions concerned. These components were:

- scheduled teaching
- preparation and assessment
- management and administration.

Case study	College type	Number of FTE teachers	Number of learners
A	SFC	105	1700 (full-time)
B	SFC	44	800 (full-time)
C	SFC	79	1300 (full-time)
D	GFEC	300	14,000 (2,000 full-time)
E	GFEC	c200	6000 (800 full-time)
F	GFEC	c220	6700 (800 full-time)

Table 1.3 Description of case study colleges

2. Staffing composition in FE colleges

As context for this study, in the surveys of curriculum leaders and HR directors, data was collected on learner numbers and the composition of staffing in the curriculum areas and colleges as a whole.

Table 3.1 shows the full-time equivalent number of learners studying in the curriculum areas covered by the respondents, and the number of teaching staff and other staff employed within those areas. The mean number of learners within a curriculum area was 957. However, this was partly the result of several institutions reporting some very large areas, and the median number of learners within an area was, therefore, lower at 455.

There is a similar pattern among full-time teaching posts, where the mean was 50 but the median was 23. Most of the curriculum leaders reported that non-teaching staff made up only a small proportion of the workforce in their area of responsibility: the median number of FTE learning support staff was two and the median number of FTE other support staff was three. For half of the curriculum areas surveyed, teaching staff made up 80% or more of the workforce. The mean proportion of the workforce comprising teaching staff was 76%.

	FTE learners	FTE full-time teaching posts	FTE teachers as proportion of all staff %	FTE learning support staff	FTE learning support staff as proportion of all staff %	FTE other support staff	FTE other support staff as proportion of all staff %
Mean	957	50	76	10	11	14	13
Median	455	23	80	2	7	3	9
N	*398*	*416*	*371*	*402*	*374*	*402*	*380*

Table 2.1 Number of learners, teachers and other staff in curriculum area

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Looking specifically at learning support staff, the survey of curriculum managers shows that in almost three-quarters of the curriculum areas covered by this survey, (73%) learning support staff are less than 16% of the total workforce (table 3.2).

N = 420	%
Less than 5%	43
6–15%	30
16–40%	24
More than 41%	4
Total	100

Table 2.2 Learning support staff as a percentage of all staff

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

An analysis of the data from the survey of HR directors would suggest that a considerable number of 'other support staff' are not allocated to one specific curriculum area (table 3.3). When exploring the staffing for a whole institution rather than a particular area we can see that in the colleges covered by the survey other support staff were, on average, over one-third (35%) of the total workforce, rather than under one-sixth (13%) when the unit of analysis is the curriculum area.

Staffing proportion figures calculated for colleges participating in this survey are very similar to LSC figures for the sector as a whole, based on the 2002–2003 SIR. Across the sector (including specialist designated institutions) the LSC has calculated that 50% of all staff are in teaching posts, 12% are in 'support' posts (learning support in this survey) and 38% are in other support roles.

	FTE full-time teaching posts	FTE teachers as proportion of all staff %	FTE learning support staff	FTE learning support staff as proportion of all staff %	FTE other support staff	FTE other support staff as proportion of all staff %
Mean	182	51	55	13	137	35
Median	165	51	36	12	93	35
N	*76*	*69*	*73*	*70*	*73*	*69*

Table 2.3 Number of teachers and other staff in college as a whole

Source: IES/LSDA survey of HR directors

Effective delivery and recruitment mix

Looking specifically at teaching staff, curriculum leaders were asked about the extent to which the mix of full-time, fractional and part-time staff currently employed was the best combination to enable the effective delivery of the curriculum. The opinions were divided: just under a half of respondents (44%) felt that the current mix was the best combination to enable effective delivery, while just over a half (51%) felt that the staff mix was not optimal (table 3.4).

N = 441	%
Current staff mix best combination	44
Current staff mix not optimal	51
Don't know	5
Total	100

Table 2.4 Curriculum leaders' opinions about extent to which staff mix enabled effective delivery

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Those who suggested that the mix was not ideal were asked to consider up to two changes that would improve the overall staff mix. Four in 10 of the respondents (42%) who felt that the staff mix in their curriculum area did not offer the best combination for delivery reported that a higher proportion of full-time staff members would lead to improvements (table 3.5). In contrast, few of the respondents felt that increasing the proportion of fractional or part-time staff would improve the composition of staff in their institution.

N = 252	%
Higher proportion fractional staff	11
Higher proportion of full-time staff	42
Higher proportion of part-time staff	6

Table 2.5 Curriculum leaders' opinions about how composition of teaching workforce should change

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

3. Working hours and workload composition

The FE sector has seen considerable change over the 11 years since colleges were separated from local government control to become corporate bodies with independent boards of governors. Two of the most significant changes in the context of this study have included changed and tightened funding arrangements and the introduction in GFECs of local contracts of employment, usually involving increased teaching hours and reduced holidays. These and other changes, including the introduction of new student assessment arrangements for some qualifications, are generally recognised to have resulted in increases and changes in the composition of the workload of teachers in further education.

Interviews conducted for the preliminary stage of this project sought to determine details of the typical teaching contract in GFECs. Discussions with officials in NATFHE suggested that teachers are typically contracted to undertake 828 hours of learner contact a year, with an average maximum in any one week of 24 hours. In the experience of an Ofsted inspector, the normal range for annual hours was 800–900 hours. Local college contracts typically also specify a total hourly working week, usually in the region of 37 hours according to NATFHE. However, several sources report that actual working hours are often well in excess of this figure, with increasing workload the result of duties other than those involving direct student contact (for example Warren 1998; Avis, Bathmaker and Parsons 2001; Edwards *et al.* 2001). The total number of contractual hours of teachers in sixth form colleges in England and Wales are determined by the national agreement for school teachers and set at 1265 a year

Steward (2002) pointed to the impact on teacher workload of the practice of 'front-loading' teaching commitments, thought by NATFHE to be a fairly common practice. In the college studied by Steward full-time lecturers were contracted for 800 hours a year, but a disproportionate amount of that time was timetabled in the first half of the year, resulting in high workloads during that period with teachers often undertaking a large amount of work during evenings and weekends, without receiving credit for having worked during that time. This and other factors, such as the growth in the incidence of Saturday working in colleges, were all contributing to conflicts between work and non-work responsibilities.

Survey findings

The survey findings confirmed the above picture of the working hours of FE teachers. Curriculum leaders were asked to say how many hours per week normally make up the actual rather than contractual working hours of a full-time main grade teacher during term. HR directors were asked to provide information on the contractual working hours of teaching staff (table 3.6).

The mean contracted working hours per week for a full-time teacher was 34 hours, compared with a median of 37 hours, according to the survey of HR directors. However, the survey of curriculum leaders suggested that, during term, hours actually worked were usually somewhat higher than this, with the mean standing at 41 hours and the median at 40 hours.

The contracts of full-time teachers in FE commonly set a figure for the maximum number of learner contact hours that any individual can be expected to work in a week and/or over an academic year. The HR survey suggested that the weekly figure is commonly 23–24 hours a week, while on average the maximum annual figure for learner contact is 821 hours (table 4.1).

	Actual hours per week for full-time teachers (curriculum leaders' survey)	Contracted hours per week for full-time teacher (HR directors' survey)	Maximum weekly learner contact hours (HR directors' survey)	Maximum annual learner contact hours (HR directors' survey)
Mean	41	34	23	821
Median	40	37	24	828
N	*435*	*75*	*72*	*70*

Table 3.1 Average full-time teaching and learner contact hours

Source: IES/LSDA surveys of curriculum leaders and HR directors

Again, in line with research cited above, the survey found that even where a weekly maximum for contact hours applies, two-thirds of HR respondents (66%) suggested that the teachers' contracts allow for the weekly maximum to be exceeded in some parts of the year (for example through front-loading) (table 4.2).

N = 79	%
Weekly maximum hours could be exceeded	66
Weekly maximum hours could not be exceeded	22
Don't know	13
Total	100

Table 3.2 Curriculum leaders' views about whether weekly maximum hours could be exceeded in some parts of the year (for example, by front-loading)

Source: IES/LSDA survey of HR directors

The case studies

The case studies provided a more detailed view of how particular college policies and practices have led to the general picture set out above. These showed that successful SFCs, particularly those with a limited curriculum offer, are able to work on the basis of lower average learner contact hours than GFECs. None of the colleges involved in the case study research collected information on the actual hours worked by teachers. In all but one college, these were thought regularly to exceed 40 hours a week. One factor which influenced total workload and the composition of that workload was the policy on remission from teaching duties. Teachers who had management responsibilities received some remission for these duties in all the colleges in this study, although the level of that remission varied. In addition, in several cases tutorial duties either attracted a remission allowance or were seen as part of learner contact time and so reduced the level of teaching undertaken by staff.

For example, in college B (an SFC), contracted directed time of 25 hours a week included 1 hour 45 minutes tutorial contact; 1 hour 20 minutes for religious and moral education,

and 1 hour 10 minutes for other activities. There was a limit of 21 classroom teaching hours a week. In addition, some staff were paid an Additional Task Allowance, to reflect extra hours involved in undertaking those tasks. Heads of department were given four hours of remission a week to deal with their extra duties.

In this college, despite the allowances for extra duties set out above, actual hours worked were seen to be high at particular points in the year. The HR director, who had a teaching background, said:

'There are certain pressure-points in the year when the hours you work far exceed your contracted hours. And, generally speaking, teachers are working over and above. Nobody says "I've done my contracted hours and now I must stop" – nobody works it out. That's not how you're assessed. Nobody's going to judge you on that. You'll be judged largely on the learner output, on their results. If you were to work to your set hours, I think you'd find yourself somewhere near the bottom on learner output.'

He referred to the college's positive ALPS (A Level Performance System value-added scores, and suggested that the college could not have achieved such good results if all its teachers worked to time.

Generally, the GFECs had slightly higher levels of learner contact and contracted contact time varied from 23 - 25 per week. So in college E teachers were contracted to work an average of 37 hours a week, with an average of 24 hours a week student contact. This weekly total was not set out in teachers' contracts of employment, which simply specified an annual teaching requirement of 864 hours a year. Total hours exceeded contracted hours for staff at different stages in the year. The head of curriculum calculated term-time hours would typically range from 37 to 44 or 45 a week.

Time allocation

The complexity of recording the full range of duties of FE teachers, and so of understanding their total workload, was shown by Steward (2002). She interviewed 18 lecturers and took them through their timetables to see to what extent those timetables reflected actual workload. She identified an 'invisible timetable,' pointing out that as a result of the lack of recording in the timetable of factors such as class size, the nature of the assessment required, whether the course was a new one or one that had previously been taught, and student characteristics, a similar timetable could hide a very different workload. She also found that about one-third of lecturers' time was spent on non-timetabled duties.

When this project was being devised a reference group of curriculum leaders categorised the work of full-time teachers in FE under three headings:

- **scheduled teaching** – which may include classroom teaching (including teaching in laboratories, studios and workshops); the observation of the teaching of others (where this is required by the course they are following); timetabled tutorials and guided learning; work-based student assessment; invigilation for public examinations, interviews and enrolment (if this is part of the timetabled guided learning hours); supporting open and distance learning; and online teaching
- **preparation and assessment** – which may include the preparation of teaching and learning materials; student assessments – college and workplace-based; developing schemes of work and lesson plans; the marking of assignments, portfolios, examinations and so on; and research and scholarly activities

- **management and administration** – which may include course management and administration (for example, management of learning programmes, supervision of student visits, caseload management, course validation, internal verification and preparing for external verification), and other management and administrative duties (for example, marketing activities, student admissions and educational guidance), general administration and personal professional development.

Survey evidence

Curriculum leaders were asked to give an account of the actual distribution of time within a working week that was used for scheduled teaching, preparation and assessment, and management and administration as defined above. The respondents were also asked about what they felt would be the ideal distribution of time for engagement in these activities (table 4.3). These findings show that, in general, curriculum leaders thought that the actual proportion of the working week spent on teaching was about right, but that there needed to be more time for preparation and assessment and less time spent on management and administration.

- In terms of teaching, the mean proportion of time that curriculum leaders reported was spent on this activity was 49%, compared with the ideal proportion of 50%.
- The mean proportion of actual time spent on preparation and assessment was 23%, while the ideal was 28%.
- While management and administration activities were estimated to take an average of 15% of the time of full-time main grade lecturers, the preferred figure averaged 12%.

	Actual teaching %	Ideal teaching %	Actual preparation %	Ideal preparation %	Actual management %	Ideal management %
Mean	49	50	23	28	15	12
50	53	52	23	30	13	10
N	*432*	*405*	*422*	*400*	*417*	*395*

Table 3.3 Comparison of actual and ideal composition of the working week of full-time main grade lecturers

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Determinants of time allocation

Curriculum leaders and HR directors were asked about the extent to which different staff groups influenced the actual allocation of teachers' hours across the three tasks.

Influence in allocating time is clearly linked to seniority. According to curriculum leaders, senior curriculum leaders and members of the college senior management team had the greatest degree of influence over actual allocation of teachers' time between scheduled teaching, preparation and assessment, and management and administration tasks (table 4.4). By contrast, individual teachers, junior curriculum teachers and teaching teams were the least likely to have an influence, with approximately one in five respondents saying that these employees had no influence at all.

	Proportion of respondents reporting level of influence				
N = 451	1 = no influence %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 = high influence %
College SMT	6	7	14	19	53
Senior curriculum leader	2	7	14	27	48
Junior curriculum leader	18	21	28	18	15
Teaching teams	21	31	26	14	7
Individual teachers	17	27	25	15	14

Table 3.4 Extent to which different college staff groups have influence over the allocation of teachers' hours (curriculum leaders)

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Human resources respondents were also asked to rate the extent to which different staff groups had influence over the allocation of teachers' hours across the three areas (table 4.5). A similar picture emerged from their responses. Over three-quarters of HR directors felt that senior managers (76%) or senior curriculum leaders (79%) had a high level of influence (scores 4 or 5), compared with under half of respondents (48%) who felt that junior curriculum leaders had a high influence. Teaching teams and individual teachers were the least likely to have an influence over time allocation, with 15% of HR directors saying that teaching teams have no influence and 16% saying that individual teachers have no influence. However, it is interesting to note that HR directors were rather more likely than curriculum leaders to see junior staff as having some (3) as compared to little or no influence (1 or 2).

	Proportion of respondents reporting level of influence				
N = 83	1 = no influence %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 = high influence %
College SMT	0	12	12	36	40
Senior curriculum leader	4	6	10	32	47
Junior curriculum leader	10	8	34	31	17
Teaching teams	15	16	32	31	7
Individual teacher	16	14	38	25	8

Table 3.5 Extent to which different college staff groups have influence over the allocation of teachers' hours (HR directors)

Source: IES/LSDA survey of HR directors

Turning to the factors that were reported to have influenced the actual allocation of time across the three tasks, it appears that the teachers' contact hours, as set out in their contracts, had the highest impact on time allocation. A similar proportion of curriculum leaders reported that the level of teacher experience and the level of courses being taught had a high impact (4 or 5) on staff influence on time allocation, while the qualification held by staff appeared to have the least impact on staff influence on allocation (commonly scoring 1 or 2) (table 4.6).

	Proportion of respondents reporting level of influence					
N = 451	1 = no impact %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 = high impact %	Don't know
Maximum teachers' contact hours	6	6	13	19	55	2
Level of teacher experience	15	14	19	26	24	1
Level of course being taught	24	12	18	21	24	1
Qualifications of teacher	25	21	19	19	13	2

Table 3.6 Factors that determine the allocation of teachers' hours (curriculum leaders)

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Human resources respondents were also asked to consider the extent to which these factors affect working time allocation across the three activities of scheduled teaching, preparation and assessment, and management and administration. As in the case of the curriculum leaders' survey, maximum learner contact hours, as set out in the teachers' contract, were felt to have the greatest impact on time allocation, with around three-quarters (78%) of respondents suggesting that it had a high (score of 4 or 5) influence on allocation. The level of the course being taught and the qualifications of the teacher, however, were most likely to be deemed to have no influence on time allocation by HR directors (table 4.7).

	Proportion of respondents reporting level of influence					
N = 72	1 = no impact %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 = high impact %	Don't know
Maximum teachers' contact hours	10	3	13	19	49	7
Level of teacher experience	14	10	17	32	24	3
Level of course being taught	32	4	19	19	18	7
Qualifications of teacher	30	10	17	28	13	3

Table 3.7 Factors that determine influences on time allocation (HR directors)

Source: IES/LSDA survey of HR directors

Case study evidence

Interviews within colleges explored in greater detail the process by which teaching hours were distributed between the main activities defined above.

In all the colleges, senior management formally determined the level of teaching undertaken by staff, individual teachers and teaching teams. It was clear from the case studies that the timetabling of teaching responsibilities was primarily the responsibility of senior management, reflecting the findings of the surveys of curriculum leaders and HR directors. There was no evidence of any formal case-loading approach to timetable allocation, nor did any college formally involve teaching teams in the process. However, the experience of these colleges would suggest that the informal involvement of individual members of staff in the decisions about their teaching load was important in gaining the cooperation of those staff and in maintaining a culture of mutual trust and support.

For example, in one GFEC the policy throughout the institution was that the heads of sub-colleges and section managers would allocate the teaching timetable, taking into account teachers' preferences for level and subject. One curriculum head in the college said:

'The college's approach to the allocation of teachers' workload generally works well for the individual. The college will try to give people a timetable according to their strengths and areas of interest, and will do as much as possible to make sure that, most of the time, teachers are happy. In some cases for people in a tutorial role, where we feel that it would be beneficial to the students, we might allocate a bigger role to their personal tutor duties. As always some staff do more than others in the department and progress to become more senior in the department, eg section managers. We have decided it's good practice to allocate time for personal tutorials and treat them with importance; this provides more time and pastoral support for students.'

In one of the SFCs the principal undertook most of the work on timetabling, although other members of the senior management team were also involved in a 'timetabling weekend'. The college prided itself on its 'learner focus' – so far as possible the timetable was adjusted to the needs of each incoming year, in line with the course selections (primarily AS, A2 and AVCE) made by the students.

In contrast, the level of preparation and assessment undertaken by teachers was not seen as the direct result of decisions by college management, but rather followed from a combination of the composition of teaching workload and individual choice. This situation was reflected in a comment from the HR director in one college. He said:

'The teachers will have a set number of hours that they teach. We schedule the teaching, but preparation and assessment, management and administration, they have to fit into the remaining time. There's no planning in terms of time for them. Heads of department are continuously requesting that they have more time, but in terms of allocation for the timetabled week, we're only concerned with the scheduled teaching. Teachers have a certain number of scheduled teaching hours, and it is anticipated that they will fit in the rest.'

One curriculum leader in a GFEC (F) suggested that although there was some variation in composition, this often balanced out. For example, low level courses require more preparation; high level courses require more assessment. However, this was a minority view, and most comments supported Steward's concept of the 'invisible timetable' cited above. A senior academic manager suggested that even within the same kind of course – for example NVQs – levels of work could vary with the subject matter. Other factors

included whether or not there were new requirements from the awarding body, and the level of experience of other members of the teaching team.

4. Changes in workload

Edwards *et al.* (2001) cite Avis, Bathmaker and Parsons (2001) as describing the impact of the 'more business-focused' ethos in colleges post-incorporation, on the experiences of lecturers as:

- loss of control
- intensification of labour
- increased administration
- perceived marginalisation of teaching
- stress on measurable performance indicators.

A two-year empirical study of two colleges by Edwards *et al.* (2001) explored the impact on teachers of the increasing demands for flexibility in the delivery of FE, of new structures, new working practices, new ways of organising the curriculum and new curricula, all of which have been portrayed as essential for widening participation and supporting lifelong learning (Edwards 2001).

A range of sources report that the increasing level of bureaucratic burden is a major reason for increased workload among FE teachers. For example in a major study of the issues in FE, which included a questionnaire survey of English and Welsh colleges, 90% of colleges said that the bureaucratic burden on teachers had increased 'substantially' in the past five years (Martinez and Pepler 2000).

Martinez and Pepler found that the following developments had contributed to this increase:

- administrative requirements associated with competency-based qualifications and those based on units
- increasing individualisation of student programmes
- the focus on the needs of students leading to more specialist in-house services
- an increased continuous or modular assessment
- the focus on standards and quality associated with increased requirements to report and provide evidence
- team teaching
- increasingly complex management tasks
- the devolution of management responsibilities to teaching teams.

A survey of its members conducted in 2002 by NATFHE found:

'overwhelming dissatisfaction with the amount of paper work and other duties respondents are expected to perform with no extra remuneration. Many of the requirements, including development of learning materials/preparations, assessments, advising, guiding and counselling students either inside or outside class time, are now a substantial part of the job for both lecturers and managers. This appears to have grown steadily over the six year since the [previous] 1996 survey.'

(NATFHE 2002).

In response to concerns about the bureaucratic burdens in FE, the government has established a Bureaucracy Task Force (BTF). In November 2002 the BTF published its agenda in *Trust in the future* (BTF 2002). A year later (BTF 2003), BTF reported on progress it had made against its recommendations in the earlier report. The tone of the later report was upbeat, suggesting that there had been progress on a wide variety of recommendations designed to engender: 'an adult to adult relationship [between national agencies and local providers] underpinned by mutual trust and common goals, as the best way to meet learner needs and the best way to limit and cut away over-regulation' (BTF 2003).

However, the report acknowledged that the impact of many of the improvements that it noted had yet to be felt in colleges. Other evidence reinforces the picture that national good intentions have yet to produce local improvements. One of the recommendations of *Trust in the future* was that a scrutiny group should be established to 'keep bureaucratic demands on administrators, managers and teachers in check'. The 2004 report of this body – the Bureaucracy Review Group (BRG) – showed that the bureaucratic burden in the sector remains too great. The report suggested a number of solutions to modernise the national management of the sector (BRG 2004). These included:

- the adoption of a strategic approach to regulation (audit, inspection and management review) to reduce the level of scrutiny to which providers are subject by 25%
- the simplification of, and substantial reduction in the LSC management information system
- the QCA to 'examine the scope for rationalising the administration of awarding bodies and the scrutiny requirements they place on providers'.

These recommendations are broadly supported in both survey and case study evidence from this project.

Survey evidence

Curriculum leaders were asked about the extent to which the composition of teachers' workload had changed since the previous (2002/03) academic year (table 5.1).

Despite local and national initiatives aimed at addressing bureaucracy in FE, three in 10 (28%) curriculum leaders reported a big increase in management and administration, with a further 41% saying that there had been some increase. Only 4% had seen any decrease in the level of management and administration undertaken by full-time main grade lecturers.

The majority of respondents also reported some increase in preparation and assessment. Just over one in five (22%) respondents had experienced a big increase in this area with a further 37% reporting some increase. Just 6% said that this aspect of the teacher's role had decreased.

By contrast, only 4% reported a big increase in the scheduled teaching aspect of teacher workload, with most (71%) saying that there had been no change.

	Proportion of respondents reporting level of increase					
N = 448	Big increase %	Small increase %	No change %	Small decrease %	Big decrease %	Don't know
Management and administration	28	41	26	2	2	1
Preparation and assessment	22	37	33	6	0	2
Scheduled teaching	4	22	71	2	0	2

Table 4.1 Changes in teacher workload since 2002/03

Source: IES/LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Those respondents who claimed that there had been a change in their workload composition since 2002/03 were asked about the factors that had led to that change, and the degree of influence that could be attributed to that factor. As the above analysis suggests, in most cases curriculum leaders reported increases in the management and administration and/or preparation and assessment roles of main grade teachers. The factor that appears to have had the greatest effect on perceived changes in work composition was change in curriculum delivery, with 68% of respondents rating the impact of such changes at the level of 4 or 5, on a scale of 1 to 5.

Similarly, another factor that was cited as having a substantial influence on changes in workload composition by a large number of respondents was change to the kinds of courses delivered. Having more learners on 'low' level courses or more on 'high' level courses were both cited as having a high impact by 67% (level 4) and 57% (level 5) of respondents.

Devolving management accountability and enforcing contractual teaching hours were seen to have a high impact on workload change by 58% (level 4) and 41% (level 5) of respondents.

Of a series of staffing changes explored, increased use of part-time, learning support or other support staff were all thought to affect developments in the workload of full-time teachers by at least one-third of respondents, with greater use of part-time staff, cited by 45% of those replying, apparently having the highest influence.

Worsening college finances were thought to have been important by 41% of respondents, while 26% said that improvements in finance had been highly influential in changes to teacher workload.

Improvements in administration systems and greater use of ICT were the most common changes to be cited by curriculum leaders and were each given impact ratings of 4 or 5 by 45% of respondents. Such improvements might have been expected to reduce some of the administrative burdens on teaching staff but the earlier analysis would suggest that this has not been the case, and that often the effect has been to increase management and administration roles (table 5.2). This confirms Martinez and Pepler's finding discussed later in the report (section 6) that change in these areas does not always lead to a reduction in teacher workload.

	1 = no impact %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 = high impact %	Don't know	N
Changing curriculum delivery	4	8	20	34	34	0	222
More learners low level courses	3	9	18	36	31	3	265
More learners high level courses	5	13	22	33	24	3	164
Devolved management accountability	3	13	24	33	25	2	227
Greater use of part-time staff	9	14	27	24	21	5	175
Improved admin systems	4	18	30	25	19	4	285
Greater use of ICT	2	21	32	31	13	2	334
Enforced contract teaching hours	15	13	28	19	22	3	217
Worsening college finances	8	15	20	21	20	16	122
Reduced use of part-time staff	15	16	26	23	14	6	115
Greater use teaching support staff	7	26	26	27	10	4	188
More use other support staff	7	17	34	27	9	7	138
Less use other support staff	16	14	24	19	14	14	58
Improved college finances	17	12	24	21	9	17	103
Reduced use teaching support staff	24	17	22	9	15	13	54

Table 4.2 Extent to which administrative and other changes since 2002/03 affect teachers' workloads

Source: IES /LSDA survey of curriculum leaders

Just under two-thirds of respondents said that other factors had been instrumental in increases in teacher workload. This reinforces the impression that bureaucratic demands on FE teachers are increasing rather than decreasing. The most commonly cited 'other' factors were:

- changing assessment and other requirements of awarding bodies (mentioned by 20% of respondents to the question – a high proportion given that the question was a completely open one)
- preparation for and responses to Ofsted or ALI inspections (cited by 19%)
- a general increase in bureaucracy (9%)
- staff shortages and staff turnover (9%)
- students receiving increased levels of support as a result of increasing participation measures or a changed regime of pastoral care (8%)
- syllabus and curriculum changes (8%)
- college restructuring (5%)
- staff absence (5%).

Case study evidence

Interviewees in the colleges all said either that teacher workload had stayed stable over the previous three years, or that it had increased. In some cases, curriculum leaders and staff representatives felt that internal changes, such as the increased use of ICT, had served to add to the administrative burden of staff. For example, in case study F, structural changes were seen to have passed a lot of administration down to main grade lecturer level. However, as indicated in the survey findings, the main reasons given for changes in the composition of teachers' workload – usually described as an increase in the bureaucratic burden – were external changes and pressures.

National initiatives cited most frequently as leading to an increase in teachers' administrative workloads were:

- Curriculum 2000
- change in the inspection regime and requirements
- changing demands of awarding bodies
- LSC requirements.

For example, in case study B, three national initiatives were identified as having led to a dramatic increase in workload – Curriculum 2000, key skills and changes in the inspection regime. A curriculum head said:

'There was far less to administer when students were only completing two three-hour exams for their particular subjects. As a result of Curriculum 2000 they can now do six individual modules of one hour each. Key skills has also increased workload enormously. The actual idea of key skills is an excellent one, it's just the way that it's administered, the way that it's checked up on, the way that it's validated, the way that it's assessed. It's just a lot of jumping through hoops. This has greatly increased our admin workload.'

She reported that the reporting required for inspections:

'seems to change from year to year. You hear people say "Oh, Ofsted are interested in this at the momen"', so we'll have to rush off and write our lesson plans incorporating, say, differentiation. But this year, key skills may be the thing they look out for, or IT, or something. I think the way we have been inspected has caused people's workload to increase.'

5. Addressing teacher workload

Martinez and Pepler in their report *Reducing bureaucratic burdens on lecturers* identified a number of approaches already in place in colleges that were attempting to address the issue of bureaucratic workload and which seemed to be having some success. These included:

- the re-engineering of processes (such as student recruitment) to remove unnecessary complexity, bottlenecks, and so on
- re-engineering of administration systems, for instance, standardising and simplifying paperwork and procedures, including rationalising course records to ensure a single filing point
- managing change – some colleges had proactive policies aimed at managing and controlling the administrative burden
- decentralised decision-making – which when implemented effectively was also found to reduce burdens.

ICT and increased administrative support were also used in some colleges, but with only patchy success. The authors found that ICT had not reduced bureaucracy in most colleges, although where employed effectively it was shown to simplify and speed up processes such as student tracking.

Martinez and Pepler also found that although increased administrative support was employed in a number of colleges, this change often involved a more centralised pool of staff, so that the support for individual lecturers was actually reduced. However, in a minority of cases, administrative staff were reducing burdens on teaching staff by, for example, handling most student enquiries. In addition, some pilot work investigating the possibility of bringing in additional support, such as for exam invigilation, was under consideration (Martinez and Pepler 2000).

Survey evidence

Survey evidence for this project supported a number of the Martinez and Pepler findings. The HR survey considered whether any measures had been taken over the last two years to change the composition of teachers' workload. Around one-third of respondents (36%) suggested that some measures hd been enacted (table 6.1).

N = 77	%
Measures had been taken	36
Measures had not been taken	53
Don't know	10
Total	100

Table 5.1 Extent to which there had been measures to change teachers' workload in last two years

Source: IES/LSDA survey of HR directors

Respondents were further asked whether any measures undertaken had led to an increase or decrease in scheduled teaching, preparation and assessment or management and administration. Few reported that the measures had any significant ('big increase'/'big decrease') effect on time allocation. Only a minority (22%) had seen any decrease in management or administration, in fact the impact of measures to address teacher workload seems more often to have been an increase in these tasks (table 6.2).

	Proportion of respondents reporting level of increase					
N = 42	Big increase %	Small increase %	No change %	Small decrease %	Large decrease %	Don't know %
Scheduled teaching	3	34	31	28	3	0
Preparation and assessment	8	29	45	8	0	11
Management and admin	10	31	19	17	5	19

Table 5.2 Extent to which there had been changes to the three key areas of workload

Source: IES/LSDA survey of HR directors

Case study evidence

Within the six case study colleges, most activity to reduce or change the workload of teachers had taken the form of appointing more support staff and restructuring the administrative function and/or of making greater use of ICT. Most of these strategies had been directed at reducing the management and administrative duties of teachers. Interestingly, in four out of the six colleges the number of support staff available at departmental level was considerably higher than the average figure suggested in table 6.2 above. Scheduled teaching and preparation and assessment remained predominantly professional teaching roles in these colleges. However, they had found ways of transferring some tasks in these areas to other staff.

Management and administration

The main area where these relatively successful colleges had sought to restructure curriculum delivery and teaching workload was in relation to management and administration tasks of teachers. All but one had decentralised administration to provide specialist support at school or department level. In addition, administrative support staff were being used in various ways to reduce the administrative burden on teachers. Many of these initiatives related to course marketing and student recruitment, enrolment and attendance. In general, these changes were felt to have had a positive effect. This finding might appear at first sight to contradict that from the survey, which suggested that measures to reduce teacher workload were often ineffective. In fact, the case studies have helped to 'unpick' the survey results. First, the survey respondents were commenting on all measures to reduce workload, not just those associated with the greater use of support staff: as set out below, some informants were not convinced that ICT changes were having an immediate positive effect on teacher workload. Second, the interviews showed that the positive effects of internal changes could be reduced or undermined as a result of external pressures, such as increasing bureaucratic demands from outside bodies (see section 5).

College B was one example of a college where support staff had been used successfully. The college had had a strategic aim of reducing paper-based administration for staff and had dramatically increased the number of support staff who were employed – from a quarter of the number of teachers to almost as many as there were teachers. These staff undertook regular routine tasks such as register reconciliation. There was a large amount of preparation involved in open evenings held at the college, as well as that needed for marketing the college externally, for example, via publicity leaflets taken to neighbouring schools. Support staff would also carry out these kinds of administration. There was also a full-time non-teaching registrar at the college, who dealt with most of the paperwork for admissions. The college tended to be very oversubscribed with typically more than 1000 applicants for 400 places, and so the registrar's work was seen as essential.

In another example, from college D, the administration team had been decentralised and each sub-college now had its own team. At the time of the research, this appeared to be more developed in some departments than others. For example, the adult and community area was seen within the college as having strong, efficient administrative support, strengthened by additional staff employed through specific project funds such as Learndirect. The section had eight full-time administrative staff. They directly supported the section manager and the teaching staff. Their duties involved typing, photocopying and dealing with phone calls, and they all used one centralised IT system. There were also 13 outreach or support workers based in the community and responsible for the recruitment of students. The head of adult education in the college felt that the use of support workers enabled staff to concentrate on teaching duties.

College A was the one example where there was a move to a centralised administration role, although again the objective was to release teaching staff for other roles. The college had appointed special staff to deal with the administrative side of admissions, as a curriculum assistant and in general administration. These staff were a central resource.

Scheduled teaching

Full- or part-time teachers undertook the classroom teaching in all the colleges; other kinds of staff were not seen as providing an alternative to teachers in this role. However, in some cases, teachers did receive support from non-teaching staff in technical and learning support roles. The only teaching role that was regularly undertaken by staff other than teachers was exam invigilation. In addition, staff with a tutorial role were commonly able to support that role with access to a student counselling service.

College A had technicians supporting staff in the sciences, music and art, and learning assistants to support students with special needs in the classroom. Exams were invigilated by specially recruited non-teaching staff. In addition, specialist counsellors were available for students after referral from a personal tutor. The college was revising its long-standing policy that teaching and assessment had to be undertaken by professional teachers and, just before the research was conducted, had appointed a non-teacher as an examinations officer.

Preparation and assessment

The main way that the assessment role of teachers was transferred to other staff was through the appointment of specialist work-based assessors. All three GFECs had chosen to adopt this approach. For example, college F had chosen to appoint specialist assessors for work-based assessment in NVQ and related programmes. This was seen as both efficient and effective because:

- teachers and assessors require different skills – assessors need to have current relevant industrial experience and competence to assess learners but teaching skills are less important for this group
- it is possible to pay assessors at a different rate from professional teaching staff.

In one of the SFCs (college B) one aspect of the assessment role was dealt with by the college pastoral officer; support staff were responsible for monitoring students' grades and attendance, and identifying those thought to need pastoral attention. These staff members wrote the letters that were signed by teachers and sent to parents about students. They were also responsible for setting up appointments and other related roles.

Use of ICT

The growing use of ICT to support preparation and administrative roles was a noticeable feature in most of the colleges. The main areas in which ICT was used were to reduce the number of times that a piece of data needed to be entered onto a system, to simplify the collection of student registration and attendance data and to enable staff to share teaching and other materials, so reducing the preparation burden on staff. However, in some cases, and in line with the survey findings above and Martinez and Pepler's work, there were concerns about whether these changes actually reduced teacher workload.

College C appeared to have been the most successful in using ICT to reduce teacher workload. The head of curriculum reported that the college had invested heavily in IT, and thus had systems in place to collect and store learner data. Teaching staff were involved with entering data initially, but altogether he felt that this was more efficient than a paper-based approach. Both union representatives referred to the big increase in the use of ICT at the college. They emphasised how strong the college was on ICT. One said 'I think we're really good here at avoiding the paper chase.' The College Information Service (CIS) manager had developed a comprehensive in-house system, which contained all college data. The system was flexible, accessible and very useful. It had drawn praise from the LSC, which had awarded the college money to share good ICT practice.

College E also had a series of interesting initiatives in place, but these were viewed less positively within the college. A key ICT change was the introduction of an 'assignment drive' where all course materials were stored to allow sharing between staff. In addition the college had started using software that enabled it to take data from ILRs over a number of years and 'do the same calculations as Ofsted would do'. This gave trends in enrolment and achievement, over a period of years and helped with the internal quality control process. The college had started to produce this information for teaching teams and for schools. It was hoped that it would help teaching staff because it answered questions for self-assessment reports – for example, it provides comparisons with the previous year's figures, national benchmarks and so on. However, the head of curriculum acknowledged that staff did not necessarily see it in this positive light: 'Some people think that they were now being asked for more information in more detail – they are now being asked to analyse and comment on it, whereas previously they were not.'

6. What makes for effective practice in the deployment of FE staff?

The case studies in this report are based on some of the more successful colleges in terms of student performance. Staff at the colleges were asked whether there were any particular aspects of their approach to organising teacher workload and managing the curriculum that they would recommend as good practice exemplars for other colleges. They were also asked whether they could cite any link between these approaches and student achievement. Although it was often difficult for interviewees to make an explicit link in this way, key aspects of curriculum management that were seen as particularly effective included:

- measures to control the level of teacher workload
- the removal of some aspects of the teacher's role that could be performed by non-teaching staff (for example invigilation and administrative duties)
- imaginative timetable organisation
- effective use of ICT.

Approaches by the colleges

Approaches adopted varied considerably between colleges and no single approach emerged as most effective. What seemed to work was a proactive management response to the external pressures on teachers' workload, rather than any particular approach to workload control. The approaches seen by the colleges as the most effective aspects of their deployment of teaching staff are described below.

College A

In college A the relatively low contact hours were seen by a number of informants as one of the reasons for the college's high success levels, although it had not undertaken any systematic research to prove this.

College B

The HR director of college B said:

'I think the college uses time efficiently, and this has enabled us to build up the funds to do the other things you need to do, like expand capacity, develop ICT, build up teaching resources. You do need to be a healthy financial institution, and our current workload allows us to be that.'

In the same institution, the changes that had flowed from this healthy financial position included recruiting of non-teaching staff for invigilation purposes, which one curriculum leader said had been 'very helpful'. The college had also 'used the year to the greatest benefit' – starting early and finishing early, in order to reduce a summer term, when many students are away on study leave.

College C

In college C the use of non-teaching staff for invigilation was also seen as a particularly positive development and one that the HR officer felt had helped to keep staff hours stable in recent years, since teachers were now able to use the exam period to do other work, such as preparation.

The head of curriculum stressed other aspects of organisation, particularly the two-week timetable used by the college. The senior management team endeavoured to keep a cap on class size and also to keep teacher workloads at a comfortable level by, for example, giving time remission for management duties. He felt it was inevitable that these features of college planning would have had a positive knock-on effect for learners. He drew attention to the college's fortnightly rather than weekly timetable. Previously, the college had had a weekly timetable with two afternoon periods each day. Staff and students had found the day overlong and had complained of tiredness. Discussions had resulted in a new fortnightly timetable, which had enabled the college to schedule just one period in the afternoon. Student results had improved as a consequence, and it was felt to be a very positive step.

Finally the head of curriculum also recommended developing a strong ICT and computer information system: 'I think it saves quite a lot of time and quite a lot of money.'

College D

In college D, a strongly managed team focus was seen as an important part of practice across the college. For example, all staff taught within their specialist areas and for each area there was a designated staff office or staff room. This allowed managers to 'keep an eye on' staff who should be in the staff room when they are not teaching. All staff rooms had computers with e-mail and internet access to assist with preparation. All staff have access to the computers and are encouraged to share good practice, which was made easier in a shared space. In addition, advanced practitioners advised teaching staff on methods, teaching material and the use of IT. Materials were tested and used by subject leaders.

The other feature of the college's approach that was seen as important was the focus on ensuring that:

'teachers teach, administrators administer, and managers manage. All the process and polices are above board to allow people to do what they are actually paid to do. 71% of staff teach, and we make that easy by employing support workers. This also helps teaching staff feel valued as teachers as other staff are employed to do other duties'

according to the head of adult education. She felt that there was definitely a link between the way workload was organised and learner satisfaction and outcomes. The college has high levels of achievement for learners. It had recently had a very good inspection report, an 'excellent' LSC provider review and had Grade A financial status.

College E

The head of business and ICT in college E said that there was a clear link between the way the curriculum was organised and student attainment, with the key feature being the control of teacher workload:

'If you have a tutor with a reasonable workload, the marking and so on gets done in time. If you overload them they will not get everything done. We try for a seven day marking turnaround for the students to get feedback. Teachers won't do an effective job – tutorials, feedback, keeping track of attendance – if they are overworked. My staff very seldom work over their hours as I give them leeway for travel between sites.'

College F

Senior management in college F saw the introduction of the 'learning champion' role between the head of a curriculum area and course coordinators as having been very valuable in promoting the quality of teaching. In addition, the head of work-based learning recommended the use of specialist assessors as a way of making it easier to have staff with the required level of current occupational competence, while reducing staffing costs.

References

Avis J, Bathmaker A-M, Parsons J (2001). Reflections from a time log diary: towards an analysis of the labour process within further education. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 53(1).

Bureaucracy Review Group (2004). *Annual report*. At www.successforall.gov.uk/linkAttachments/Bureaucracy_Report_2.pdf

Bureaucracy Task Force (2002). *Trust in the future: the report of the Bureaucracy Task Force*. November. At http://www.lsc.gov.uk/National/Documents/Keyinitiatives/BureaucracyTaskForce/default.htm

Bureaucracy Task Force (2003). *Building trust: a Bureaucracy Task Force report*. November. At http://www.lsc.gov.uk/National/Documents/Keyinitiatives/BureaucracyTaskForce/buildingtrust.htm

Edwards R, Clarke J, Harrison R, Reeve F (2001). Flexibility at work: a study of further education. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training,* 53(3).

Martinez P, Pepler G (2000). *Reducing bureaucratic burdens on lecturers*. London: Learning and Skills Development Agency.

NATFHE (2002). *Overworked and undervalued*. London: National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education.

National Remodelling Team. At www.remodelling.org/what_na.php

Ofsted (2001). *The common inspection framework for inspecting post-16 education and training*. London: ALI and Ofsted. February.

Ofsted (2002). *Handbook for inspecting colleges*. London: Ofsted. May.

The final report of the working group on 14-19 reform – chaired by Mike Tomlinson (2004). At www.14-19reform.gov.uk

Steward A (2003). *Towards constructive practice: lecturers' workloads as a vehicle for continuing professional development*. At www.triangle.co.uk/jvet/Resources/Steward.pdf

Steward A (2002). Invisible workloads: investigating lecturers' timetables in a college of further and higher education. *Research and Development Bulletin*, 1(3), November.

Warren T (1998). Excellence through people in further education colleges. *'t' Magazine*. At www.tmag.co.uk/articles/nov_983.html