

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

RECENT CHANGES IN BUSINESS EDUCATION FOR
HIGHER NATIONAL AWARDS

by

MERVYN LAVENDER

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Philosophy.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
1988

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Master of Philosophy

RECENT CHANGES IN BUSINESS EDUCATION FOR HIGHER NATIONAL AWARDS

by Mervyn Lavender

The Haslegrave report in 1969 gave rise to a number of changes in teaching business studies for higher national awards. The thesis identifies the main areas of change since that date, considers the reasons for these changes, identifies the main differences between the business studies curriculum set up by the Business Education Council (BEC) created as a result of the Haslegrave Report and the curriculum that was replaced and examines the strategies adopted by educational establishments to implement those changes.

The reasons for change were drawn from general curriculum literature and experience of the writer and colleagues in similar educational institutions. The effects of those changes were adduced from a pilot study conducted at Southampton College of Higher Education and interviews with heads of departments, course leaders and other tutors at twelve similar educational establishments. Further to those interviews all establishments offering business studies courses for higher national awards were surveyed by postal questionnaires targetted at heads of departments, course leaders and other tutors.

The main conclusions drawn are the changes made by BEC were implemented at a pace not matched by that of the management and teaching staff, different styles of teaching and learning were attempted by the staff, without prior training in the new methods. The administrative burden placed on teaching staff was much heavier compared to the curriculum that was replaced.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are offered to Southampton Institute of Higher Education for allowing the time to research the project, to my tutor Mr Gordon Bloomer who offered patience tempered with sympathy during periods of low activity, to numerous colleagues who offered criticism, anecdotal experiences and sources of information and to Mrs Rosemary Halford who dealt with the vagaries of the word processing and reprocessing of the script. This thesis could not have been completed without the forbearance of my wife who at all times was convinced that it could be done.

PREFACE

For the past seven years most of my work as a lecturer in a Business Studies Department has been concerned with implementing the curriculum policies of the Business Education Council (BEC).

During this period I have supervised the compilation of three course submissions to BEC, participated in numerous seminars and courses run by the Business Education Teachers' Association (BETA) and the Further Education Staff College at Coombe Lodge, team taught, integrated my teaching with other specialists and found new ways of assessing students work.

My interest in the changes brought by BEC to the classroom and the management of my department was born out of frustration. As a teacher in accountancy the compilation of this thesis has broadened my knowledge in the areas of curriculum reform and professional knowledge way beyond my subject specialism to the curriculum in general.

This thesis was commenced before the merger with the Technician Education Council and refers solely to the 'Business' side of the Business and Technician Education Council (BTEC). My references to BEC refer to BTEC since the merger.

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Abstract	(i)
Acknowledgments	(ii)
Preface	(iii)
1 <u>Introduction</u>	
Aims and Outlines of Methods	1
Recent Developments in Further Education	2
Structure of the Thesis	4
2 <u>History of Business Education Courses</u>	
Introduction	7
A Brief Recent History	8
Official Reports with Special Reference to the Haslegrave Report	12
Immediate Pre/Post BEC Years	19
3 <u>Influences on BEC's Curriculum Policies</u>	
Introduction	29
Evaluations and Reports on Business Studies	31
DES	33
HMI	36
NATFHE	41
BETA	45
Others	46
4 <u>BEC's Change Strategies for Curriculum and Examinations</u>	
Introduction	55
Changes in the Light of Educational Theory	77
5 <u>Methodology of the Survey and its Findings</u>	
Introduction	92
Methodology	92
Opportunity Sample	94
Pattern of Replies	96
Responses by Heads of Departments	97
Responses by Course Leaders	110
Responses by Other Tutors	124
6 <u>Conclusions</u>	
Introduction	133
Changes Made	133
Reason for Change	134
Differences	135
Strategies adopted by Establishments to Implement Change	137
Summary of Findings from the Research	138
Effects of BEC' Changes	140
Key Curriculum Issues	147
Topics for Further Research	150

Appendix I	<u>Copies of Questionnaires</u>	
	Heads of Departments	151
	Course Co-ordinators	165
	BTEC Teachers	180
Appendix II	<u>Summary of Results obtained from the Questionnaires</u>	
	Heads of Departments	185
	Course Co-ordinators	192
	BEC Teachers	203
Appendix III	<u>Glossary of Acronyms</u>	208
Bibliography		209

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

AIMS AND OUTLINE OF METHODS

The Business Education Council (BEC) was created in May 1974 and since then it has introduced major curriculum changes in business studies. These changes have been in structure, aims, content, teaching methods, assessment, validation and control. These curriculum innovations and their consequences are the subject of this thesis. The aims of the thesis are:

1. a) To identify the nature of the changes in the field of higher national awards in business studies courses before and since the formation of BEC
- b) To consider reasons for these changes
- c) To identify and analyse the main differences between the business studies curriculum set up by BEC and the curriculum that was replaced
- d) To examine the management strategies adopted by educational establishments to implement the changes introduced by BEC

A broad approach has been adopted in identifying the nature of BEC's policies on change and control. The study is set in a wide social, political, historical, economic and educational context and draws mainly on general curriculum literature as well as on some specialist material on curricula in further education. Evidence is also used from the experience of the writer and colleagues in his own and other institutions. In the examination of management strategies adopted by educational establishments implementing the changes a survey of all institutions offering BEC (now BTEC) higher national courses was conducted.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN FURTHER EDUCATION

Further education has been relatively neglected in curriculum studies compared with most other areas of education. Fowler (1972) has dubbed further education the 'forgotten sector'. Recently this sector has received more attention. There are several reasons for this awakening of interest. One of the main ones is the rising concern about the adequacy of present education and training for all in the 16-19 age group and the increased doubts about the wisdom of maintaining different and separate types of institutions as expressed in the McFarlane Report (1981)¹. Other reasons are the close involvement since 1984 of the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) with further education in the provision of courses for the young unemployed and the interest shown in the work of the Further Education Curriculum Unit (FEU)², much of which is concerned with MSC Courses.

The political significance of and consequent greater public interest in further and higher education has been greatly increased since the mid 'seventies. Reasons for this increased interest are its increased cost, its greater social impact, its greater economic relevance in a period of public expenditure cuts, changing manpower needs in the light of a changing industrial structure and high unemployment, especially among school leavers. The BEC reforms could be seen as one response to the call for education to meet employers' needs more effectively and so enhance the possibility of national economic growth based on the premise that students on first destination appointments arrive equipped with work related skills rather than a pure academic background.

The further and public higher education sectors have always been more directly concerned to provide vocationally educated and trained manpower than have schools, and this remains one of their main functions. The White Paper on Technical Education, published in 1956 (Cmnd. 9703), when David Eccles was Minister of Education, underlined this purpose and proposed a substantial expansion of technical and technological education to provide the highly skilled labour force required to meet the challenge of new technologies in world markets. In May 1967 the Secretary of State for Education and Science invited the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce (NACEIC) to review the national pattern and organisation of technician courses and examinations. A committee appointed for this purpose and chaired by Dr H L Haslegrave published its report in October 1969. The recommendations of that report were subsequently carried out, resulting in the formation of the Technician Education Council (TEC) and the Business Education Council (BEC) in 1973 and 1974 respectively. One of the longer term recommendations was that these two newly formed councils should, at some later date, be merged. On 1 January 1983 the merger took place and the Business and Technician Education Council (BTEC) was formed.

Prior to September 1975 the Joint Committee for National Awards in Business Studies and Public Administration awarded the Higher National Certificate (HNC) and Higher National Diploma (HND) in Business Studies. From 1 September 1978 the titles of the awards changed to the Business Education Council Higher National Certificate and Diploma (BEC HNC/D) in Business Studies.

STRUCTURE OF THESIS

Against this background Chapter Two outlines the history of business education courses and points to the main problems that surfaced from the 'sixties onwards. The chapter attempts to answer the questions - what were the main curriculum changes before BEC and why did they occur? Relevant aspects of the Haslegrave (1969) report are discussed. A comparison, is made of BEC's curriculum policies and those of the previous, Joint Committee system.

Viewed historically, some of BEC's reforms, for example, the use of an objectives model of design, assessment, and teaching methods, appear less arbitrary or sudden. These changes are the outcome of several long term curriculum developments which were brought together by BEC. One of the main features of BEC's reforms is the recognition of the links between different aspects of the curriculum - assessment, content, pedagogy - and the need to plan them jointly.

Chapter Three attempts to identify influences on BEC's policies. The force of educational ideas and theories, and the political power pressure groups and individuals are considered.

In Chapter Four the methods used by BEC to secure change and to maintain control are identified and analysed from practical and theoretical stances. Value questions on the balance of control over business studies curricula are raised here. A central argument advanced is that reform and close supervision of assessment is used by BEC as a major means of effecting change.

Chapter Five sets out the methodology of the survey conducted and summarises its findings.

The last chapter outlines the conclusions of previous chapters, summarises the findings on the effects of BEC's changes, suggests explanations for those effects, identifies key curriculum issues arising from BEC's reforms, and proposes topics and approaches for further research and evaluation in business education.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

NOTES

1. See the McFarlane Report (1981) for a discussion of these issues.
2. The Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit was established by the DES in 1977. The main aim of the FEU is to improve the co-ordination of curriculum development in further education.

REFERENCES

Fowler, G. 1972 'DES, Ministers and the Curriculum' in Bell, R. 'Curriculum Innovation' 1972, Croom Helm

Haslegrave Report, 1969, 'Report of the Committee on Technician Courses and Examinations', NACEIC, Department of Education and Science, HMSO

McFarlane Report, 1981, 'Education for 16-19 Year Olds', Department of Education and Science, HMSO

CHAPTER 2 - THE HISTORY OF BUSINESS EDUCATION COURSES

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter changes in business studies curricula and courses are studied from an historical perspective. The development of the Joint Committee system of control over business studies courses will be outlined and reference made to the main official reports and White Papers pertinent to business education. In particular, the Haslegrave Report (1969) will be discussed. The chapter concludes with a comparison of Joint Committee and BEC curriculum policies.

Two elements of the BEC system are noted in particular: the radical curriculum change and a more centralised curriculum control. These elements are related to each other. The rapid introduction of radical changes in all the main aspects of business studies curricula, including strategies for implementing reform, may require a high degree of central control. It will be argued that under the much looser system of Joint Committee control the curriculum changed little over several decades.

Nevertheless, changes in the real curriculum - the teaching and learning experiences of students - may have occurred even though the formal curriculum was static. Conversely, BEC's radical curriculum changes might not be matched by corresponding changes in practice in the classroom. This fundamental issue recurs throughout the thesis.

A BRIEF RECENT HISTORY

Business studies, in its broadest sense, includes a wide field of education and training, ranging from basic clerical skills to postgraduate management training. In addition, it includes preparation for examinations for numerous professional associations in commerce. The main focus of the present thesis is on BEC higher level courses.

No substantial recent history relating specifically to business education, in book or article form, appears to have been written. It has therefore been necessary to gather material from a variety of primary and secondary sources, in an attempt to construct a coherent history.

It has been necessary in the preparation of the dissertation to write a short history of business education based on themes relevant to curriculum studies. Primary and secondary sources have been used. There appears to be no substantial history of business education, beyond brief summaries in general works on further education, in either book or article form. There are some references to the topic in Coombe Lodge Reports. A recent short history of business education by Cowan, M is available from the Coombe Lodge Information Bank, Paper 1714, 1982.

See Cantor and Roberts (1979) for a recent critical survey of further education. The Journal of Further and Higher Education is a valuable source of articles on current developments. Technical Education Abstracts, Coombe Lodge Reports, Vocational Aspects of Education, and NATFHE Journal were also useful in preparing the dissertation.

Appendix 3 of Cantor and Roberts, op. cit., contains a fuller list of sources of information on further education.

The history of business education can be grouped into four major stages. The first stage is from early history until the mid 1930s, the second from the mid-1930s to 1961, the third from 1961 to the introduction of BEC in 1974 and the fourth stage from 1974 is the current time (1987). Only at the start of the second stage, the mid 1930s, were courses becoming coherent groups of subjects and the concept of the grouped courses then gained ground. Previously, business education had been on the basis of ungrouped, single subjects. Ordinary National Certificates in Commerce were started in 1939. A Joint Committee of representatives from HMI, colleges and commerce was set up to control these courses.¹ By 1948 Ordinary National Certificates (ONCs) and Higher National Certificates (HNCs) in commerce were still a very minor part of further education work. In that year only 114 ONCs and 11 HNCs were awarded.²

This second stage lasted until 1961, when ordinary and national certificates in commerce were replaced by ONCs and HNCS in Business Studies.³ Commerce was thought to be an outdated term and a change of name was intended to provide a fresh start. At the same time, full-time courses at ordinary and higher levels were introduced.

The third stage was one of rapid expansion of student numbers at ordinary, higher and degree levels in both full and part-time modes of study. Lower level business studies courses, equivalent to craft courses in the technical area, were rationalised nationally in 1963 with the introduction of the Certificate of Office Studies (COS) to

replace scores of local and residual courses. Administrative reforms were more evident than real curriculum changes. An examination of ordinary and higher level business studies curricula indicates little change in aims, content and assessment from their introduction until reforms by BEC in the fourth stage some thirty years later. The formal curriculum it appears had been remarkably stable. Joint Committee control, at least for business education, tended to preserve tradition. The changes that did happen originated at the periphery rather than at the centre.

Links between the national courses in commerce and the requirements of professional associations became closer from the 1960s onwards. Until that time very few examination exemptions were granted by these bodies, in particular to holders of ONCs.

The fourth stage in the development of business education starts in the earlier 'seventies, at the time of the Haslegrave Report (1969) and the setting up of BEC in 1974. Cantor and Roberts (1972) observed that links between business, further education and professional bodies had grown closer in the sixties and that grouped certificates such as ONCs, HNCs and the COS were becoming more acceptable to professional institutes. Most professional courses consisted of three, four or five stages of examinations, the first stage being a combination of examinations in Mathematics, English, Economics or Commerce, Law and Accounting. ONCs and HNCs adopted this same pattern and therefore coincided with the breadth and generality of knowledge required by the professional courses which allowed exemptions to be granted from the first series of examinations.

Until the third stage was well established, curriculum matters were not seen as contentious and thus not much discussed. Values were not in conflict: there was tacit consensus; administrative co-ordination and expansion appeared the main concerns. From the mid 1960s, however, critical curriculum questions began to be raised. It should be noted that curriculum issues were not analysed in depth or at length in the Haslegrave Report. Questions were posed, for example, on aims and assessment but discussion of administrative matters predominated. BEC brought curriculum matters to the centre of debate and acted as a potentially powerful means for centrally directed change. This much greater use of existing central power, on curriculum matters especially, is a crucial feature of this fourth stage. Under the Joint Committee system, HMI did not try to force the pace of change, or, in practice, control curricula closely. The power to do so existed but was used sparingly.

BEC used this potential of the existing system to reform business education. This role appears not to have been envisaged by the Haslegrave Report, at least not in the shorter term. According to Haslegrave, course rationalisation was to be BEC's immediate task; review was a longer term project. Interestingly, there was a delay of three years from the publication of the report before TEC was set up, and four years in the case of BEC. The reasons for this delay have never been fully explained. A possible explanation is that by 1973 or 1974 pressure may have been growing for greater central control over education and training, in order to increase its responsiveness to national economic needs.

OFFICIAL REPORTS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE HASLEGRAVE REPORT
(1969)

Several major official reports on business education have been produced since the end of the Second World War. The more recent include:-

- a) Percy (1945) - Higher Technical Education. A Report of a Special Committee appointed in 1944. The three main recommendations relating to Business Studies were as follows: all students of technology should be introduced to 'Management Studies' during their final year; at least one institution be selected as a centre for postgraduate study of industrial administration and all college teaching for national certificates should have Management Studies as part of the courses (see paras 70-76).
- b) McMeeking (1959) - Report of the Advisory Committee on Further Education for Commerce. The recommendations on pp 25-27 cover 30 aspects from the encouragement of different modes of study to include more full-time, block release, sandwich and refresher courses to the inclusion of modern languages as part of the curriculum. The Joint Committees were urged to link syllabuses to those of the professional bodies. College management it was felt should encourage the study of commercial practice abroad. The Local Education Authorities were requested to pay higher fees to more highly qualified lecturers and to use their full discretion in grading lecturers posts to provide better equipped and staffed libraries and provide more suitable accommodation and office equipment for teaching and research and make efforts to publicise what colleges had to offer.

c) Robbins (1963) - Higher Education. This Report concentrates on the provisions for universities but does refer to 'Business Studies' and 'Education for Management' in paras 407 and 408, suggesting that these studies should be at postgraduate level, preferably after a period of work experience.

d) Crick (1964) - Report of the Advisory Committee on a Higher Award in Business Studies. The recommendations on pp 8 - 23 include the provision for an advanced qualification in Business Studies equivalent in standard to the then Diploma in Technology. It was urged that the course should include practical experience linked to the academic work in college, that advanced general education should be combined with practical training in business with full collaboration between colleges and employers and that such courses should be offered only at colleges where staff, library and other facilities are found to be adequate for the work required at that level. (para 48) The following reports, covering the wider field of technical and higher education, have made recommendations on business education.

Two important White Papers which set out general principles applicable to business education, as well as other areas in further education are:

e) Technical Education (1956 Comnd 9703). The concluding paragraphs (154 to 159) point out the need for co-operation between the parents and indirectly to encourage school leavers to go on to further education, thus creating a demand for colleges to offer courses linked to employers' needs.

f) Better Opportunities - Technical Education (1961 Cmnd 1254). The Government's chief proposals (pp 3 and 4) were that further education should commence immediately after leaving school; there should be a move away from evening only classes to a full day release system; sandwich courses and block release should be encouraged. At para 3(2) the comment is made that:

"Colleges should experiment with full-time induction courses and with tutorial methods".

It is proposed to consider only the Haslegrave Report in more detail because it, more than the others, raises issues still relevant to BTEC's curriculum policies.

Haslegrave's (1969) main recommendation was the establishment of TEC and BEC. These bodies were to be responsible for 'planning, co-ordinating and administering technician and comparable courses examination and educational qualifications of a national character'. (para 89) The terms of reference suggested for BEC were:

To plan, administer and keep under review the development of a unified pattern of courses in the field of business and office studies, at levels below that of first degree, and in pursuance of this to devise or approve suitable courses, establish and assess standards of performance, and award certificates and diplomas as appropriate'.

(para 173)

These terms were, in substance, adopted by BEC on its formation.

If these terms of reference are compared to those for TEC the reader would see a remarkable similarity. The TEC terms of reference differ only by an exchange of the phrase:

"in the field of business and office studies, at levels below that of first degree" for

"of technical education for technicians in industry" (para 166)

From this similarity the research concludes that both TEC and BEC were to have the same aims but that business and office studies were not classed as part of industry. It is worth commenting that the title of Haslegrave's report is the "Report of the Committee on Technician Courses and Examinations", and that students in the field of business and office studies were regarded as some sort of technicians. Any definitions of a technician that would fit both TEC and BEC students was apparently a difficult task (para 4)

The main conclusion of the report was that the existing pattern of technician courses was not suitable for meeting current or future changing needs brought about by technical developments, by organisational changes and by improved management techniques. New administrative machinery was required to ensure that courses were adapted and created to meet the changing manpower needs of industry and commerce (paras. 149 - 158)

Most of the report was concerned with definition of a technician and technical education, but some important observations on business education were made. It was suggested that the HND course could be

'misused' by students who took a place on an HND course only because they were unable to obtain a degree place (paras 114 - 115). It was even suggested that consideration be given to abolishing the HND in business studies (para 116). Concern was also expressed at another type of distortion, that of the examination exemption system for the professional bodies. While the report urged that exemptions should be encouraged in principle, in practice the narrow requirements of professional bodies imposed severe limitations on syllabus content and teaching method (para 125). BEC has attempted to resolve this dilemma by extensive and patient negotiation with professional bodies. Most of these bodies have now accepted BEC curriculum reforms.

Only four paragraphs of the Haslegrave Report were concerned exclusively with assessment (paras 131 - 134). Traditional external examinations were criticised and a greater variety of methods was urged. Much greater involvement of teachers in assessment was suggested. An ultimate aim should be a system of end-of-course profiles of students. Some stress was put on the need to plan assessment in conjunction with other aspects of the curriculum. Beyond these general comments little was said on assessment. BEC has based its assessment system on principles such as these. Although profiles have not generally been introduced by BEC, colleges have been encouraged to start developing such systems.⁴

A fundamental question raised, but not answered, in the report is how to strike the right balance between employers' and students' interests (para 212). Looked at in terms of standards, the question is whether course standards should be based solely on job analysis and thus be

determined by employers' requirements alone, or whether standards should be based on 'the quality of the output from the appropriate parts of the educational system.....' (ibid). Presumably, what this phrase means is that many students may have been academically over-qualified for the type of employment they could expect to obtain. Standards as determined on a criterion-referenced rather than a norm-referenced basis may be below students' expectations and well within their capabilities. This may satisfy employers but not meet the wider needs of students.

A key question is to what extent did Haslegrave's recommendations influence BEC's curriculum policies? Although resemblances can be found, for example, in assessment policies, other recommendations were not followed. An important instance of this is BEC's decision not to adopt a proposal of Haslegrave that compulsory liberal studies should be included in business courses (para 268). On some matters, particularly content, no guidance was given by the report: nor does Haslegrave appear to comment on integration, yet this is one of the central features of BEC's philosophy as expressed in BEC's Initial Guidelines on the Implementation of Policy 1977. No reference can be found to BEC's strategies for integration: central themes, integrated cores and cross-modular assignments. These have emerged from BEC's own 'think tank'. The report's concept of a course seems to be a coherent group of traditional business subjects. BEC has accepted the basis of Haslegrave, in the view that the structure of awards should be rationalised and the curriculum based more on the needs of business, but accepted only some of the detailed recommendations, eg no attempt seems to have been made to develop the HND in Business

Studies exclusively as a three-year sandwich course and the promotion of a further increase in the number of places on degree courses in business studies (paras 229-231), encouragement of block release courses (paras 255-260), the introduction of legislation to confer on technicians and comparable trainees a right to appropriate release to follow a course of further education associated with the training for his occupation (para 263), course arrangements in other countries (paras 264-267).

IMMEDIATE PRE/POST BEC YEARS

The four most important of the many documents published by BEC on aims and policy are: 'BEC Consultative Document' (1975); 'First Policy Statement' (1976); and 'Initial Guidelines on the Implementation of Policy' (1977); 'Priorities and Policies into the 1990s' (1985). The first of these documents stressed the importance of identifying the 'central core of fundamental knowledge and skills' for employees in business. These skills would need to be transferable between occupations. The view was that a course 'should be more than a collection of unrelated packages of knowledge'. Integration in structure, content and teaching method was urged from the outset.

After a year's consultation, mainly with employers, BEC published, in 1976, its 'First Policy Statement'. This document is still BEC's main statement of policy, although BEC produces no evidence of the employers' views. In contrast to the aims and policies of the Joint Committees for Business Studies (see DES Rules 124*) those of BEC are more extensive, detailed and prescriptive. Apart from a short list of very general aims, which could apply to almost any area of education, Joint Committee aims tended to be tacit. The Joint Committee approach was liberal, general and subject-based, whereas BEC courses 'are basically vocational'. (See Chairman's foreword to BEC First Policy

*DES Rules 124 - Arrangements and Conditions for the Award of National Certificates and Diplomas in Business Studies and in Public Administration to students in Establishments for Further Education in England and Wales and Northern Ireland

Statement 1976) Nonetheless BEC was anxious not to be suspected of 'illiberalism'. In the statement it was argued that a sound, broad education could be provided by good teaching in business subjects and through the proper use of BEC's four central themes. BEC did not require a formal programme of liberal studies which was mandatory under DES Rules 124.

The central themes identified by BEC are a crucial aspect of BEC's course design and aims.⁵ These themes, which BEC believes permeate all business activity, are: communication; people; money and familiarity with analytical techniques and problem solving in a technical environment. In addition to their part in developing essential vocational skills and helping to provide a broad and liberal education, the themes are also a major means of integration. They are intended to appear, in all core and option modules, as well as in cross-modular assignments, and so increase the coherence of the courses. Much rests on these central themes. The use of themes by BEC was new to business studies but not to other areas of education, for example, the primary and secondary sectors. However, there are some issues, such as the number and suitability of the themes chosen, their effectiveness in promoting integration and transferable business skills and the extent to which they may provide a liberal education that may usefully be analysed by further study.⁶

Priority was given in the 1976 statement to integration through cross-modular assignments; avoidance of overstressing the academic element; the importance of complementary in-house training, in the case of part-time students; and the need for students to develop qualities of adaptability.

In summary, the main differences in aims between DES Rules 124 and the view of BEC are that the BEC philosophy stresses the vocational element more and liberal education less than the previous system. Adaptability, problem-solving abilities and an integrated practical conception of knowledge are given priority by BEC.

The previous courses in business studies leading to the Higher National Certificate/Diploma under DES Rules 124 consisted of five subjects in each year, plus a major multi-disciplinary project in the second year. Economics, Law, Accounting and Statistics were the main subjects. Their development was from theory to application over the two-years. Inter-disciplinary integration was not a formal feature of the course design. In addition to these compulsory elements, students could select groups of subjects relevant to their intended careers, for example, in marketing or finance. Students also took liberal studies.

Units of a BEC course are called modules rather than subjects. There are six modules in each year of an HND course: usually three cores and three options. Each core has an integrated syllabus based on several business studies subjects. Core content draws on more disciplines, eg politics, management, and self study than were included in the old HND and is much less theoretical and academic. Central themes and problem solving skills are also included in the cores. Another level of integration is between core modules. In each year, students also take a programme of cross-modular assignments (CMAs) which are intended to integrate core material and progressively develop skills in solving business problems. The CMAs, are seen as a superior learning and teaching method in that basic business problems are

examined several times at increasing levels of sophistication. BEC's option modules are similar to the optional specialist subjects in the old scheme.

The main content changes at the higher level were a reduction in the amount of theoretical economics and substantive law, and an increase in business planning, decision-taking, politics, government, and the functional aspects of business, such as personnel and production.

Numerous recommendations on teaching methods appropriate to the new approach are made in BECs Annual Reviews, especially 1984 and 1985.

They stress a student-centred approach and encourage active teaching methods such as group discussions, oral presentations, case studies, business games and other simulations, and exercises to develop social skills. The use of essays as either a teaching or examining technique is discouraged. Reliance on lecturing and formal class contact is discouraged. BEC considers that under the old scheme teaching was too didactic and generally there was a lack of innovation in teaching methods.

By its nature, change in classroom practice is hard to detect. A judgement based on the writer's experience, and that of colleagues, is that under BEC no more than a slight shift away from formal teacher-centred to active student-oriented teaching occurred in the first few years after 1978/79. Indeed, on integrated cores taught by teams of lecturers from different disciplines there appeared to be a tendency for even more formal teaching in order to 'cover the material'. In parts, this reflects overcrowded syllabuses, a common problem in integrated courses.

One of the most striking changes was in assessment. Under the old system, in the final year, assessment consisted of five examinations with a weighting of 70%, a project weighted 15% and homework, mostly essays, accounting for the remaining 15%. Percentage marks were used.

The BEC system presents the students with a series of hurdles to jump both during both academic years and end of year examinations. BEC uses literal grades (A to F) instead of percentages. To pass, a student must normally obtain a 'grade profile' of at least 13 D grades - six for examination, six for module course work and one for cross-modular course work. This raises the problem of averaging literal grades rather than numerical weightings. The intention is to increase the importance of course work. Students may be overloaded with assessments, as well as content, under the new scheme. This danger was pointed out in the Haslegrave Report (para 262).

Haslegrave had expressed concern over high wastage rates. (paras 119-124). In its assessment rules BEC followed Haslegrave in stating that if a student is 'recruited with integrity and works conscientiously, he or she ought to pass the course'.⁷ Under the Joint Committee system, marks tended to be normally distributed. An analysis by the writer of BEC grade distributions in his own institution and figures for pass and distribution rates published in BEC Annual Reports indicates a trend away from norm-referencing under BEC.⁸

A final point on assessment is that whereas under the old scheme one of the conditions for passing was 60% attendance, in the rules for BEC scheme no formal attendance requirement is stipulated.⁹

(In practice, given pressures from employers, grant authorities and

lecturers, it would be very hard for a student to pass without reasonable attendance.) However, this apparently unconcerned attitude by BEC does perhaps indicate a belief that the physical presence of the student in a classroom is not necessarily essential for learning to take place. In the writer's experience part-time students who are in employment adapt more readily to this type of distance learning than do full-time students fresh from school.

BEC's style of course planning contains elements both of the type of objectives model proposed by American writers, for example, Tyler (1949) and of the process model suggested by Stenhouse (1975). The planning sequence adopted by BEC consists of: identification of aims; specification of general and learning objectives for content appropriate to the aims; choice of suitable teaching methods and course organisation; and design of assessment methods in harmony with the prior steps, which are all closely related. The resulting design is not to be regarded as a static plan: BEC encourages colleges to view planning as an iterative process.

BEC's model is also not strictly behavioural in another respect: the type of objectives used. These are more a means of clearly specifying the content that must be covered rather than identifying external behaviour of the student that may be evidence of learning. In contrast to this type of instructional or expressive objective, the ones used by TEC are much nearer to those of the behavioural model. In the technical area there is probably more scope for the sensible use of this model, especially where motor skills are assessed. This model seems inappropriate for business studies, particularly at the higher level. Recognition of this is borne out in the May 1985

review of the BTEC National courses and may well be adopted by the higher level in the near future.

Business studies could be seen as a field of activity similar to Aristotle's practical disciplines of ethics and politics. Their essence is deliberative choice, decision-making and action in changing conditions. Prespecification of behaviour certainly in a mechanical manner would, therefore, be inappropriate.¹⁰

BEC required the content to be prespecified in the form of set objectives and all main objectives to be assessed. The development of problem-solving skills and the use of case studies, for example, stresses process rather than content. In practice, therefore BEC's curriculum planning model combines elements of both the behavioural and process approaches.¹¹

To reinforce integration, BEC presses for collective management and decision-making structures in business studies departments. Control is therefore more rigorous under the BEC than under the Joint Committee system.

SUMMARY

The pace of change in the evolution of business studies appears to have gathered rapid momentum since the introduction of BEC. The changes made were most evident in curriculum design and central control. New types of integrated courses were developed by BEC without pilot studies and enforced on institutions from 1975. The

idea of the use of core themes as a vehicle for integration comes from BEC rather than Haslegrave. The speed of the rate of change may have been too great.

Cotgrove (1958) pointed to the slow pace of change in the educational system and the need for informed political action to accelerate change (p 206)

Something more will be required than slow evolution out of the existing structures and traditions, which hinder change and adjustment.... the nature of educational reorganisation should not be dominated by the expressed needs of industry. Rapid change will require political action, but this must be based on a more detailed knowledge of the structure and functioning of the educational system and of the social forces which share it.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

NOTES

1. See Venables (1956), p621, for a list of Joint Committee courses and the years in which they were introduced.
2. Holmes, P W, 'The Business Education Council', Coombe Lodge Report, Vol. 9, No. 7, 1976, p232.

3. Following recommendations in the McMeeking (1959) and Arnold (1960) Reports.
4. See 'Assessment and Examinations in BEC Awards', BEC, March 1977, p 1.
5. 'Initial Guidelines on the Implementation of Policy', BEC, May 1977, p 1.
6. In this connection see Pring (1976 pp 104-7) for cautionary comments on the use of themes as a means of integration.
7. 'Assessment for BEC Awards', BEC Circular 4/77, November 1977, para 8.
8. A comparison, for example, of national failure and distinction rates shows that since BEC started its course, the former are lower and the latter higher than under the Joint Committee system. Summary statistics can be found in the Haslegrave Report (1969) and BEC's Annual Report 1984-1985.
9. BEC Circular 4/77, op. cit.
10. See Schwab (1964) in Golby et al., (1975, p257).
11. Refer to Heathcote, G et al., 'Aims, objectives and goals', NATFHE Journal, June-July 1980, pp26-28, for a discussion of the use of curriculum planning models in further education.

REFERENCES

Cantor, L.M. and Roberts, I.F., 1972 'Further Education in England and Wales', Routledge and Kegan Paul

Cotgrove, S. 1958 'Technical Education and Social Change' Allen and Unwin

Crick Report, 1964 'Report of the Advisory Sub-Committee on a Higher Award in Business Studies', NACEIC, HMSO

Haslegrave Report, 1969, 'Report of the Committee on Technician Courses and Examinations', NACEIC, HMSO

Heathcote, G., et al 1980 'Aims, Objectives and Goods' NATFHE Journal

Holmes, P.W., 1976 'Business Education Council' Coombe Lodge Report

McMeeking Report, 1959 'Report of Advisory Committee on Further Education for Commerce', HMSO

Percy Report, 1945 'Higher Technological Education, Report of the Committee', Minister of Education

Robbins Report, 1963 'Higher Education, Report of the Committee on Higher Education', HMSO

Schwab, J.J., 1964 in Golby, et al 1975 'Curriculum Design', Croom Helm

Stenhouse, L., 1975 'An Introduction to Curriculum Research' Heinemann

Tyler, R.W., 1949 'Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction' University of Chicago Press

Venables, P.F.R., 1956 'Technical Education' Bell

CHAPTER 3 - INFLUENCES ON BEC'S CURRICULUM POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and examines evidence on possible influences on BEC's curriculum policies. The power of ideas, individuals and organisations will be considered. The relationships between power and the curriculum focuses attention on some central questions.

'Under what conditions and by whom, is power over the organisation and content of the school curriculum organised?

What changes are taking place in the distribution of such power, and to what pressures are these changes due?'

(In Power and the Curriculum, Richards (ed) 1978, p18)

Such questions are equally relevant to further education, especially in view of the substantial changes in content, organisation and changes in the form of control over curricula that have occurred in the last decade.

The Haslegrave Committee, which recommended the establishment of BEC reported in 1969. The establishment of BEC took a further five years. In June 1975, BEC issued a consultative document which set out the

Council's views on business education and called for views and advice.¹ After nine months of consultation, BEC issued, in March 1976, its first policy statement² and in the following year initial guidelines on implementation of policy were issued.³ A few colleges started BEC courses in September 1978 and by September 1982, all Joint Committee courses were phased out. Since its initial guidelines in May 1977 BEC has issued a considerable number of documents on curriculum matters. They have added to its initial policy, but not changed in any issue of substance.

Despite the unavailability of some evidence, for example, internal papers of BEC and DES, there is not enough space in this chapter to review adequately all material collected. A selection of what are judged to be the more important influences has therefore been made. The following are identified as major influences for discussion on the grounds that they affect all institutions offering BEC courses. Other material collected focused on how influences affected individual institutions rather than problems of a national character:

- a) evaluations and reports on business studies;
- b) the Department of Education and Science; (DES)
- c) Her Majesty's Inspectorate; (HMI)
- d) National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education; (NATFHE)
- e) the Business Education Teachers' Association; (BETA)
- f) other influences.

EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS ON BUSINESS STUDIES

Reports evaluating the state of business studies curricula in the 1970s are considered first in order to provide a background to discussion of the change. Such reports, and the growth of public debate generally, on business education were stimulated by the publication of the Haslegrave Report in 1969.

Political and Economic Planning (PEP) were commissioned by the DES to conduct three surveys of business education in the early 'seventies. The report most pertinent to BEC is on the HND in Business Studies (Daniel, 1971). The other reports are concerned with CNAAB business studies degrees (Daniel and Pugh, 1975) and European business education (Seglow and Thomas, 1974), and will not be considered here.

Research for the 1971 report was carried out in 1969 and concentrated on the job experience of HND graduates and their views on the course. An attempt was made to contact all HND graduates since the course started in 1967; the response rate was about 70%. It was found that holders of the Higher National Diplomas obtained good jobs in industry and commerce comparable with those filled by graduates from disciplines such as economics. The students, in general, held the course in very high regard, but there was widespread unease about content, teaching methods and status. The main criticism was that the course should be more practical and the course was considered to be too superficial, with too many subjects. Fewer subjects it was suggested would help enable greater depth and critical understanding to be achieved and subjects such as economics and law should be made more relevant to business situations; no attempt was suggested to

integrate subjects. More stress should be placed on communication skills. (ibid pp42-48)

BEC's policies on integration, stress on the practical, and the introduction of central themes can be seen as an attempt to meet some of these criticisms. However, presenting subject matter in an integrated form may give rise to the danger of superficiality of treatment. This is a not uncommon criticism of BEC courses by students, especially those who, immediately prior to study for an HND, have followed a traditional sixth-form 'A' level course.

PEP concluded that the HND should continue to be a 'broadly based, general education in business subjects greater specialisation would be against the long term interests of students'. The main content should be based around quantitative methods, (mathematics and statistics), the behavioural sciences and economics (ibid pp49-69).

A survey of twenty-five English colleges running the HND, by Robertson and Manning (1972) tended to support the findings of the PEP report. It suggested minor reforms, with the emphasis on teaching method, compared to the major changes later introduced by BEC. The PEP report (Daniel, 1971) whilst encouraging debate on business education was not the blueprint for the changes introduced. An important point is that PEP did not suggest a major attempt at integration. It was BEC that made integration aynch-pin of its policies.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (DES)

The DES and HMI will be considered separately. However, it is recognised that it is becoming harder to distinguish the policy-making function of administrators and HMI in the DES.

Little direct information on DES policy on particular sectors of further education is available, (assuming that such policies exist). One public statement, however, by J L Gayler, HMI, is a useful starting point for a discussion of the relationship between BEC and DES. At a conference in 1973, Gayler referred to DES policy on further education. (Coombe Lodge, 1973, pp333-334).

He pointed out that the DES had no specific policy on business education, nor for other particular fields such as science or engineering. One reason for this, in business studies, was the difficulty of manpower forecasting. He said the Secretary of State exercised control in only a general way through delegation to local authorities, Joint Committees and 'in recent years, by the establishment of autonomous bodies, such as the CNAA, TEC and (in future) BEC..... . The establishment of these bodies is a deliberate act on the part of the Secretary of State ' (ibid)

Since 1973 this policy has been followed. BEC was created in 1974 and more recently the National Advisory Board (NAB).⁴

Another autonomous body, the Manpower Services Commission (MSC), operating under the aegis of the Department of Employment and supported by very substantial funding, has been a powerful influence

on further education curricula since 1973, when it was established.

Another agency influencing education curricula is the Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit (FEU) set up by DES in 1977.

Both HMI and the administrative branch of the DES influence BEC and FEU through membership of the boards and committees of these bodies. It is hard to tell which is the more important. However, as the administrative branch controls funds, one suspects it is more influential. This stress on planning is not surprising during a period of economic recession, public expenditure cuts, and scepticism about the contribution of education to economic growth. Moreover, it is a time when urgent and perhaps unconventional ways are required to ameliorate the chronic problem of unemployment and to provide the new range of skills to supply the labour demands of a markedly changing industrial structure. During such a period there is pressure on an education system, further and higher education included, to operate seemingly more relevant courses and curricula and to be more cost-effective.

Since the DES appears to have distanced itself from control of, and intervention in all but the broadest aspects of curriculum policy, its detailed power over the curriculum has devolved to BEC. One view of the relationship between BEC and DES is contained in the FEU report on curriculum control (FEU, 1981 p21):

'Since the establishment of the (BEC) Council, the Secretary of State has not attempted to influence or direct the Council in the content of its educational and training policies. The Council has close and cordial relations with the DES.'

In this FEU report, no evidence or arguments are presented either for or against these assertions. Close and cordial relations may be the outcome of pursuing policies known to be acceptable to the DES. It is hard to believe that the DES would not attempt to influence or direct BEC if its philosophy and practice on business education were at variance with the department itself or any government plans and general policies on further education which may exist. The power of the DES over BEC, and other autonomous bodies in education, is absolute in the sense that it surely has the power to override decisions made by BEC. The DES created BEC, sustains it, appoints its council members, and could extinguish its life. The conclusion is, then, that BEC's policies are very probably in accord with the general view and policies of the DES on business education.

In the early 1970s, when BEC was deciding on changes in business education curriculum policy and on detailed curriculum matters such as integration, there is no evidence about DES influence. In common with many areas of government activity, the relationship between the DES and the other government departments and autonomous bodies appears to be cloaked in secrecy.⁵ Apparently some matters of curriculum may not be discussed between Ministers and Members of Parliament.⁶

HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE (HMI)

This section presents views on business education publicly expressed by members of HMI, either officially or unofficially. These views are compared with BEC's policies. No necessary causal link is suggested between views expressed by HMI, or its individual members, and subsequent policies adopted by BEC. HMI views are advanced only as indicators of trends in official thinking on business education policy.

Radical change in business education had been forecast in 1965, before Haslegrave, by E I Baker, HMI Staff Inspector in Business Studies, who argued in the official Department of Education and Science Journal, 'Trends in Education' (Jan 1968 pp25-30) that 'nothing is sacred in the field of business studies'. He suggested breaking down subject barriers between law, accounts and economics; student-centred learning; integrated problem-solving; and a move away from traditional examinations towards continuous assessment.

Four years later, at a conference at the Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, (Coombe Lodge Reports, 1969) J L Gayler, HMI, also from the FE Branch of the Inspectorate, criticised the Joint Committee HNC in Business Studies for its high failure rate. In his view this was due to excessive reliance on examinations in assessment - examinations 70% and course work 30%. He was convinced that 'the examination system as it exists to-day..... was ripe for reform' (ibid p11). This comment is interesting in the light of BEC's major reforms to assessment to help overcome the types of problem pointed out below.

At a Coombe Lodge conference in 1973⁷ Gayler again expressed his views on the future of business education. Some of his proposals, made before BEC was set up, are very similar to BEC's policies. He suggested that consideration should be given to a problem-finding, rather than a problem-solving approach; questioned the suitability of academic economics for business studies courses; repeated his concern over high wastage and examination failure rates and forecast that we might have to reconsider our methods of teaching business studies.

Both types of integrating problem oriented teaching, finding and solving, are stressed by BEC in its overall philosophy, although most emphasis in its main publications is placed on problem-solving. However, BEC's learning objectives for general and national level cross-modular assignment (CMA) programmes include specific objectives on identification of problems.⁸ A quotation from Dewey used by Gayler (1973) is worth repeating in full as it has been quoted by others in specific reference to BEC. It also summarises some of the main aspects of BEC's philosophy on business education.

'Education does not belong to the ivory tower. It should be a right for the masses, not a privilege for the elite. Its approach should be practical, pragmatic and experimental, rather than scholastic, abstruse and theoretical. Its concern should be with man and his workaday world'.

It seems that BEC did see a need for some reform akin to Gayler's comments in 1973 by a movement away from single subject based assignments and examinations to a stress on problem identification/

solving, practical experience and the use of active learning methods using work simulation as these phrases were commonplace at BEC dissemination conferences for college staff, as well as being the basic themes of BECs first and subsequent policy documents. The concern over high rates of wastage and examination failure, which the Haslegrave Committee shared, also finds an echo in Dewey's philosophy. His belief in education as a 'right for the masses' is perhaps partly reflected in BEC's policy that any student recruited with integrity, who works conscientiously, should pass his course.⁹ This policy implies teaching and assessment geared to agreed minimum criteria rather than the normal curve: mastery instead of credentialism.

It is not being claimed that the views of any one individual were a major influence on BEC policy. They are advanced, however, as evidence of a trend in thinking on curriculum issues by a significant and influential minority in business education circles.

Coombe Lodge, for example, is a recognised forum for sounding out official views. Conferences are attended by senior staff from colleges and personal views of HMI expressed there are given respect and seen as possible indicators of official policy which should not be disregarded. Views presented there receive wide circulation through formal and informal reports by conference members in their own colleges and through Coombe Lodge's publication.

The view has been advanced by Salter and Tapper (1981) that members of HMI are 'organic intellectuals' whose function is to legitimise current DES ideology. They claim that the ability of HMI to perform this role successfully depends on the public seeing a clear

distinction between the DES and the Inspectorate, (ibid p234). Members of HMI must appear to be the wise men of education. In further education there seems to be little evidence for this contention. HMIs have become less visible to staff in colleges in the 1980s - visits are infrequent - and seem now more closely associated with the administrative branch of DES. A case could be made that officers of BEC and TEC, including part-time moderators, are the advocates and publicists of DES policies and values rather than the Inspectorate.

A recent indication of HMI's policy on business education in schools and further education is given in a survey by HMI (Wales), (Welsh Office, 1979). Some of the findings can be justifiably applied to England. HMI (Wales), carried out the survey in the sessions 1973/74 and 1977/78. The report argued 'the need for a fundamental reconsideration of the curriculum of commercial and business studies' (ibid p84).

It strongly recommended the integration of subjects plus specialist options. The need for collaboration between teachers of different disciplines was stressed. It was suggested that more attention should be given to work-related skills such as 'greater and social and personal competence and greater confidence and skill in mathematics and written English, especially in the context of business processes' (ibid). There was a need for a new role of course co-ordinators to promote integration and teacher collaboration.

All these changes were seen as necessary to make business education more relevant to current and future needs of students and commerce. The similarity to BEC's policy - cores, options, practical relevance,

themes (people, numeracy, and communication), and integration - is striking, particularly if HMI (Wales) and BEC conducted their researches independently. Both reached the same diagnosis on the state of business education.

Even if one disagrees with the values underpinning the report's findings, the thoroughness of its research and arguments should be commended. They tend to be characterised by firm conclusions with few arguments and little evidence adduced in support. BEC has consistently adopted this approach. Since its establishment, BEC has been very reluctant to enter into open and serious debate, in particular with lecturers, about fundamental policy and values issues in business education. It can be argued that BEC sometimes enters into dialogue, listens and then pursues its own policies regardless of the debate. (Report on BTEC National Courses 1985.)

BEC has carried out consultations, invited opinions, and conducted some research into business education. As no record of this work has been published, its extent and quality cannot be judged. The survey by HMI (Wales) 1979 shows that a strong, reasoned case for business education curriculum reform can be made. As the report supports BEC policies, it is surprising that BEC has not used it as part of its strategy for producing change in colleges. There appears to be no reference to the report in any BEC publications. This raises several questions about BEC's methods for effecting changes, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Becher and McClure (1978, p57) stressed the power exercised by the Further Education Inspectorate over curricula until the mid 1970's:

'Their work carried curricular discretion with administrative obligations, and so produced in the colleges of further education a degree of control over the curriculum unlike any exercised by the central government over primary and secondary education.'

Since BEC assumed responsibility for validation of further education business courses, the direct influence of HMI on curricula appears to have been greatly reduced. If HMI continues to influence business curricula, it is less directly and possibly less formally than before. Even if BEC had not been established, it seems probable, given the views expressed earlier and the theory of the report by HMI (Wales), that change would have happened. BEC has undoubtedly accelerated change, at least at the formal level.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS IN FURTHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION (NATFHE)

NATFHE is the main trade union and professional association for lecturers in further education. In its evidence to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee (1972), NATFHE (then ATTI) approved the establishment of TEC and BEC. It felt confident that the council's work would reduce administrative complexity. It welcomed the Haslegrave proposals on the composition of the BEC and TEC councils, which NATFHE understood had been accepted by the then Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mrs Shirley Williams. Teachers were

to form about forty per cent of the council's membership (ibid, Education and Art Sub-committee, Evidence, 21 February 1972, p191). Neither this hope nor that of a similar system has been realised. (There are three teachers among the twenty-four BEC Council members listed in BEC's 1980-1981 Annual Report (pp25-26); although the number of members drawn from education administration (directors of education, local councillors, principals, heads of department) is eleven. The policy before 1978, of giving a majority of teachers on Schools' Council was not followed for BEC and TEC. It may have been felt that the pace of change would be faster without a substantial or majority teacher interest on the BEC and TEC.

In the early days, NATFHE policy was to support BEC. However, a divergence between official and lecturers' views quickly arose. The main objection to BEC was the extra administrative work its policies produced for lecturers at a time of public expenditure restraint. Concern was also expressed at the danger of reduced standards. Particular interest groups of lecturers, such as subject specialists in economics and law, whose predominant positions on business studies courses were threatened by BEC's policies on curriculum content and integration objected very strongly.

In the writer's own experience such subject specialists all too often claim that there is insufficient time for them to raise the students' knowledge to a sufficiently high standard in a particular specialism. This argument may be countered in two ways, firstly the student requires only a working knowledge and needs to be shown how that knowledge in one area can be usefully combined with knowledge in other integrated areas; secondly many subject specialists are so narrow in

their thinking or they have not worked in industry or commerce for some considerable time they do not understand the need for an integrated approach to some workaday problems.

The officers of NATFHE began to respond to members' feelings. The education secretary of NATFHE, Janey Rees, a former chairman of Inner London Education Authority's (ILEA's) Further and Higher Education Committee, considered that 'we are trying to achieve a major curriculum reform for peanuts'. She felt that it was another example of British ad hocery. No other country would have put through such a major curriculum reform without extra resources. (Guardian, 9 May 1978).

At NATFHE'S 1977 Annual Conference, TEC and BEC were criticised harshly by delegates. A motion was passed calling for postponement of the introduction of further TEC and BEC courses until the structure of the courses had been approved by the union as educationally desirable and time allowances, in the form of relief from teaching, for extra administrative and other work had been agreed. The delegates instructed the union's National Executive Committee (NEC) not to co-operate in the introduction of new courses until these allowances had been settled. The union's NEC argued that there had been consultation, (Times Higher Education Supplement, 10 June 1977, p2).

Since then, modest allowances have been secured in some authorities but not on a national scale. In some areas there are no allowances. Introduction of courses was not postponed, although the position stated above, I understand, remains NATFHE's official policy. The researcher is not a member of this trade union and letters to NATFHE

requesting opinions or official policies regarding BEC remain unanswered. The relative inability of the NEC to implement the motion, and generally to influence BEC's policies, caused some friction with the membership. The general conclusion is that NATFHE has exercised little influence on BEC's curriculum policies, their effects, and the pace at which BEC has introduced its reforms. For the first three or so years, the official union approach was to support BEC policy. Change was welcomed. NATFHE continues to send representatives to BEC's committees. The NATFHE committee members do not, however, appear to exercise much influence on BEC policy. In colleges there has been a good deal of grumbling and often bitterness from lecturers about BEC. However, as lecturers recognise that these courses provide them with their livelihood, and that colleges compete with each other, their complaints have not been translated into industrial actions.

BUSINESS EDUCATION TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION (BETA)

The aim of BETA, formed in 1973, is to bring together business studies lecturers of different disciplines, teaching on BEC and CNAA courses, in order to promote business studies as an inter-disciplinary activity. Membership is corporate: colleges, not individuals. This type of membership may have increased BETA's influence through appearing to give its views the approval of colleges by virtue of their membership. The representatives of business studies departments of colleges attending BETA meetings tend to be senior staff. This may further increase the authority of BETA. The association acts also as a counterweight to the influence of subject associations such as the Economics Association. The fact that BTEC officers often attend BETA Conferences indicates that BEC sees BETA as an important and useful forum for disseminating BEC views and receiving opinion from Colleges.

From the researcher's attendance at various BETA seminars the views of BETA appear largely in accord with BEC's; they support integration, the breakdown of subject barriers and a more practical approach. Its formation in the early '70s is another indication of the growing dissatisfaction with the nature of business studies courses at that time and of the need for reform.

OTHER INFLUENCES

To complete the picture of forces influencing BEC's curriculum changes, several other organisations need to be considered. For discussion, they are grouped into two categories: bodies within education and organisations representing employers and professions. Reference is also made to the views of some individuals.

Groups within education are discussed first. Regional Advisory Councils (RACs) have played only a minor part in the formation and implementation of BEC's policies. BEC's reference to them, in its first Policy Statement (BEC, 1976 pp24-25) carried an implication that it wished to distance itself from these bodies. The need for a national structure for validation and maintenance of standards was stressed, and it was stated that the RACs and Regional Examination Boards (REBs) were not to have an examining function on behalf of BEC. Under the old system, some REBs had organised examinations, particularly at COS level. RACs have helped to disseminate BEC policies by organising courses and conferences. These developments are further signs of increasing centralisation of power over further public sector higher education within the DES and the central bodies for which it is responsible.

A decade ago when BEC and TEC were being established, as separate institutions, general support for the concept of autonomous councils in technician education was expressed in education and trade union circles. It was seen as an improvement on the previous system.

In evidence to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee in 1972 the Association of Principals of Technical Institutions and the Association of Colleges of Further and Higher Education welcomed the proposed establishment of BEC and TEC. They felt something had been missing since the creation of the industrial training boards in relation to the educational needs of technicians.¹⁰ The TUC, in its statement on further education to the same Committee, also welcomed the proposals to set up TEC and BEC.¹¹ In its statement to the Committee ATTI (now NATFHE) pointed to inconsistency in HMI policies for different Joint Committees.¹²

Three years earlier at a Coombe Lodge conference on business education (Coombe Lodge, 1969, p 20), a critical view of the Joint Committees had been expressed. It was felt that they granted course approvals in what appeared to be a very cursory manner.

Turning from the college to the employer side, the impact of the British Association for Commercial and Industrial Education (BACIE) is next examined. Addressing the 1975 Annual Conference of BACIE, on the topic of BEC and TEC, Sir William Pile, the then Permanent Secretary at the DES, stressed that, for those in education and training, the first objective had to be to optimise the efficiency of industrial and commercial manpower. He felt that the best courses were those that integrated general and vocational studies consciously, rather than by

the accident of their co-existence in the same course. (BACIE Journal, September 1975, pp 126-127).

The stress on integration is particularly interesting. This approach is an essential part of many further education curriculum developments since the mid 70s. BEC has put much emphasis on integration, and also on co-operation between colleges and employers in the design of courses. National economic requirements, as expressed by employers, are the main guiding principle of curriculum design.

BACIE, itself, has also stressed the necessity for co-operation of colleges and employers in a policy document prepared for submission to BEC. (Rationalising Clerical Courses and Examinations, BACIE Journal, September 1973 pp66-73). A major change in examination methods was recommended, including more informative descriptions of student performance for employers. In its response to BEC's initial policy proposals, BACIE cautioned against excessive change and recommended closer links between education and commerce. (Business Education at Sub-degree Level, BACIE Journal, February 1976, p35-36). BACIE is an important and influential body representing employers. BEC's task would no doubt have been harder without its support.

While the support of BACIE is helpful to BEC, the co-operation of professional associations is vital. One of the BEC's main aims is to secure more exemptions for holders of its awards from the examinations of professional associations. In general it is achieving this aim. BEC's 1980/81 Annual Report states that 'recognition of BEC awards by professional bodies continues to grow'(p11). BEC's latest circular on recognition lists over fifty bodies granting exemptions.

There have been two major setbacks. The Institute of Bankers (IOB), which used to give quite generous recognition to joint committee awards has been less generous since 1985. The main reason for this change in policy appears to be a preference for subject based courses and a concern over standards on integrated courses. There is now less overlap between the content of IOB and BEC syllabuses.

The main professional accounting bodies such as the Chartered Association of Certified Accountants, Institute of Cost and Management Accountants and Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators also no longer grant as much recognition. They express some concern over standards, but their new attitude is also linked to the growth of accounting technician qualifications. BEC awards are seen as nearer to these than to the professional level.¹³ The influence of the accountancy bodies on the B2 (Finance) Boards guideline is noticeable. These are more traditional in subject content and structure than the guidelines of other boards. In general, however, professional associations have co-operated with BEC and have not proved a conservative influence on its reforms. They seem not to have been a source of ideas for BEC.

Professional associations have been far more influential than Industrial Training Boards (ITBs). The Boards' impact on commerce has been much less than in technical areas. Even their slight influence appears to have ended with the abolition of most of the ITBs in 1982.

Recently the Confederation of British Industries (CBI) has given more attention to business education. In the past the CBI appears to have been concerned chiefly with technical education. The organisation of the joint conference by Coombe Lodge and CBI on the future of BEC is evidence of this new interest. (Coombe Lodge, 1981).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

BEC's policies on the curriculum have been shaped by a variety of forces. A main factor has been the DES policy to establish a national, central validating body such as BEC for Business Studies education. This greater centralisation of control was a necessary condition for the development of a uniform national philosophy on business studies curricula. The climate of opinion, at least in some government circles, which favours a close correspondence between national economic needs and education provision has also been a key influence on BEC's curricular policies.

It appears that BEC believed stricter control was necessary for rapid change in curriculum design, teaching and learning methods and that this more centralised approach was justified. Control had to be more prescriptive, and detailed than, for example, that of the CNAA. Given that there would be resistance to BEC's views, particularly in further education establishments, either because of explicit disagreement with BEC's policies, or simply through inertia, too much diversity and independence on decision about curriculum plans and the pace of change could not be allowed. Close and continuing supervision was necessary.

This approach of BEC is related to general trends in education in the 'seventies: greater centralisation of control of education and the changing relationship between education and the economy. At the time of writing this thesis the thrust of centralised control is being evidenced by the proposed introduction of a national core curriculum in secondary education by Kenneth Baker, Secretary of State for

Education (1987). The theme of centralisation of control was developed in the discussion of the influence of the HMI and DES on BEC's policies. These trends produced conditions which favoured the creation of a uniform, national policy on business studies curricula, which allows little local diversity on main aspects of the curriculum.

Key concepts in this policy, or philosophy, are: integration, practical relevant work, problem-solving, central themes, active learning methods, student-centredness, skills, objectives, variety in assessment, core knowledge, team teaching, and collective course management as set out in the Initial Guidelines on the Implementation of Policy 1977.

A vital factor in allowing BEC to formulate its philosophy was the lack of any concerted opposition. No organisation or individual in any senior post in education appears to have argued publicly for the status quo or an alternative set of reforms significantly different from those of BEC. Integration, for example, was fashionable in schools before it reached further education. The ideology of integration is probably the most dominant set of values and beliefs underpinning BEC's policies.

From the evidence reviewed it seems clear that a powerful movement for reform of business education emerged in the 'seventies in parallel with calls for change in education generally. BEC responded with proposals to meet the main criticisms of business curricula that had been expressed. An important conclusion is that the main impetus and pressure for change did not come from lecturers. BEC, therefore, could not necessarily rely on the support of teachers as much as on other groups in its attempts to implement change.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

NOTES

1. - BEC Consultative Document, June 1975
2. First Policy Statement, BEC, March 1976
3. Initial Guidelines on the Implementation of Policy, BEC, May 1977
4. The National Advisory Board, set up in late 1981, is quickly extending its power over allocation of courses and resources in the public sector of higher education in England and Wales. Several reports on NAB's policies have appeared in the educational press. See, for example, 'NAB considers closure of unpopular courses', THES, 7 May 1982, pp1 and 3.
5. The recent evaluation of BTEC National Courses (1985) makes no reference to DES policies on areas of business education.
6. According to the BBC1 current affairs television programme 'Panorama', 8 March 1982, Ministers were not permitted to answer questions from Members of Parliament on school discipline and curricula.
7. Coombe Lodge Report, 'Business Education in the Polytechnics,' 73/46, Vol. 6, No. 19, pp933-7.
8. BEC National Awards, January 1979, pp14-17.
9. 'Assessment for BEC Awards', BEC circular 4/77, November 1977, para 9.

10. Evidence, 14 February 1972, in the form of a memorandum to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee 1972-73, Report of Education and Arts Sub-Committee, HMSO, p.155.
11. Ibid, Appendix 18 para 20, p712.
12. Ibid, Evidence 21 February 1972, p188.
13. See Coombe Lodge Report, BEC, 'The Way Ahead,' Vol.14, No. 10, 1981, pp537-8, for a discussion of the relationship between BEC and professional bodies.

REFERENCES

- Baker, E.I, 1968, 'The Future of Business Studies', Trends in Education
- Becher, T. and MacLure, S 1978, 'The Politics of Curriculum Change!' Hutchinson
- David, W. W. 1971, 'Business Education at 18+, a Survey of HND Business Studies' PEP Broadsheet 524.
- David, W. W. and Pugh, H, 1975, 'Sandwich Courses in Higher Education', PEP Broadsheet 557.
- Haslegrave Report 1969 'Report of the Committee on Technical Courses and Examinations' NACEIC, HMSO
- Richards, C, ed. 1978 'Power and the Curriculum' Nafferton Books
- Salter, B, and Tapper, T. 1981 'Education, Politics and the State: The Theory and Practice of Educational Change', Grant McIntyre.
- Seglow, P. and Thomas, M. 1974 'Re-Experience Business Education and the EEC', PEP Broadsheet 545.

CHAPTER 4 - BEC'S CHANGE STRATEGIES FOR CURRICULUM AND EXAMINATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Strategies used by BEC to implement its curriculum reforms are discussed in this chapter. The first section summarises BEC's objectives. In the second and third sections the strategies adopted by BEC are identified, and analysed from a practical standpoint. Methods used to influence groups outside and within education are discussed. In the fourth section, BEC's approach to communication is examined. Finally, change strategies are scrutinised in the light of theories which appear relevant to the conditions of further education in England and Wales. Observations are made where appropriate on the possible effectiveness of these strategies.

Many references are contained in BEC's Annual Reviews, particularly the 4th and 5th Annual reviews 1982/3 on the need for change generally, as well as particular reforms required. However, few explicit statements on its policies for securing change exist, apart from those stressing the obvious need for good communications and co-operation. It is not clear whether BEC attempted to secure change through a planned strategy based on a systematic analysis of change literature or developed its strategies in an ad hoc way.

In the absence of a statement of policy on change from BEC itself the probable change strategies have been identified from an examination of BEC publications, in the light of experience of the writer and other colleagues who teach on BEC courses.

BEC's Objectives

The terms of reference of BEC are to plan, administer, keep under review and control standards of a national system of non-degree level business studies. These functions appear to be concerned primarily with curriculum planning and control rather than curriculum development per se. BEC assesses needs, decides on aims, devises course structures, issues guidelines and rules on content, teaching methods, standards and assessment. But even though BEC's decisions have substantial development implications, BEC's function is to make curriculum planning decisions, rather than to use its resources for funding projects in colleges or producing materials itself. In this respect BEC contrasts sharply with development agencies for schools such as the Nuffield Foundation and the Schools Council. BEC has, however, provided financial sponsorship for some development work, for example, on distance learning and materials such as specimen assignments for core and cross-modular programmes that have been produced for general and national levels.

It is clearly BEC's policy that development work should be carried out almost exclusively in educational establishments by lecturers. The responsibility for and the costs of this work are borne chiefly by staff in institutions offering BEC courses. It is worth noting that BEC decided not to mount pilot projects at this juncture. Rapid national change was considered essential. A recently published evaluation criticised TEC for precisely the same approach. It was recommended that 'new proposals should be trial-tested and supportively evaluated'. (FEU, 1981, p.viii)

BEC's objectives, or functions, can be divided into two groups: explicit and tacit or hidden. The main explicit objectives as set out on page 2 of BEC's First Policy Statement of March 1976 are: to introduce a simplified system of awards for non-degree business education and to secure national and international recognition for these awards; to raise standards but to reduce wastage and failure rates; to increase the range of exemptions for BEC award holders from professional associations' examinations as part of a process of long-term rationalisation to expand substantially the market for business education, for example, post-experience courses; to improve the cost-effectiveness of business education through the more widespread use of teaching methods such as directed private study; and to reform the curriculum so as to meet more effectively national economic needs. It is not possible here to discuss adequately the methods BEC uses to attempt to achieve all of these objectives. Administrative reforms, marketing of awards, public relations, and cost-effectiveness will not be covered in any detail. The objectives overlap to some degree and in a sense all the other objectives are subordinate to the last one of reforming the curriculum to meet economic needs. Hence prior condition for change in colleges was co-operation of employers.

The explicit objectives are well documented, whereas the tacit or hidden objectives, and the processes by which they might be achieved are, by their nature, much harder to identify and more controversial. The following are suggested as possible hidden objectives: the promotion of a vocational, rather than a broader educational ethos (in so far as they are separate) in further education; a revision of the content of what constitutes socially acceptable knowledge in business

education; socialisation of students, and lecturers, into methods of working based on co-operation and problem-solving appropriate for current and future methods of operation in industry and commerce; and the creation of a more effective social and occupational selection mechanism at the technician level.

BEC's initial priority was to secure acceptance of its new system of awards and its reforms by its customers: employers, professional associations, potential students and parents. Without the support of employers in particular it was felt there would be little purpose in proceeding to the next stage of promoting change in the further education establishments. Further education establishments are still far more dependent on the market and lecturers have traditionally had less independence over curriculum issues than their school colleagues. John Bruce Lockhart (BEC's Chairman, at this time) saw gaining the confidence of employers as the single most important factor for the future. (Trade and Industry, 26 March 1976, p850.) He added that this was not to say that the teachers were not important. In his foreword to BEC's 'Initial Guidelines on Implementation' (BEC, 1977) he referred to the danger that employers might 'put away their cheque books'. BEC has consistently attempted to involve employers closely in its activities. Nearly half of the Council Members of BEC are drawn from industry and commerce and employers have substantial representation on BEC's committees; colleges are encouraged to make their courses work-related and higher level course submissions are required to show evidence of adequate consultation with local employers on the course design. An example of co-operation was a joint CBI and BEC conference on the future of BEC (Coombe Lodge 1981).

BEC has attempted to inform parents, teachers in schools and potential students of the new system of BEC awards and the approach taken to the curriculum. Despite a continuing public relations effort, BEC's courses are not yet as well known by employers as had been hoped. The researcher's own experience and that of other colleges show that the larger, usually nationwide, employers are aware of BEC and the new awards but the smaller employers at local level do not appreciate the differences between the pre BEC HNC/D and the new BEC awards. Apart from just increasing the number of BEC students, the hope is presumably to widen the appeal of the practical orientation of BEC courses.

BEC's Strategies

I now turn to change strategies intended to act directly on colleges, bearing in mind that there exist continuing pressures, from employers, and to a lesser extent professional associations and students. These pressures may not always act in the way BEC might wish and may conflict with each other.

BEC makes substantial use of its monopoly position as a central validating body to effect reform through the use of administrative power and regulation. Strategies in the following four areas will be discussed:

- a) course philosophy, structure, content and teaching method;
- b) assessment, moderation and standards;
- c) the validation system self-evaluation;
- d) collective course management.

In addition to securing quick adoption of BEC policies in colleges these strategies are also, no doubt, intended to encourage long term staff development in colleges in order to change attitudes and perhaps reduce the need for continuous monitoring of colleges.

Philosophy, Structure, Content and Teaching Method

The philosophy and structure of all three levels of BEC courses is decided centrally. The content of general and national level modules is decided by BEC; colleges must use these syllabuses. The modules were designed in objectives form, by sub-committees of BEC Boards working within BEC's philosophy of integration and a practical approach. There appeared to be little disagreement on BEC philosophy or the need to abandon traditional teaching and assessment methods such as the essay. Groups were working on other modules at the same time. Cross-fertilisation between modules was encouraged by BEC officers. The concept of the cross-modular assignment (CMA), BEC's primary means for integration, appears to have originated from this process of mixing ideas of different groups.

At the higher level, guidelines for core modules are drawn up in a similar way. Colleges devise their cores on the basis of these guidelines.¹ There are no guidelines issued for option modules, but the form of design and the content must be in accord with BEC philosophy. Cores and options designed by colleges are subject to validation by BEC.

BEC does not possess as much power to influence teaching methods as it does to determine the formal content of modules. One of BEC's hardest tasks, and probably the most intractable, is clearly that of producing change in practice in the classroom. Control of content taught can be achieved in part through assessment systems, which is also used by BEC to encourage change in teaching and learning methods. Moderators, for example, strongly advise the use of case studies in examinations and student-centred problem-based assignment programmes.

BEC originally had not intended to issue curriculum materials. In response to requests from colleges BEC arranged for volunteer committees to design a few sets of specimen assignments to support active, integrated and student-centred teaching methods. Of much greater help would be commercially published textbooks written specially for BEC higher courses and these are only now (1986) coming onto the market - a wide selection is now available. A personal conclusion from observing the impact of BEC's attempts to secure changes in teaching methods is the not unexpected one that substantial resources for staff development are required to change the practice of most lecturers. Alternative methods of development such as the various forms of self-evaluation or the teacher-as-researcher are still relatively unknown in further education.

Assessment and Moderation of Standards

In Chapter 1 the view was advanced that the BEC assessment system is one of the main means used to produce change. The strategy is the familiar one of teaching to the examination. In BEC's case there is an extra twist of teaching to the assignment programmes which in principle should be agreed between a BEC centre and its moderator.

The rules for assessment are set out in a complex BEC document, Circular 4/77.² The essence of the system is that a full-time student, for example, must obtain in order to pass each year of his two year course, a profile of at least thirteen D grades (six for examinations, six for course work and one for cross-modular work) subject to compensation and referral provisions. This gives a weighting of just over half for course work compared to thirty per cent under the Joint Committee system. Under that system the student took only five examinations. The BEC student is now arguably under greater pressure from examinations and to complete course work.

The purpose of this reform appears to be in part at least, to encourage students to work consistently throughout the year. The system is also designed to ensure assessment of most of the content of each module. This is achieved through the assignment programme and examinations jointly with little choice allowed to students. Assignments and examination questions are required to be work-related, integrating, non-academic and problem-oriented; case studies are favoured. Answers in essay form are discouraged. At the general level BEC is able to implement this policy for examinations because they are centrally set and marked. All other assessments are set and marked locally. In addition to agreeing a centre's assignments and examination papers the moderator samples assessed work to check standards and to gauge how far BEC philosophy has been implemented. This assessment system appears to be a powerful method of forcing lecturers to think about greater variety in assessment methods and to link assessments more closely to teaching method and content, especially with a vigilant moderator.

Under the Joint Committee system standards, in examinations were monitored by national subject assessors. Joint committees had the right to call for course work but in practice never did. Assessors were concerned solely with examinations in their own subjects. Usually their identities were not known to colleges.

The main duties of a BEC moderator, who is a generalist rather than a subject specialist, are to check on the implementation of BEC's policies and to monitor standards. The moderator is an agent for BEC, and in that capacity sends regular reports to BEC on his centres, but he is also intended to be a friend of the college. These roles sometimes conflict. If a moderator is too 'friendly', for example by agreeing to a slow pace of change, validation of a college's course might become harder to obtain. He is also supposed to encourage curriculum development. Normally he moderates three to five centres, on a part-time basis. It is widely felt that this is an excessive load which reduces his ability to promote change, and maintain effective control.³

In particular there is wide concern among lecturers about the ability of moderators to monitor standards. Possible reasons include the heavy workload of moderators, their lack of expertise in specialist areas and their local rather than national function. Which of the moderator's roles is his main one is not entirely clear. The view advanced here is that the primary duty is to act as a change agent for BEC, that is to say, to promote change in colleges using a variety of methods from persuasion to control of examinations. On this view, monitoring of standards, at least in a traditional sense, is a secondary and perhaps even insignificant function. BEC officers would appear not to agree to this view.

Comments raised by BEC students in the writer's own institution at student meetings, Boards of Studies and in tutorials indicate mixed opinions. Full-time students tend to think integrated cores superficial and undemanding compared to 'A' levels or specialist options on their BEC course. Part-time students appear to be satisfied with the new approach. The work experience of day-release students and their greater maturity than full-time students are possible reasons for this finding. In the writer's institution some staff are strongly against the principle of integrated cores. The majority recognise the potential of cores for a more applied approach but believe that in practice standards have fallen noticeably. A typical view expressed by a lecturer, in another institution, is that where there are up to nine lecturers teaching their specialisms on an integrated core, standards were irrelevant. This type of view, however, is based on the assumption that standards should be judged on the traditional criteria used typically for assessing essays in academic subjects. It appears to be assumed by many lecturers that performance will be distributed normally.

BEC appears to want a different conception of standards based on criterion-referenced skills in the areas of problem-solving, communication, social relations, work and so forth. The stress is on practical skills instead of the intellectual abilities associated with a conventional academic view of knowledge. This is the conclusion reached from a study of BEC's annual reviews of standards and other BEC documents. Despite the efforts of moderators, numerous BEC communications to colleges, and a sustained policy to involve employers at all levels, the traditional view of standards is still

held firmly by staff, students and many employers. This is not surprising given the strength of feeling with which views on standards are often held. BEC no doubt realises that standards are a sensitive issue and this may explain the impression one gains of a certain coyness on BEC's part about entering into explicit public discussion on the matter.

The main conclusion on the role of the moderator as an agent for change is that conflict of responsibilities and excessive workloads limit his effectiveness. His role as an external examiner of course and examination work may be considered the one most likely to lead to change. Even here, however, a busy moderator may not have the time to examine enough student work to check that the rhetoric of assessment programmes is matched by corresponding changes in teaching practice. Nor should it be too readily assumed that a moderator will be wholly sympathetic towards BEC policies.⁴ Given their duties in assessment, communications with colleges, and in validation procedures, good selection procedures for appointing moderators are crucial. The moderator system gives BEC more control over establishments than the Joint Committee assessor system, but its effectiveness has not yet been fully demonstrated.

The validation system and self evaluation

The BEC validation committee bases its decisions on moderators' reports and the establishments' course submissions. Permission to run a course is given for periods of between one and five years, usually with conditions. The usual period appears to be three years. Some

establishments have been given two or three short term approvals apparently to encourage faster implementation of BEC policy. Precise figures on rejection rates and periods of approval are not published; in the writer's experience some submissions have certainly been rejected. Approval can be withdrawn or suspended at any time if BEC's requirements are not being met. In the present economic climate this is a powerful strategy for securing change.

Approval to run the HND was withdrawn from Southbank Polytechnic for a short time in 1981. BEC was concerned about inadequate co-ordination of staff teaching on the course and the discovery that part of the course had not been taught. The suspension was lifted after it was satisfied that the management structure of the Polytechnic's Business Department would be improved to enable lecturers to work as a team. (THES, 4 September 1981, p9.)

The BEC Validation Committee for Higher Awards has eighteen members. Half the membership consists of college vice principals and heads of departments; two members are from industry, at general management level; and the remaining members are principal and senior lecturers from colleges. Commitment to BEC policies is no doubt an essential requirement for membership. BEC officers assist the work of the committee.⁵

During the past few years the validation committee has been sending panels of its members to visit further education establishments. The panels meet staff and discuss development and implementation. This strategy is a further incentive for colleges, including those not yet

visited, to treat implementation seriously. The validation system has probably accelerated the pace of change. The threat of suspension is a potent coercive strategy if used selectively, but, if used widely this weapon would be self-defeating through reducing student numbers on BEC courses and causing a loss of revenue to BEC.

BEC encourages establishments to evaluate their BEC courses as part of the validation process. In future it seems that BEC will look for evidence that establishments possess a permanent system for regular review of all aspects of the curriculum. If such systems of self-evaluation became institutionalised they may assist staff development and generally help to promote change. On the other hand, if staff become more critical on curriculum issues, particularly over goals, this may increase the difficulties of BEC in achieving the types of change it believes necessary. Stenhouse (1975, p176) believes that the 'key quality needed in a school, if development is to take place, is reflectiveness: a capacity to review continually and reflectively its own processes and practices'. BEC's encouragement of self-evaluation in colleges is a move in the direction favoured by Stenhouse. However, in the different ethos of the further education establishments with less professional autonomy for lecturers than for teachers in schools, and more controls over the curriculum than in schools, reflectiveness might not be such a potentially valuable aid to development as in schools. It will be interesting for further researchers to examine this point in the light of the introduction of a national core curriculum in schools in the 1990's.

Collective Course Management

The final strategy to be considered within this section is course management structure. BEC strongly urges colleges to adopt a course management structure for BEC courses that is intended to develop team teaching and integration. One feature is mandatory: each centre must appoint a BEC courses co-ordinator. BEC must be told the names of the holders of these posts. The formation of core teams and cross-modular teams is firmly recommended. In its documents BEC puts great stress on the need for team or collective decision-making on curriculum matters. It seems clear that a hierarchical course management structure would, in BEC's eyes, hinder integration. This may not necessarily be so. In a very authoritarian hierarchy an integrated course might be easier to implement, for example, in countries where syllabuses are determined entirely by the state. However, in the conditions of further education, where course development depends in whole or part on the willingness of the individual lecturers, BEC's strategy seems well judged. In further education establishments there is now more discussion and development across subject barriers as well as a more collective commitment to decision-making than before.

How far these four types of change strategy - control of aims and content, assessment and moderation, validation, and collective course management - will lead to longer term change in attitudes and curriculum practice is hard to assess.

The changes that have taken place may not be deep-rooted. Despite changes in surface behaviour, some staff still firmly hold to

attitudes and values on issues such as standards and integration sharply at variance with BEC's philosophy. From BEC's point of view there must remain the haunting fear that if controls were relaxed old habits would quickly reappear. Apart from differences in values, there is also the formidable problem of just changing classroom practice. Another danger facing BEC is that the burden of curriculum planning and administration may exhaust staff, and hinder implementation and staff development even when goodwill is shown. Fowler (1978) pointed to the risk of such a collapse of the system.

Communication

A condition for the success of BEC's methods of effecting change and maintaining control is an effective system of communication with lecturers and other staff in further educational establishments. BEC uses a variety of channels of communication, formal and informal. The primary means is through circulars and other written means. With over five hundred centres this is inevitable. This method is supported by the work of BEC's officers who keep in touch with key personnel and staff generally in colleges by visits, letter and telephone and through attendance at conferences organised by Coombe Lodge, RACs, BETA and other bodies. Although this work is important it has clear limits as there are only six field officers at BEC.

Groups of further education establishments in an area are encouraged to arrange conferences, workshops, and set up working parties on aspects of curriculum such as design of integrated assignments and

assessment. Personal experience has borne out that team teaching and collective decision making, as well as less formal contacts between staff, are important means of communication.

Evidence of BEC's priorities in communication and the effectiveness of its methods is included in a report of a survey of curriculum dissemination strategies of the main validating bodies in further education (FEU, 1980). The most fundamental, general issue identified in the report was the constancy of change: curriculum change is the norm. Two reasons were advanced in support of this view. Firstly, there is the continuing pressure on further education to adopt its courses as a result of the explosion of knowledge and technology and its impact on industry and commerce. Secondly, there are the increasing demands, related to this pressure, by validating bodies for more sophisticated styles of curriculum development in terms of design, implementation and evaluation. The main areas recommended for improvement were design of information dissemination systems; distribution networks (ie networks of social contacts) and guidance and support for staff receiving complex and innovative messages (op.cit. p31). Above all a plea was made for a more systematic and co-ordinated strategy for dissemination by validating bodies acting in co-operation.

The survey findings are in agreement with the experience of the writer and colleagues at Southampton and other colleges visited. A reservation is felt, however, about the recommendation for a more systematic and co-ordinated dissemination strategy. Grafting a more rational and co-ordinated system onto the present structure of further education with existing attitudes held by staff and their current

conditions of service may achieve little. The present structure of further education may be inherently ill-suited to effective dissemination. Fundamental changes in organisation and concepts of professionalism may be required.

A few examples may help to clarify the argument. If it is felt that validating bodies overestimate the ability, in present conditions, of lecturers to understand, absorb and act on development requirements. More effective communication, on its own, will not remove this barrier to development. This is a particular problem for lecturers teaching on courses validated by different central bodies. In business studies departments, for example, this is often the case. The demands of keeping abreast with the different curriculum policies on, say, design, teaching method and assessment, of three or more bodies are considerable. When a lecturer had to concentrate just on subject development, the relatively slow pace of change in the broader curriculum area could be handled with more ease. Now, curriculum skills are increasingly required by all staff, whereas formerly a few senior staff in a department could deal adequately with curriculum responsibilities.

Curriculum messages may be given low priority by lecturers who see themselves primarily or exclusively as professionals in their subject, for example, law or accountancy, rather than as teachers who also need curriculum skills. A decade ago Price (1972) stressed this type of role conflict as a major barrier to curriculum development especially in business studies.⁶ Despite BEC's reforms this concept of professionalism is still prevalent in business studies departments.

A further problem arises when a lecturer has a low commitment to a course because his main teaching is elsewhere. This may happen when a BEC module is serviced from another department. A lecturer from a mathematics department, for example, might experience difficulty in adjusting to the ethos of an integrated course.

Proposals for reforms to overcome these obstacles to communication and development may seem impracticable in the present economic climate of educational cutbacks. Furthermore, they risk staff and union opposition and could upset the balance of power within colleges. They should, therefore, be seen as long term solutions. The aim of such proposals would be to help to develop a broad concept of professionalism in further education that stressed competence in skills of curriculum development equally with subject expertise. The following specific proposals are suggested; they would need to be introduced in stages.

First, there should be compulsory teacher training for all new lecturers. Staff training should be strengthened and supported by staff development in colleges which should be given high priority and more funds. The cost need not be high in comparison to other expenditures. More full-time staff development officers should be appointed. Full-time specialists on curriculum matters are also required. Some establishments have made such appointments; other establishments need to follow this lead.

These changes should be reinforced by changes in lecturers' conditions of service in order to reduce existing obstacles to the spread of curriculum skills. To create time for carrying out curriculum

responsibilities effectively, lecturers' weekly teaching hours (15 to 22 hours according to grade) should be reduced. This could be balanced by an extension to the college year with a requirement to attend courses or engage in other development activities. In addition, management structures in colleges and salary scales should be changed to encourage staff to specialise in teaching and curriculum development rather than administration. In further education there is evidence of the need for curriculum managers, or professionals, as well as traditional heads of departments who are responsible mainly for administration. Finally, changes are required in departmental structures to overcome the servicing problem. Subject based departments in particular hinder the development of integrated courses.

Communication has been discussed in a wide context so as to identify some of the more deeprooted obstacles to innovation that would not be removed simply by designing more effective systems for delivering and interpreting messages. It appears that BEC attempts to solve the communication problem at this deeper level, for example, through its advocacy of co-ordination posts and collective management in further education establishments. Its success in this area is limited by constraints levied by Local Education Authorities over which BEC has no control. BEC may suggest the creation of co-ordinators posts but it is the LEA who control the financial budget and set ceilings on establishment levels. BEC do not appear to have the same dialogue with education establishments as with the LEAs.

Analysis of Political Strategies

The political background to BEC's relations to other groups will now be considered. BEC is a powerful body: it possesses authority as an agency of the DES and it has almost a monopoly, as a validating body, of courses in its area of responsibility. This applies particularly to full-time, higher level courses for which there are no adequate substitutes, for example, courses with a minimum entry standard of one 'A' level, carrying the right to mandatory student grants, and which provide exemptions from examinations of some professional associations. There is, therefore, a powerful incentive for institutions to meet BEC's requirements as well as to compete with each other. In the 1980's in further education establishments, the fear of losing courses, student points and staff is considerable. Even if there were suitable alternative courses at the higher level, colleges are unlikely in the current climate to receive permission to run them. Also, BEC's power is enhanced by its ability to negotiate separately with organisations.

John Sellars, the then chief officer of BEC, has argued that the Council has few powers and must work mainly by persuading others, particularly professional bodies. (Education and Training, February 1978, p40). The argument advanced by Sellars is that this assessment substantially underestimates the power of BEC, for example, in relations with colleges and NATFHE.

In dealing with employers' associations, on the other hand, BEC must largely use persuasion. With individual employers the main problem facing BEC is to raise awareness and increase involvement rather than create support for a particular curriculum policy. In the writer's experience, employers are concerned with standards and status of business courses, rather than their specific content. In an interview, J M Bruce-Lockhart, chairman of BEC, 1974-80, stated that employers' attitudes varied from unenthusiastic to downright apathetic, (Trade and Industry, 26 March 1976, p850). Thus, on most curriculum issues, BEC possesses power in this sphere also when there is no strong united alternative view from employers.

Failure to communicate, or willingness to communicate only on certain terms is a familiar way of using political power. One is on tentative grounds in discussing this strategy because its success may depend, in part, on BEC not admitting to its use. Hence, evidence may not be available, except indirectly.

Two hypotheses are advanced: first, there are some issues BEC will not discuss, and second, on those issues open to discussion, BEC will not necessarily debate in a rational way with respect for evidence. These are well known features of political activity and it should be no surprise that BEC engages in them, given the political dimension to curriculum control and development. The motive behind the use of these strategies "appears to be to maintain the clarity and singlemindedness of its philosophy and prevent alternative views gaining influence. Uncertainty and weakness of resolve would hinder communication and implementation. Issues that are not negotiable include integration, cores, and central themes. On assessment policy

some discussion can take place, within the limits of BEC's regulations on assessment, but not at a serious level. BEC officers are unwilling, for example, to discuss with lecturers the merits of the essay or the disadvantages of case-study examinations in an open way, to the point of conceding a case. This approach is sensed through talking to BEC officers, and the content and tone of BEC publications. BEC rarely replies to press articles or comments on published reports of research or other articles in academic journals.

Other political strategies that may be used by BEC include reliance on the power of DES; encouraging groups which tend to favour BEC policies, for example, BETA; appointments to BEC committees and working parties; dividing opposition; gaining and keeping the support of employers as a 'first priority'; suspension or withdrawal of course approval; secrecy; and, most recently, the merger with TEC. This new body is in a more powerful position to negotiate with other interests including government departments and the MSC (THES, 28th June 1982, p2).

CHANGE STRATEGIES IN THE LIGHT OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY

In the previous sections of this chapter BEC's strategies for implementation of its curriculum reforms were identified through an examination of practice in colleges. It was deliberately decided to approach this analysis of evidence in a pragmatic way so as to reduce the possibility of taking a particular theoretical stance that might narrow the analysis. Although it was attempted to approach the analysis in an open-minded way, the difficulty, if not impossibility of escaping the influence of theory is recognised. The purpose of this section is to analyse practice with the aid of theory and empirical studies on change in order to gain a more systematic understanding of BEC's strategies and help assess their strengths and weaknesses.

BEC's changes are broader than innovation in teaching method or subject matter. A new philosophy of business education covering all aspects of the curriculum has been introduced. The changes are system-wide, rather than specific to one or more groups of subjects.

To implement these reforms BEC relies partly on long term, natural, and perhaps random, diffusion of ideas through social interaction. The main means of change, however, are strategies of planned dissemination. These strategies are intended to lead to quite rapid change, compared to natural diffusion, and also to the constitution of a permanent system. This long term system also helps the diffusion process, for example, through creating institutional structures that support social networks. Thus planned change might be a more apt term for BEC's strategies than dissemination. Some of BEC's changes must

be complied with immediately; others are to be implemented gradually. In both cases a central system is needed to monitor the changes in practice. Hence, BEC's control and change strategies are closely linked and hard to separate.

There are several models of change, through diffusion and dissemination, which may help to clarify BEC's change strategies. These models overlap to some degree and are used as a rough guide to understanding practice rather than a detailed map.

Schon (1971), in his analysis of social change advances three models of the diffusion of innovation: Centre-Periphery (CP); Proliferation of Centres (PC) and Shifting Centres (SC).

Centre-Periphery: This model rests on three basic elements:

The innovation to be diffused exists, fully realised in its essentials, prior to its diffusion;

Diffusion is the movement of an innovation from a centre out to the ultimate users;

Directed diffusion is a centrally managed process of dissemination, training, and provision of resources and incentives (p81)

Proliferation of Centres: This is an elaboration of the centre periphery model, designed to extend the limits of that simpler model. Secondary centres engage in the diffusion of innovations while the primary centres support and manage the secondary centres ie the centre becomes a trainer of trainers.

Shifting Centres: Over a period of time the secondary centre may become fragmented from the primary centre and break away becoming a primary centre within its own right, creating and disseminating ideas and innovations that do not emanate from the original primary source.

A further threefold division is advanced by Bennis, Benne, Chin and Corey (1976). Their models are: Empirical-Rational; Power Coercive and Normative Re-educative.

Empirical- Rational: An assumption that men are guided by reason and that they will utilise some rational calculus of self interest in determining needed changes in behaviour, since systems depend on knowledge as a major ingredient of power (p35 and 52).

Power - Coercive: A system of change that seeks to mass political and economic power behind the change goals which the strategists have decided are desirable. This usually creates an opposing power-coercive group and a division is created (p53).

Normative Re-Educative: These approaches centre in the notion that people technology is just as necessary as thing technology in working out desirable changes. Put in this way, it is obvious that for the agents of normative re-educative change, clarification and reconstruction of values is of pivotal importance in changing. By getting the values of the client system, along with his own, openly into the arena of change and by working through value conflicts in a responsible manner, the change agent seeks to

avoid manipulation and indoctrination of the client in the normally reprehensible meaning of these terms.

In applying these models, the distinction between system-wide change and subject innovation should be remembered. BEC's changes are system-wide and compulsory. In contrast, agencies such as the Nuffield Foundation and the Schools' Council sponsored innovation which was mostly in particular subject areas. Schools were not bound to accept these innovations. Another important difference is the relatively small size, compared to the number of schools, of the system BEC controls: about five hundred centres and about ten thousand lecturers. Moreover, BEC is a permanent institution in contrast to the centres for Schools' Council projects, which tended to be temporary. BEC is also a substantial organisation with about 60 permanent staff. Further Education establishment at the periphery are also permanent. This stability and compactness favours BEC in that the proliferation of centres could be difficult to achieve. The centre-periphery and power-coercive models fit the BEC system. BEC can also rely on existing networks. Thus control, monitoring and communication are simplified. Moreover, BEC is helped by its inheritance of the tradition of centralism in further education.

Havelock's (1975) classification of change models include Research, Development and Diffusion (RRD)

The RDD approach consists of central design and preparation of packaged materials, their dissemination and adoption at the periphery. Although BEC was responsible for overall design of the structure, content and assessment of its curricula and for their dissemination,

it produced few materials. This approach is supported by a high degree of central control. In this respect the BEC system is even more of an engineering model than RDD by diffusion, planned or otherwise in a free market. Further Education institutions are under very strong pressure to adopt BEC's changes because of central power and control.

The two main weaknesses in BEC's general approach are the costs of control and insufficient central support through training and materials. The costs of control rest in the hands of the college management who rely on their Local Education Authority's budget. Such budgets are funded by the rating system and the NAB. BEC's influence in these two areas is, I suspect non-existent. One of BEC's methods of incourse assessment is the use of Case Studies for both problem seeking and problem solving. For lecturers to build, implement and assess Case Studies, time and resources must be utilised at all three stages. The staffing and resourcing framework within which lecturers work is still geared to the extended essay style of teaching and assessing; ie a typical essay title can be a single sentence, requiring a student response of a 300-500 word script; the assessment would normally be a mark of 'x' out of 20 with 5 or 6 lines of comment from the tutor. The time involved in setting the problem, can be counted in minutes, the assessment would normally take, say three hours to mark a set of 20 scripts. Compared to building a realistic Case Study that required investigation into a work related problem, the essay is a very simple method of problem setting and assessing. A Case Study requires considerably more material to be prepared and given to the same group of 20 students and assessments would usually require not only a written reply but a tutorial or viva voce. Add to

this a need for integration where a number of subject specialists must agree to the content and as to how they will assess their particular subject specialism in the answers proffered and the time and resources needed bear no relationship to the essay type of problem. (see Pearse, J NATHFE Journal: Spring 1978 pp 3 - 9).

The lack of support for training and materials is less evident at levels below HNC/D. The lower levels are much more prescribed in syllabus content and BEC produce examples of Case Study material. The researcher often wonders how long it took the team of authors at BEC to compile one of their examples and how they tested the reliability through operation and assessment on an intake of 60 students. The training materials needed are no longer pencil and papers, they include accessibility to computer terminals (up to 60 at the same time for large intakes) and a variety of software to be available as well as blank floppy discs. Students have to purchase their own computer discs as well as pencils, paper and textbooks. The volume of paper to be printed by way of illustrative material for the Case Study is much more than 'one sentence' essay title. In this last respect BEC may either be underfunded or need to reallocate its income more to training and production of materials. Substantial control is required - validation, monitoring of standards, moderation, central examinations at general level - to attempt to ensure implementation and prevent unacceptable diversity. This uniformity in itself is another possible disadvantage.

Control systems alone will not solve the key problem of effecting change at the classroom level. Even a costly control system might not detect a gap between intention and reality. BEC clearly seems aware that political and coercive strategies alone are insufficient and, equally, that the rational appeal of the changes themselves in terms of their possible effectiveness in meeting national economic needs, or their appeal to the self-interest of lecturers or colleges, is not sufficient. The vital need to change attitudes and values and relationships is also recognised.

Social interaction models apply to BEC in various ways. BEC encourages informal links between colleges around the periphery. Within colleges the spread of ideas is facilitated by BEC requirement for teaching and collective management. This is supported by visits to centres and other contacts with moderators and BEC officials. Their function is to persuade and re-educate as well as to monitor. The small size of the system may promote interaction. However, slow turnover of staff and movement between colleges, at present, may have slowed down the rate of diffusion. Contacts with employers are also important. Each college acts as a secondary centre for transmitting ideas through regular contact with local employers.

From BEC's point of view there is a danger of overload at the periphery because of this work as well as curriculum development and the increased level of administration in colleges required by the BEC system. A further danger is the risk of BEC's philosophy being distorted in transmission and practice at the periphery. Given the need to tap local initiative, this presents BEC with a continual dilemma over the correct balance between central control and local autonomy.

A problem-solving approach to planned dissemination may help to resolve this tension. This model stresses the needs of the user. Once a need for change is recognised, solutions to the problems of implementation are reached by the institution at the periphery with the help of the centre. BEC's validation and moderation procedures and college-based design of assignments are based partly on this approach. The work of colleges, however, is carried out within constraints set by BEC. In so far as this is seen as a restriction on staff independence, the problem-solving approach is weakened. The shortage of funds for such work at BEC is a further problem. Nonetheless this approach would seem vital for the success of BEC's reforms as most curriculum development work takes place in colleges.

This raises the question as to whether BEC has misjudged the resilience of existing attitudes and values held by staff or indeed the possibility of competing ideas emerging which are not compatible with BEC philosophy. Schon's shifting centres model is helpful in considering this issue. New ideas, or a resurgence of old ideas in new guise, can arise in Schon's words 'in the interstices of established organisations'. Within a compact system especially, they could spread rapidly through informal means, laterally between colleges. New ideas diffused in this way could conflict with BEC philosophy and threaten its system of control. Schon, looking at society broadly, sees shifting centres at the periphery in a battle of ideas with the centre. House (1974) also believes conflict to be the key element in change processes. Whereas Schon sees success for shifting centres, House forecast victory for the central system at the cost of excessive control, suppressed innovation and lack of diversity.

This contrast may be too polarised. New ideas are slow to take hold in education: the system is resistant to change. Innovation from any source, a fixed centre or a shifting centre, may be restricted by attrition at the periphery.

The metaphor of struggle will be continued a little longer. BEC's political strategies of dividing opposition have been discussed earlier. An example of this is BEC's apparent policy of deliberately arousing the opposition of economics and law lecturers who were the main exponents of the theoretical and academic tradition under the Joint Committee system. No compromise was sought by BEC; possible merits of the old approach would not be discussed by BEC officers, for example, at conferences on BEC's policy. This battle over ideas, values and attitudes still continues in further education establishments, although less sharply than before; some economists and lawyers have been won over to the BEC side.

One last point to be made about conflict is that the models of Schon or House seem not to cover the possibility of shifts in power and values at the centre. The MSC, for example, is a strong and well-financed rival of BEC's in the provision of education and training for the 16-19 age group.

I now turn from this analysis and interpretation of BEC's strategies for change through theoretical models to a short summary of experience of curriculum change in Britain and other countries. This is intended to provide a background to discussion of the possible effectiveness of BEC's reform. It will also serve as a guide to proposals for research and evaluation.

American experience of curriculum development has shown weaknesses in the RDD approach used on its own: it depends too much on chance diffusion. Even when supplemented with social interaction and planned dissemination, the gap between intent and practice remained substantial. More complex strategies of packages were recommended, for example by Havelock (1975), who suggested that his three models should be used together, (see MacDonald and Walker, 1976, pl2). House (1974) was pessimistic about the prospects for curriculum change, despite more sophisticated strategies. He foresaw a continuing divergence between reality in the classroom and the hopes of planners. However, this begs the question as to what is a reasonable success and how-one measures it.

A conclusion reached by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (OECD 1975, p46) was that the lesson of large scale curriculum change was one of disappointingly slow progress. It was felt that in countries where a system-based approach was used, major curriculum change was much delayed by the need to convince teachers of the validity of the changes and to help them reshape their classroom tradition. Teacher re-education was vital. Decades, rather than years, might be needed for change to be implemented. Whether or not this was right, it was argued, there were definite limits to the pace of centrally guided change.

If these findings on system-wide change are accepted, the outlook for BEC's reforms is pessimistic. Furthermore, as suggested already, BEC's centralised control may stifle local initiative and diversity. In assessing BEC it should again be stressed that the balance between central and local control is a vital issue. A related, crucial issue

is the strong autonomy of the teacher and the consequent difficulties of re-education towards acceptance of centrally decided values.

This analysis of BEC's strategies in practice indicates, on balance, some potential for success. However, the findings of OECD (1975) and House (1974) on educational change are pessimistic.

SUMMARY

BEC's terms of reference are to plan, administer and control national non-degree courses in Business Studies. The decisions taken in order to implement the regional changes involve a considerable amount of development work which seems to have fallen on the establishments offering BEC courses rather than being pioneered by BEC itself. The success of such a strategy depends largely upon gaining the co-operation of the lecturing staff to put the new system into operation and the acceptance of employers to encourage their staff to attend. No evidence can be found for the qualified or unqualified acceptance by employers and some reservations are still held by lecturers.

After a decade of the new philosophy of integrated courses incorporating themes, new methods of teaching, learning and assessing BEC courses flourish. Whether this is due to a universal acceptance of the BEC ethos or the fact that there is no alternative for mandatory award courses in this field is difficult to assess. If one accepts that planning, administering and controlling are sound tenets

of management theory it would seem rational that full acceptance should have been obtained, widely publicised that this was so and then, and only then put the system into operation. BEC may have put the cart before the horse.

If BEC wished to push changes in teaching, learning and assessment methods it should have taken the lead by having a firm policy of first teach the teachers and not leave it to self motivation backed by the threat of withdrawal of permission to offer courses if certain conditions were not met.

Changes to course management by possible deviation from the traditional hierarchal system and the insistence of the appointment of a course co-ordinator for each educational centre requires agreement from both the senior college management and may require a change to the overall establishment figures set by the LEA. Little or no discussion seems to have taken place with LEA's. Senior college managements may, indeed most of them have, appointed co-ordinators by simply re-naming the post of course supervisor or course modes which was used for the DES Rules 124 courses. The fact that a BEC co-ordinator requires more skills in the area of curriculum design and more time to implement the new courses necessitating changes to the lecturers conditions of service appears to be a non-consideration. The strategies adopted to bring about the required changes to move from DES Rules 124 courses to BEC courses is unclear.

By accident, or design, BEC seems to have created a varied and complex planned dissemination strategy that draws on theory and the experience of other curriculum projects. It is probably too early to evaluate

fully the effectiveness of these strategies, although not to assess the value aspects of BEC's objectives and the means of securing change. In practice the strategy may lack coherence. Social interaction may work too slowly, transmit the wrong messages, or fragment. Within the dissemination plan, social interaction and problem-solving methods may conflict with coercive aspects. A possible crucial weakness in the BEC system is that normative re-educative strategies may have been underused.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

NOTES

1. -See, for example, illustrative material for BI Board core studies included in 'BEC Higher National Awards', BEC, (undated).
2. 'Assessment for BEC Awards', BEC Circular 4/77.
3. For a further discussion, see Craven, B, and Franklin, B, 'Moderation in All Things', Business Education, Spring 1982, pp7-15: and, Midgley, K, 'A Moderating influence', Times Higher Education Supplement, 4 September 1981, p10.
4. Midgley, a former BEC moderator, is critical of some aspects of BEC's policies (ibid).
5. A list of senior staff at BEC is given in BTEC's Annual Report 1985/86, pp35-36.
6. Price, T K, 'The Curriculum Process - with Special Reference to Business Studies', The Vocational Aspects of Education, (Autumn 1972), Volume XXIV, No. 59, p119-120.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, Benne, Chin and Corey, (1976) 'The Planning of Change', Holt Rinehart & Winston
- Bruce-Lockhart, JM (1976), 'Trade and Industry Journal'
- Craven B and Franklin B (1982) 'Moderation in all Things' in Business Education Journal
- Fowler, G (1978) 'The Validation Game in Education and Training Journal'
- Havelock, RG (1975), 'Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilisation of Knowledge', Ann Arbor: Centre for Utilisation of Scientific Knowledge for Social Research
- House, E R (1974), 'The Politics of Educational Innovation' McCutcheon
- MacDonald, B and Walker, R (1976) 'Changing the Curriculum', Open Body
- Midgley, K (1981) 'A Moderating Influence' in THES, 4 September
- Price, T K (1972) 'The Curriculum Process - with Special Reference to Business Studies' in 'The Vocational Aspects of Education, Volume XXIV
- Schon, D A (1971) 'Beyond the Stable State: Public and Private Learning in a Changing Society', Penguin
- Sellars J (1978) 'Education and Training Journal'
- Stenhouse, L (1975) 'An Introduction to Curriculum Research', Heinemann

CHAPTER 5 - METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY AND ITS FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this chapter are to show the method of conducting the survey and to summarise its findings. A pilot study was carried out at the writer's own college in January 1985. A small sample of colleges was visited in March and April 1985 and a postal questionnaire sent to all other further educational establishments currently offering HNC/HND BEC, now BTEC (Business and Technician Educational Council) courses in Business Studies in May 1985.

METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY

The reason for embarking on this thesis was the writer's dissatisfaction of the way in which BEC courses were being conducted in his own college. After 15 years of teaching solely on courses for externally examined professional examinations and with only two years experience of teaching BEC courses the difference between the two types of courses became more obvious and more frustrating. Changes in the syllabus for the professional courses had occurred with new subjects appearing, some subjects amalgamating into one paper and some subjects disappearing altogether. Such changes had always been made fairly smoothly and minor hiccoughs quickly overcome. The change from The DES Rules 124 HNC/D to BEC, however did not run smoothly and what appeared to be minor hiccoughs often blew up into full scale problems. The writer deduced that the problems could be compartmentalised into two broad categories, either the change in curriculum was inappropriate or the administrative or teaching machinery was at fault.

Discussions with colleagues and members of BEC convinced the writer that there was a strong case for the general philosophy or ethos of BEC and that the main problem was centered around the administrative machinery and to some extent the lecturers themselves.

The belief that the administrative machinery and/or the lecturers may be at fault prompted a small pilot study to be carried out at Southampton Institute of Higher Education with a questionnaire circulated to two heads of departments and eight lecturers who either ran BEC courses in their departments or taught on BEC courses. The responses from both heads of departments were similar as were the responses from two of the lecturers who were also course leaders. The responses from the remaining six lecturers showed some differences. The differences centred around the amount of time the individual lecturers taught on the BEC courses; those whose timetables showed that they spent six or more hours per week teaching BEC students gave responses akin to those of the course leaders and where less than six hours per week were spent on BEC courses the responses showed less interest in the administrative detail yet offered complaints regarding the dilution of content of the curriculum in their specialist areas. These comments prompted the researcher to develop three target areas for a more detailed questionnaire - heads of departments, course leaders and other teachers who had little or no administrative responsibility for the course. The more detailed questionnaire was well received by the staff at Southampton Institute and the same questionnaire was used, after small amendments, for the full survey.

In order to discover the interest in establishments other than Southampton the researcher decided to contact other colleges to

ascertain the willingness of heads of departments and teaching staff to take part in a national survey. Twelve other colleges were approached and all agreed to participate.

OPPORTUNITY SAMPLE

As no financial funding was available for this project the researcher decided to test an opportunity sample based on personal contacts made through attending courses and seminars with administrative and teaching staff whilst keeping travelling distance to an acceptable minimum. Care was taken to choose different types of establishments such as institutes and colleges of further and higher education who were known to offer and run full and part-time BEC HNC/D courses in Business Studies. Each establishment approached was not informed of the names of other establishments that had been similarly approached to avoid the possibility of deliberate or accidental collusion.

The initial contact was made by telephone or personal meeting with the BEC co-ordinator or course leader at the various establishments who was asked to put the proposition of involvement in the survey to their head of department. All such requests were favourably met by the heads of departments.

In order to maintain anonymity it is sufficient to state that the opportunity sample covered the geographical areas of Hampshire, Dorset, Bedfordshire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, Derbyshire

and Lancashire. The questionnaires were sent out two or three weeks prior to the visit to those establishments by the researcher who covered each question with each respondent at the interview stage.

As the questionnaires had been sent in advance the 12 respondents had had the opportunity of answering the questions without prompts from the interviewer. During the interviews each question was covered to discover any ambiguity. Some ambiguity did arise and again small corrective changes were made, eg sandwich courses could conceivably be classed as either full or part time, consequently all sandwich courses were classified as part time.

The amended questionnaires were despatched to all other establishments offering courses for higher national awards in business and finance. The list of such institutions was obtained from BEC who provided a computer printout of all establishments offering currently validated courses:-

Total number of establishments	142
Less pilot college	<u>1</u>
	141
Less colleges visited	<u>12</u>
	129
Respondents not now offering courses	<u>3</u>
POSSIBLE RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE	126

At the time of conducting the survey the teaching profession generally was going through a difficult period of poor industrial relations and

spasmodic bans on overtime and additional duties were in operation and this factor may well have influenced the response rate.

A full statistical analysis of the replies is given in Appendix II.

PATTERN OF REPLIES

	Heads of Departments	Course Leaders	Other Tutors
Original letter (May 85)	18	47	24
1st Reminder (Sep 85)	10	15	23
2nd Reminder (Oct 85)	2	-	10
Total	30	62	57
Percentage	24%	49%	45%

Total Responses

All future comments will refer to the total responses from both the interviews and the postal questionnaires which show the following figures:

	Heads of Departments	Course Leaders	Other Tutors
Questionnaires	30	62	57
Interviews	13	13	13
Total	43	75	70
Percentage of possible	31%	54%	50%

RESPONSE BY HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

The survey showed that only 31% of the HODs returned completed questionnaires and the following conclusions are drawn:

Question 1 - 3 (Student enrolment)

The first three questions attempted to discover any relationships between:

- a) total college student population
- b) the percentage of that population on BEC (all boards) courses and
- c) the percentage of BEC students on business studies course

The only pattern to emerge was that of an uneven distribution eg

	Full-time	Part-time
College A	students	students
Total population	3,500	2,000
BEC (all boards)	1,400	900
BEC (Business studies)	80	25

	Full-time	Part-time
College B	students	students
Total population	4,400	15,000
BTEC (all boards)	176	nil
BTEC (Business studies)	176	nil

All respondents were quite specific on the number of students enrolled. This is an important factor as most Head of Department appointments and positions on the salary scale are related to the number of students enrolled.

Question 4 (Trends in enrolment)

Half of the respondents noticed a rise in the number of full-time students and none had a falling roll. Part-time enrolments showed that 40% of establishments had fewer students over the last three years.

Question 5 (Reasons for trends)

The rise in full-time student numbers was due to new option modules being offered in response to student and employer demand. The new areas of interest were mainly in Tourism and the Leisure Industry.

The rise in part-time students was due mainly to the introduction of sandwich courses.

In all cases the fall in part-time student numbers was put down to the "economic climate". The writer assumes this to mean that as businesses have slimmed down and shed staff, employers feel that they cannot afford to have staff away from their place of work even for one day per week. The general response was not that which the writer anticipated as over the period of time in question, 1980-1983, as there was growing unemployment of school leavers and establishments offering further and higher education courses might have received more

applications for courses, including BTEC courses. As the entry level is a minimum of one GCE "A" level pass perhaps those school leavers without jobs were not qualified for entry.

Question 6 (Average class size)

The average class size of 20-25 students remains similar to that of pre BEC courses and this number in a class utilising the time of one tutor would maintain the HODs "Staff to Student Ratio" (SSRs). As the use of SSRs is often a measuring rod for funding and staff requirements, the class size may not be as a result of student demand, more a result of staff availability imposed by the constraints on HODs.

The teaching methods of BEC are essentially student centred, project (cross-modular assignment) based and learning by experience through directed study. A class size of over 20 students may not lend itself to those methods required by BEC.

Question 7 (Post BEC education)

84% of the respondents use the BEC courses as a stepping stone to some further qualification rather than offer the course with a terminal qualification. This appears logical in that a student who completes a two year BEC course in business studies will, if he/she wishes to continue in further education, choose courses in marketing, finance or personnel administration for instance which are offered by the same department. This will ensure that HODs have a continuing throughput of students in their departments for a number of years.

Question 8 (Conversion courses)

BEC teaching and learning methods are different from those employed for GCE "A" levels and there is a requirement that all prospective BEC students undergo a conversion course to prepare them for the new style of teaching and learning. For part-time students this period of conversion usually takes one year and may or may not be offered by the same establishment. The survey showed that all part time conversion courses are programmed for one academic year although that year may be 30 or 36 weeks long. Full-time conversion courses are part of the first year of the two year course and vary from three to four and a half weeks in length.

Question 9 (Approval period)

Before a BEC course may be offered by an establishment it must be validated by a panel of BEC officers. The validation system is similar to, albeit not so rigorous as, the Committee of National Academic Awards (CNAA). The maximum period of validation is five years and is by no means automatic. None of the respondents admitted to having their submission rejected outright by the validation panel, nevertheless not all respondents replied to this question. To the researchers knowledge two of the responding colleges were given a one year approval on condition that major changes were made to their submission. The norm appeared to be a three year approval (51% of respondents), no establishment was granted a four year approval and 18% were permitted to recruit students for a five year intake.

Question 10 (Staffing)

Only 12% of respondents have all the staff that teach in BEC courses under the same head of department. For those HODs that "borrow" staff on a servicing basis more than half borrow 50% of the staff to cover all subjects in the BEC curriculum. This diffusion of staff can only lead to unnecessary timetabling problems not only for classroom periods but also for team meetings where servicing staff are part of the BEC management team.

Questions 11-12 (Team composition)

Only a quarter of the respondents claim to have a course management team. In the researcher's own experience it is the team management that should be developed first with other teaching and learning teams such as CMAs and IMAs being formed and guided by the overall management structure. Over 80% of the various team members are from departments other than that in which the course is offered with no pattern regarding the subject specialism.

Question 13 (Part-time and full-time tutors)

Three-quarters of the respondents use part-time tutors for some specialism with no significant bias towards core or option modules - yet 70% of the respondents said that they would prefer to have all full-time tutors on BEC courses. The main reason for preferring full-time tutors was their availability for team meetings. Other reasons given included integration of studies, co-ordination of course work over a full academic year and team building.

HODs who welcome the use of part-time tutors to bring job relevance and fresh ideas from recent or current industrial experience could be accused of not developing their own full-time staff.

Questions 14-15 (Staff employed solely on BEC courses)

Over half the respondents use 30 or more staff to cover all subject areas on their BEC courses. It is suggested that team meetings of 30 members could rarely be fully attended and even if they were the decision making process with so many members would be truncated. Only six HODs had any members of staff fully timetabled on BEC courses, the maximum number of staff so timetabled in any one establishment was five.

Questions 16-17 (Resource requirements)

All respondents agreed that there has been a change in their resource needs; the types of changes can be prioritised as follows:

Need	Reason	Identified	
		by	%
Time	preparation of assignments	80	
	timetable allowances	61	
	team meetings	51	
Support Staff	secretarial staff backup	74	
Library Space	reference and research	71	

Physical resources	information technology	68
	text books for library	58
Assessment time	end of year assignments/examinations	52
Accommodation	BEC resources centre	16
Staff development	staff training	8

The changes wrought by BEC in terms of teaching and learning methods seem to have had repercussions not envisaged by them at the initial implementation stage. An example is given of the production and implementation of a cross-modular assignment:

Time This may require, say, 4-6 staff getting together in the same place at the same time to build a case study or similar problem covering many subject specialisms. Timetabling 4-6 staff (half of whom may be servicing tutors from another department) can be very difficult. Previously individual tutors would have developed their own confirmation exercises in their class preparation time without consultation with other staff. The theme of integration, so strong in BEC philosophy, no longer tolerates such isolation of subject matter. All staff have preparation time on their individual timetables, the problem is one of scheduling the various staff to have their preparation time coincidental with the other team members. Such coincidental scheduling may not be necessary every week of the term and can only be successfully accomplished by flexible timetabling.

Support Preparation of material for case studies and similar problems not only require new skills from the staff but place a heavier demand on the departmental typing, word processing and photocopying facilities. A typical CMA may require up to 20 sides of A4 typed instructions, background information, and maps or diagrams for the student together with 50 questionnaires per student for subsequent analysis. If this amount of support is needed for a CMA, compared to the previously used "extended essay", departmental heads would be justified in requesting more staff and other resources.

Question 18 (Resource requests to LEAs)

Considering that all departmental heads recognised the need for extra resources and that only 28% have made formal requests to their LEAs could indicate that HODs are not prepared to support their own staff to meet these changes in needs. In the researchers opinion this apathy may be so in only isolated cases and the more likely reason is the known lack of funding from the LEAs coupled with the futility of demanding more from any local authority that is being restricted in its educational spending by central government.

If the DES, through BEC, insist on changes that require more funds in establishments of further and higher education it must enhance the budgets of the college paymasters, ie the LEAs.

Question 19 (LEAs response to requests)

The HODs interviewed were the only respondents to this question. No reasons or comments were noted by those not replying to this question. Requests by HODs for accommodation library resources and information technology equipment were met with a favourable response. The areas of poor response were with secretarial support and staff development.

The poor response for increases in secretarial support places more strain on individual tutors most of whom do this type of work themselves over and above their contractual obligations. This involves, for instance, self training in the use of word processing which is perhaps the most time consuming method of learning. The lack of time for staff development was described by one respondent as a "catch 22" situation in the following manner.. "The need for staff development is evident - funding is usually available for one member of staff per annum or the college rules allow only one member of staff to be away from teaching at any one time - team teaching is difficult on an individual basis". Even when staff are away on courses for short periods of time there is a need to replace them in the classroom. Because the BEC tutor has become a multi-discipline teacher it is difficult to find a suitable replacement with the same mixture of skills and knowledge. Funding is usually available to employ a part-time tutor but the rates of remuneration are not sufficient to engage a competent replacement. Advertisements requesting replacements for say, a period of four weeks, may ask for:- Previous teaching experience in Economics, Law and Accounts, hold a degree or professional qualification, ability to conduct workshops,

give lectures and tutorials, work closely with a team of other specialists with a rate of pay equivalent to approximately £11,000 per annum. Any person who can fulfil most of these requirements is more likely to be earning well in excess of this amount outside educational establishments. The researchers own local authority recently advertised two vacancies in the same page of a newspaper seeking an accountancy lecturer for a one year tenure who must be a qualified accountant with recent industrial or commercial experience for a salary of £11,000 pa, the second advertisement was for a PART qualified accountant to work in a town hall which was a PERMANENT POST with PROMOTION PROSPECTS with a starting salary of £13,000 pa.

Question 20 (Courses and secondment of teaching staff)

Although 94% claimed that staff had attended courses or had taken periods of industrial secondment very few gave precise details of the types of courses or secondments. Visits to Coombe Lodge (the Further Educational Staff College) were the most popular followed by secondments to local firms. This lack of preciseness could indicate that HODs show a high proportion of staff undergoing staff development in their end of year reports but are unsure of where they attended. If this is the case then HODs would be guilty of providing good annual report figures without understanding or meeting the needs of their staff and students.

Question 21 (Organisation chart)

Less than half the respondents produced a chart or diagram showing the hierarchal and/or functional relationships of their BEC course structure.

Question 22 (Pastoral care)

Almost two-thirds claim to charge tutors with pastoral care with only two establishments having a ratio of 1 : 15 or less. The norm seems to be one member of staff to 16 - 20 students. One-fifth of establishments have a ratio of 1 : 26 or more.

Questions 23-24 (Time spent in meetings)

All HODs commented that this was a difficult question but nevertheless 73% provided a figure on an annual basis. 32% of respondents suggested that between 600 - 1,000 hours per annum was a reasonable estimate, 27% suggested less than 600 hours per annum with 14% suggesting up to 2,000 hours per annum. The staff actually performing the duties of course supervisors claim that 700 hours per annum is spent on resubmissions alone, see answers to question 9 for course leaders on pp 111 and 112.

Question 25 (Location of staff)

Despite the need for the creation of teams, co-ordination of course production and integration of subject matter, two-thirds of the BEC teaching staff are not located in the same building with another 21% being located on different sites.

Summary

In the opinion of the writer many Heads of Departments are unsure of the fine detail of work carried out by their staff. It is a management principle that the senior staff cannot know all subject areas

intimately but in order to manage effectively they should be fully aware of the administrative detail with which they charge their staff.

All those interviewed could quote from memory the headcount of students on BEC courses. When this was mentioned to one frustrated course leader who suggested that the phrase headcount should be renamed "bumcount". This sarcasm reflects the lecturers perception of a head of department who suffers from the "bums-on-seats" syndrome, ie provided that the classroom is full and that all desks are in neat rows it is assumed that the course is progressing successfully. Some Heads of Department seemingly do not appreciate the BEC style of student-centred learning where tutorials, research and field work are legitimate activities to be carried out in a business studies course. Indeed, visits to employers' premises, tutorials and market research field work are often seen as holidays or free time for both staff and students.

Many heads of departments are ex-teachers and some do still have a teaching commitment. Perhaps their teaching experience was pre BEC when the HNC/D courses consisted of separate subjects and "teaching" was dictation, note taking, blackboard examples followed by further examples for homework and centred around a rigid syllabus which was examined once a year. One Head of Department was heard to remark that he did not understand what all the fuss was about needing extra preparation time as he could go to his cupboard and retrieve teaching notes for almost any lesson in his own subject.

It seems that what was regarded as good teaching practice a decade or so ago coupled with long service are all that is needed to progress from teaching to administrative posts. It is the writer's firm opinion that all Heads of Departments offering BEC courses should teach or tutor some part of that course. This opinion was substantiated by all colleagues at all colleges visited. (Perhaps this should have been the basis of one of the questions.)

HODs were the worst in terms of response rate to the questionnaires. The characteristics drawn from the replies can be summarised as follows:-

1. They were knowledgeable and accurate in the areas of statistics which form part of their termly or annual returns to senior management but less knowledgeable of the accurate deployment of their staff.
2. Many were unaware of the need for course management and what such course management entailed. Although they were aware of the demands made on staff and other resources due to the implementation of BEC courses they were hesitant in making these demands known to their LEAs.
3. Almost all HODs underestimated the usage of time by their staff for course management and resubmission of courses for validation.

RESPONSE BY COURSE LEADERS OR CO-ORDINATORS

The survey showed that 62 course leaders out of a possible 126 replied; 47 of those responded to the original request returning their questionnaire within two weeks of receipt. This high and often urgent response may have indicated the enthusiasm for an enquiry of this nature.

Questions 1 - 3 (Liaison with Employers)

Only one-third of colleges employ a liaison officer to maintain contact with employers. BEC have always emphasised the need for continual contact with employers yet 49% of establishments who offer BEC courses seem to leave this task to a teaching member of staff. Such meetings that do take place occur on an ad hoc basis.

Questions 4 - 5 (Employer Assistance)

When employers are asked to give assistance with the design or implementation of the course a favourable response rate was never lower than 86%. If this proved to be a general attitude of employers all further educational establishments should further tap this rich source of information and assistance.

Further and higher education colleges are becoming more aware of the need to educate students for work and who better to advise on the curriculum design and implementation than those who will use the output of those colleges?

Question 6 (Student Interviews)

All establishments manage to interview some of their prospective students prior to their enrolling on the course. Only 25% claim to see all students with 47% seeing most of the applicants.

Question 7 (Student Surveys)

Less than half of the respondents attempt to gain feedback from their students regarding the design and implementation of the course. Without feedback information the direction of the course will be in the hands of the teachers and this can lead to stagnation of the curriculum development.

Questions 8 - 9 (Preparation for Course Validation)

16% of respondents claimed to be the sole compiler of submission documents for course validation, the remaining 84% enlist the assistance of a course team or co-ordinating committee. The amount of time spent in preparation of the documentation varies from less than 200 hours to over 3,000 hours per annum. 58% of respondents attempted calculations by way of notations to the questionnaire which suggests that no log appears to have been kept of the time spent on this task. The larger the number of students enrolled the more time seems to be needed to complete the submission documentation. This can be put down, to some measure, to the fact that more option modules are offered when the enrolment figures are high. As the course is highly integrated the addition of one more module adds a disproportionate amount of time.



In the following table it is assumed that an average lecturer is available for 30 hours per week for 36 weeks per year:

<u>Student numbers</u> <u>in annual intake</u>	<u>Average time taken</u> <u>(hours pa)</u>	<u>Equivalent number of</u> <u>full-time staff</u>
Under 20	400	0.37
21 - 30	950	0.83
31 - 40	1,400	1.30
41 - 50	1,400	1.30
Over 50	1,500	1.39

Questions 11 - 12 (Submission Problems)

All respondents stated that they had problems and sought guidance from various sources. The moderator was always consulted and 73% also contacted BEC officers. The main problem areas seemed to be:

Submission document layout/format

Course structure

Course content

Skill development programme

Questions 13 - 14 (Full-time and Part-time Courses)

80% of respondents did not compile a separate submission for full and part-time courses even though a number of differences were acknowledged to exist between the two courses. A quarter of those who do not compile separate submissions for full and part-time courses did comment that they will consider separate submissions next time.

The main points of difference identified by the respondents show that even though a part-time student would have seven or eight hours of learning support compared with the 18 - 20 hours received by the full-time student, the part-time student must pass four modules per year compared to the six modules required of a full-time student. The assumption made is that where the course submission is the same for both full and part-time, the part-time student appears to be at a disadvantage in that he/she must pass two-thirds as many modules as a full-time student with less than half the tuition received by a full-time student. This disadvantage is mitigated to some extent in that the part-time student is better at interpersonal skills, more readily assimilates work ideas and is a better attender than a full-time student.

Question 15 (Submission Time)

The majority of course leaders will start to compile their submissions three years prior to the submission date, although all respondents stated that the process of course amendment was of a continuous nature.

The number of man hours expected to be required to compile the next submission varied from "up to 300" to "a lot" with 23% not knowing how long it would take. 21% considered that the submission would take between 1000 and 2000 hours and 10% needed between 2000 to 5000.

Questions 16 - 18 (Staffing levels and staff skills)

Three quarters of the respondents considered that they needed more staff to successfully offer and run BEC courses compared to the pre BEC courses. The percentage increase needed varied from 10% to more than 25%, with 46% of the respondents requiring an increase of 21-25% in staffing levels.

All respondents considered that their staff required new skills to teach on BEC courses. The most often quoted areas of new teaching skills needed were: Assignment building, Information technology, Developing material for assignments, Group work, Team Teaching and the use of Audio Visual Equipment.

Question 19 (Staff Training)

Although only 16% of new staff needed complete training in the new areas, 69% nevertheless required considerable training.

Questions 20 - 21 (Accommodation)

The respondents were asked if they needed more or different accommodation to successfully offer BEC courses, 55% required more and 71% required different accommodation. The additional types of accommodation were mainly for smaller study rooms and seminar areas, this was requested by 69% of the respondents. Other needs required were rooms for audio visual work (25%), terminal rooms for information technology (18%), open access work rooms and library resource areas (12%). A significant proportion of the respondents (80%) pointed out

that the number of traditional classrooms needed was the same as before, the amount of time spent in such rooms was, however, less than on the pre BEC courses.

Specific examples given were:

Marketing - a course requiring 100 hours on this subject may only occupy a classroom for half that time with the remainder of the student involvement time being on field work or researching in the library.

Management Studies (interviewing techniques) - Having taught the various techniques for interviewing and being interviewed the following assignment is usually a role play exercise which may involve small groups of students with four staff members using four or five rooms equipped for video recording and such activities being conducted concurrently. Rooms needed for this type of activity would not be booked for every week of any one term. Subsequent "debriefing" requiring similar facilities.

Such irregular use of classroom space require a much tighter scheduling of current classrooms and other study areas. If BEC courses are only a small proportion of the establishments roll with the majority of other courses using classrooms on a traditional basis, ie the use of a regular room every week, the classroom scheduling must surely be done on a college rather than a course or departmental basis.

Questions 22 - 23 (Equipment)

The need for different equipment was expressed by 73% of respondents. Of those requiring different equipment, 78% identified photocopying, printing and reprographics for use by staff and students as a major area. Computer hardware and software were also high on the list of requirements with 73% requiring hardware and 89% software. From this it appears that many establishments still need more computing facilities and those that do have the necessary machinery still do not have the right type of teaching software to run on those machines. Other areas identified were video library of suitable teaching material, modern business equipment, eg telex/fax, and study packs.

Questions 24 - 26 (Measures to determine staff levels)

Over half the respondents claimed that the number of staff employed on BEC courses were determined by a pre-set staff to student ratio with all respondents agreeing that this system of determining staff levels needed some degree of amendment. 61% suggested that the formula was totally unsuitable. No suggestions were forthcoming as to how the formula should be changed.

The method of determining how many hours a lecturer should be employed is based on a "Class Contact" basis, ie a lecturer would be timetabled to take charge of a class of students for "x" hours per week, this varies from 15 to 22 hours depending on seniority. This method of timetabling was criticised on the grounds that it does not take account of the amount of time spent in consultation with employers, yet the course should be geared to the needs of those same employers.

Such consultation usually takes place off campus and is currently performed in the lecturers non class contact time. Meetings of course tutors, regarded as vital for team teaching, is an area noted by 43% of respondents being regarded as non class contact time. Meeting students in small groups for seminars, student presentations and role play exercises was noted by 28% of respondents as a militating factor against the present staff student ratios. The compiling of submissions, whilst time consuming, is an area noted by 26% of respondents as necessary for the continuance of the course yet not classed as class contact time. Comments on how to overcome this problem suggested that HODs must not only realise the fact that course leaders can actively improve their courses whilst not standing in front of a class and adjustments to their teaching timetables be made to reflect the amount of work done in the non-teaching time. Another suggestion was the use of block timetables where a small group of BEC lectures can be allocated a period of time, say 50-100 hours of learning support per subject per annum and have the freedom to decide how and when the teaching and learning take place with the overall constraint that the syllabus be adequately covered within that period of time.

Questions 27 - 30 (Awareness of BEC by Employers)

The majority (84%) of respondents considered that employers did not know the difference between the DES Rules 124 HNC/D courses and the current BEC courses. The course leaders were asked what BEC should do to remedy this seeming lack of information. Almost threequarters, (74%), wished BEC to explain to employers the value of a BEC HNC/D vis-a-vis a certificate or diploma awarded under DES Rules 124.

Central advertising similar to that put out by the DES for the current Youth Training Schemes was seen by 18% as an effective way to bring the BEC awards and the educational standing of such awards to the notice of the employers. It was suggested by 24% of respondents that the LEA also have a responsibility (since BEC awards attract mandatory grants) to assist central government in "spreading the news". Other suggestions include using local chambers of commerce, employer associations and professional associations to advertise the value of BEC awards regarding employment prospects and possible exemptions from certain professional examinations. One respondent claimed that when he had suggested to BEC the need for a national advertising campaign, received the reply that BEC have very little funds for such an exercise - to which he replied "we (further educational establishments) have considerably less". 81% of respondents did, however, consider that their own establishments should take some responsibility in keeping employers informed of changes in the educational system. Suggested ways as to how this may be achieved were by:

- a) creating a post of Departmental Liaison Officer to visit employers, such an incumbent could be used for all courses offered by the establishment,
- b) use local branches of professional associations as many lecturers are active members of such bodies,
- c) create consultative committees, hold open days and invite employers to seminars on campus.

Question 31 (Acceptance and Credibility of BEC awards)

A high degree of acceptance was found amongst Educational Bodies 84%, Employers (84%), Students 93%, Careers Advisors (91%) and Parents (93%) but the Professional Bodies showed only 41%, yet the credibility was lower in all but one group. Respondents found that credibility of the awards varied from educational bodies 45%, employers 63%, students 90%, careers advisors 90%, parents 93% and the professional bodies only 29%. The high degree of acceptance yet the lower levels of creditibility may be due to the fact that there is no other national examining body that offers any alternative course of a similar level that attract mandatory grants.

Questions 32 - 34 (Links with Professional Bodies)

Asked if BEC courses linked directly and deliberately with other courses offered at the same establishments the respondents showed that in almost one third of cases there was a direct link. The only exception being the building societies where 97% showed no links. The following question asked if there was compatibility between BEC examinations and those of the same bodies where the links were made. In this instance almost two-thirds of the respondents found that there was compatibility with the exception of the building societies (no compatibility) and the Institute of Bankers (only 3% compatibility). This information is based on the fact that 91% of the respondents do have contact with the professional bodies with the aim of gaining exemptions from part of the professional examinations.

Questions 35 - 39 (Skills and Skill Development)

83% of the respondents do prepare a skills development programme for their students. When asked to list the types of skills included in the skills development programme 7% thought their list too long to include in the reply to the questionnaire, of the remainder 100% included communication and numeracy skills, 49% included interpersonal skills, 24% included receptiveness to new ideas and only 14% include information technology skills. A following question asked how the skills were implemented into the teaching programme. The same 7% who thought their list too long also considered the answer to this question too long. For the remainder, the main vehicles for implementation appear to be CMAs (100%), IMAs (91%), case studies (70%), workshops (56%), group work (40%), lectures and simulation exercises (35%), and work experience and seminars (24%). Question number 38 requested examples of how the skills were assessed and only 29 out of a possible 75 attempted to reply. The main methods of assessment appear to be through written and oral presentations conducted by team or panel of tutors. The final question asked if full-time students needed a different balance of skills to be taught than part-time students, 87% of respondents considered that they did. The specific needs for full-time students were perceived as computer usage (83%), work simulation exercises (63%), interviewing techniques (22%) and interpersonal skills (16%). The needs of part-time students were seen as knowledge (83%) and study skills (13%). It is interesting to note that "study skills" did not appear in the list of skills to be developed included in the previous answers.

SUMMARY

The response rate from course leaders was the highest of the three categories surveyed.

The duty of liaison between the colleges and employers rests mainly with the course leader where there is no specific post of a Liaison Officer to maintain contact with employers. It seems that the course leaders are doing a good job as there is substantial assistance given by the employers.

Only a quarter of the potential students are interviewed prior to joining the course and this could ultimately affect the quality of the students who enrol. During the course or immediately following the completion of the course only half the respondents attempted to survey the students to ascertain feedback on the suitability of the course. Both these points could indicate that the course leaders have insufficient time to conduct interviews or surveys.

Preparation for submissions of courses for validation consume a significant amount of time where the intake of students is around 50 per annum it seems that the full-time employed purely on this exercise would be about 1 1/3, although no formal log of the time appears to have been kept. The most common problem encountered was the form in which the document should be prepared rather than the content. This suggests that those who wish the information have not given clear instructions as to how it should be presented. Where this lack of direction is given it must have been frustrating when the completed document was returned by the validators with adverse comments regarding its layout and format.

Three quarters of the respondents required more staff to offer BEC courses compared to the DES Rules 124 courses and all existing staff needed some form of training in the skills required to offer BEC courses. Where new staff were recruited a large proportion needed considerable training in those skills.

The teaching and learning accommodation required for BEC courses also posed problems as the style of teaching and learning was different to many of the other courses offered at the same establishment. If irregular use is made of classrooms and other areas in the college it suggests that the scheduling of rooms ought to be conducted on a college-wide basis. The reasoning for this conclusion is that many of the tutors were supplied by departments other than that offering the course. Cross-usage of departmental resources could best be facilitated by allocations from a central rather than a fragmented pool of resources.

Different equipment was needed and the provision was often of a capital rather than a revenue nature. The use of a photocopying machine was the most popular request for use by both staff and students. Computer hardware and software was also in great demand. If the students were to be prepared for employment where the use of computerised information is the norm, it seems logical that students should receive thorough training in that area.

The impression gained by the researcher was that course leaders are overloaded with work and the method of determining the staffing levels was not commensurate with the workload. Where changes are made to the mode and quantity of work to be done there needs to be a change in the method of determining the provision of resources to successfully meet those new demands.

A very high proportion of the respondents considered that the "end users" of their product, employers, were not aware of the difference between a pre and post-BEC qualification, yet most employers accepted the new qualification. This can be interpreted as a reflection of industry's interest in education provision by the state. The professional bodies were also not entirely happy with the new qualification yet accepted it. The acceptance can be put down to the fact that little alternative is available in business education courses at this level.

The development of students' transferable skills posed problems to many teachers and if BEC insist on this approach to learning a determined effort should be made by BEC, the college management, or a combination of both to teach the teachers.

RESPONSE BY OTHER TUTORS

The survey showed that the overall response rate from other tutors was 45% with 57 out of a possible 126 responding to the postal questionnaires.

Questions 1 - 5 (Teacher Status)

The majority of other tutors were full-time employees (94%) and just over half (57%) were employed in the same faculty or school that offers the BEC course. Only 15% of other tutors teach exclusively on BEC courses and the same 15% also taught on HNC/D courses prior to BEC. 29% are timetabled for less than half their time on BEC courses with 55% having between half and threequarters of their timetable devoted to BEC courses.

Question 6 (Previous BEC teaching experience)

Tutors who have four or more years' experience teaching on BEC courses account for 78% of the respondents, 6% have taught on BEC courses for less than one year, 10% for between one to two years and 6% for between two to three years.

Question 7 (BEC -V- Other Courses)

Those who have taught on courses other than BEC found the main differences between BEC and other courses to be:-

Teaching Methods: Other courses are taught from a strict syllabus and tested by previously unseen questions in a two or three hour examination. BEC students are tested by assignments throughout the

whole period of the two year course. Much of the teaching on the other courses is done by "chalk and talk" with the tutor being the focal point as a knowledge base which creates an attitude of certainty in the tutor. BEC courses create interactive learning by the use of directed self study with very little dictated note taking and more use made of investigative work on the part of the student. Directed self study builds confidence in the student and tends to create a self-reliance in problem solving thus transferring the focal point from the tutor to the student. Many respondents likened this to their own experiences when studying for their degrees. Lectures are seen as a way of introducing BEC students to a knowledge base and to show how business problems arise and to demonstrate various techniques of problem solving whereas other courses use lectures as a knowledge base followed by demonstrations of how to attempt examination questions (which are not always good business simulations). Tutors on BEC courses invite criticism and comments rather than offer information that is taken down in note form, slavishly learnt by heart and reproduced in examinations.

Learning Methods: Learning was described as more active than passive on BEC courses and students were said to often learn by non-classroom contact with tutors. Other courses relied on retention of knowledge whereas BEC courses made much more use of the library and research methods with the emphasis on where to find the information rather than committing the knowledge to memory. In almost every case the respondents mentioned the use of the case study approach linked to a work-related problem as a basis of learning where subject specialisms overlapped in the problem posed and in the possible solution. Other participative methods such as role-play and field-work used on BEC

courses are rarely if ever used on other courses. Phrases such as "developing self-confidence", "become more independent", "able to work in a less structured environment under pressure to meet deadlines", and "the ability to present themselves in an effective manner to employers" were used to explain the benefit of BEC learning methods over other courses.

Assessment Methods: The pre-BEC assessment by "marks" which meant marking schedules which specified "right" and "wrong" answers were not suitable for alternatives that might work in a given situation. The wider range of assessment methods to include oral, visual, computer based and investigative research were welcomed but many tutors found difficulty in finding the best ways of grading such work and expressed a desire for more staff development in this area. The BEC grading system allows for remedial work to be undertaken where minor deficiencies are exposed whereas other courses have a pass or fail than can only be remedied by a retaking of the whole year, often involving the taking of examinations that have previously been passed. The most often quoted difference was that the BEC system was more subjective and as a result it was more difficult to arrive at a national standard. (One respondent tardily stated "one medical certificate = one BEC certificate".) The assessment methods of continual testing by assignments and less emphasis on end of year examinations tends to give the student a fairer deal in a grouped award. Students are usually informed of the assessment criteria in the BEC system. A spin-off often mentioned was that staff more readily accepted the team approach to teaching as a result of having to assess students as a panel member in a face-to-face situation which involved making use of information outside the sphere of their own specialism.

Question 8 (Full or part-time courses)

Only 11% of the respondents teach part-time students exclusively, 21% only full-time students and remaining 68% teach both full and part-time students.

Questions 9 - 10 (Creating demand for BEC courses)

When asked if the college staff, including themselves should help create the demand for BEC courses, 33% strongly agreed, 47% agreed, 4% disagreed and 16% did not consider it their job. Of the 11 respondents who did not consider it their job, 7 laid the responsibility with the head of the department, 3 with the course supervisor and 1 with the college liaison officer.

Question 11 (Assistance from employers)

It appears that employers give some considerable assistance to this group of tutors in the design and running of BEC courses in the following areas: 80% received assistance by visits to the employers premises and by employers acting as visiting lecturers on campus, 55% by employers offering work experience periods for students, 35% in setting assignments - although only 25% assist in assessing assignments, 20% with curriculum design and 15% with course design.

Questions 12 - 13 (Class size)

The average class size varied from less than 10 to over 26 students. An average of between 16-20 students was recorded by 42% of the

respondents, 37% had an average class size of over 26 students with 6% between 21-25 students and 5% with less than 10 students. The average number of students in a tutorial group varied from less than 5 students to more than 15, the largest proportion of respondents (30%) had between 11-15 students per group, 20% with 8-10 students, 25% with 5-7 students, 15% with the largest group size of over 15 students and 10% with less than five students in a group.

Questions 14 - 15 (Student attendance hours)

The number of hours that full-time students are required to attend lectures or formal classes varied from 11 hours to more than 17 hours per week. More than half of the respondents (53%) stated that such attendance time was for 17 or more hours per week, 31% required between 13-14 hours per week, 11% required between 15-16 and 5% requiring an attendance of between 11-12 hours per week.

Part-time students (one day per week) were required to attend lectures or formal classes for between 5-6 hours per week by 58% of the respondents, 7-8 hours per week by 36% and less than 4 hours per week by 6% of the respondents.

Questions 16 - 17 (Hours spent on BEC meetings)

All tutors timetabled on BEC courses were required to attend meetings regarding such courses irrespective of the amount of hours per week they taught BEC students. Over half (57%) claim to spend between 1-2 hours per week attending meetings on BEC matters, 38% spend between 2-3 hours per week and only 5 % spend less than one hour per week at

such meetings. Timetable allowances or remission for this non-teaching time was given to only 12% of respondents.

Questions 18 - 19 (Industrial experience)

This question was addressed to full-time staff only. A number of tutors (11%) had never been employed in industry, a further 3% had had no industrial experience since 1970. 44% had been employed in industry during the period 1970-1975, 28% within 1975-1980 and only 14% had recent industrial experience since 1980. As BEC courses are closely related to the work situation it seems surprising that so few tutors have had recent first hand experience in the areas they are teaching. Since 1975 only 42% of the respondents had been employed in industry yet 79% considered that staff should have regular periods of secondment with industry.

Questions 20 - 22 (Staff development)

During the last 5 years 53% had attended courses related to BEC teaching/learning methods yet 79% considered that BEC should offer courses for staff development. If BEC did offer such courses the respondents would attend courses in the following areas; assignment design and skills assessment (75%), case study preparation (73%), assessment methods (60%), skills development (52%), team teaching (42%), curriculum development (40%), non-standard examination setting/assessment methods (32%), information technology (25%), in-house staff/team development and courses designed to keep staff up to date on the most recent BEC literature (14%), workshops (14%), integration of finance with other modules (12%) and application of business

expertise to teaching materials/methods (8%). In addition to nominating areas that would interest themselves 21% of the respondents suggested that they would like to take BEC staff on courses held at their individual establishments in order to teach BEC staff the problems of implementing the BEC philosophy at 'the chalk face'.

14 respondents commented to the effect that they had attended short courses/workshops run by BEC officers but felt that these courses were 'poorly organised and unprofessionally conducted'. 10 respondents suggested that this was because the officers were not (or were no longer) practising teachers and did not/could not understand the constraints on teachers of "to-day". This undermined their confidence in attending further courses offered by BEC.

Questions 23 - 24 (Accommodation)

One-third of the respondents were accommodated in staff rooms that had more than 70% of the occupants currently teaching on BEC courses, a further third had between 31 - 70% and the final third had less than 30% of occupants currently teaching on BEC courses. Asked if they considered that any advantage might be gained from having all BEC tutors accommodated in the same staff rooms, 11% considered that it would be of great advantage, 69% considered that some advantage would be gained, whereas 20% saw no advantage.

SUMMARY

The majority of other tutors were full-time tutors (94%) and any comments must be viewed in this light. So few part-time tutors returned questionnaires that a further survey could prove interesting at a future date which is targetted at part-time tutors only and a comparison made with the findings of this survey.

It appears that most (78%) tutors experienced the change from HNC/D to BEC having taught under both systems.

The response to question 7 (examining any differences between BEC and other courses) prompted the most comments. It would seem that teaching on BEC courses involves tutors more individually with students, creates a deeper awareness of other specialist subject areas and encourages team teaching yet, despite any headaches this may create, the replies indicated a measure of enjoyment in their teaching and a satisfaction of giving the student a good chance of future employment. The most often quoted problem centred around "how to grade students work" and frequent pleas were made for more staff development in this area with the lead coming from BEC.

Assistance from employers showed that there is an interest from the "end users" of the course and all encouragement should be given to extending this valuable resource.

The fact that greater involvement of the staff in the course as a whole does not attract time allowances was regularly quoted in the comments at the end of the questionnaires. The thrust of these

comments can be summed up by one respondent who said "give us the right tools (including time) and we can give BEC and the student a good deal".

Staff development requests (question 22) confirmed the need quoted in the responses to question number 7 and a substantial list could be extracted from the responses.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The aims of the thesis were to identify the changes made by BEC, consider the reasons for change, identify the main differences in the curriculum set up by BEC compared to the curriculum that was replaced and to examine strategies adopted by educational establishments to implement those changes (see page 1). A brief summary is given of the findings from the questionnaires showing the effects of BEC's changes. Key curriculum issues are identified and suggestions made for further research.

CHANGES MADE

The system of Joint Committees offering HNC/D courses and examined under DES Rules 124 was replaced by the creation of BEC who changed the title of the award to include the words "Business Educational Council" that were to be shown before the words Higher National Certificate/Diploma. A more clear distinction could have been made by choosing a completely different title to mark the change from one system to another. A complete change in the title of the award may have helped employers as well as students to differentiate between the old and the new awards. A further minor change occurred when BEC and TEC merged to include the word "Technician" in the title (see page 3). Historically changes had been suggested in the field of business studies (see page 11 et seq) and any changes made by BEC may seem less sudden when viewed in this light. The use of central power on

curriculum changes was held, but rarely used by HMI, and BEC simply took up this power in an apparently more determined way than was suggested by Haslegrave.

The curriculum design took on such ideas as themes, skills and a totally integrated approach as opposed to imparting knowledge in single subject areas. The mode of assessment using assignments testing students continually over the two year period replaced the system of annual examinations and a single major project (see page 19).

Under the old system there was an attendance requirement of 60% which appears to have been dropped and not replaced by BEC (see page 23).

In order to attempt to reinforce the integrative approach of the curriculum BEC suggested a tighter system of management control in the decision making structures of Business Studies Department (see page 25).

The assessment of students work is criteria based under BEC, compared to the norm referencing under the Joint Committees (see page 64).

REASONS FOR CHANGE

One of the main reasons appears to be concern expressed in the Haslegrave Report (1969) over the adequacy of business education generally and the wisdom of having numerous validating bodies offering slightly different courses in this field, which was reinforced by the

McFarlane Report (1981), (see page 2). The inclusion of the MSC since 1984 as a competitor for providing further education for the 16 - 19 year olds could be viewed purely as an instrument of government policy to link industry more closely with education or as a failure by BEC and the state controlled further education establishments to meet the new demands made by the economy in general and employers in particular. As the pace of change in education seems to be slow BEC apparently opted for tighter control in order to enforce a more rapid change (see page 51). The changes that did come about seemed to come from the centre (BEC) and not from the lecturers in colleges (see reports from HMI Wales on page 39 et seq). Much of the change came about due to the lack of opposition by lecturers or their managers.

DIFFERENCES

A major difference in the BEC system is the close supervision of assessment of students (see page 4). Previously work produced by students was assessed on a normative basis and the standards set were the responsibility of the tutor with little or no interference from the validating body. The use of BEC moderators now means that colleges are visited approximately three times a year and assignments and assessment schemes are vetted by the moderator. Haslegrave made little comment on the type or style of assessment (see page 16) yet BEC see this as a major plank for achieving tighter control.

Under DES Rules 124 there was a compulsory element of liberal studies which was recommended by Haslegrave in his 1969 report at paragraph 268 but this was not taken up by BEC. The system introduced by BEC

concentrates on the vocational aspects of business problem solving in a work environment either real or simulated.

The introduction of central themes, integrated cores and cross modular assignments do not appear in the Haslegrave (1969) report but seem to have emerged from BEC's own think tank with more emphasis on directed self study and the use of the case study approach as a vehicle for integration (see page 17). The manner in which the central themes, integrated cores and cross modular assignments were to be developed appears to have been left to the lecturers themselves. This method of motivation to accept and implement change was apparently unsuccessful as in 1984 and 1985 BEC were still making recommendations on how this should be carried out in their annual reviews (see page 22).

BEC also suggested changes in some of the subject areas previously taught under DES Rules 124. There was to be a reduction in theoretical economics and substantive law with more emphasis placed on the problems of business planning, decision taking and examination of the functional areas of a business organisation.

Different teaching and learning methods recommended by BEC included the use of role play, case studies and oral presentations with the active discouragement of the use of the extended essay. Each of these new methods required some measure of retraining by the teacher as such methods were previously rarely used, except in the area of communications teaching. Little effort seems to have been offered by BEC or made by the business studies departmental management for formal retraining, once again the driving force was expected to come from the teaching staff. If a majority of the teaching staff were members of

NATFHE who were not happy with the introduction of BEC without retraining, (see page 42), or time allowances for staff development it seems logical that without the recognition of the problem by management the teaching staff would "drag their feet" and perpetuate the slow pace of change.

STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY ESTABLISHMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGE

The main areas of change that affected the Business Studies Departments management were the control of aims and content of the course, assessment and moderation, validation and collective course management. In essence the management had little or no option but to accept the "suggested" changes. The aims of the course were firmly set down by BEC who allowed the colleges to develop their own content for the course, but by the process of rigid validation and moderation by BEC effectively removed almost all of the manoeuvrability that the business studies department management thought that they had. The moderator was appointed by BEC who notified the colleges of that fact. The collective course management was the only area left entirely to the business studies department management who, in the majority of cases, simply appointed the member of staff who was previously the course leader of the old HNC/D course to take charge of the new BEC course. The result was, in many cases, that the course leader carried on in the same way as before merely adopting the change in the title of the appointment from course leader to "course co-ordinator", a designation recommended by BEC. If BEC had realised that this was the extent of the innovation and imagination of the college management then perhaps BEC should have gone all the way down the authoritarian

road and appointed course co-ordinators themselves. To do so would have meant that BEC may have had to be responsible for the retraining of such staff - a matter that they were either not capable of or did not want the responsibility for.

Such strategies that were adopted are best drawn from the responses gathered from the questionnaires which follow.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE RESEARCH

The business studies department management can only be judged on the responses to the questionnaires from Heads of Departments who for the purposes of this chapter will be regarded as the "managers" of Business Studies Departments and as such pursue the policies of College senior management.

The Heads of Departments of the twelve establishments visited and the researcher's own college readily agreed to participate in the research project yet answered in an almost defensive manner. This inference was drawn by the researcher who can find little basis for the manner seemingly adopted. Statements of a statistical nature relating to numbers of students attending college, the percentage rise or fall in the college roll, the number of staff they were responsible for and the staff to student ratios were readily given without recourse to notes. The actual number of teaching hours performed by staff was also well known but those activities that were carried out in the lecturers' preparation time were not. Although they seemed aware that BEC did place demands on the lecturers they were unsure of the extent

of these demands in terms of the need for retraining, giving sufficient time allowances for good course management and actively encouraging staff development. Any encouragement for staff development goes beyond informing staff that they are in need of developmental training to seeking out courses suitable for their staff. Where no such courses exist it is incumbent upon them to press BEC to create such courses or develop in-house courses themselves in conjunction with heads of other business studies departments. The pressure on scarce resources of the college in terms of classroom accommodation, computer hardware and software, self study areas and secretarial backup also seems to be well known by Heads of Departments yet little attempt appears to have been made at securing increases in these resources from their LEA's (see the response made to questions 16 - 18 from Heads of Departments on pages 102-104). The point regarding the usage of time for effective course management, pastoral care, career guidance, team building, team teaching and cross modular activities seems to be lost with the Heads of Departments and a source of frustration amongst their staff. To build a brand new course for BEC, with clear guidelines and staff who have no preconceived ideas from teaching on the previous DES Rules 124 scheme and a sympathetic Head of Department who is willing to take an active part in the teaching would be not only possible, given a reasonable amount of time, but an exciting and enjoyable task. To be given the same task without the positive and active encouragement from a Head of Department who takes no part in the teaching yet demands a high standard and a full five year approval from BEC is almost impossible despite the enthusiasm of the teaching staff. Heads of Departments should lead and use the art of delegation with care.

THE EFFECTS OF BEC'S CHANGES

The effects of BEC's changes seem to have fallen mainly on the lecturers responsible for co-ordinating the courses and those teaching the new curriculum. Any new system can be expected to place new demands on those implementing the system. The new demands can be summarised as:

- a) multidisciplinary knowledge needed and more awareness of other specialisms impinging on one's own subject area
- b) more detailed planning over the whole course
- c) working under closer scrutiny of the validating body
- d) new teaching and learning methods to be used
- e) a need to widen the lecturers' perception of real life business
- f) more non-teaching time to plan and resubmit plans at least every five years
- g) different accommodation and other physical resources

Each of these new demands will be examined in turn.

a) Multidisciplinary Knowledge

Comments that the lecturer must become a generalist rather than a specialist are rejected on the grounds that by taking time to learn about other specialisms does not automatically mean that a lack of updating in one's own specialism takes place simultaneously. It does mean, however, that the lecturer is busier than before in knowledge acquisition. Extra knowledge is acquired rather than substituted. There is an art in acquiring knowledge in

another area and knowing how to use that knowledge in one's own teaching which demonstrates to the student how, for example, a decision in marketing can usefully apply quantitative techniques to analyse market research reports to arrive at a more profitable business decision.

b) Detailed Planning

The planning of a BEC course can only be done effectively on a team basis and cover the whole course of two, sometimes three, years. To be effective this requires an amount of continuity in team leadership and preferably team membership of full-time staff to meet on an ad hoc as well as a preplanned basis.

c) Working under scrutiny

Previously the monitoring of the workman-like way in which the teaching was carried out was the responsibility of the course leader and the Head of Department. Under BEC the preparation of normative assessments and criteria based assignments come under the close scrutiny of the BEC moderator. Would it be possible to dispense with the Head of Department in this monitoring function and rely entirely on the BEC appointed moderator? Examination papers for the end of year assignments come under particularly close scrutiny by the moderators who request more imaginative ways of testing students.

d) New Teaching and Learning Methods

Teaching old dogs new tricks may be difficult but encouraging "old" lecturers to use new ways of teaching and learning may be more so! This area, above all others, brought forth comments on the dire need for formal retraining and staff development. Using a case study approach to a business problem that may have a number of possible outcomes means that the lecturer should be aware of most of the possible answers and be ready to accept those that are seen for the first time and judge them on their own merits. Group work, rarely used previously, can also create new problems for the uninitiated particularly in the assessment of a piece of work where the contributions by the group participants is either unequal or indivisible. The use of audio-visual equipment can be daunting for the non technically minded lecturer.

The most recent publication seen on assessment is by Kitley (1987) and demonstrates that while new ideas can be put forward by the theorist the changing of old habits is a difficult task. This influential report is a result of an MSC-funded research project looking at the assessment methods used by BTEC centres.

The report finds that there were a number of centres who were successfully using a student-centred approach with emphasis on what are called "influencing skills" and "self skills", and these were seen to be the most successful centres generally. But when it came to assessment, even the successful centres tended to use inappropriate methods relying heavily on structured marking of written work, and "formative assessment" was frequently under-emphasised or missing.

("Formative assessment" helps students learn and is not concerned necessarily with grading.) There was a general reluctance to become involved in the assessment of "influencing skills", probably due to an unwillingness to stray outside subject specialisms or to make subjective decisions about student performance in this area.

The report recommends:

- more teaching staff development run both by centres and by BTEC with MSC support
- more emphasis on skills development on staff development programmes
- more appreciation by centre managements, and by the DES, of the resource implications of skills-based courses
- greater use of a variety of assessors, including student peer groups, employers and external examiners. This, it is felt, would counteract the subject nature of assessment in the case of "self- skills" and "influencing skills"

These conclusions may have a familiar ring, but the report's discussion of specific teaching/assessment methods does contain new ideas and will probably be of some influence in the future. There are notes on:

- learning contracts, negotiated with the student and the employer, which define the skill areas where the student will develop and form the framework for curriculum content and assessment
- learning communities, where part of the course is handed over to the students who specify their needs, work out how and when they will learn, and how assessment will be carried out.

Other interesting notes cover:

- action learning sets
- peer group assessment
- employer involvement
- students' personal development journals
- use of outside experts
- group working

All these sections contain practical observations and information, sometimes controversial, as in the suggestion that learning groups should be streamed by ability described in Appendix 7.

Several methods for analysing the skills content of a course are suggested.

This publication by Kitley in 1987 would have acted as a useful handbook to both managers and tutors of BEC courses were it published ten years earlier!

e) Business Perception

To create life-like business situations to pose to students as assignments requires a working knowledge of various businesses. This cannot be drawn from text books and must come from first hand experience. The experience should be drawn from short term regular periods of work in business and longer periods of secondment every few years. In order to test students who will receive an award in business surely the tester must have some recent experience in the world of business.

f) Non Class Contact Time

Class contact time for most lecturers in the institutions surveyed varied from 15 - 21 hours per week. The remaining hours of the working week are designated preparation or non-teaching time. The non class contact time was used for preparing lessons or lectures, up- dating material for use in class and keeping up to date with current ideas in the subject matter. Very little time was devoted to the planning and administration of the courses under DES Rules 124 as they were well established and suffered little outside control or close monitoring by the DES. The introduction of BEC required an assimilation of new ideas, the compilation of new syllabi, the creation of assignments for each new module, new assessment schemes, and the moulding of unlike minds into teams. At the same time there was a requirement to produce a document for validation by a hitherto unknown body. The submission document was to cover such items as course aims and objectives, learning objectives for up to 15 different modules, a teaching strategy covering a continuous two year period, an assessment strategy, a skill development programme and a course review programme. This workload was in addition to the preparation and marking time for the current DES course as the BEC course would run sequentially, no break being allowed between the two courses. In most instances the two courses ran concurrently for one year as the second year DES course operated at the same time as the first intake of BEC students arrived. Little or no timetable remission was given to accomplish these tasks. As most Heads of Departments did little or no teaching they considered it not unreasonable to ask those who were to teach the new syllabus to prepare it. Once the

enormity of the task was recognised by the course leaders and lecturers they requested timetable allowances at a time when central government were imposing resource restraints on the public sector spending (see page 83). Consequently not only more work but new work was being asked of the teaching staff within the same time scale. This attitude of financial constraint was the cause of sometimes bitter feelings which were directed towards BEC who were the instigators of the increased workload. BEC may have come in for some unfair criticism as it is doubtful that they expected the full weight of implementing their scheme should have fallen on so few pairs of shoulders with no funding. For those colleges who submitted a course that received validation for two or three years soon found themselves in the position of having to revise their plans for their next submission which elongated the period of pressure causing possible further strain on already stretched resources. As BEC higher courses were the only ones that attracted a mandatory grant for students from LEAs and often provided the business studies departments with a substantial proportion of their non-professional students, the departments were under pressure to gain a continuing period of validation as these courses would be a major part of their funding. Consequently those colleges who could not get it right at first were obliged to try and try again.

g) Accommodation and Other Resources

The emphasis was on different rather than more accommodation for such activities as role-play exercises, small group discussions, research and team project work when the group size was much

smaller than that for lessons or lectures. Rooms for audio-visual work needed less cubic capacity than classrooms and highlighted the need for more than one set of recording equipment per intake of students.

Computer equipment was also in high demand, particularly suitable software packages for teaching purposes. Those establishments who did possess a large number of machines complained of their incompatibility. This would indicate the lack of a central purchasing policy. Even where there was compatibility of machinery there was still a lack of suitable teaching software.

KEY CURRICULUM ISSUES

Remoteness Most interviews conducted brought forth ad hoc comments on this aspect; "the planners are far removed from the doers", "BEC officers are ex teachers because they deliberately chose to leave the chalk face as they could not stand the pace of change".

Heavy demand on college staff The demands placed on the college staff were made without prior consultation with the paymasters. The logical chain of planning, funding and stating operational requirements seemed to miss out on the second stage which makes the third stage very difficult (see page 73).

New syllabi The new syllabi were to be compiled with little guidance from BEC who, at that time were perhaps experiencing growing pains themselves, and may have changed the ground rules at short notice. Such changes of rules were not always quickly communicated to the staff who were engaged in preparing a two year plan at least one year in advance of its submission.

New Methods The new methods in both teaching and learning demanded by BEC were to be used immediately the new courses started. Many staff were untrained in these methods and few staff development programmes were available to update staff (see page 88).

General

'Too much, too soon' The pace of change in education was known to be slow and in the opinion of the researcher BEC expected too rapid a change. At the time of completing this thesis (1988), the change is now being accepted by college managements, LEAs as well as the staff. This acceptance has taken a decade. The key point which stands out above all others is that for orderly change to take place thorough planning must be undertaken together with the provision of identified resources. All members who are affected by the planning and resource requirements need to be thoroughly briefed, funded and trained before the plans are put into operation.

Recommendations Any further updating of education in business studies at the higher national level should be approached in a business-like manner. Radical change may not be readily accepted. The management of change is an all-embracing task and all those who will be affected by the change ought to be consulted at the earliest possible stages. An analogy can be drawn from a typical business plan - the board of directors dictate the aims and goals (the DES or BEC), long-term plans are discussed with the providers of finance and other resources (the LEA), managers and operatives are trained ahead of production (college management and teaching staff), a pilot or practice run to establish

faults in the original plans that can be put right prior to full scale operations, (a two year course) continual monitoring of actual production to establish any weaknesses that need correction or good points that can be capitalised to enhance the operation further (annual reviews). During all phases of the plan, the customer (potential employer and student) need to be consulted to prove that the product provided meets the changing demands of the market place. This analogy indicates two main requirements from either the DES or BEC - staff development to be offered in a highly professional manner for those currently teaching and the inclusion of practical and up-to-date methods of teaching and learning in all teacher training colleges.

The next round of major changes in educational policy will no doubt be well planned at ministerial level but the procedures will need to be discussed at all levels prior to implementation. Such discussion would ideally include a significant proportion of those who will carry out the changes in the classroom in order to attempt a balance between political, economic and educational expedience. The current situation in secondary schools with the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) serves to emphasise the need for co-operation at all levels if a smooth and beneficial change is to be brought about. The inclusion of an experienced management consultant may prove to be a useful addition to any panel planning new changes.

Topics and approaches for further research

The use of central themes The choice and number of themes intended to promote integration in courses at all levels of education may usefully be analysed in further study now that its use extends from primary to further education. In particular its use and effectiveness in the new core curriculum in secondary education (see page 20).

Central control The quotation from Stenhouse (1975) on page 68 implies that reflectiveness is an invaluable tool in the development of education but time to reflect may now be an unaffordable luxury due to the imposition of a national core curriculum by central government.

Theoretical models of change strategies The attempt at interpretation of BEC's strategies for change through theoretical models is briefly mentioned on page 78. This fascinating area of educational theory may provide an excellent basis for further investigation.

Response from employers An interesting follow-up would be to ascertain the usefulness of the new style courses to students in finding employment and the opinion of employers who have experience of taking on pre- and post-BEC students.

Survey of part-time tutors The replies to the questionnaires for "Other Tutors" were from a very high proportion of full-time employees (see page 124). A similar survey targetted at the part-time employees may reveal some interesting comparisons.

SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITYDEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONQUESTIONNAIRE FOR
HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

1. What is the size of your College in terms of total students enrolled on all courses?

2. What is the number of students enrolled on all BTEC courses this year? (Boards 1 to 9 inclusive).

3. What is the number of students this year enrolled on?

a.	BTEC	Bd2	Full-time	Year 1	<input type="text"/>
b.	BTEC	Bd2	Full-time	Year 2	<input type="text"/>
c.	BTEC	Bd2	Part-time	Year 1	<input type="text"/>
d.	BTEC	Bd2	Part-time	Year 2	<input type="text"/>
e.	BTEC	Bd8	Full-time	Year 1	<input type="text"/>
f.	BTEC	Bd8	Full-time	Year 2	<input type="text"/>
g.	BTEC	Bd8	Part-time	Year 1	<input type="text"/>
h.	BTEC	Bd8	Part-time	Year 2	<input type="text"/>

4. Over the past 3 years what was the number of enrolments on?

- a. BTEC Bd1 + Bd2 full-time
- b. BTEC Bd1 or Bd2 part-time
- c. BTEC Bd4 or Bd8 full-time
- d. BTEC Bd4 or Bd8 part-time

1982/3	1983/4	1984/5

5. If the numbers enrolled in Ques. 4 were split into smaller classes/groups for class contact, what was the number of students in each class/group?

- a. BTEC Bd1 + B2 full-time
- b. BTEC Bd1 + B2 part-time
- c. BTEC B4 or Bd8 full-time
- d. BTEC B4 or Bd8 part-time

1982/3	1983/4	1984/5

6. If the answer to Ques. 4 shows any significant increase or decrease over the last 3 years, can you state briefly what you think the reasons were?

7. a. Do you divide BTEC intakes into streams to facilitate progression towards some future examination?

YES	NO

7. b. If the answer to Ques. 7.a. is yes, what title do you give the streams and what future examination do you suggest the student should study for?

<u>Board 2</u>	<u>Tick</u> <u>Appropriate</u> <u>Box</u>	<u>Name of Examining Body</u>
Stream		
A Marketing		
B Finance		
C Accounting		
D Banking		
E Insurance		
F Others - please list		

<u>Board 8</u>	<u>Tick</u> <u>Appropriate</u> <u>Box</u>	<u>Name of Future Examining Body</u>
Stream		
A Public Admin- istration		
B Health		
C Police		
D Fire Service		
E Others - please list		

8. a. Do you conduct your own in house "conversion course" for BTEC students.

(1) Full-time

(2) Part-time

YES	NO

8. b. If the answer to Ques. 8.a. is NO, who offers the "Conversion Course".

8. c. If the answer to Ques. 8.a. is YES, what is the duration of the conversion course in weeks.

(1) Full-time

(2) Part-time

Weeks

9. For your most recent submission to offer BTEC courses, what period of approval were you granted?

Place Tick Appropriate Box

Rejected
ONE intake
TWO intakes
THREE intakes
FOUR intakes
FIVE intakes
More than five intakes

STAFFING

- 10.a Are all the staff teaching on Bd2 and 8 administered by one department.

YES	NO

10.b If the answer to Q.10.a is NO how many staff in your department teach on BTEC courses and how many staff service your BTEC courses?

Departmental Staff

Servicing Staff

10.c If the answer to Ques. 10.a is NO, what was the approximate percentage of class contact hours serviced by other departments in the last academic year.

Board 2			Board 8		
Module	Max. class contact hrs. P.A.	% class contact hrs. serviced	Module	Max. class contact hrs. P.A.	% class contact hrs. serviced

11. BTEC Bd2 and 8 courses are usually taught on a "team basis". What is the title and composition of the teams that your College uses? (A photo copy of the relevant pages of your last submission will suffice as an answer).

Team Title	No. of staff on Team	Brief Responsibilities

12.a Do servicing teachers form part of any of the teams mentioned in Q11.

YES	NO

12.b If the answers to Ques. 12.a is YES, on which module do they teach and to which team to they belong?

No. of Teachers	Module Taught	Member of Which Team

13.a Are any BTEC teachers employed on a part-time basis only?

YES	NO

13.b If the answer to Ques. 13.a is YES, on which module do they teach and are they also team members.

No. of Part-time teachers	Module Taught	Member of which team (if any)

13.c If the answer to Ques. 13.a is YES, would you prefer to employ all BTEC teachers on a full-time basis,

YES	NO

13.d If the answer to Q.13 c is YES, what are your reasons for preferring full-time teachers on BTEC courses?

13.e If the answer to Q.13.c is NO, what benefits do you gain by employing part-time lecturers on BTEC courses?

14.a How many staff teach on BTEC courses?

14.b Are any of your full time staff fully timetabled on BTEC courses?

YES	NO

15. If the answer to Ques. 14 is YES, how many staff are fully timetabled on BTEC courses?

RESOURCES

16. Since 1978/9 has your department had to make significant changes in its resource requirement as a direct result of offering BTEC courses?

YES	NO

17. If the answer to Ques. 16 is YES, what was the nature of the changes?

18. Since 1978/9 have you, at the College, made any requests to the LEA for improvements in staffing levels, accommodation, or any other areas as a direct result of offering BTEC courses?

YES	NO

19. If the answer to Ques. 18 is YES,

a What requests were made?

- (1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____
(5) _____

b Did the LEA respond favourably or unfavourably to your requests?

- (1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____
(5) _____

Favourable	Unfavourable

20.a As a direct result of offering BTEC courses, have you, or any of your staff, attended courses of more than one days duration in the last 3 years?

YES	NO

20.b If the answer to Ques. 20 is YES, please complete the table below.

No. of Staff	Year of Course	Title of Course	Who promoted the course

20.c As a direct result of offering BTTC course, have you, or any of your staff, had a period of secondment to industry or commerce in the last 3 years? If YES please complete the following table.

No. of Staff	Year	Nature of Secondment

BTEC COURSE MANAGEMENT - FORMAL AND INFORMAL

21. Can you give a diagram of the course management structure for your college? (A photocopy of the relevant part of your last submission will be acceptable).

22a. Are teachers charged with pastoral care of students outside normal class contact time?

Yes

No

22b. If the answer to question 22a is Yes, what is the ratio of staff to students?

Staff for every

Students

23.a How many formal meetings, relating to BTEC courses, are held each academic year (from enrolments to examinations)?

Type of Meeting	No of Meetings pa	Duration of Meeting (hours)

23.b For all meetings listed in Q.23a please complete the following table

Type of Meeting	Timetabled as Class Contact	Not timetabled but allowances Given	Meeting not timetabled and no allowances
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

24. If meetings are also held on an INFORMAL basis, what is the approximate total hours spent on unscheduled meetings by all staff on BTEC courses?

Approx hours p.a.

25. Are most BTEC teachers accommodated in the same staff room or are the staff rooms scattered over the college campus - Please tick appropriate box(es).

All in same staff room

☐

Most in same staff room

☐

All in same building but
different staff rooms

☐

Separate building on
same site

☐

Separate buildings on
different sites

☐

Any Other Comments

SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BTEC CO-ORDINATORS
CREATION AND SATISFACTION OF DEMAND

1. Does the College employ a 'Liaison Officer' (or similar post) with the sole responsibility of maintaining contact with employers and potential employers?

YES	NO

2. If the answer to Ques. 1. is NO, is this responsibility concerning BTEC (B2 and B8) courses vested in the Course Supervisor or some other post?

Course Supervisor	Some Other Post

If some other state title of the post _____

3. How often does the person responsible for liaison meet employers?

Weekly	
Monthly	
Termly	
Annually	
Ad hoc	

4. a. Have employers been asked to assist in -

- (1) Designing the curriculum?
- (2) Teaching students?
- (3) Assessing students assignments?
- (4) Allow students to use their facilities?
- (5) Allow students to visit their premises

YES	NO

4. b. If the answer to Ques. 4.a was YES, was their response favourable or unfavourable in -

- (1) Designing the curriculum?
- (2) Teaching students?
- (3) Assessing students assignments?
- (4) Allowing use of their facilities?
- (5) Allowing students to visit their premises

FAVOURABLE	UNFAVOURABLE

4. c. If the response was favourable, what degree of assistance was given
(Please tick appropriate box)

	Grud- ingly	Moderately Helpful	Helpful	V. Helpful	Enthusiatic
(1) Curriculum					
(2) Teaching					
(3) Assessing					
(4) Use of facilities					
(5) <u>Visits</u>					

4. d. If the answers to Ques. 4.b is favourable in any of the boxes can you give brief details of how the assistance was given.

5. a. Are employers requested to provide feedback information on their satisfaction with BTDC students in their suitability as employees?

YES	NO

5. b. If the answer to Ques. 5. is YES, would that information be available to me, if requested, at a later date?

YES	NO

6. Are students interviewed by the teaching staff prior to joining a BTEC course? (Please tick appropriate box)

All Students	Most Students	Few Students	No Students

7. a. Are students surveyed, using questionnaires, whilst they are on a BTEC course?

YES	NO

7. b. If the answer to Ques. 7.a. is YES, will you attach to this questionnaire a copy of the questions asked and indicate at what time during the course the survey is conducted.

YES	NO

7. c. If the answer to Ques. 7.a is YES, would this information be available to me, if requested, at a later date?

YES	NO

COMPILATION OF SUBMISSIONS FOR VALIDATION

8. Who compiles the resubmission for validation?

State Post: _____

9. a. How long did your last submission take from start to finish in total man hours (e.g. a team of 4 working 1 hour per week for 36 weeks = 4 x 1 x 36 144 man hours)

approximate

--

man hours

9. b.. In your opinion is this time adequate to compile a satisfactory submission?

10. a. Is the time taken in Ques. 9.a part of the teachers "preparation time" or are timetable remission hours allotted for this task?

Prep. Time	Remission

10. b. If remission of timetable hours are allowed, what is the normal allowance per year for the whole BTEC team?

--

total man hours

11. Prior to resubmission do you discuss any problem areas with?

- a. BTEC
b. Moderator
c. Other Colleges
d. Others - please list

12. For your last submission what were the areas in which you received assistance from:

a. BTEC

b. Moderator

c. Other Colleges

d. Others

13. a. Do you compile separate resubmissions for?

(1) Bd 2

YES	NO

(2) Bd 8

13. b. Do you compile separate submissions for full time and part time students?

YES	NO

14. What are the main points of difference between courses for full time and part time students?

15. a. On what date was your last submission accepted by BTEC?

15. b. On what date will you start compiling your next submission?

15. c. How many man hours do you expect to spend on your next submission?

RESOURCES

16. Do you consider that you need more staff to successfully offer a BTEC course compared with the "pre BEC" HNC/D course?

YES	NO

Any Comments -----

17. If the answer to Ques. 16 is YES, what percentage increase in staff do you consider you need assuming that the number of students were the same on BTEC as they were on HNC/D?

--

Any Comments -----

18. a Do you consider that BTEC courses demand new teaching skills compared to those needed on "pre BEC" HNC/D courses?

YES	NO

18. b If the answer to Ques. 18.a is YES, please list the types of new teaching skills needed.

19. Do staff new to teaching on BTEC courses arrive equipped with these skills or do they require some form of training?

Please tick appropriate box

Untrained in BTEC Teaching	Need Considerable Training	Need little Training	Fully Equipped

20. Do you consider that you need more or different accommodation to successfully offer BTEC courses compared with the old HNC/D courses.

More

YES	NO

Different

YES	NO

21. If the answer to Ques. 20. is YES, what additional or different type of accommodation do you need?

22. Do you consider that you need more or different equipment to successfully offer BTEC courses compared with the old HNC/D courses?

More

YES	NO

Different

YES	NO

23. If the answer to Ques. 22 is YES, what sort of additional or different equipment do you need?

24. "Does your college use "Staff to Student Ratios" (SSRS) and/or "Class Contact Hours" as a means to determine the number of staff employed?

a.

SSRS

YES	NO

b.

Class Contact Hours

YES	NO

25. If the answer to Ques. 24. is YES, do you consider that SSRS and/or class contact time to be an effective measure for determining the number of staff required to successfully run a BTEC course?

a.

SSRS

YES	NO

b.

Class Contact Time

YES	NO

26. If the answer to Ques. 29.a or 29.b is NO, what do you consider would be a more effective measure for determining a number of staff needed to successfully run a BTEC course?

BTEC LINKS WITH EMPLOYERS AND PROFESSIONAL BODIES

27. Do you consider that BTEC have made known to employers in the public and private sector the differences in old HNC/D awards and BTEC qualifications?

(a) Public Sector	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Private Sector	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

28. If the answers to question 27(a) or 27(b) is NO, what would you like to see BTEC do to keep employers informed?

29. Do you consider that each individual college should also take some responsibility in informing employers of the changes from HNC/D, BEC and onto BTEC?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

30. If the answer to question 29 is YES, what do you consider to be the most effective way(s) of keeping employers up-to-date with changes in business education.

31. BTEC Policies and Priorities into the 1990's document, (Para 19.), stated that BEC and TEC qualifications earned for themselves a high degree of national credibility and acceptance by the following groups. Do you consider this is true of BTEC HNC/D in business studies and public administration.

	Acceptance		Credibility	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Educational Bodies				
Professional Bodies				
Employers				
Students				
Careers Advisers				
Parents				

32. BTEC state that their HNC/D awards are designed as a stepping stone to professional qualifications. Does your college offer BTEC courses designed to link with professional qualifications in:

	YES	NO
(1) Accountancy (ICMA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ACCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(AAT)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Banking (I of B)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) Building Societies (I of BS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(5) Company Secretaryship (ICSA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(6) Public Health (IHSA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(7) Public Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please list any other Board 2 or Board 8 professionally linked courses offered by your college

(8) ☐

(9) ☐

(10) ☐

33. Do you consider that the style of assessment of a BTEC course is compatible with and could be acceptable as a sound exemption from any of the professional qualification mentioned in Ques. 5?

Name & level of Professional Examination	Compatible		Granted Exemption	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 34 a. Does your College have contact with professional bodies with the aim of gaining exemptions from part of their examinations?

Yes ☐ No ☐

- 34 b. If the answer to 34.a is YES, which professional bodies have you approached in the last three years?

<u>Related BTEC Course</u>	<u>Professional Bodies</u>	<u>Exemptions Gained</u>
(Bd 2) _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
(Bd 8) _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SKILLS AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT

- 35 Has your college prepared a skills development programme in addition to any skills mentioned in individual module "aims and objectives"?

YES	NO

- 36 Please list the full range of skills enumerated in either the skills development programme or the module aims and objectives:-

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

- 37 Please give examples of how you implement the skills listed at Ques. 36.

Skill

How Implemented

38 Please give examples of how you assess the skills listed in Ques. 36 or 37:-

Skill

Assessment Procedure or Criteria

39 a. Do full-time students require a different balance of skills development to part-time students?

Yes	No

- 39 b. If the answer to Ques 39.a is YES, what are the essential differences between the needs of full and part-time students?

SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

BTEC Teachers

1. Are you a full time or part time lecturer? Full-time 1
Part-time 2
2. Are you a servicing lecturer or are BTEC courses run by your Department? Servicing 1
Own Department 2
3. Does your teaching time table include? BTEC Bd2 only 1
BTEC Bd 8 only 2
BTEC Bd 2 and Bd 8 only 3
BTEC and other courses 4
4. Did you teach on HNC or HND courses before the introduction of BEC? Yes 1
No 2
5. If you currently teach on BTEC and other courses, what proportion of your time is devoted to BTEC courses? Less than 10% 1
10 - 25% 2
26 - 50% 3
51 - 75% 4
More than 75% 5
6. How many years have you taught on BTEC courses? 1 year 1
1 - 2 years 2
2 - 3 years 3
3 - 4 years 4
More than 4 years 5
7. If you do teach, or have taught on courses other than BTEC, what do you consider the main differences between BTEC and other courses in the following areas?

a. Teaching methods.....

.....

.....

.....

b. Learning methods.....

.....

.....

.....

c. Assessment methods.....

.....

.....

.....

d. Any other differences.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

8. Do you teach full and/or part time students? Full time only 1
Part time only 2
Both full and part time 3

9. Do you consider that staff teaching on BTEC courses should help to create the demand for such courses? Strongly agree 1
Agree 2
Disagree 3
Not my job 4

10. If you consider that it is not your job, who should have this responsibility?

11. For the BTEC courses on which you teach do employers assist in any of the following? Curriculum design 1
Course design 2
Setting assignments 3
Assessing assignments 4
Offer work experience 5
Visits to their premises 6
Lectures/talks to students 7

2. What is the average class size for lectures on BTEC courses? Less than 10 1
11 - 15 2
16 - 20 3
21 - 25 4
25 or more 5

3. What is the average number in a tutorial group on BTEC courses? Less than 5 1
5 - 7 2
8 - 10 3
11 - 15 4
More than 15 5

14. For FULL TIME students, how many hours per week would they be timetabled to attend lectures or formal classes?
Less than 10 per week 1
11 - 12 per week 2
13 - 14 per week 3
15 - 16 per week 4
More than 16 per week 5

15. For PART TIME students, how many hours per week would they be timetabled to attend lectures or formal classes?
Less than 4 per week 1
5 - 6 per week 2
7 - 8 per week 3
More than 8 per week 4

16. How many hours per week do you spend attending meetings connected with BTEC courses?
Less than 1 per week 1
1 - 2 per week 2
2 - 3 per week 3
More than 3 per week 4

17. For any of these meetings that you attend - is any time-table allowance or remission given?
Yes 1
No 2

If yes how many hours per week

18. Have you been employed in industry or commerce prior to your current period of teaching?
Yes 1
No 2

19. If you were employed in industry or commerce prior to your current period of teaching, what types of post did you hold and in what type of business?

Post held

Nature of business

.....

.....

.....

20. In order to keep up to date with employers needs, do you consider that staff on BTEC courses should have regular periods of secondment to industry and/or commerce?
Yes 1
No 2

21. Have you attended any staff development courses related to BTEC teaching, learning and assessment methods?
Yes 1
No 2

If yes:

Type of course	Sponsor or organiner of the course
.....
.....

22. Do you consider that BTEC should offer courses for staff development

Yes	1
No	2

23. If BTEC did offer a series of courses for BTEC teachers - in what areas would you be interested sufficiently enough to attend such courses?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

24. How many members of your staff room teach on the same BTEC course as yourself?

..... out of

25. Do you think it would be an advantage for BTEC teachers to be accommodated in the same staff room?

Great advantage	1
Some advantage	2
No advantage	3

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OBTAINED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES

The results obtained from the three types of questionnaires are given in the Appendix in the order of:-

- A. HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS
- B. COURSE LEADERS OR CO-ORDINATORS
- C. OTHER TUTORS

A. HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

Part I - Course Administration

1. Size of College - number of students

	<u>Up to 2000</u>	<u>2001- 3000</u>	<u>3001- 4000</u>	<u>4001- 5000</u>	<u>over 5000</u>
Full-time students	40%	10%	20%	10%	20%
Part-time students	40%	20%	10%	20%	10%

2. No. of BTEC students (all Boards)

	<u>Up to 200</u>	<u>201- 300</u>	<u>301- 400</u>	<u>401- 500</u>	<u>500- 1000</u>	<u>1001- 2000</u>	<u>over 2000</u>
Full-time students	10%	10%	10%	10%	30%	20%	10%
Part-time students	-	10%	20%	10%	30%	30%	-

3. No. of BTEC Business Studies Students

	<u>Up to 50</u>	<u>51- 100</u>	<u>101- 150</u>	<u>151- 200</u>	<u>Over 200</u>
Full-time students	-	20%	30%	20%	30%
Part-time students	20%	40%	40%	-	-

4. Over the last 3 years 1982/85 was there a rise or fall in number of enrolments on BTEC Business Studies Course?

	<u>Rise</u>	<u>Static</u>	<u>Fall</u>
Full-time students	50%	50%	-
Part-time students	30%	30%	40%

5. What was average class size?

Full-time	All classes between 21-25 students
Part-time	Varied between 15-30 students depending on choice of option modules taken

6. Reasons for rise or fall in student numbers?

Rise - 10% - offering the course on a Sandwich basis
(classed as part-time)

- 12% - offering new modules by demand for Tourism,
Health Service, Languages and Leisure Studies

Fall - only 10% responded and all suggested that the general
economic climate accounted for their shortfall in
part-time student enrolments

7. Are the courses streamed to facilitate progression towards some
further examinations?

Yes 84%
No 16%

If yes - what further examinations?

Finance/Accounting	47%
Marketing	39%
Personnel Administration	23%
Purchasing and Supply	21%
Others (unspecified)	20%
Transport Administration	12%
Recreation	12%

8.- Does your Institution offer conversion courses for?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Full-time Courses	100%	-
Part-time Courses	51%	49%

If yes - What is the duration, in weeks of your conversion
course?

	<u>3 weeks</u>	<u>4 weeks</u>	<u>4 1/2 weeks</u>
Full-time	20%	60%	20%
		<u>30 weeks</u>	<u>36 weeks</u>
Part-time (full academic year)		50%	50%

9. For your recent submission, what period of approval were you
granted?

Rejected	- None
1 intake	- None
2 intakes	- 18%
3 intakes	- 51%
4 intakes	- None
5 intakes	- 18%
5+ intakes	- None

NB Some respondents did not reply to this question.

Part 2 - Questions on Staffing

10. Are all the staff teaching on BTEC Business Studies Courses administered by one department?

Yes - 12%
No - 88%

If no - what is the approximate percentage of own staff

The answers varied from 28% to 80% and did not correlate to the total number of staff teaching on BTEC.

If no - what approximate percentage of class contact hours are serviced by other departments

Less than 30% class contacts serviced	18%
31 - 40%	11%
41 - 50%	16%
51 - 60%	21%
61 - 70%	14%
more than 70%	20%

11. As BTEC courses are taught on a "team basis" - what are the titles given to the teams and how many staff comprise the teams?

<u>Designation</u>	<u>% Respondents</u>	<u>No in Team</u>
Cross Modular Assignment Teams	85	from 3 - 6
Core Teams	71	from 3 - 22
Total Teaching Teams	18	from 18 - 46
Course Management Teams	27	from 3 - 8

12. Do servicing tutors form part of the above teams?

Yes 81%
No 19%

If yes - what modules do they teach?

Almost all module titles were cited with no one module appearing more than 4 times out of 43

13. Are any tutors employed on a part-time basis?

Yes	74%
No	26%

If yes - do they teach on core or option modules?

Core)	again - almost all modules cited with
Options)	no significant bias

Would you prefer to have full or part-time tutors on BTEC courses?

<u>Preferences</u>	<u>% of Respondents</u>
Full-time tutors	77%
Part-time tutors	23%

Reasons for preferring full-time staff (not all respondents answered)

<u>Reason given</u>	<u>% of Respondents</u>
Availability for Meetings	82%
Integration of Studies	73%
Co-ordination	61%
Team Building	43%
Pastoral Care	27%

What benefits, if any, are gained from employing part-time tutors

<u>Benefits</u>	<u>% of Respondents</u>
Recent industrial experience	73%
Helps to maintain contacts with employers	61%
Fresh ideas	41%
They create relevant assignments	30%

NB One respondent who did not prefer part-time staff gave the reason as:

"They do not appreciate the BTEC philosophy and consequently do their own thing!"

14. What is the total number of staff who teach on your BTEC courses?

Less than 30	49%
30 - 35	35%
36 - 45	14%
46 - 50	-
Over 50	2% - one respondent quoted 64

15. Are any staff time-tabled exclusively on BTEC courses?

Yes	- 14%
No	- 86%

If yes - how many staff are exclusively on BTEC courses

Of the 6 respondents	2 showed 2 staff
	2 showed 3 staff
	1 showed 3 staff
	1 showed 4 staff

A following question asking for the approximate number of class contact hours that the departmental staff have time-tabled on BTEC courses was only answered by one Head of Department. No comments or reasons were offered for leaving this question blank.

All those interviewed promised to post the information on but it was not received.

Part 3 Resources

16. Since 1978/79 (introduction of BTEC courses) has your department had to make significant changes to resource requirements as a direct result of offering BTEC courses?

Yes 100%

17. If yes - what was the nature of those changes

<u>% Respondents</u>	<u>Reason</u>
80	Time for preparation of Cross Modular Assignments
74	Secretarial support (typing, photocopying and Word Processing facilities for both staff and students)
71	Library space for Reference/Research
68	Information technology, hardware and software
61	Timetable allowances for course management and BTEC Reviews/Resubmissions
58	Textbooks for Library
52	Examination structure (due to the move away from end of year time constrained examinations)
51	Time for meetings
16	Resource Centre
8	Staff training in psychology for pastoral care

18. Have requests been made formally to the LEA for any changes brought about by BTEC?

Yes 28%
No 72%!

19. If yes - what requests were made and what response was forthcoming from the LEA
(12 respondents all interviewed)

<u>Request</u>	<u>Favourably Met</u>	<u>Unfavourably Met</u>
Accommodation - all types	8	4
Library Resources	9	3
Secretarial Support	1	11
Staff Development	4	8
Information Technology equipment	10	2
Staff Time Allowance	10	2

20. As a result of offering BTEC courses have any staff attended courses of longer than one day's duration in the last three years, including secondment to industry?

Yes 94%
No 6%

Types of courses (although 94% claimed yes there were very few details of courses attended)

21% - Coombe Lodge - various
2% - Advisory Council for FE
23% - University (unnamed)
2% - Business Schools (unnamed)
9% - Information Systems/Technology

Type of Secondment

12% - Local firms (unnamed)
4% - National firms (unnamed)

Part 4 Course Management

21. Can you please supply diagram of course management structure? - only 23 respondents from 43 completed this question.

22. Are tutors charged with pastoral care?

Yes 60%
No 40%

If yes - what is the ratio of staff to students - of the 26 that replied yes -

1 said	1 staff	:	7-10 students
1 said	1 staff	:	11-15 students
15 said	1 staff	:	16-20 students
4 said	1 staff	:	21-15 students
4 said	1 staff	:	26-30 students
1 said	1 staff	:	30+ students

23 &

24. How many formal and informal meetings are held per annum involving BTEC staff and specifically relate to BTEC courses?

No Heads of Department could answer this question with any degree of certainty. A general response was given estimating the number of man hours spent on meetings as:

27%	Don't know
5%	100- 150 hours per annum
6%	151- 250 hours per annum
12%	251- 400 hours per annum
2%	401- 500 hours per annum
2%	501- 600 hours per annum
32%	601-1000 hours per annum
6%	1001-1500 hours per annum
8%	1501-2000 hours per annum

25. Are your BTEC tutors accommodated in one staff room or scattered over the campus

All in same room	Nil
Most in same room	Nil
Same building - different rooms	66%
Separate building - same site	3%
Different sites	21%

COURSE LEADERS OR CO-ORDINATORS

Part 1 Creation and Satisfaction of Demand for BTEC courses

1. Does your college employ a Liaison Officer (or similar post) to maintain contact with employers?

Yes 35%
No 65%

2. If no - is this your responsibility or that of some other member of staff? - of 49 respondents who replied no:

39 said the job was part of their duties
2 said the job was the responsibility of year tutors
3 said the job was the responsibility of Heads of
Departments
2 said the job was the responsibility of Director of the
Institute
3 said the job was the responsibility of a member of staff
who did not teach on BTEC courses

3. How often does the person responsible meet employers?

Weekly 4%
Monthly -
Termly 8%
Annually 8%
Ad hoc 80%

4. - Have employers been asked to assist in the following, and was their response favourable or not?

	Request		Response	
	Made		Favourable	Unfavourable
	Yes	No		
Curriculum Design	57	43	100%	-
Teaching	65	35	100%	-
Assessment of Assignments	65	35	91%	9%
Use of Other Facilities	70	30	86%	14%
Visits to their premises	91	9	100%	-

In all cases the assistance given was in a helpful manner and brief details of types of assistance were:

	%
Specialist Lecturers/Guest Speakers	57
Visits to Premises (workshops)	52
Use of Market Research Data	44
Use of Computer Facilities	42
Compiling Assignments	42
Assessing Project Work	37
Visits to Premises (offices)	23
Placements for Work Experience During Course	23
Career Consultation	16
Placements at End of Course	16
Drafting Syllabuses for option modules	12
In-house Seminars	7
Examination Panel Members	5

5. Are employers required to give feedback information on their satisfaction with students as employees?

Yes 50%
No 50%

6. Are students interviewed by the teaching staff prior to joining the course?

	%
All students	25
Most	47
Few	28
None	-

7. Are the students surveyed, using questionnaires whilst on the course, regarding their attitude towards curriculum design and implementation?

Yes 43%
No 57%

In which term are they surveyed?

Year 1	1st	2nd	3rd
	7%	5%	31% (some students are surveyed more than once per year)

Part 2 Compilation of Submission for Validation

8. Are you alone responsible for compiling submissions?

Yes 16%
No 84%

If no - who gives assistance?

Course Team	80%
Co-ordinating Committee	20%

9. In the year preceding your last submission how many man-hours were spent in preparation of the documentation? (An example given in the questionnaire was - a team of 4 working 1 hour per week for 36 weeks = $4 \times 1 \times 36 = 144$ man-hours per annum)

(61% commented that the submission time was spread over more than one year). The Table given below shows the total time taken in one year.

17 stated that they did not know. The 58 who responded gave the following:-

Average No. of Students	Under 20	21-30	31-40	41-50	50+
<u>Hours Spent on last Submission</u>					
Up to 250	1	1			
251-300		1			
301-350	1				
351-400		1			
401-450	2				
451-500			1	1	
501-600	2	2	1	1	1
601-700					1
701-800	1	1	1	3	1
801-900				1	1
901-1000		1	1	1	1
1001-1200			2	1	3
1201-1400			2	1	2
1401-1600					3
1601-1800				1	3
1801-2000				2	2
2001-3000			1		1
Over 3000					1*

*This respondent quoted "5250 Honest - I submit calculations as I did not believe it at first".

10. Is the time taken part of the tutor "preparation time" or are timetable remission hours allocated for this task?

Preparation Time = 93%
Remission Given = 7%

Various comments were added to the replies to this question eg:

"No such thing as remission"

"Would be less if BTEC Guidelines were clearer"

"Made more difficult because BTEC change the rules too often"

If an allowance were given to adequately cope with submissions and consequent reviews what, in your opinion, would be a sufficient allowance for the team?

Average number of students	Under 20	21-30	31-40	41-50	50+
----------------------------	----------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Hours per team per annum

Up to 250	3	-	-	-	-
251-500	2	1	-	-	-
501-1000	2	4	3	4	4
1000-1500	-	1	2	3	12
Over 1500	-	1	4	6	6

11. Prior to your last submission did you discuss any problem areas with any of the following:

a) Moderator	100%
b) BEC Officers	73%
c) Other Colleges	53%
d) Employers	27%
e) Regional Officers	11%
e) HMI	5%
g) Professional Bodies	5%

12. What sort of assistance was requested?

a) Moderator -	Submission layout/format 37%: Evaluation and Review documents 25%: Skills dependant 75%: Course Structure 52%: Contents generally 75%:
b) BTEC -	Strategy 12%: Information Technology 23%: Submission layout/format 35%: Course Structure 25%: Course Guidelines definitions 23%:
c) Other Colleges -	Borrowing good ideas 20%: Teaching/learning skills 23%: (Un)reality of employer links 20%:
d) Employers -	Relevance of course as a whole 18%: Content of option modules 20%: Assignment building 18%:
e) Regional Officers -	Course Guidelines 11%:
f) HMI -	No answer given
g) Professional Bodies -	Exemption policy 5%:

13. Do you compile separate submissions for full and part-time courses?

Yes 20%

No 80% (20% commented that they will or are considering separate submissions next time)

14. What are the main points of difference between full and part-time courses?

72% - Attendance -	Part-time much better
57% - "Life Experience" -	Part-time students much better at interpersonal skills
52% - Mode of teaching -	Part-time students must have almost as much as full-time students in less than half the time
24% - Assignment Programmes -	must be "real" for part-time students or they lose interest
24% - Business Simulation Exercises -	same comment as above
18% - Industrial/Work Experience -	Part-time students can assimilate work ideas more readily

The above is the researchers interpretation of the majority of statements made.

15. When will you start compiling your next submission?

Years prior to submission dates

2	-	7%	
3	-	65%	
4	-	19%) all these respondents claimed that it was a continuous programme of constant change
5	-	9%	

How many man hours do you expect to spend on your next submission?

up to 300 manhours	-	8%
301-600	-	12%
601-750	-	9%
751-1000	-	15%
1001-2000	-	21%
2001-5000	-	10%
A LOT	-	2%
Don't know	-	23%

Part 3 Resources

16. Do you need more staff to successfully offer BTEC courses compared to the pre BTEC HNC/D courses?

Yes - 77%
No - 23%

17. If yes - what percentage increase is needed, assuming that the number of students were the same?

10-15% increase	-	31%
16-20%	-	8%
21-25%	-	46%
more than 25%	-	15%

18. Do you consider that BTEC courses demand new teaching skills compared to those needed for pre-BTEC HNC/D courses?

Yes - 100%
No - -

If yes - what types of new skills

%	
55	needed Assignment Building
40	Information Technology
35	Material Development
35	Group Work
27	Team Teaching
25	Use of Audio Visual Equipment
24	Interpersonal Skills
17	Transferable Skills
16	Project Management
11	Work Related Skills
10	Interpreting Statistics
10	Oral Communication

19. Do staff new to BTEC teaching arrive with the appropriate teaching skills or do they require some form of training?

Completely untrained	16%
Need considerable training	69%
Need little training	7%
Fully equipped	8%

20. Do you need more or different accommodation to successfully offer BTEC courses compared with the pre BTEC HNC/D courses?

More	Yes 55%	Different	Yes 71
	No 45%		No 29

21. If yes - what additional accommodation is needed?

80% of the respondents pointed out that although the number of classrooms required was the same, less time was spent in those classrooms and the emphasis should be in "different" accommodation eg:

69% needed	Study/seminar areas/rooms
25	Audio-visual rooms
24	Teaching rooms/staff rooms/study areas in close proximity
23	Terminal rooms for Information Technology
12	Open access work rooms
11	Resource area in library
7	Committee Rooms
4	Storage space

22. Do you need different equipment to successfully offer BTEC courses compared to the pre BTEC HNC/D courses?

Yes 73
No 27

23. If yes - what sort of equipment?

89%	Software
78 need	Printing/photocopying for staff and students
73	Hardware
43	Audio-visual equipment
36	Keyboards or terminals
32	Video library
17	Modern business equipment eg telex/fax
11	Study packs

24. Does your college use "Staff to Student Ratios (SSR's)" and/or "class contacts hours" as a basis for determining the number of staff employed on BTEC courses?

SSR's	Yes	53
	No	47

Class contact	Yes	100
	No	-

25. If yes to SSR's - is this a realistic measure?

Strongly agree	-
SSR formula needs some amendment	- 15%
SSR formula needs large amendment	- 61
Totally unsuitable for BTEC	- 24

If yes to Class contact hours - is this a realistic measure?

Agreed	25
Adequate	39
Disagree	36

26. For those who did not agree that this method was an effective measure, why do you not agree?

Does not take account of time spent in the following areas:

43%	Meetings of course teams
28%	Small groups for seminars/presentations/role play etc
26%	Submission writing
15%	Consultation with employers off campus

Other comments were offered such as: HODs must move away from the old fashioned measure of "bums-on-seats": need block timetables: judgement of Solomon is needed to solve this one: neither can adequately reflect the quality of the course.

Part 4 Links with Professional Bodies and Employers

27. Do you consider that BTEC have made known to employers the differences between HNC/D courses and BTEC courses?

Yes	16%
No	84%

28. If no - what would you like to see BTEC do to keep employers up to date?

74%	said	Explain the value of a BTEC pass vis-a-vis old HNC/D
28		Advertise as per YTS etc
24		LEA to assist BTEC
16		Direct liaison via CBI, Chamber of Commerce etc
15		Regional Officers to have a higher profile
11		Use professional associations
9		Videos and leaflets on trade stands at exhibitions
8		Use employer associations
6		National campaign
1		Any information must help

One additional comment made was "BTEC claim they have little funds for such exercises - we have considerably less".

29. Do you consider that individual colleges should take some responsibility in keeping employers informed?

Yes	81
No	19

30. If yes, how?

- 28 Departmental liaison officers to be appointed and go out to the employers
- 18 Chamber of Commerce
- 15 Open Days
- 14 Local branches of professional associations
- 12 Create consultative committees
- 6 Leaflets at enrolment time
- 6 Seminars on campus

31. Para 19 "BTEC Policies and Priorities into the 1990's" states that BTEC has earned a high degree of national credibility and acceptance by the following groups - do you agree?

	Acceptance		Credibility	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Educational Bodies	84	16	45	55
Professional Bodies	41	59	29	71
Employers	84	16	63	37
Students	93	7	90	10
Courses Advisers	91	9	90	10
Parents	93	7	93	7

32. BTEC also state that their Higher Awards are designed as stepping stones to further qualifications. Do your college BTEC courses deliberately link with other courses for professional examinations of the following bodies? (These answers are tabled together with those of Question 33)

33. Do you consider that the style of assessments is compatible with the examinations of those professional bodies?

<u>Professional Body</u>	<u>O 32</u> Links		<u>Q 33</u> Compatible	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
ICMA	39	61	61	39
CACA	36	64	61	39
CIPFA	39	61	50	50
IoB	24	76	3	97
Insurance	24	76	64	35
Building Societies	3	97	-	100
ICSA	36	64	76	24
IHSA	16	84	50	50

34. Does your college have contact with the above professional bodies with the aim of gaining exemptions from part of the examinations?

Yes 91%
No 9%

Part 5 Skills and Skill Development

35. Has your college prepared a skills development programme in addition to any skills mentioned in individual module "aims and objectives"?

Yes 83%

No 17%

36. Please list the skills enumerated in either your skills development programme on the module aims and objectives.

	%
Communication	100
Numeracy	100
Analytical	91
Problem Solving	91
Interpersonal	49
Themes	28
Receptiveness to New Ideas	24
Information Technology	14
Relational	3
Too long!	7

37. Please give examples of how you implement the teaching of skills.

	%
CMAs	100
IMAs	91
Case Studies	70
Workshops	56
Group Work	40
Simulation Exercises	35
Lectures	35
Work Experience	24
Seminars	24
Too long!	7

38. Please give examples of how you assess these skills (less than 50% of respondents answered this question).

Team assessment (IMA + CMA)	29	out of 29 responded
Use a weighting system or use numbers and convert them to a literal grade	23	out of 29 responded
Presentations (written)	21	out of 29 responded
Presentations (oral)	20	out of 29 responded
Clarity	12	out of 29 responded
Style	4	out of 29 responded
"The mailable copy"	3	out of 29 responded

39. Do full-time students require a different balance of skills development to part-time students?

Yes 87%

No 13%

If yes - what are the essential differences between the needs of full and part-time students?

<u>Full-time students need</u>		<u>Part-time students need</u>	
	%		%
Computers	83		
Work Simulation	63		
Interviewing/Interviewed	22	Study Skills	13
Interpersonal Skills	16	Knowledge	83

OTHERS, INCLUDING SERVICING TUTORS

1. Are you a full-time or part-time tutor?

Full 94%
Part 6%

2. Are you employed by a Faculty or School other than that which offers the BTEC course?

Own Faculty/School 57%
Outside 43%

3. Do you teach on courses other than BTEC Business Studies?

BTEC only 15%
BTEC and Others 85%

4. Did you teach on the HNC/D courses prior to BTEC?

Yes 15%
No 85%

5. If you do not teach full-time on BTEC courses, what percentage of your teaching timetable is spent on BTEC?

Less than 10% 11 - 15% 26 - 50% 51 - 75% 75% or more

% of re-
spondents
not fully
time-
tabled on
BTEC

9% 11% 9% 55% 15%.

6. How many years have you taught on BTEC?

	%
Less than one year	6
1 - 2 years	-
2 - 3 years	10
3 - 4 years	6
4 or more years	78

7. If you do teach or have taught on other than BTEC courses, what are the main differences in the following:

a) <u>Teaching Methods</u>	<u>% of respondents</u>
Less time for my subject	80
More directed learning and research	55
More case studies	55

b)	<u>Learning Methods</u>	<u>% of respondents</u>
	Learning by doing	20
	Learning by making mistakes	55

c)	<u>Assessment Methods</u>	<u>% of respondents</u>
	ABC grades rather than percentages	80
	More difficult as they are subjective	55
	Criteria referencing	42
	Can be more open to inadvertant favouritsim	20

d)	<u>Others</u>	<u>% of respondents</u>
	More skills development	70

8. Do you teach full-time, part-time or both full and part-time students?

a)	Full-time students only	21%
b)	Part-time students only	11%
c)	Both full and part-time students	68%

9. Do you consider that college staff, including yourself, should help to create the demand for BTEC courses?

Strongly agree	33%
Agree	47%
Disagree	4%
Not my job	16%

10. If you consider that it is not your job, who should have this responsibility? (11 respondents)

Head of Department	7
Course Supervisor	3
College Liaison Officer	1

11. For the BTEC courses on which you teach do employers assist you in any of the following?

	<u>% of respondents who received assistance</u>
Curriculum Design	20%
Course Design	15%
Setting Assignments	35%
Assessing Assignments	25%
Other Work Experience	55%
Visits their Premises	80%
Lectures and Talks to Students on campus	80%

12. What is the average class size for lectures on BTEC courses?

	%
Less than 10 students	5
11 - 15 students	10
16 - 20 students	42
21 - 25 students	6
26 or more students	37

13. What is the average number in tutorial groups?

	%
Less than 5 students	10
5 - 7 students	25
8 - 10 students	20
11 - 15 students	30
15 or more students	15

14. For full-time students, how many hours per week are they timetabled to attend lectures or formal classes?

	%
Less than 10 hours per week	-
11 - 12 hours per week	5
13 - 14 hours per week	31
15 - 16 hours per week	11
17 or more hours per week	53

15. For part-time students, how many hours per week, are they timetabled to attend lectures or formal classes?

	%
Less than 4 hours per week	6
5 - 6 hours per week	58
7 - 8 hours per week	36
8 or more hours per week	-

16. How many hours per week do you spend attending BTEC meetings?

	%
Less than one hour per week	5
between 1 - 2 hours per week	57
between 2 - 3 hours per week	38
more than 3 hours per week	-

17. For the meetings you attend, are any timetable allowances or remission given?

Yes 12%
No 88%

18. Full-time Tutors only - have you been employed in industry prior to your current period of teaching?

Never	11%
Prior to 1970	3%
Between 1970-75	44%
Between 1975-80	28%
Since 1980	14%

19. Do you consider that staff on BTEC courses should have regular periods of secondment to industry?

Yes 79%
No 21%

20. Have you attended any staff development courses related to BTEC teaching/learning in the last 5 years?

Yes 53%
No 47%

21. Do you consider that BTEC should offer courses for staff development?

Yes 79%
No 21%

22. If BTEC did offer such courses in what areas would you be interested sufficiently enough to attend?

75%	Skills assessment
75%	Assignment design
73%	Case study preparation
60%	Assessment methods
52%	Skill development
42%	Team teaching
40%	Curriculum development
32%	Non-standard examination setting/assessing
25%	Information technology
21%	In house staff/team development
21%	BTEC - updating of their own literature
14%	Workshops
12%	Integration of Finance with other modules
8%	Application of business expertise to teaching materials/methods

23. How many members of your staff room currently teach on BTEC courses, as a percentage of total occupants?

<u>% Staff on BTEC</u>	
less than 10%	16%
10 - 30%	16%
31 - 50%	12%
51 - 70%	23%
71 - 100%	33%

24. Do you consider that there is any advantage to be gained from BTEC tutors being accommodated in the same staff room?

Great advantage	11%
Some advantage	69%
No advantage	20%

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ATTI	Association of Teacher in Technical Institutes (now NATFHE)
BACIE	British Association for Commercial and Industrial Education
BEC	Business Education Council
BEC BOARDS	B1 Business Studies B2 Financial Sector Studies B3 Distribution Studies B4 Public Administration and Public Sector Studies
BETA	Business Education Teachers' Association
BTEC	Business and Technician Educational Council
CBI	Confederation of British Industries
CMA	Cross-modular assignment
CNAA	Council for National Academic Awards
COS	Certificate in Office Studies
DES	Department of Education and Science
FEU	Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectorate
HNC	Higher National Certificate
HND	Higher National Diploma
ITB	Industrial Training Board
MSC	Manpower Services Commission
NAB	National Advisory Board (for Public Sector Higher Education)
NACEIC	National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce
NATFHE	National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education
ONC	Ordinary National Certificate
OND	Ordinary National Diploma
PEP	Political and Economic Planning
RAC	Regional Advisory Council
REB	Regional Examination Board
RSA	Royal Society of Arts
TEC	Technician Education Council

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold Report, Report of the Working Party on Management Studies, Ministry of Education, 1960

Becher, T & Maclure, S, The Politics of Curriculum Change, Hutchinson, 1978

Bennis, Benne, Chin and Corey, The Planning of Change, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976

Cantor, LM and Roberts, IF, Further Education in England and Wales, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972

Cantor, LM and Roberts, IF, Further Education Today: A Critical Review, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979

Craven B and Franklin B, 'Moderation in All Things', Business Education, Spring 1982

Coombe Lodge Report, Education for Business, Vol. 2, No.14, 1969

Coombe Lodge Report, Business Education in the Polytechnics, Vol.6, No.19, 1974

Coombe Lodge Report, Business Education Council, Vol.9, No.7, 1976

Coombe Lodge Report, BEC: The Way Ahead, Vol.14, No.10, 1981

Cotgrove, S, Technical Education and Social Change, Allen and Unwin, 1958

Cowen, M, Coombe Lodge Information Bank, Paper 1714, 1982

Crick Report, Report of the Advisory Sub-committee on a Higher Award in Business Studies, NACEIC, HMSO, 1984

Daniel, WW, Business Education at 18+, a survey of HND Business Studies, PEP Broadsheet 524, February 1971

Daniel, WW and Pugh, H, Sandwich Courses in Higher Education, a Report on CNAA Degrees in Business Studies, PEP Broadsheet 557, September 1975

Fowler, G, 'DES, Ministers and the Curriculum', in Bell, R, et al, eds, Curriculum Innovation, Croom Helm, 1972

Fowler, G, 'The Validation Game', Education & Training, February 1978.

Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit, Loud and Clear?, Project Report No.3, FEU, 1980

Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit, Curriculum Change: AN evaluation of TEC programmes in colleges, FEU, 1981

Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit, Curriculum Control, Project Report 8, Vol.1, FEU, 1981

Haslegrave Report, Report of the Committee on Technician Courses and Examinations, NACEIC, Department of Education and Science, HMSO, 1969

Havelock, RG, Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilisation of Knowledge, Ann Arbor: Centre for Utilisation of Scientific Knowledge for Social Research, 1975

Heathcote, G et al 'Aims, Objectives and Goals' NATFHE Journal, June-July 1980

Holmes, PW, 'The Business Educational Council', Coombe Lodge Report, Vol.9, 1976

House, ER, The Politics of Educational Innovation, McCutchan, 1974

House, ER, Evaluating with Validity, Sage, 1980

Kitley, A, et al 'The Assessment of Management Skills', BTEC 1987

MacDonald, B and Walker, R, Changing the Curriculum, Open Books, 1976

McFarlane Report, Education for 16-19 Year Olds, Department of Education and Science, 1981

McMeeking Report, Report of Advisory Committee on Further Education for Commerce, HMSO, 1959

Midgley, K, 'A Moderating Influence' THES 4.9.1981

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Handbook on Curriculum Development, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 1975

Pearce, J, 'The Death of Essay-English Under BEC', Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol.2, No.1, Spring, 1978, pp.3-9

Percy Report, Higher Technological Education, Report of the Committee, Ministry of Education, 1945

Price, TK, The Curriculum Process- with Special Reference to Business Studies', The Vocational Aspects of Education, (Autumn 1972)

Pring, R, Knowledge and Schooling, Open Books, 1976

Roberts, I and Manning, A, 'Research Report: Business Studies in Scotland', Further Education, 1970

Richards, C, ed, Power and the Curriculum, Nafferton Books, 1978

Robbins Report, Higher Education, Report of the Committee on Higher Education, Cmd.2154, HMSO, 1963

Salter, B and Tapper T, Education, Politics and the State: The theory and practice of educational change, Grant McIntyre, 1981

Schon, DA, Beyond the Stable State: Public and Private Learning in a Changing Society, Penguin, 1971

Schwab, JJ, 'Structure of the Discipline: Meanings and Significances', in Golby, M, Greenwald, J, and West, R, eds, Curriculum Design, Croom Helm, 1975

Seglow, P and Thomas, M, Pre-Experience Business Education and the EEC, PEP Broadsheet 545, July 1974

Stenhouse, L, An Introduction to Curriculum Research, Heinemann, 1975

Tyler, RW, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Chicago Press, 1950

Venables, PFR, Technical Education, Bell, 1956

Welsh Office, Commercial and Business Studies in the Schools and Colleges of Wales, HMI Wales, Educational Survey, HMSO, 1979